

Studies in John Malalas

# Byzantina Australiensia

## *Editorial Board*

Ken Parry (*Macquarie University*)  
Amelia Brown (*University of Queensland*)  
Meaghan McEvoy (*Macquarie University*)  
Eva Anagnostou-Laoutides (*Monash University*)  
Danijel Dzino (*Macquarie University*)  
Wendy Mayer (*Australian Lutheran College | University of Divinity*)  
Roger Scott (*University of Melbourne*)

VOLUME 6

The titles published in this series are listed at [brill.com/byza](http://brill.com/byza)

# Studies in John Malalas

*Edited by*

Elizabeth Jeffreys

*with*

Brian Croke

Roger Scott



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

This paperback was originally published as Volume 6 in the series *Byzantina Australiensia*, Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, Department of Modern Greek, University of Sydney NSW, 2006, Australia.

Cover illustration: Fol 98v of Cod. Laur. Plut. IX.28, containing the Christian Topography of Cosmas Indicopleustes, is reproduced on the cover with the kind permission of the Biblioteca Laurenziana, Florence.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017939522

ISSN 0725-3079

ISBN 978-09-59-36265-7 (paperback, 2017)

ISBN 978-90-04-34462-4 (e-book, 2017)

ISBN 0 9593626 5 7 (paperback, 1990)

Copyright 2017 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.



Εἰ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀντιπόδων ἐπεξεργαστικώτερον θελήσειέ τις ζητῆσαι,  
ῥαδίως τοὺς γράῳδεις μύθους αὐτῶν ἀνακαλύψει.

Cosmas Indicopleustes, I,20.

∴



# CONTENTS

|                                                  |                                       |     |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|
| List of contributors                             |                                       | vi  |
| Acknowledgements                                 |                                       | vii |
| Preface                                          |                                       | ix  |
| Abbreviations                                    |                                       | xi  |
| 1 Malalas, the man and his work                  | <i>Brian Croke</i>                    | 1   |
| 2 Byzantine chronicle writing                    |                                       |     |
| 1: The early development of Byzantine chronicles | <i>Brian Croke</i>                    | 27  |
| 2: The Byzantine chronicle after Malalas         | <i>Roger Scott</i>                    | 38  |
| 3 Malalas' world view                            | <i>Elizabeth Jeffreys</i>             | 55  |
| 4 Malalas and his contemporaries                 | <i>Roger Scott</i>                    | 67  |
| 5 A record of public buildings and monuments     | <i>Ann Moffatt</i>                    | 87  |
| 6 Chronological structures in the chronicle      | <i>Elizabeth Jeffreys</i>             | 111 |
| 7 Malalas' sources                               | <i>Elizabeth Jeffreys</i>             | 167 |
| 8 Language of Malalas                            |                                       |     |
| 1: General survey                                | <i>Alan James</i>                     | 217 |
| 2: Formulaic phraseology                         | <i>Michael Jeffreys</i>               | 225 |
| 3: Portraits                                     | <i>Elizabeth and Michael Jeffreys</i> | 231 |
| 9 The transmission of Malalas' chronicle         |                                       |     |
| 1: Malalas in Greek                              | <i>Elizabeth Jeffreys</i>             | 245 |
| Appendix: A lacuna in Theophanes' Malalas?       | <i>Michael Jeffreys</i>               | 268 |
| 2: Malalas in Slavonic                           | <i>Simon Franklin</i>                 | 276 |
| 3: Malalas in Latin                              | <i>Jane Stevenson</i>                 | 287 |
| 4: Malalas in Syriac                             | <i>Witold Witakowski</i>              | 299 |
| 5: Transmission of Malalas                       |                                       | 311 |
| 10 The development of a critical text            | <i>Brian Croke</i>                    | 313 |
| 11 Modern study of Malalas                       | <i>Brian Croke</i>                    | 325 |
| 12 Conclusion                                    |                                       | 339 |
| Passages cited from Malalas                      |                                       | 341 |
| Index                                            |                                       | 349 |

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

**Brian Croke** is Assistant Director, Catholic Education Commission, Sydney and an honorary research associate of the Departments of History in both the University of Sydney and Macquarie University.

**Simon Franklin** is a lecturer in Slavonic Studies, University of Cambridge and Fellow of Clare College.

**Alan James** is a senior lecturer in the Department of Greek, University of Sydney.

**Elizabeth Jeffreys** is an honorary research associate of the Department of Modern Greek, University of Sydney.

**Michael Jeffreys** is the Sir Nicholas Laurantus Professor of Modern Greek, University of Sydney.

**Ann Moffatt** is a senior lecturer in the Department of Art History, Australian National University.

**Roger Scott** is Reader in Classical Studies in the Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies, University of Melbourne.

**Jane Stevenson** is a lecturer in medieval European history in the Department of History, University of Sheffield.

**Witold Witakowski** is a researcher attached to the Institute of African and Asian Languages, Uppsala University, Sweden.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We must express first, and above all, our gratitude to the Australian Research Council for continued support in 1987, 1988 and 1989. Its grants have enabled work to be undertaken both for this volume and for our planned commentary on Malalas through the provision of a part-time salary over three years for the editor and for a travel grant which enabled the Australian-based members of the team to meet and discuss our work in 1988. We must also thank the Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies of the University of Melbourne for providing funds to meet the shortfall in the salary component over these three years.

We must express also especial gratitude to the Department of Modern Greek in the University of Sydney for allowing those participating in this project access to computers, photocopiers and a laser printer, which has enabled the composition and production of the text to proceed relatively painlessly.

We would also like to thank a number of individuals who have offered advice, criticism and information, especially Stephen Reinert, Lennart Ryden, Michael Whitby, and Agamemnon Tselikas and Maria Politi-Sakellariadi of the Cultural Foundation of the National Bank of Greece. Thanks are due too to Graeme Clarke, Deputy Director of the Humanities Research Centre of the Australian National University at Canberra, for the opportunity afforded several contributors to this volume to air some speculative views during a conference on 'Reading the Past' held in Canberra in May 1988.



# PREFACE

In practical terms this volume is a prolegomenon to the translation of Malalas' chronicle published in 1986, as well as to the commentaries that are being prepared. It was originally intended to include all that could be said about Malalas and his chronicle in the introduction to the translation. However, as our work progressed it became obvious that a separate volume would be required in order to treat properly all the many facets of the chronicle which demanded discussion, and to include the valuable material collected up during our attempts to understand the chronicle's structures. This has meant that some sections of this volume are intended primarily for reference purposes (chapter 6 on chronology, chapter 7 on sources, parts of chapter 8 on language, and chapter 9 on the transmission of the text) while other sections (chapters 1–5 on the author and his background, and chapters 10 and 11 on the editing and study of the chronicle) are more expository.

The chronicle of John Malalas was taken seriously in the sixth century when it first appeared, and it subsequently had a profound impact on the tradition of chronographical writing in Greek, Syriac and Slavonic. Yet in modern times it has been treated as a shallow and ridiculous work. This paradox suggests a failure to understand the significance and usefulness that it had for the Byzantine world.

'We are continually pestered with letters from forrain parts to set it forth out of a conceit that rare things ly hid therein', wrote Humphrey Prideaux when engaged in 1674 to complete the first edition of the chronicle, 'wereas more than halfe the book is stuffed with ridiculous lys and although there be something of good use contained therein, yet they are not of such number or value as to make any recompense for the rest of his booke which is intolerable' (Thompson, 1875, 16). For a man of classical taste like Prideaux the chronicle of Malalas was a contemptible work. A century later even Edward Gibbon, who was familiar with the full range of classical and Byzantine literature, found himself ambivalent. On the one hand the chronicle provided a valuable source of information for the historian of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, on the other 'the authority of that ignorant Greek is very slight' (Gibbon in Bury, 1897c, 338, note 72). Gibbon's judgement has been passed on uncritically ever since. Bury considered that the chronicle was not designed for the educated 'but written down to the level of the masses. There is no sense of proportion, the fall of an empire and the juggling of a mountebank are related with the same seriousness ... all manner of trivial gossip is introduced ... the blunders are appalling' (Bury, 1898, 519).

Bury's assessment has been frequently repeated in similar wording. The chronicle is written by a monk (Mavrogordato, 1948, 234; Barker, 1966, 296) for the uneducated masses.<sup>1</sup> It has no sense of proportion<sup>2</sup> which means that it presents an uncomfortable

<sup>1</sup>Bury, 1923, 435; Baynes, 1925, 35; Stein, 1949, 705; Vasiliev, 1952, 183; Moravcsik 1958, 330; Jones, 1964, 721 and 1010; Dölger, 1967, 234; Hunger, 1978, I, 325; Grant, 1980, 272.

<sup>2</sup>Bury, 1923, 435; Vasiliev, 1952, 183; Dölger, 1967, 234.

mixture of the trivial and serious<sup>3</sup> so that it can even be labelled 'childish'.<sup>4</sup> When the chronicle has actually been appreciated, it has been as the earliest specimen of popular Greek<sup>5</sup> or as a mine of reliable facts for the history of the late fifth and sixth centuries.<sup>6</sup>

This mainly negative judgement is founded on a perception of a sharp dichotomy between history and chronicle: history is written in a high style by well-educated scholars concerned to describe for the literate aristocracy important political and military developments of the recent past in a serious and rational way; a chronicle is written in a low style by ill-educated hacks (usually monks) concerned to provide entertainment for the naive masses by collecting together all sorts of trivial and irrational tales in the context of world history. However, recent research in Byzantine literature and history has begun to suggest that this traditional dichotomy is misconceived in that it masks the complexity of the social and literary context of both historians and chroniclers. It is now becoming clearer that scope, style and content are not necessarily a reliable indication of different audiences or different kinds of authors; rather, histories and chronicles are different expressions of the same Byzantine mentality (Beck, 1965). The view of world history contained in the chronicles was shared by the educated and uneducated alike (Mango, 1980) and on closer inspection the rigidity of distinction between genres begins to dissolve (Cameron [A.M.], 1985).

This volume consolidates and extends the results of this recent research by providing a clearer understanding and appreciation of the common intellectual and political background shared by chroniclers such as Malalas and historians such as Prokopios. Indeed this volume arguably represents the first in-depth study of a Byzantine chronicle, that is to say, it is one which treats the chronicle as a unified whole and explores as many facets as possible of its contemporary and historiographical context. Equally, however, this volume does not present a definitive answer to the identified problems, even if the problems may now be posed in different ways; rather, it is intended to sum up the present state of research, indicate some directions for future progress and to provide material on which such progress may be more reliably made in the future. Furthermore, while the editors have encouraged the members of the group working on Malalas to reconcile discordant views through ongoing discussion and research, it is inevitable that a topic which has generated so much controversy in the past should defy unanimity in the present; the editors are in fact amazed that the degree of consensus demonstrated in this volume should have been reached. Readers are nevertheless warned that divergent views will be found in the studies presented here: it is hoped that all these have been flagged and cross-referenced. Collectively these studies demonstrate the complexity of construction involved in a Byzantine chronicle, they explain the importance in the Byzantine world of correctly calculating and interpreting the chronology of world history and they attempt to explain why Malalas came to hold the place he did in the Byzantine historiographical tradition.

<sup>3</sup>Mavrogordato, 1948, 234; Moravcsik, 1958, 330; Dölger, 1967, 234; Barker, 1966, 296.

<sup>4</sup>Jones, 1964, 267; Momigliano, 1970, 641; cf. Hunger, 1978, I, 321-4.

<sup>5</sup>Mavrogordato, 1948, 234; Stein, 1949, 703; Vasiliev, 1952, 184; Momigliano, 1970, 641; Hunger, 1978, I, 323-4.

<sup>6</sup>Jones, 1964, 267; Momigliano, 1970, 641; Kazhdan, 1976, 530.



# ABBREVIATIONS

- A: Parisinus Graecus 1336, ff. 143-151 (Ἐκλογή τῶν χρονικῶν; Cramer, 1839, 231-242).
- Abbeloos/Lamy, 1872-7: F.B. Abbeloos and T.J. Lamy, *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, Louvain.
- Abrahamse, 1982: D. de F. Abrahamse, Magic and sorcery in the hagiography of the middle Byzantine period, *Byzantinische Forschungen* 8, 3-17.
- Abramovich, 1928: D.I. Abramovich, Otryvok khroniki Ioanna Malaly v Zlatostrue XII v, *Sbornik statey v chest' A.I. Sobolevskogo*, Leningrad, 19-24.
- Adler, 1989: W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: archaic history and its sources in Christian chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*, Washington, D.C.
- Agathias: R. Keydell, ed., *Agathiae Myrinaei Historiarum libri quinque*, Berlin, 1967.
- AJA: *American Journal of Archaeology*.
- Alexander, 1967: P.J. Alexander, *The Oracle of Baalbek: the Tiburtine Sibyl in Greek dress*, Washington, D.C.
- Allen, 1908: T.W. Allen, ed., *Homeri Opera*, 4 vols., Oxford.
- Allen, 1981: P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus, the church historian*, Louvain.
- Allen/Datema, 1987: P. Allen and C. Datema, *Leontii Presbyteri Constantinopolitani Homiliae*, Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 17, Turnhout/Leuven.
- Allen, 1988: P. Allen, An early epitomator of Josephus: Eustathius of Epiphaneia, *BZ* 81, 1-11.
- Anderson, 1977: W.S. Anderson, ed., *P. Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoses*, Leipzig.
- Anderson, 1982: J.C. Anderson, The Seraglio Octateuch and the Kokkinobaphos Master, *DOP* 36, 83-114.
- Anon. Mal.: Oxford, Baroccianus 194 (= Bo 1-22).
- AP: *Anthologia Palatina*; W.R. Paton, *The Greek Anthology*, 5 vols., Cambridge, Mass., 1916-18.
- Arndt/Krusch, 1884: W. Arndt and B. Krusch, edd., *Gregorii Episcopi Turonensis Opera*, MGH, *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* 1, Hanover.
- B: Parisinus Graecus 1630, ff. 236-9 (FHG IV, 540-49).
- Ba: Oxford, Baroccianus Graecus 182.
- Bagnall/Cameron/Schwartz/Worp, 1987: R. Bagnall, A.D.E. Cameron, S. Schwartz and K. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta.
- Baldwin, 1981: B. Baldwin, The date of a circus dialogue, *REB* 39, 301-6.
- Baldwin, 1981a: B. Baldwin, Physical descriptions of Byzantine emperors, *Byzantion* 51, 8-21.
- Baldwin, 1987: B. Baldwin, Dio Cassius and John Malalas: two ancient readings of Virgil, *Emerita* 55, 85-6.
- Balty, 1984: J. Balty, Les mosaïques de Syrie au V siècle et leur répertoire, *Byzantion* 54, 437-68.

- Bandy, 1983: A. Bandy, ed. and trans., *Ioannes Lydus, On Powers, or The Magistrates of the Roman State*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 149, Philadelphia.
- Barker, 1966: J.W. Barker, *Justinian and the Later Roman Empire*, Madison.
- Barnes, 1982: T.D. Barnes, *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Barzos, 1984: K. Barzos, 'Η γενεαλογία τῶν Κομνηνῶν, 2 vols, Thessalonike.
- Bauer, 1905: A. Bauer, *Die Chronik des Hippolytus in Matritensis Graecus 121*, Leipzig (Texte und Untersuchungen 14).
- Baynes, 1925: N.H. Baynes, *The Byzantine Empire*, London.
- Beaucamp *et al.*, 1979: J. Beaucamp, R. Bondoux, J. Lefort, M.Fr. Rouan, I. Sorlin, Temps et Histoire I: Le prologue de la Chronique Pascale, *TM* 7, 229-301.
- Beck, 1965: H.-G. Beck, Zur byzantinischen 'Mönchschronik', *Speculum Historiale*, Freiburg, 188-97.
- Beck, 1986: H.-G. Beck, *Byzantisches Erotikon*, 2nd ed., Munich.
- Berger, 1988: Albrecht Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos*, Poikila Byzantina 8, Bonn.
- BG: J.A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, 12 vols., 4th ed., Hamburg, 1790-1809.
- Bickerman, 1980: E.J. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World*, London, revised edition.
- Bidez, 1902: J. Bidez, Sur diverses citations et notamment sur trois passages de Malalas retrouvés dans un texte hagiographique, *BZ* 11, 388-94.
- Bikerman, 1951: E. Bikerman, Les Maccabées de Malalas, *Byzantion* 21, 63-83.
- Bischoff, 1966: B. Bischoff, Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter, *Mittelalterliche Studien. Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, 3 vols, Stuttgart, 1966-81, I, 205-73.
- Bischoff, 1966a: B. Bischoff, Theodulf und der Ire Cadac-Andreas, in Bischoff, 1966, II, 19-25.
- Blockley, 1981: R.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, Liverpool.
- Blockley, 1983: R.C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2: Text, translation and historiographical notes, Liverpool.
- Blockley, 1985: R.C. Blockley, *The History of Menander the Guardsman*, Liverpool.
- Blumenthal, 1978: H. Blumenthal, 529 and after: what happened to the Academy?, *Byzantion* 48, 369-385.
- BMGS: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*.
- Bo: *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia. Accedunt Chilmeadi Hodiique Annotationes et Ric. Bentleii Epistola ad Io. Millium*, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn, 1831.
- Borda, 1958: M. Borda, *La pittura romana*, Milan.
- Bordellès, 1985: H. Le Bordellès, *L'Aratus Latinus: Etude sur la culture et la langue latine dans le Nord de la France au vii siècle*, Lille.
- Bosworth, 1983: A.B. Bosworth, Arrian at the Caspian Gates: a study in methodology, *CQ* 33, 265-70.

- Bottari, 1964: Bottari, Iacopo Barozzi, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 6, 508-9.
- Bourier, 1899: P.H. Bourier, *Über die Quellen der ersten vierzehn Bücher des Johannes Malalas*, Augsburg.
- Bowersock, 1969: G.W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford.
- Bowersock, 1989: G.W. Bowersock, Herodotus, Alexander and Rome, *American Scholar* 58, 407-414.
- Brock, 1977: S. Brock, Greek into Syriac and Syriac into Greek, *Journal of the Syriac Academy* 3, 1-17.
- Brock, 1979/80: S. Brock, Syriac historical writing: a survey of the main sources, *Journal of the Iraqi Academy (Syriac Corporation)* 5, 1979/80, 1-30.
- Brock, 1980: S. Brock, The orthodox-oriental orthodox conversations of 532, *Apostolos Barnabas* 51, 219-228.
- Brock, 1982: S. Brock, From antagonism to assimilation: Syriac attitudes to Greek learning, in *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the formative period*, edd. N.G. Garsoian, T.F. Mathews and R.W. Thomson, Washington, D.C., 17-34.
- Brock, 1983: S. Brock, A Syriac collection of prophecies of the pagan philosophies, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 14, 203-46.
- Brooks, 1892: E.W. Brooks, The date of the historian John Malala, *EHR* 7, 291-301.
- Brooks, 1906: E.W. Brooks, The sources of Theophanes and the Syriac chroniclers, *BZ* 15, 578-587.
- Brooks, 1919: E.W. Brooks, ed. and trans., *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, CSCO, SS, ser. 3, vol. 5, Paris.
- Brooks, 1923-5: E.W. Brooks, ed. and trans., *John of Ephesus, Lives of the Eastern Saints*, PO 17.1, 18.4, 19.2; reprinted 1974-83.
- Brooks, 1935-6: E.W. Brooks, ed. and trans., *Johannis Ephesini Historiae Ecclesiasticae pars tertia*, CSCO 105, 106, SS III:3 = SS 54 T(extus), 55 V(ersio), Paris.
- Browning, 1964: R. Browning, review of Weierholt, 1963, in *CR* 14, 351-2.
- Browning, 1965: R. Browning, Notes on the 'Scriptor Incertus de Leone Armenio', *Byzantion* 35, 389-411.
- Browning, 1978: R. Browning, Literacy in the Byzantine world, *BMGS* 4, 39-54.
- Browning, 1980: R. Browning, *The Byzantine Empire*, London.
- Browning, 1983: R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek*, Cambridge.
- Budge, 1932: E.A.W. Budge, ed. and trans., *The Chronography of Gregory Abû'l Faraj 1225-1286 ... commonly known as Bar Hebraeus*, I-II, London; reprinted Amsterdam, 1976.
- Bury, 1886: J.B. Bury, A note on the emperor Olybrius, *EHR* 1, 507-9.
- Bury, 1888: J.B. Bury, review of Sotiriadis, 1888, in *CR* 2, 208-9.
- Bury, 1889: J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols., London.
- Bury, 1897: J.B. Bury, Johannes Malalas: the text of the codex Baroccianus, *BZ* 6, 219-30.
- Bury, 1897a: J.B. Bury, The Nika riot, *JHS* 17, 92-119.
- Bury, 1897b: J.B. Bury, review of Krumbacher, 1897, in *CR* 11, 209-13.

- Bury, 1897c: J.B. Bury, ed., *Edward Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. 1, London.
- Bury, 1898: J.B. Bury, ed., *Edward Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. 4, London.
- Bury, 1912: J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire from the fall of Irene to the accession of Basil I, A.D. 802-867*, London.
- Bury, 1923: J.B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire from the death of Theodosius I to the death of Justinian*, 2 vols, London; reprinted New York, 1958.
- Buschhausen, 1986: H. Buschhausen, La sala dell'Ippolito, presso la chiesa della Vergine Maria, in M. Piccirillo, ed., *I mosaici di Giordania*, Rome, 117-127.
- Büttner-Wobst, 1892: T. Büttner-Wobst, Der Tod des Kaisers Julian, *Philologus* N.F. 5, 561-580.
- Byzantine Books and Bookmen*, 1975: *Byzantine Books and Bookmen* (Dumbarton Oaks Colloquium), Washington, D.C.
- BZ: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*.
- C: Parisinus Graecus 854, ff. 71-99 ('Εκλογή ἱστοριῶν; Cramer, 1839, 166-230).
- Cameron (A.D.E.), 1965: Alan Cameron, Wandering poets: a literary movement in Byzantine Egypt, *Historia* 14, 470-509.
- Cameron (A.D.E.), 1969: Alan Cameron, The last days of the Academy at Athens, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* N.S. 15, 7-29; reprinted in *Literature and Society in the Early Byzantine World*, London, 1985, no. XIII.
- Cameron (A.D.E.), 1970: Alan Cameron, *Claudian. Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius*, Oxford.
- Cameron (A.D.E.), 1970a: Alan Cameron, *Pap. Ant.* III.115 and the iambic prologue in late Greek poetry, *CQ* 20, 119-129; reprinted in *Literature and Society in the Early Byzantine World*, London, 1985, no. II.
- Cameron (A.D.E.), 1976: Alan Cameron, *Circus Factions*, Oxford.
- Cameron (A.D.E. and A.M.), 1966: Alan and Averil Cameron, The Cycle of Agathias, *JHS* 86, 6-25.
- Cameron (A.D.E. and A.M.), 1967: Alan and Averil Cameron, Further thoughts on the Cycle of Agathias, *JHS* 87, 131.
- Cameron (A.M.), 1970: Averil Cameron, *Agathias*, Oxford.
- Cameron (A.M.), 1976: Averil Cameron, *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*, London.
- Cameron, (A.M.), 1978: Averil Cameron, The Theotokos in sixth-century Constantinople. A city finds its symbol, *JTS* N.S. 39, 79-108; reprinted in *Continuity and Change in Sixth-Century Byzantium*, London, 1981, no. XVI.
- Cameron (A.M.), 1985: Averil Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, London.
- Cameron (M.L.), 1983: M.L. Cameron, The sources of medical knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England, *Anglo-Saxon England* 11, 135-55.
- Cameron/Herrin, 1984: A. Cameron and J. Herrin, *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: the Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*, Leiden.
- Campbell, 1988: S. Campbell, *The Mosaics of Antioch*, *Subsidia Mediaevalia* 15, Toronto.

- Cantarella, 1970: R. Cantarella, Giovanni Malalas, Themis e le origini della tragedia, *Acme* 23/24, 61-66.
- Carney, 1971: T.F. Carney, *Bureaucracy in Traditional Society: Romano-Byzantine bureaucracies viewed from within*, Lawrence.
- Carpenter, 1970: M. Carpenter, trans., *Kontakia of Romanos Byzantine Melodist, I: On the Person of Christ*, Columbia.
- Carter, 1975: H. Carter, *A History of the Oxford University Press*, Oxford.
- Carter, 1984: J.M. Carter, ed., *Suetonius, Divi Augusti*, Bristol.
- Cary, 1937: E. Cary, *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, 7 vols., London, 1937-1950.
- Cavallo, 1978: G. Cavallo, La circolazione libraria nell'età Giustiniano, in *L'Imperatore Giustiniano. Storia e Mito, Giornale di Studio a Ravenna*, 14-16 October 1976, ed. G.G. Archi, 201-236.
- Cavallo/Maehler, 1987: G. Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period, A.D. 300-800*, London, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, Supplement 47.
- CCSL: *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*.
- Chabot, 1899: see MS.
- Chabot, 1924: see MS.
- Chabot, 1960: I.-B. Chabot, trans., *Chronicon ad annum Domini 846 pertinens*, CSCO vol. 4, SS tom. 4, Chronica Minora 2, Louvain.
- Chalmers, 1960: W.R. Chalmers, Eunapius, Ammianus Marcellinus and Zosimus on Julian's Persian expedition, *CQ* 10, 152-60.
- Charalambakis, 1978: C. Charalambakis, Παρατηρήσεις αναφερόμεναι εἰς τὸν σχηματισμὸν τῶν ἐπιθετῶν κατὰ τὴν περιγραφὴν προσώπων εἰς τὴν Χρονογραφίαν τοῦ Μαλάλα, *Λεξικογραφικὸν Δελτίον* 13, 21-42.
- Charanis, 1949: P. Charanis, Byzantium, the West and the origin of the first crusade, *Byzantion* 19, 17-36.
- Chatzidakis, 1938: M. Chatzidakis, Ἐκ τῶν Ἑλπίου τοῦ Ῥωμαίου, *EEBS* 14, 390-414.
- Chernousov, 1926: E. Chernousov, Etudes sur Malalas, *Byzantion* 3, 65-72.
- Chernysheva, 1982: M.I. Chernysheva, Zamechaniya o priemakh perevoda portretnoy leksiki iz *Khroniki* Ioanna Malaly, in *Istoriya russkogo yazyka. Pamyatniki XI-XVIII vv.*, ed. S.I. Kotkov, Moscow, 57-66.
- Chernysheva, 1983: M.I. Chernysheva, O sootnoshenii slavyanskogo perevoda *Khroniki* Ioanna Malaly i ee grecheskogo teksta (na materiale portretnoy leksiki), *TODL* 37, 222-8.
- Chernysheva, 1983a: M.I. Chernysheva, K kharakteristike slavyanskogo perevoda *Khroniki* Ioanna Malaly (rol' inoyazychnykh vkrapleniy), *VV* 41, 221-6.
- Christ/Schmid/Stählin, 1924: W. von Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, 6th ed, rev. W. Schmid and O. Stählin, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft VII, II, 2, Munich.
- Christ, 1982: K. Christ, *Römische Geschichte und deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft*, Munich.

- Chronicle to the year 1234: Chronicon anonymum ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens*, ed. I.-B. Chabot, I-II, CSCO 81, 82, SS III: 14, 15 = SS 36, 37 – T(extus), Paris, 1920, 1917; the Latin and French translations of parts I and II respectively: *Chronicon anonymum ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens* I, trans. I.-B. Chabot, CSCO 109, SS III: 14 = SS 56 V(ersio), Louvain, 1937; *Anonymi auctoris Chronicon ad a.d. 1234 pertinens* II, trans. A. Abouna, introd., notes et index de J.-M. Fiey, CSCO 354, SS 154, Louvain, 1974.
- Chrysos, 1966: E. Chrysos, Eine Konjektur zu Johannes Malalas, *JÖBG* 15, 147-52.
- Ciocan-Yovanescu, 1969: R. Ciocan-Yovanescu, Sur le rôle d'Antioche au point de vue économique, sociale et culturel au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle, *Byzantion* 39, 53-73.
- CIL: *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, 1863- .
- CJ: *Codex Justinianus*; P. Krüger, ed., *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. 2, Berlin, 1928; reprinted 1954.
- CMH: *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4, *The Byzantine Empire*, ed. J.M. Hussey, Cambridge, 1966.
- Colgrave/Mynors, 1969: B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors, edd., *Bede, Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, Oxford.
- Colonna, 1956: A.E. Colonna, *Gli storici bizantini dal IV al XV secolo*, Naples.
- Conybeare, 1902: F.C. Conybeare, The relation of the Paschal Chronicle to Malalas, *BZ* 11, 395-402.
- Cook, 1914: A.B. Cook, *Zeus: a study in ancient religion*, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1914-1940.
- Costanza, 1959: S. Costanza, Sull' utilizzazione di alcune citazioni teologiche nella cronografia di Giovanni Malala e in due testi agiografici, *BZ* 52, 247-52.
- Coussin, 1953: J. Coussin, Suétone physiognomiste dans les *Vies des XII Césars*, *Revue des Etudes Latines* 31, 234-256.
- Cox, 1983: P. Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley.
- Coxe, 1855: H.O. Coxe, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars prima*, Oxford; reprinted 1969.
- CP: *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn, 1832.
- CQ: *Classical Quarterly*.
- CR: *Classical Review*.
- Cramer, 1839: J.A. Cramer, ed., *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis*, vol. 2, Oxford; reprinted Hildesheim, 1967.
- Crawford, 1914/19: J.R. Crawford, De Bruma et Brumalibus festis, *BZ* 23, 365-396.
- Croke, 1981: B. Croke, Two early Byzantine earthquakes and their liturgical commemoration, *Byzantion* 51, 122-47.
- Croke, 1983: B. Croke, The origins of the Christian world chronicle, in *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*, edd. B. Croke and A. Emmett, Sydney, 116-131.
- Croke, 1983a: B. Croke, Porphyry's anti-Christian chronology, *JTS* 34, 168-184.
- Croke, 1985: B. Croke, Mommsen and Byzantium, *Philologus* 129, 274-85.
- Croke, 1990: B. Croke, City chronicles of late antiquity, in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*, edd. G.W. Clarke et al., Canberra, 165-204.

- CSCO, SS: *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri*.
- Cumont, 1935: F. Cumont, Les noms des planètes grecs et l'astrolatrie chez les grecs, *L'Antiquité Classique* 4, 5-43.
- Cumont-Bidez, 1938: F. Cumont and J. Bidez, *Les mages hellénisés*, 2 vols., Paris.
- Cutler, 1984: A. Cutler, 'Roma' and 'Constantinopolis' in Vienna, in *Byzanz und der Westen. Studien zur Kunst des europäischen Mittelalters*, ed. I. Hutter, Vienna, 43-64.
- D'yakonov, 1903: A. D'yakonov, Ioann Efesskiy i khronika izvestnaya pod imenem Dionisiya Tell'-Makhrskago, *Khristiyanskoe Chtenie* 216, 599-614, 818-35.
- D'yakonov, 1908: A. D'yakonov, *Ioann Efesskiy i ego tserkovno-istoricheskie trudy*, St Petersburg.
- Dagron, 1974: G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, Paris.
- Dagron, 1984: G. Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire. Etudes sur le recueil des 'Patria'*, Paris.
- Daniélou, 1948: J. Daniélou, La typologie millénariste de la semaine dans le christianisme primitif, *Vigiliae Christianae* 2, 1948, 1-16.
- De Boor, 1905: see *De insid.*
- De Boor, 1912: C. de Boor, Suidas und die Konstantinische Excerptensammlung I, *BZ* 21, 384-424.
- De Boor, 1914/19: C. de Boor, Suidas und die Konstantinische Excerptensammlung II, *BZ* 23, 1-127.
- De Boor/Wirth, 1978: see GM.
- De insid.*: Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Excerpta de insidiis*, in *Excerpta historica*; C. de Boor, ed., Berlin, 1905, 151-76.
- De virt.*: Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*, in *Excerpta historica*; T. Büttner-Wobst and A.G. Roos, edd., Berlin, 1906-10, 157-63.
- Degrassi, 1952: A. Degrassi, *I Fasti Consolari dell' Impero Romano*, Rome.
- Delisle, 1890: L. Delisle, Notices sur les manuscrits originaux d'Adémar de Chabannes, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques* 35, Paris, 241-357.
- Deryugin, 1975: A.A. Deryugin, Vergiliy v drevnem slavyanskom perevode Khroniki Ioanna Malaly, in *Antichnost' i Vizantiya*, ed. L.A. Freyberg, Moscow, 351-62.
- Devreesse, 1945: R. Devreesse, *Le patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Eglise jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris.
- Dewing, 1914-40: H.B. Dewing, *Procopius*, 7 vols, Cambridge, Mass. and London.
- Diller, 1955: A. Diller, The authors named Pausanias, *TAPA* 86, 269-79.
- Dindorf, 1831: L. Dindorf, ed., *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia. Accedunt Chilmeadi Hodiique Annotationes et Ric. Bentleii Epistola ad Io. Millium*, Bonn.
- Dodwell, 1682: H. Dodwell, *Dissertationes Cyprianae*, Asaph.
- Dölger, 1964: F. Dölger, Zur Bedeutungen von Philosophia, *Byzanz und die europäischen Staatenwelt*, Darmstadt, 197-208.
- Dölger, 1967: F. Dölger, Byzantine Literature, in *CMH*, vol. 4, part 2.

- Dohrn, 1960: T. Dohrn, *Die Tyche von Antiochia*, Berlin.
- DOP: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.
- Dostál, 1963: A. Dostál, K slovanským verzím byzantských kronik, *Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philologica Slavica Pragensia* 4, 663-70.
- Downey, 1935: G. Downey, References to inscriptions in the Chronicle of Malalas, *TAPA* 66, 55-72.
- Downey, 1938: G. Downey, Seleucid Chronology in Malalas, *AJA* 42, 106-120.
- Downey, 1938a: G. Downey, Imperial building records in Malalas, *BZ* 38, 1938, 1-15, 299-311.
- Downey, 1939: G. Downey, *A study of the comites Orientis and the consulares Syriae*, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton.
- Downey, 1939a: G. Downey, The Olympic Games of Antioch in the fourth century A.D., *TAPA* 70, 428-38.
- Downey, 1940/1: G. Downey, The calendar reform at Antioch in the fifth century, *Byzantion* 15, 39-48.
- Downey, 1955: G. Downey, Earthquakes at Constantinople and vicinity A.D. 342-1454, *Speculum* 30, 596-600.
- Downey, 1961: G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*, Princeton.
- Drijvers, 1984: H. Drijvers, *East of Antioch: Studies in Early Syriac Christianity*, London.
- Droysen, 1879: H. Droysen, ed., *Eutropii Breviarium cum versionibus et continuationibus*, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi 2, Berlin; reprinted 1961.
- Dubarle, 1959: A.M. Dubarle, La mention de Judith dans la littérature ancienne, juive et chrétienne, *Revue biblique* 66, 514-49.
- Dübner, 1840: A. Dübner in F.S. Lehrs, 'Ἡσιόδος ποιήματα, Leipzig.
- Duchesne, 1886: L. Duchesne, ed., *Liber Pontificalis*, 3 vols, Paris, 1886-1957.
- Dudley/Lang, 1969: D.R. Dudley and D.M. Lang (eds.), *The Penguin Companion to Literature 4: Classical and Byzantine, Oriental and African Literature*, Harmondsworth/Ringwood.
- Dummler, 1881: E. Dummler, ed., *Theodulfi Carmina*, MGH, Poetae Latini aevi Carolini 1, Berlin, 1881, 436-581.
- EccIHist: Parisinus Graecus 1555A, ff. 7r-13r ('Επιλογή ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας; Cramer, 1839, 87-114).
- EEBS: 'Επετηρίς 'Εταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν.
- EHR: *English Historical Review*.
- Ehwald, 1919: R. Ehwald, ed., *Aldhelmi Opera*, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi 15, Berlin, 1919.
- Eisenhut, 1969: W. Eisenhut, Zum neueren Diktys-Papyrus, *RhM* N.F. 112, 114-9.
- Eisenhut, 1973: W. Eisenhut, ed., *Dictys Cretensis: Bellum Troianum*, Leipzig.
- Ensslin, 1933: W. Ensslin, review of von Stauffenberg, 1931, in *Philologische Wochenschrift* 28/9, 769-89.



- Ensslin, 1949: W. Ensslin, *Zu den Kriegen des Sassaniden Schapur I*, Sitzungsberichte d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl. 147, no. 5.
- Erbse, 1941: H. Erbse, *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien*, Hamburg.
- Eusebios/Jerome, 1956: R. Helm, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, Berlin, 1956.
- Ev: J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, edd., *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius*, London, 1898; reprinted Amsterdam, 1964.
- Evans, 1901: A. J. Evans, Mycenaean tree and pillar cult and its Mediterranean relations, *JHS* 21, 99-204.
- Evans, 1935: E.C. Evans, Roman descriptions of personal appearance in history and biography, *HSCP* 46, 43-84.
- Evans, 1941: E.C. Evans, The study of physiognomy in the second century A.D., *TAPA* 72, 96-108.
- Exc. Barb.*: *Excerpta Latina Barbari*, or *Barbarus Scaligeri*, in Frick, 1893.
- Ferrari, 1957: G. Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries. Notes for the History of the Monasteries and Convents at Rome from the Vth through the Xth Century*, Vatican City.
- Festa, 1902: N. Festa, ed., *Mythographi Graeci* III.2 (Palaephati Περὶ ἀπίστων), Leipzig.
- Festugière, 1978: A.-J. Festugière, Notabilia dans Malalas I, *Revue de Philologie* 52, 221-241.
- Festugière, 1979: A.-J. Festugière, Notabilia dans Malalas II, *Revue de Philologie* 53, 227-237.
- FGrH: F. Jacoby, ed., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin, 1923-.
- FHG: C. Müller, ed., *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*, 5 vols., Paris, 1848-84.
- Field, 1875: F. Field, *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt*, Oxford.
- Fiey, 1984/5: J.-M. Fiey, Les chroniqueurs syriaques avaient-ils le sens critique?, *Parole de l'Orient* 12, 253-64.
- Finsterwalder, 1929: P.W. Finsterwalder, ed., *Die Canones Theodori Cantuariensis und ihre Überlieferungsformen*, Weimar.
- Fishman-Duker, 1977: R. Fishman-Duker, The Second Temple period in Byzantine chronicles, *Byzantion* 47, 126-56.
- Fitton, 1974: J. Fitton, Domitian and St John in Malalas, *Byzantion* 44, 193-4.
- Fleschenberg, 1908: O. Schissel von Fleschenberg, *Dares-Studien*, Halle.
- Fleschenberg, 1909: O. Schissel von Fleschenberg, Die psycho-ethische Charakteristik in den Porträts der Chronographie des Joannes Malalas, *Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte* 9, 428-433.
- Fontaine/Pietri, 1985: J. Fontaine and C. Pietri, edd., *Le monde antique et la Bible*, Paris.
- Förster, 1893: R. Förster, *Scriptores Physiognomici Graeci et Latini*, 2 vols., Leipzig.
- Fourrier, 1960: A. Fourrier, *Le courant réaliste dans le roman courtois en France au moyen âge*, Paris.
- Fowden, 1986: G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: a historical approach to the late pagan mind*, Cambridge.

- Fränkel, 1961: H. Fränkel, ed., *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*, Oxford.
- Franklin, 1982: S. Franklin, Some apocryphal sources of Kievan Russian historiography, *Oxford Slavonic Papers* NS 15, 1-27.
- Franklin, 1983: The empire of the *Rhomaioi* as viewed from Kievan Russia: aspects of Byzantino-Russian cultural relations, *Byzantion* 53, 507-37.
- Franklin, 1987: S. Franklin, An obscure sentence in the Slavonic translation of the Chronicle of John Malalas, *Byzantinoslavica* 47, 189-95.
- Freund, 1972: W.H.C. Freund, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, Cambridge.
- Freudo, 1975: J.D. Freudo, trans., *Agathias, The Histories*, Berlin.
- Freund, 1882: A. Freund, *Beiträge zur antiochenischen und konstantinopolitanischen Stadtchronik*, Jena.
- Frick, 1893: C. Frick, ed., *Chronica Minora*, Leipzig.
- Fürst, 1901: J. Fürst, Untersuchungen zur Ephemeris des Diktys von Kreta, *Philologus* 60, 229-260, 330-359.
- Fürst, 1902: J. Fürst, Untersuchungen zur Ephemeris des Diktys von Kreta, *Philologus* 61, 592-622.
- Gagé, 1953: J. Gagé, Les Perses à Antioche et les courses de l'hippodrome au milieu du IIIe siècle, à propos du 'transfuge' syrien Mariades, *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strassbourg* 31, 301-24.
- Geanakoplos, 1962: D.J. Geanakoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Gedeon, 1877: M.J. Gedeon, Πατριαρχικὸν Χρονικόν, Παρνασσός 6 (text 3-52; notes by A.P. Petrides, 253-8).
- Gelzer, 1885: H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, 2 vols., Leipzig; reprinted in one volume, New York, c. 1970..
- Gelzer, 1892: H. Gelzer, review of Patzig, 1890/1, in *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*, 141 ff.
- Gelzer, 1894: H. Gelzer, Zu Africanus und Johannes Malalas, *BZ* 3, 394-5.
- Geyer, 1965: P. Geyer et al., ed., *Itineraria et alia geographica*, CCSL 175, Turnhout, 1965.
- Gignac, 1977: F.T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. 1: *Phonology*, Milan.
- Gignac, 1981: F.T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. 2: *Morphology*, Milan.
- Gleye, 1893: C.E. Gleye, review of E. Patzig, 1890/1, in *BZ* 2, 148-61.
- Gleye, 1894: C.E. Gleye, Zum slavischen Malalas, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 16, 578-91.
- Gleye, 1894a: C.E. Gleye, review of Shestakov, 1890, in *BZ* 3, 625-30.
- Gleye, 1896: C.E. Gleye, Beiträge zur Johannesfrage, *BZ* 5, 422-64.
- Gleye, 1899: C.E. Gleye, review of Istrin, 1897, in *BZ* 8, 499-508.
- Gleye, 1913: C.E. Gleye, Die grusinische Malalasübersetzung, *BZ* 22, 63-4.
- GM: George Monachos, *Chronicon*; C. de Boor, ed., Leipzig, 1904 (2nd ed., P. Wirth, Stuttgart, 1978).
- Goffart, 1988: W. Goffart, *The Narrators of Barbarian History*, Princeton.

- Grabar, 1966: A. Grabar, *Byzantium from the Death of Theodosius to the Rise of Islam*, trans. S. Gilbert and J. Emmons, London.
- Grant, 1950: R.M. Grant, The problem of Theophilus, *Harvard Theological Review* 43, 179-96 (reprinted in *Christian Beginnings: Apocalypse to History*, London, 1983, no. XX).
- Grant, 1970: R.M. Grant, *Theophilus of Antioch, Ad Autolycum*, Oxford.
- Grant, 1980: M. Grant, *Greek and Latin Authors 800 B.C. - A.D. 1000*, New York.
- GRBS: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*.
- GrChron: see Whitby, 1982/3.
- Greer, 1961: R. A. Greer, *Theodore of Mopsuestia, Exegete and Theologian*, London.
- Grégoire, 1936: H. Grégoire, Du nouveau sur la chronographie byzantine; le 'Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio' est le dernier continuateur de Malalas, *Académie royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques*, 5e série, XXII, 10-12, 420-436.
- Grégoire, 1936a: H. Grégoire, Un nouveau fragment du 'Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio', *Byzantion* 11, 417-427.
- Griffin, 1907: N.E. Griffin, *Dares and Dictys: an introduction to the study of the medieval version of the Story of Troy*, Baltimore.
- Gross, 1950: K. Gross, *Archiv*, RAC 1, 1950, 618-9, 623-4.
- Grumel, 1932: V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarcat de Constantinople*, Chalcedon.
- Grumel, 1958: V. Grumel, *La Chronologie*, Traité d'études byzantines 1, Paris.
- Gutschmid, 1894: A. von Gutschmid, Die Grenze zwischen Altertum und Mittelalter, *Die Grenzboten* 22, 1863, 330-47 = *Kleine Schriften* 5, 1894, 393-417; reprinted in P.E. Hübinger, ed., *Zur Frage der Periodengrenze zwischen Altertum und Mittelalter*, Darmstadt, 1969, 1-23.
- Haase, 1916: F. Haase, Untersuchungen zur Chronik des Pseudo-Dionysius von Tell-Mahré, *Oriens Christianus*, ser. 2.6, 65-90, 240-70.
- Hansen, 1971: G.C. Hansen, *Theodoros Anagnostes: Kirchengeschichte*, Berlin.
- Harvey, 1988: S.A. Harvey, Remembering pain: Syriac historiography and the separation of the churches, *Byzantion* 58, 295-308.
- Haupt, 1880: H. Haupt, Über die altslavische Übersetzung des Johannes Malalas, *Hermes* 15, 230-5.
- Hauray, 1900: J. Hauray, Johannes Malalas identisch mit dem Patriarchen Johannes Scholastikos?, *BZ* 9, 337-56.
- HE: *Historia Ecclesiastica*, of Eusebios, Evagrius (Ev), John of Ephesos (JE), Sozomen (Soz).
- Head, 1980: C. Head, Physical descriptions of the emperors in Byzantine historical writing, *Byzantion* 50, 226-40.
- Helms, 1971/2: P. Helms, Syntaktische Untersuchungen zu Ioannes Malalas und Georgios Sphrantzes, *Helikon* 11-12, 309-388.
- Hendy, 1985: M. F. Hendy, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy c. 300-1450*, Cambridge.

- Hes: Ἡσυχίου ἐκ τῶν εἰς τὴν Χριστοῦ γέννησιν, ed. H. Hody, 1691, reprinted in the Prolegomena to Bo, lii-liii.
- Hinck, 1873: H. Hinck, *Polemonis Declamationes*, Leipzig.
- Hody, 1691: H. Hody, Prolegomena to Chilmead's edition, Oxford, reprinted in Bo.
- Holder-Egger, 1876: O. Holder-Egger, Untersuchungen über einige annalistische Quellen zur Geschichte des fünften und sechsten Jahrhunderts, *Neues Archiv* 1, 215-368.
- Holder-Egger, 1877: O. Holder-Egger, Die Chronik des Marcellinus Comes und die oströmischen Fasten, *Neues Archiv* 2, 49-109.
- Holum, 1982: K. G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses*, Berkeley-Los Angeles.
- Holum/Hohlfelder, 1988: K.G. Holum and R.L. Hohlfelder, eds., *King Herod's Dream. Caesarea on the Sea*, New York/London.
- Honigmann, 1947: E. Honigmann, The Patriarchate of Antioch, *Traditio* 5, 135-161.
- Honigmann, 1951: E. Honigmann, *Evêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieurs au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, CSCO 127, Subsidia 2, Louvain.
- Honoré, 1971: A.M. Honoré, *Justinian's Digest: Work in progress* (Oxford University inaugural lecture).
- Honoré, 1974: A.M. Honoré, The background to Justinian's codification, *Tulane Law Review* 48, 859-893.
- Honoré, 1978: A.M. Honoré, *Tribonian*, London.
- Hörling, 1980: E. Hörling, *Mythos und Pistis; zur Deutung heidnischer Mythen in der christlichen Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas*, Lund.
- Housman, 1926: A.E. Housman, ed., *M. Annaei Lucani belli civilis libri decem*, Oxford. *HSCP: Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.
- Hude, 1908: C. Hude, ed., *Herodoti Historiae*, Oxford.
- Humphrey, 1986: J. Humphrey, *Roman Circuses. Arenas for chariot racing*, London.
- Hunger, 1978: H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 2 vols., Munich.
- Hunger, 1981: H. Hunger, The classical tradition in Byzantine literature: the importance of rhetoric, in M.E. Mullett and R.D. Scott, ed., *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, Birmingham, 35-47.
- Hunt, 1953: R.W. Hunt, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, vol. 1, Oxford.
- Huxley, 1959: Huxley, G. *Anthemius of Tralles, a study in later Greek geometry*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Huxley, 1983: G. Huxley, An Argive dynasty in Malalas, *GRBS* 24, 345-7.
- Huxley, 1987: G. Huxley, A Theban kinglist in Malalas, *Philologus* 131, 159-61.
- Iacobitz, 1836: C. Iacobitz, *Luciani Samosatensis opera*, 4 vols., Leipzig, 1836-41; reprinted Hildesheim, 1966.
- IGLS: L. Jalabert and R. Monterod, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, 1929.
- IP: Isaac Porphyrogenitus, Περὶ ιδιότητος καὶ χαρακτήρων τῶν ἐν Τροίᾳ Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ Τρώων, in Hinck, 1873, 57-88.
- Isaac, 1988: B. Isaac, The meaning of the terms *limes* and *limitanei*, *JRS* 78, 125-147.

- Irmscher, 1969: J. Irmscher, *Geschichtsschreiber der Iustinianischenzeit, Wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift der Univ. Rostock* 18, 469-74.
- Istrin, 1893: V.M. Istrin, *Aleksandriya russkikh khronografov*, Moscow.
- Istrin, 1897-1914: V.M. Istrin, *Khronika Ioanna Malaly v slavyanskom perevode*, in *Zapiski Imp. Akad. Nauk, VIII ser., istoriko-filologicheskoe otdelenie* I, no. 3, St Petersburg, 1897; *Letopis' istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva pri Imp. Novorossiyskom Universitete*, Odessa, 10, 1902; 13, 1905; 16, 1910; 17, 1913 (= *Vizantiyskoslavyanskoe otdelenie* 7, 8, 9); *Sbornik otdeleniya russkogo yazika i slovesnosti*, St Petersburg, 89, no. 3, 1911; no. 7, 1912; 90, no. 2, 1913; 91, no.2, 1914.
- Istrin, 1897a: V.M. Istrin, *Khronograf ipatskogo spiska letopisi pod 1114 godom, Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya* 314, pt. 11, November, 83-91.
- Istrin, 1912a: V.M. Istrin, *Osobly vid Ellinskogo letopista iz sobraniya Tikhonravova, Izvestiya Otdeleniya russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti* 17, bk. 3, 1-30.
- Istrin, 1920-30: V.M. Istrin, *Khronika Georgiya Amartola v drevnem slavyano-russkom perevode*, 3 vols., Petrograd-Leningrad.
- JA : John of Antioch (= Johannes Antiochenus) in FHG IV, 540-62 and V, 27-38.
- Jagic, 1880: V. Jagić, *Zum altslavischen Malalas, Hermes* 15, 235-7.
- Jal, 1967: P. Jal, ed., *Florus: Oeuvres*, 2 vols., Paris.
- Janin, 1964: R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine. Développement urbain et répertoire topographique*, 2nd ed., Paris.
- Janin, 1969: R. Janin, *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique. Les églises et les monastères*, 2nd ed., Paris.
- Janin, 1975: R. Janin, *Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins*, Paris.
- JD: John of Damascus, *De Imaginibus Orationes III* (Πρὸς τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὰς ἀγίας εἰκόνας), PG 94, cols. 1369-73.
- JE: John of Ephesos (also John of Asia or John of Amida); for editions see Land, 1868, and Van Douwen/Land, 1889, and Brooks, 1935-6.
- Jebb, 1889: R. Jebb, *Bentley*, London.
- Jeep, 1881: L. Jeep, *Die Lücken in der Chronik des Malalas, RhM* 36, 351-61.
- Jeffreys, 1978: E.M. Jeffreys, *The Judgement of Paris in later Byzantine literature, Byzantion* 48, 112-131 (reprinted in *Popular Literature in Late Byzantium*, London, 1983, no. VIII).
- Jeffreys, 1979: E.M. Jeffreys, *The attitudes of Byzantine chroniclers towards ancient history, Byzantion* 49, 199-238.
- Jeffreys, 1990: E.M. Jeffreys, *Malalas' use of the past*, in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*, edd. G.W. Clarke et al., Canberra, 121-146.
- Jeffreys/Jeffreys/Scott, 1986: E.M. Jeffreys, M.J. Jeffreys, R.D. Scott et al., *The Chronicle of John Malalas: a translation*, Melbourne.
- Jenkins, 1948: R.J.H. Jenkins, *Constantine VII's portrait of Michael III, Académie Royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques*, 5e série XXXIV, 71-77.

- Svoronos, 1939: N. Svoronos, Ἰωάννης Στάνοϋ, Ἀθηνᾶ 49, 233-42.
- Swete, 1880: H. B. Swete, ed., *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii: The Latin Version with the Greek Fragments*, 2 vols, Cambridge.
- Synk: see Mosshammer, 1984.
- TAPA: *American Philological Association, Transactions and Proceedings*.
- Tarditi, 1968: J. Tarditi, ed., *Archilochus*, Rome.
- TF: Tusculan Fragments (Cryptoferratensis Za xxxiv, ff. 62r-69v); see Mai, 1839.
- TGF: A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Berlin, 1888; reprinted with supplement by B. Snell, Hildesheim, 1964.
- Th: C. de Boor, ed., *Theophanes: Chronographia*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1880; reprinted Hildesheim, 1980.
- Th Sim: C. de Boor, ed., *Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae*, Leipzig; 2nd revised edition, P. Wirth, Stuttgart, 1972.
- Thackeray *et al.*, 1926-81: H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus and L.H. Feldman, *Josephus*, 10 vols., Cambridge, Mass.
- Thee, 1984: F.C.R. Thee, *Julius Africanus and the Early Christian View of Magic*, Tübingen.
- Theod. Anag.: see Hansen, 1971.
- Thilo/Hagen, 1878-81: G. Thilo and H. Hagen, edd., *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, 3 vols., Leipzig; reprinted Hildesheim, 1961.
- Thompson, 1875: E.M. Thompson, ed., *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis*, Camden Society N.S. 15; reprinted 1965.
- Thompson, 1947: E.A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Cambridge.
- Thomson, 1978: see MK.
- Thomson, 1988: F.J. Thomson, *Sensus or Proprietas Verborum: medieval theories of translation as exemplified by translations from Greek into Latin and Slavonic, Symposium Methodianum (= Selecta Slavica 13)*, Neuried, 675-691.
- TM: *Travaux et Mémoires*.
- TODL: *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoy literatury*.
- Tomadakis, 1974: N.B. Tomadakis, Romanus Melodus and the Greek tragedians, in *Serta Turyniana*, ed. J.L. Heller, Urbana, 401-9.
- Tomasini, 1650: I.F. Tomasini, *Bibliothecae Venetae manuscriptae publicae et privatae*, Udine.
- Topping, 1976: E.C. Topping, The Apostle Peter, Justinian and Romanos the Melodos, *BMGS* 2, 1-15.
- Topping, 1977a: E.C. Topping, Mary at the Cross: St. Romanos' Kontakion for Holy Friday, *Byzantine Studies/Etudes Byzantines* 4, 18-37.
- Topping, 1977b: E.C. Topping, Romanos, On the entry into Jerusalem: A Basilikos Logos, *Byzantion* 47, 65-91.
- Topping, 1978: E.C. Topping, On Earthquakes and Fires: Romanos' Encomium to Justinian, *BZ* 71, 22-35.

- Kyrtatas, 1989: D. Kyrtatas, The transformations of the text: the reception of John's *Revelations*, in *History as Text*, ed. A.M. Cameron, London, 144-162.
- Laistner, 1983: M.L.W. Laistner, *The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages* (ed. C.G. Starr), New York.
- Land, 1856: J.P.N. Land, *Johannes Bischof von Ephesos, der erste syrische Kirchenhistoriker*, Leiden.
- Land, 1868: *Joannis episcopi Ephesi Monophysitae scripta historica quotquot adhuc inedita supererant*, syriace edidit J.P.N. Land, Lugduni Batavorum, 1868; = J.P.N. Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, tom. 2.
- Lane Fox, 1986: R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians*, London.
- Lapidge, 1986: M. Lapidge, The school of Theodore and Hadrian, *Anglo-Saxon England* 15, 45-72.
- Laskaris, 1925: M.T. Laskaris, Αἱ βυζαντιναὶ χρονογραφίαι ἐν τῇ παλαιοσλαβικῇ λογοτεχνίᾳ, *EEBS* 2, 335-6.
- Lasserre/Bonnard, 1958: F. Lasserre and A. Bonnard, edd., *Archiloque, Fragments*, Paris.
- Layton, 1981: B.A. Layton, ed., *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*; vol. 2: *Sethian Gnosticism*, Leiden.
- Laud, 1700: W. Laud, *Remains*, vol. 2, London.
- Lemerle, 1971: P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, Paris (= 1986: *Byzantine Humanism*, trans. H. Lindsay, and A. Moffatt, Canberra).
- Lemerle, 1979-81: P. Lemerle, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans*, 2 vols., Paris.
- Leopold, 1986: J.W. Leopold, *Consolando per edicta*: Cassiodorus *Variae* 4.50 and the imperial consolations for natural catastrophes, *Latomus* 45, 816-836.
- Lepper, 1948: F.A. Lepper, *Trajan's Parthian War*, Oxford.
- Levi, 1947: D. Levi, *Antioch Mosaic Pavements*, 2 vols., Princeton.
- Levine, 1987: L. I. Levine, The Second Temple synagogue: The formative years, in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, ed. L. I. Levine, Philadelphia, 7-31.
- Levison, 1946: W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*, Oxford.
- LG: Leo Grammaticus, Parisinus Graecus 854, ff. 328 ff. (Cramer, 1839, 243-379; reprinted Bonn, 1842).
- Libanios: R. Förster, ed., *Libanii Opera*, 12 vols., Leipzig, 1903-27.
- Liebeschuetz, 1972: J.H.W.G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch: city and imperial administration in the later Roman Empire*, Oxford.
- Lieu, 1985: S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China: a historical survey*, Manchester.
- Likhachev, 1947: D.S. Likhachev, *Russkie letopisi i ikh kul'turno-istoricheskoe znachenie*, Moscow-Leningrad.
- Likhachev, 1948: D.S. Likhachev, *Elliniskiy letopisets vtorogo vida i pravitel'stvennyye krugi Moskvyy kontsa XV veka*, *TODL* 6, 100-10.
- Lindsay, 1922: W.M. Lindsay, ed., *Palaeographia Latina*, vol. 1, Oxford.
- Lipsius, 1891: R.A. Lipsius, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, vol. 1, Leipzig.
- LM: *Laterculus Malalianus*, ed. Mommsen, 1898, 424-437.

- Lydus: *De Magistratibus*, see Bandy, 1983; *De Mensibus*, see Wünsch, 1967.
- Lyle, 1984: E. Lyle, The circus as cosmos, *Latomus* 43, 827-41.
- Maas, 1912: P. Maas, Metrische Akklamationen der Byzantiner, *BZ* 21, 28-51.
- Maas, 1986: M. Maas, Roman history and Christian ideology in Justinianic reform legislation, *DOP* 40, 17-31.
- MacCormack, 1975: S. MacCormack, Roma, Constantinopolis, the emperor and his genius, *CQ* 25, 131-50.
- MacCoull, 1988: L.S.B. MacCoull, *Dioscorus of Aphroditto: his work and his world*, Berkeley.
- Macray, 1890: W.D. Macray, *Annals of the Bodleian Library*, Oxford.
- Magie, 1950: D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ*, 2 vols., Princeton.
- Mai, 1839: A. Mai, ed., De fragmentis historicis Tusculanis, *Spicilegium Romanum*, vol. 2, Rome; Appendix, 1-28; reprinted in PG 85, cols. 1807-24.
- Mai, 1843: A. Mai, ed., Chronicon Palatinum [= *Laterculus Malalianus*], *Spicilegium Romanum*, vol. 9, Rome, 118-40.
- Malcovati, 1938: E. Malcovati, ed., *L. Annaei Flori quae exstant*, Rome.
- Man: Constantine Manasses, Σύνοψις Ἱστορική, Bonn ed., 1837.
- Malingrey, 1961: A.-M. Malingrey, *Philosophia. Etude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque des présocratiques au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.C.*, Paris.
- Mango, 1959: C. Mango, Letter to the Editor, *Art Bulletin* 14, 351-6.
- Mango, 1959a: C. Mango, *The Brazen House*, Copenhagen.
- Mango, 1960: C. Mango, The Legend of Leo the Wise, *ZRVI* 6, 59-93.
- Mango, 1963: C. Mango, Antique statuary and the Byzantine beholder, *DOP* 17, 53-75; reprinted in *Byzantium and its Image*, London, 1984, no. V.
- Mango, 1973: C. Mango, The Phanariots and the Byzantine Tradition, in *The Struggle for Greek Independence*, ed. R. Clogg, London, 41-66; reprinted in *Byzantium and its Image*, London, 1984, no. XVIII.
- Mango, 1978: C. Mango, Who wrote the Chronicle of Theophanes?, *ZRVI* 18, 9-17.
- Mango, 1980: C. Mango, *Byzantium: the Empire of New Rome*, London.
- Mango, 1981: C. Mango, Discontinuity with the classical past in Byzantium, in *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, ed. M. Mullett and R. Scott, Birmingham, 48-57.
- Mango, 1984: C. Mango, St Michael and Attis, Δελτίον τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 12 (1984, publ. 1986), 39-62.
- Mango, 1985: Cyril Mango, *Le développement urbain de Constantinople (IV<sup>e</sup> - VII<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, Paris.
- Manoussakas, 1947: M. Manoussakas, Ἡ ἐπιτομή τῆς ἱεροκοσμικῆς ἱστορίας τοῦ Νεκταρίου Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ αἱ πηγαὶ αὐτῆς, *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 1, 291-232.
- Markopoulos, 1978: A. Ph. Markopoulos, Ἡ χρονογραφία τοῦ Ψευδο-Συμεῶν καὶ οἱ πηγές της, Ioannina.



- Materialy*, 1985: Issledovatel'skie materialy dlya slovarya knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevney Rusi, *TODL* 39, 18-277.
- Mavrogordato, 1948: J.M. Mavrogordato, Byzantine literature, in *Byzantium*, ed. N.H. Baynes and H.St.L.B. Moss, Oxford, 221-252.
- Mavrokordatos, 1716: A. Mavrokordatos, 'Ιστορία ἱερα ἤτοι τὰ 'Ιουδαϊκά, Bucharest.
- Mavromati-Katsouyiannopoulou, 1988: S. Mavromati-Katsouyiannopoulou, 'Ο θάνατος τοῦ Ποντίου Πιλάτου μέσα ἀπό τίς βυζαντινές ἀφηγηματικές πηγές, Μνήμη Αἵνου Πολίτη, Thessalonike, 77-107.
- Mazal, 1971: O. Mazal, ed., *Aristaeneti epistolarum libri II*, Stuttgart.
- McCrindle, 1897: J.W. McCrindle, trans., *The Christian Topography of Cosmas, an Egyptian monk*, London (Hakluyt Society, vol. 98).
- McNally, 1961: R.E. McNally, Isidorean Pseudepigrapha in the Early Middle Ages, in *Isidoriana*, ed. M.C. Díaz y Díaz, Leon, 305-16.
- Merz, 1910/11: L. Merz, *Zur Flexion des Verbums bei Malalas*, Pirmäsens, 1911.
- Meshchersky, 1955: N.A. Meshchersky, K voprosu o datirovke Vilenskogo khronografa, *TODL* 11, 380-6.
- Meshchersky, 1956: N.A. Meshchersky, Dva neizdannyykh otryvka drevneslavyanskogo perevoda *Khroniki* Ioanna Malaly, *VV* 11, 279-84.
- Meshchersky, 1978: N.A. Meshchersky, *Istochniki i sostav slavyano-russkoy perevodnoy pis'mennosti IX-XV vekov*, Leningrad.
- Meyvaert, 1982: P. Meyvaert and C. Franklin, Has Bede's version of the *Passio S. Anastasii* come down to us in BHL 408?, *Analecta Bollandiana* 100, 372-400.
- MGH: Monumenta Germaniae Historica.
- Millar, 1964: F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford.
- Miracula*, 1892: *Miracula S. Anastasii*, anon. ed., *Analecta Bollandiana* 11, 233-41.
- Misener, 1924: G. Misener, Iconistic portraits, *Classical Philology* 19, 96-123.
- MK: Moses Khorenats'i, *History of the Armenians*, trans. R.W. Thomson, Cambridge, Mass., 1978.
- Moffatt, 1973: M.A. Moffatt, Science teachers in the early Byzantine empire: some statistics, *Byzantinoslavica* 34, 15-18.
- Momigliano, 1966: A. Momigliano, Cassiodorus and Italian culture of his time, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 41, 1955, 207-45; reprinted in *Studies in Historiography*, New York, 1966, 181-210.
- Momigliano, 1970: A. Momigliano, John Malalas, *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford, 641.
- Mommsen, 1857: Th. Mommsen, Zur byzantinischen Chronographie, *RhM* 11, 625-6 (= GS 7, 753-4).
- Mommsen, 1871: Th. Mommsen, Über die dem Cassius Dio beigelegten Theile der ~~Plautischen~~ und der Konstantinischen Excerpte, *Hermes* 6, 82-91 (= GS 7, 700-9).
- Mommsen, 1872: Th. Mommsen, Bruchstücke des Johannes von Antiochia und des Johannes Malalas, *Hermes* 6, 323-83 (= GS 7, 710-90).

- Mommsen, 1882: Th. Mommsen, ed., *Jordanis Romana et Getica*, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi 5, Berlin; reprinted 1961.
- Mommsen, 1892: Th. Mommsen, ed., *Chronica Minora I*, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi 9, Berlin; reprinted 1961.
- Mommsen, 1894: Th. Mommsen, ed., *Chronica Minora II*, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi 11, Berlin; reprinted 1961.
- Mommsen, 1895: Th. Mommsen, Lateinische Malalasauszüge, *BZ* 4, 487-8 (= GS 7, 751-2).
- Mommsen, 1898: Th. Mommsen, ed., *Chronica Minora III*, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi 13, Berlin; reprinted 1961.
- Mommsen, GS: Th. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. O. Hirschfeld, vol. 7, Berlin, 1910.
- Moravcsik, 1958: G. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. 1, 2nd ed., Berlin.
- Morrison, 1967: S. Morrison, *John Fell, the University Press and the Fell Types*, Oxford.
- Mosshammer, 1984: A.A. Mosshammer, ed., *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga Chronographica*, Leipzig.
- MS: I.-B. Chabot, ed. and trans., *Chronique de Michel le Syrien patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1199)*, vols. 1-4, Paris, 1899-1924.
- Müller, 1839: C.O. Müller, *Antiquitates Antiochenae*, Göttingen.
- Müller, 1870: L. Müller, ed., *Rutilius de Reditu*, Leipzig.
- Murray, 1902-10: G. Murray, ed., *Euripidis Fabulae*, 3 vols., Oxford.
- Mynors, 1969: R.A.B. Mynors, ed., *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Oxford.
- Nau, 1897: F. Nau, Analyse de la seconde partie inédite de l'Histoire ecclésiastique de Jean d'Asie patriarche jacobite de Constantinople (†585), *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 2, 455-93.
- Nau, 1911: F. Nau, Un exemple de la prononciation occidentale du syriaque au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle, *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 10, 17, 185 ff.
- Naval, n.d.: M. Naval, *a Roma si racconta che ... leggende aneddoti curiosità*, Rome.
- Neumann, 1880: J. Neumann, Der Umfang der Chronik des Malalas in der Oxforder Handschrift, *Hermes* 15, 356-60.
- Nicholson, 1985: O. Nicholson, The source of the dates in Lactantius' *Divine Institutes*, *JTS* 36, 291-310.
- Noack, 1892: F. Noack, Der griechische Diktys, *Philologus*, Supplementband 5.
- Nordh, 1949: A. Nordh, ed., *Libellus de regionibus Romae*, Lund.
- Nov.: *Novellae*; R. Schöll and W. Kroll, edd., *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. 3, Berlin, 1928; reprinted 1954.
- Obolensky, 1851: M.A. Obolensky, *Letopisets Pereyaslavlya Suzdal' skogo*, Moscow.
- Oeconomus, 1959: L. Oeconomus, Remarques sur trois passages de trois historiens grecs du moyen âge, *Byzantion* 20, 177-83.
- Ogilvie, 1965: R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*, Oxford.
- Ogilvie, 1974: R.M. Ogilvie, ed., *Titii Livi Ab Urbe Condita Libri I-V*, Oxford.

- Oikonomides, 1959: D.B. Oikonomides, 'Χρονογράφου' τοῦ Δωροθέου τὰ Λαογραφικά, *Λαογραφία* 18, 139-142.
- Oldfather, 1933: C.H. Oldfather, *Diodorus of Sicily*, 12 vols., Cambridge, Mass.
- Orlov, 1926: A.S. Orlov, K voprosu ob Ipat'evskoy letopisi, *Izvestiya Otdeleniya russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti* 31, bk. 1, 93-126.
- Orlov, 1947: A.S. Orlov, O galitsko-volynskom letopisanii, *TODL* 5, 15-35.
- Ostrogorsky, 1968: G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (trans. J. Hussey), revised edition, New Brunswick.
- P: Paris, Supplementum Graecum 682, ff. 9-14 (V. Istrin, ed., *Zapiski Imp. Akademii Nauk*, ser. 8, vol. 1, no. 3, St Petersburg, 1897, 1-29).
- Papadopoulos, 1912: C. Papadopoulos, Περὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς χρονογραφίας τοῦ δεκάτου ἐννάτου αἰῶνος, *Ἑκκλησιαστικὸς Φάρος* 9, 410-454.
- Parr, 1686: R. Parr, *Life of Ussher*, London.
- Patzig, 1890/1: E. Patzig, Unerkannt und unbekannt gebliebene Malalas-Fragmente, *Jahresbericht der Thomasschule für den Schuljahr von Ostern 1890 bis Ostern 1891*, Leipzig.
- Patzig, 1891/2: E. Patzig, Johannes Antiochenus und Johannes Malalas, *Jahresbericht der Thomasschule für den Schuljahr von Ostern 1891 bis Ostern 1892*, Leipzig.
- Patzig, 1892: E. Patzig, Dictys Cretensis, *BZ* 1, 131-52.
- Patzig, 1893: E. Patzig, Die Hypothesis in Dindorfs Ausgabe der Odysseescholien, *BZ* 2, 413-440.
- Patzig, 1898: E. Patzig, Die angebliche Monophysitismus des Malalas, *BZ* 7, 111-28.
- Patzig, 1901: E. Patzig, Die Abhängigkeit des Johannes Antiochenus von Johannes Malalas, *BZ* 10, 40-53.
- Patzig, 1901a: E. Patzig, review of Bourier, 1899, in *BZ* 10, 256-62, 598-611.
- Patzig, 1903: E. Patzig, Das Trojabuch des Sisypchos von Kos, *BZ* 12, 231-257.
- Patzig, 1908: E. Patzig, Das griechische Diktysfragment, *BZ* 17, 383-8.
- Patzig, 1911: E. Patzig, review of Fleschenberg, 1908, in *BZ* 20, 228-39.
- Patzig, 1928: E. Patzig, Von Malalas zu Homer, *BZ* 28, 1-11.
- Payne Smith, 1860: R. Payne Smith, trans., *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John bishop of Ephesus*, Oxford.
- Peristerakis, 1984: A. Peristerakis, Δίκτυς ὁ Κρής, Athens.
- Perry, 1967: B.E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances; A literary-historical account of their origins* (Sather Classical Lectures, vol. 37), Berkeley.
- Peter, 1906: H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, vol. 2, Leipzig; reprinted Stuttgart, 1967.
- Petitmengin, 1981: P. Petitmengin et al., edd., *Pelagie la Pénitente: métamorphoses d'une légende, I: Les textes et leur histoire*, Paris.
- Pfeiffer, 1949-53: R. Pfeiffer, ed., *Callimachus*, 2 vols., Oxford.
- PG: Patrologia Graeca.

- Pigulevskaya, 1940: N. Pigulevskaya, Mesopotamiya na rubeze V-VI vekov n.e.: siriyskaya khronika Ieshu Stilita kak istoricheskiy istochnik, *Trudy Instituta Vostokovedeniya* 31, Moscow-Leningrad.
- Pigulevskaya, 1941: N. Pigulevskaya, *Siriyskie istochniki po istorii narodov SSSR*, Moscow-Leningrad.
- Pigulevskaya, 1967: N. Pigulevskaya, Theophanes' Chronographia and the Syriac chronicles, *JÖBG* 16, 55-60.
- PL: Patrologia Latina.
- PLRE 1: A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1: A.D. 260-395, Cambridge, 1971.
- PLRE 2: J.R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2: A.D. 395-527, Cambridge, 1980.
- PO: Patrologia Orientalis.
- Popov, 1866: A.N. Popov, *Obzor khronografov russkoy redaktsii I*, Moscow.
- Praechter, 1896: K. Praechter, Die römische Kaisergeschichte bis auf Diokletian in cod. Par. 1712 und cod. Vatic. 163, *BZ* 5, 484-537.
- Praechter, 1897: K. Praechter, Quellenkritische Studien zu Kedrenos (cod. Par. Gr. 1712), *Sitzungsberichte der bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Classe*, Bd. 2, Hft. 1, 1-107.
- Preger, 1901: T. Preger, ed., *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1901-7; reprinted in 1 vol., New York, 1975.
- Price/Trell, 1977: M.J. Price and B.L. Trell, *Coins and their Cities. Architecture on the ancient coins of Greece, Rome, and Palestine*, London.
- Prokopios: see Dewing.
- Psaltis, 1913: S.B. Psaltis, *Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken*, Leipzig; reprinted Göttingen, 1974.
- PsD I, II: The Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysios, parts I and II: *Chronicon anonymum Pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dictum, I-II*, ed. I.-B. Chabot (CSCO 91, 104, SS 43, 53 = T[extus]), Paris, 1927, 1933; Latin translation (of the first part only): *Incerti auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dictum*, trans. I.-B. Chabot (CSCO 121, SS 66 = V[ersio]), Louvain, 1949.
- PsS: Pseudo-Symeon, *Chronicle*, in Parisinus Graecus 1712, ff. 18v-272r.
- PW: *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. G. Wissowa, 1893-.
- RAC: *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*.
- Ramsey, 1984: J.T. Ramsey, ed., *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*, Chico, California.
- REB: *Revue des Etudes Byzantines*.
- Reinert, 1981: S. Reinert, *Greek Myth in Johannes Malalas' Account of Ancient History before the Trojan War*, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Reinert, 1985: S. Reinert, The image of Dionysus in Malalas' chronicle, *Byzantine Studies in Honor of Milton Anastos*, ed. S. Vryonis, Malibu, 1-41.
- Reiske, 1830: J.J. Reiske, ed., *Constantini Porphyrogeniti Imperatoris de Cerimoniis Aulae Byzantinae libri duo*, Bonn.

*RhM*: *Rheinisches Museum*.

Richard, 1955: M. Richard, Les chapitres à Epiphane sur les hérésies de George Hiéromoine, *EEBS* 25, 33-49.

Robert, 1968: L. Robert, Trois oracles de la Théosophie et un prophète d'Apollon, *Comptes Rendus des Séances, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 567-99.

Robert, 1971: L. Robert, Un oracle gravé à Oinoanda, *Comptes Rendus des Séances, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, 597-620.

Robinson, 1981: J.M. Robinson, ed., *The Hag Hammadi Library in English*, New York.

Robinson, 1986: B. P. Robinson, Zipporah to the Rescue: a contextual study of Exodus IV. 24-6, *Vetus Testamentum* 36, 447-61.

Rochow, 1983: I. Rochow, Malalas bei Theophanes, *Klio* 65, 459-74.

Rose, 1977: P.L. Rose, A Venetian patron and mathematician of the sixteenth century: F. Barozzi (1573-1604), *Studi Veneziani* N.S. 1, 119-87.

Ross, 1969: A.S.C. Ross, A connection between Bede and the Anglo-Saxon gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels?, *JTS* 20, 482-94.

Roueché, 1989: C. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity*, London.

Routh, 1846: R.J. Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, vol. 2, Oxford, 238-309.

Rüger, 1895: A. Rüger, *Studien zu Malalas. Präpositionen und Adverbien: Das 18. Buch; Die konstantinischen Exzerpte. Die tusculanischen Fragmente*, Bad Kissingen.

Russo, 1939: D. Russo, Cronica della 1570. Turcograecia lui Crusius. Cronografele lui Dorotei si Cigala. Cronografele romanesti, *Studii istorice Greco-Romane* 1, Bucharest, 53-100.

Sabatier, 1743: P. Sabatier, ed., *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae*, 3 vols, Rheims.

Samodurova, 1961: Z.G. Samodurova, Chronika Petra Aleksandriyskogo, *VV* 16, 150-97.

Santini, 1979: C. Santini, ed., *Eutropii Breviarium ab urbe condita*, Leipzig.

Schaeder, 1957: H. Schaeder, *Moskau, der dritten Rom: Studien zur Geschichte der politischen Theorie in der Slawischen Welt*, Hamburg, 1929; 2nd edition, Darmstadt.

Schanz/Hosius, 1927: M. Schanz and C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, vol. 1, 4th ed., Munich.

Schehl, 1932: F. Schehl, Die Kaiserzeit bis Diokletian in ihrer Darstellung bei Malalas, *Actes du IIIe Congrès International d' Etudes Byzantines*, Athens, 124-5.

Schehl, 1938: F. Schehl, review of von Stauffenberg, 1931, in *BZ* 38, 157-69.

Schmidt, 1854: M. Schmidt, *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*, Leipzig.

Schoene, 1875: A. Schoene, ed., *Eusebi Chronicorum Liber Prior*, Berlin.

Schreiner, 1975: P. Schreiner, ed., *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, vol. 1, Vienna.

Schwartz, 1894: E. Schwartz, *Die Königslisten des Eratosthenes und Kastor*, Abh. Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Göttingen 40, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Heft 2.

- Schwartz, 1933: E. Schwartz, *Die Kanonessammlung des Johannes Scholasticus*, Bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 6, Munich.
- Scott, 1932: S.P. Scott, trans., *The Civil Code*, 7 vols., Cincinnati.
- Scott, 1968: R.D. Scott, review of Perry, 1967, in *AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Literature Association* 29, 70-72.
- Scott, 1981: R.D. Scott, The classical tradition in Byzantine historiography, in *Byzantium and the Classical Tradition*, edd. M.E. Mullett and R.D. Scott, Birmingham, 61-74.
- Scott, 1981a: R.D. Scott, Malalas and Justinian's Codification, in *Byzantine Papers*, ed. E.M. and M.J. Jeffreys, A. Moffatt, Canberra, 12-31.
- Scott, 1985: R.D. Scott, Malalas, *The Secret History* and Justinian's propaganda, *DOP* 39, 99-109.
- Scott, 1990: R.D. Scott, Malalas' view of the classical past, in *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*, ed. G.W. Clarke et al., Canberra, 147-164.
- Scriptores*: R.E. McNally, ed., *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores I*, CCSL 108b, Turnhout, 1973.
- Seeck, 1906: O. Seeck, Zur Chronologie und Quellenkritik des Ammianus Marcellinus, *Hermes* 41, 481-539.
- Selden, 1680: J. Selden, *De iure naturali et gentium iuxta disciplina ebraeorum libri septem*, London.
- Shakhmatov, 1940: I. Shakhmatov, Povest' vremennykh let i ee istochniki, *TODL* 4, 11-150.
- Shchapov, 1976: Ya. M. Shchapov, *Vostochnoslavjanskije i Juzhnoslavjanskije rukopisnye Knigi v sobranijakh Pol'skoy Narodnoj Respubliki*, Moscow.
- Shelton, 1979: K.J. Shelton, Imperial Tyches, *Gesta* 18, 27-38.
- Shestakov, 1890: S.P. Shestakov, Ioann Ritor (Ἰωάννης ὁ ῥήτωρ) v tserkovnoy istorii Evagriya, *Ucheniye Zapiski Imperatorskogo Kazanskogo Universiteta* 57.5, 97-132.
- Shestakov, 1894: S.P. Shestakov, O znachenii slavyanskogo perevoda khroniki Ioanna Malaly dlya vosstanovleniya i ispravleniya ee grecheskogo teksta, *VV* 1, 503-552.
- Shestakov, 1895: S.P. Shestakov, Pribavlenie k stat'e 'O znachenii slavyanskogo perevoda Malaly', *VV* 2, 372-7.
- Shustorovich, 1968: E.M. Shustorovich, Khronika Ioanna Malaly i antichnaya traditsiya v drevnerusskoy literature, *TODL* 23, 62-70.
- Shustorovich, 1969: E.M. Shustorovich, Drevneslavjanskiy perevod Khroniki Ioanna Malaly (istoriya izucheniya), *VV* 30, 136-52.
- Shustorovich, 1970: E.M. Shustorovich, Ob odnom otryvke iz drevneslavjanskogo perevoda Khroniki Ioanna Malaly, *Nauchnye doklady vysshey shkoly. Filologicheskie nauki*, 6, 105-10.
- Simpson, 1935: P. Simpson, *Proofreading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Oxford; reprinted 1970.

- Sk: Theodoros Skoutariotes, Σύνοψις χρονική, ed. C. Sathas, Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη, vol. 7, Paris, 1894, 1-556.
- Slav: Slavonic translation of Malalas; see chapter 9, section 2, pp. 276-87 for details of manuscripts and editions.
- Sofroniou, 1965: S.A. Sofroniou, *Studies in the Vocabulary of Early Medieval Greek, with special reference to John Malalas, the Chronicon Paschale, Theophanes Confessor and the De Administrando Imperio of Constantine Porphyrogenitus*, Ph.D. thesis, London.
- Sopikov, 1904: V.S. Sopikov, *Opyt rossiiskoi bibliografi*, 2nd ed, by V.N. Pogozhin, St Petersburg; reprinted with title translated as *An Essay in Russian Bibliography or a complete dictionary of works printed in the Church Slavonic and Russian languages from the introduction of printing to the year 1813*, London, 1982.
- Sorabji, 1987: R. Sorabji, *Philoponos and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science*, Ithaca.
- Sorlin, 1973: I. Sorlin, La diffusion et la transmission de la littérature chronographique byzantine en Russie pré-mongole du XIe au XIIIe siècle, *TM* 5, 385-408.
- Sotiriadis, 1888: G. Sotiriadis, Zur Kritik des Johannes von Antiocheia, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Suppl. 16, 1-125.
- Soz: R. Hussey, ed., *Sozomeni Ecclesiastici Historia*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1860.
- Speransky, 1934: M.N. Speransky, Zabelinskiy otryvok khronografa s Malaloy, in *Sbornik statey, posvyashchennykh akademiku A.S. Orlovu*, Leningrad, 75-81.
- Spiazzi, 1964: Spiazzi, Francesco Barozzi, *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 6, 495-99.
- Spinka/Downey, 1940: M. Spinka and G. Downey, *Chronicle of John Malalas: Books VIII-XVIII, translated from the Church Slavonic*, Chicago.
- Sreznevsky, 1879: I.I. Sreznevsky, Russkiy istoricheskiy sbornik XV veka Moskovskogo glavnago arkhiva Ministerstva inostrannykh del (= *idem*, Svedeniya i zametki o neizvestnykh i maloizvestnykh pamyatnikakh, 84), *Sbornik Otdeleniya russkogo yazyka i slovesnosti* 20, no. 4, 111-39.
- Stanitsas, 1986: S. Stanitsas, Τὸ 'Χρονικὸ τοῦ 1570' καὶ οἱ παραλλαγές του : Τὰ Χρονικὰ Ψευδο-Δωροθέου καὶ Μανουὴλ Μαλαξοῦ, *Πελοποννησιακά* 16, 593-633.
- Stein, 1920: E. Stein, Bericht über die Literatur zur Geschichte des Übergangs vom Altertum zum Mittelalter aus dem Jahren 1893-1931, *Bursians Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Altertumswissenschaft* 74, 1-90.
- Stein, 1949: E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. 2: *De la disparition de l'empire d'occident à la mort de Justinien (476-565)*, Paris.
- Stein, 1959: E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. 1: *De l'état romain à l'état byzantin (284-476)*, Paris.
- Strabo: M. Meineke, ed., *Strabonis Geographica*, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1907-13.
- Strahl, 1828: P. Strahl, *Das gelehrte Russland*, Leipzig.
- Su: *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, 5 vols., Leipzig, 1928-38.
- Sutcliffe, 1978: P.H. Sutcliffe, *The Oxford University Press: an informal history*, Oxford.

- Svoronos, 1939: N. Svoronos, *Ἰωάννης Στάβος*, Athens.
- Swete, 1880: H. B. Swete, ed., *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii: The Latin Version with the Greek Fragments*, 2 vols, Cambridge.
- Synk: see Mosshammer, 1984.
- TAPA: *American Philological Association, Transactions and Proceedings*.
- Tarditi, 1968: J. Tarditi, ed., *Archilochus*, Rome.
- TF: Tusculan Fragments (Cryptoferratensis Za xxxiv, ff. 62r-69v); see Mai, 1839.
- TGF: A. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Berlin, 1888; reprinted with supplement by B. Snell, Hildesheim, 1964.
- Th: C. de Boor, ed., *Theophanes: Chronographia*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1880; reprinted Hildesheim, 1980.
- Th Sim: C. de Boor, ed., *Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae*, Leipzig; 2nd revised edition, P. Wirth, Stuttgart, 1972.
- Thackeray *et al.*, 1926-81: H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus and L.H. Feldman, *Josephus*, 10 vols., Cambridge, Mass.
- Thee, 1984: F.C.R. Thee, *Julius Africanus and the Early Christian View of Magic*, Tübingen.
- Theod. Anag.: see Hansen, 1971.
- Thilo/Hagen, 1878-81: G. Thilo and H. Hagen, edd., *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, 3 vols., Leipzig; reprinted Hildesheim, 1961.
- Thompson, 1875: E.M. Thompson, ed., *Letters of Humphrey Prideaux to John Ellis*, Camden Society N.S. 15; reprinted 1965.
- Thompson, 1947: E.A. Thompson, *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus*, Cambridge.
- Thomson, 1978: see MK.
- Thomson, 1988: F.J. Thomson, *Sensus or Proprietas Verborum: medieval theories of translation as exemplified by translations from Greek into Latin and Slavonic, Symposium Methodianum (= Selecta Slavica 13)*, Neuried, 675-691.
- TM: *Travaux et Mémoires*.
- TODL: *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoy literatury*.
- Tomadakis, 1974: N.B. Tomadakis, Romanos Melodus and the Greek tragedians, in *Seria Turyniana*, ed. J.L. Heller, Urbana, 401-9
- Tomasini, 1650: I.F. Tomasini, *Bibliothecae Venetae manuscriptae publicae et privatae*, Udine.
- Topping, 1976: E.C. Topping, The Apostle Peter, Justinian and Romanos the Melodos, *BMGS* 2, 1-15.
- Topping, 1977a: E.C. Topping, Mary at the Cross: St. Romanos' Kontakion for Holy Friday, *Byzantine Studies/Etudes Byzantines* 4, 18-37.
- Topping, 1977b: E.C. Topping, Romanos, On the entry into Jerusalem: A Basilikos Logos, *Byzantion* 47, 65-91.
- Topping, 1978: E.C. Topping, On Earthquakes and Fires: Romanos' Encomium to Justinian, *BZ* 71, 22-35.



- Topping, 1982: E.C. Topping, Romanos, On Judas: A Byzantine Ethopoeia, *Byzantiaka* 2, 10-27.
- Toynbee, 1947: J.M.C. Toynbee, Roma and Constantinopolis in late-antique art from 312 to 365, *JRS* 37, 135-144.
- Traube, 1895: L. Traube, Chronicon Palatinum, *BZ* 4, 489-92; reprinted in his *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, ed. F. Boll, 3 vols, Munich, 1909-20, vol. 3, 201-4.
- Treadgold, 1979: W. Treadgold, The bride-shows of the Byzantine emperors, *Byzantion* 49, 395-413.
- Treu, 1880: M. Treu, ed., *Excerpta anonymi Byzantini ex codice Parisino suppl. gr. 607 A*, Städtisches Gymnasium zu Ohlau, Prog. Nr. 167, Ohlau.
- TrGF: B. Snell *et al.*, *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta*, Göttingen, 1971-.
- Trypanis, 1971: C.A. Trypanis, *The Penguin Book of Greek Verse*, Harmondsworth/Ringwood.
- Tsafirir, 1986: Y. Tsafirir, The maps used by Theodosius: on the pilgrim maps of the Holy Land and Jerusalem in the sixth century C.E., *DOP* 40, 129-46.
- Tvorogov, 1974: O.V. Tvorogov, Povest' vremennykh let i Khronograf po velikomu izlozheniyu, *TODL* 28, 99-113.
- Tvorogov, 1975: O.V. Tvorogov, *Drevnerusskie khronografy*, Leningrad.
- Tvorogov, 1979: O.V. Tvorogov, Antichnye mify v drevnerusskoy literature XI-XVI vv, *TODL* 33, 3-31.
- Tvorogov, 1983: O.V. Tvorogov, Materialy k istorii russkikh khronografov. 2. Sofiyskiy khronograf s *Khronikoy* Ioanna Malalay, *TODL* 37, 188-211.
- Tzetzes: editions cited for *Antehomerica*, *Homerica*, and *Posthomerica* (I. Bekker, Berlin, 1816); *Allegoriae in Iliadem* (J. Boissonade, Paris, 1851); *Chiliades* (= *Historiae*; P.A.M. Leone, Naples, 1968); Scholia on Lykophron (E. Scheer, *Lycophronis Alexandra*, vol. 2, Berlin, 1881).
- Udal'tsova, 1965: Z.V. Udal'tsova, La chronique de Jean Malalas dans la Russie de Kiev, *Byzantion* 35, 575-91 (also in Russian in *Arkheograficheskiy ezhdognik za 1965 god*, 47-56).
- Udal'tsova, 1971: Z.V. Udal'tsova, Mirovozzrenie vizantiyskogo khronista Ioanna Malaly, *VV* 32, 3-23.
- Udal'tsova, 1984: Z.V. Udal'tsova, ed., *Kul'tura Vizantii: IV-pervaya polovina VII v.*, Moscow (section *Ioann Malala* by Udal'tsova, pp. 246-60).
- Ussher, 1648: J. Ussher, *De Macedonum et Asianorum anno solari dissertatio*, London.
- Ussher, 1680: J. Ussher, *Chronologia Sacra*, ed. T. Barlow, Oxford.
- V: Vatopedi 290, f. 148.
- Van Douwen/Land, 1889: W.J. Van Douwen and J.P.N. Land, trans., Joannis episcopi Ephesi Syri Monophysitae Commentarii de beatis orientalibus et historiae ecclesiasticae fragmenta, *Verhandelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde* 18, Amsterdam, 216-258.
- Vasiliev, 1952: A. Vasiliev, *The Byzantine Empire*, vol. 1, Madison.
- Vat. Gr. 163: Vaticanus Graecus 163, ff. 1-61r.

- Vermes, 1957-8: G. Vermes, Baptism and Jewish exegesis: new light from ancient sources, *New Testament Studies* 4, 308-19.
- Viljamaa, 1968: T. Viljamaa, *Studies in Greek Encomiastic Poetry of the Early Byzantine Period* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum Societas Scientiarum Fennica, vol. 42, no. 4, Helsinki).
- Viteau, 1897: J. Viteau, *Passions des saints Ecaterine et Pierre d'Alexandrie*, Paris.
- von S: see von Stauffenberg, 1931.
- von Simson, 1948: O.G. von Simson, *Sacred Fortress, Byzantine art and statecraft in Ravenna*, Princeton; reprinted 1987.
- von Stauffenberg, 1931: A. Schenk von Stauffenberg, *Die römische Kaisergeschichte bei Malalas*, Stuttgart.
- Vosté, 1941: J.-M. Vosté, L'ère de l'Ascension de Notre Seigneur dans les manuscrits nestoriens, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 7, 233-243.
- VV: *Vizantijskiy Vremennik*.
- Walker, 1957: G.S.M. Walker, ed., *Sancti Columbani Opera*, Dublin.
- Walton, 1965: F.R. Walton, A neglected historical text, *Historia* 14, 236-51.
- Wartelle, 1987: A. Wartelle, ed., *Saint Justin, Apologies*, Paris.
- Walz, 1832-6: C. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, 9 vols., Stuttgart.
- Weber, 1965 R. Weber, ed., *Breviarius de Hierosolyma, Itineraria et alia geographica*, CCSL 175-176, Turnhout, 105-112.
- Weber, 1927: W. Weber, Studien zur Chronik des Malalas, *Festgabe für A. Deissmann*, Tübingen, 20-66.
- Weierholt, 1963: K. Weierholt, Studien in Sprachgebrauch des Malalas, *Symbolae Osloenses*, Supplement 18.
- Weierholt, 1965: K. Weierholt, *Zur Überlieferung der Malalas Chronik* (typescript), Stavanger.
- Weingart, 1922: M. Weingart, *Byzantské kroniky v literaturě církevněslovanské I*, Bratislava.
- Weitzmann, 1942/3: K. Weitzmann, Illustrations for the chronicles of Sozomenos, Theodoret and Malalas, *Byzantion* 16, 87-134.
- Weitzmann, 1979: K. Weitzmann, ed., *Age of Spirituality. Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century. Catalogue of the exhibition at The Metropolitan Museum of Art*, New York.
- West, 1983: M.L. West, *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford.
- Whitby, 1982/3: M. Whitby, The Great Chronographer and Theophanes, *BMGS* 8, 1-20.
- Whitby, 1988: M. Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice and his Historian: Theophylact Simocatta on Persian and Balkan warfare*, Oxford.
- Whitby, 1989: M. Whitby, trans., *Chronicon Paschale, 284-628 A.D.*, Liverpool.
- Wilkinson, 1977: J. Wilkinson, *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*, Warminster.
- Wirth, 1894: A. Wirth, *Johannes Antiochenus von Antiocheia in chronographische Späne*, Frankfurt.

- Witakowski, 1987: W. Witakowski, *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre: a study in the history of historiography*, *Studia Semitica Upsaliensia* 9, Uppsala.
- Wolf, 1911: K. Wolf, *Studien zur Sprache des Malalas: I Formenlehre; II Syntax*, Munich.
- Wolska-Conus, 1968: W. Wolska-Conus, *Cosmas Indicopleustès, Topographie chrétienne*, 3 vols., Paris, 1968-73.
- Wood, 1691: A. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, Oxford.
- Wünsch, 1967: R. Wünsch, ed., *Ioannes Lydus de Mensibus*, Leipzig, 1903; reprinted Stuttgart.
- Wyatt, 1976: J.A. Wyatt, *The History of Troy in the Chronicles of John Malalas: the English translation and literary analysis of the Greek and Slavonic texts of Malalas' fifth book*, Ph.D. thesis, Berkeley.
- Zach. Mit.: Zachariah of Mytilene; see Brooks, 1919.
- Zotenberg, 1883: J. Zotenberg, trans., *Chronique de Jean, évêque de Nikiou*, Paris.
- ZRVI: *Zbornik Radova Vizantoloskog Instituta*.



# MALALAS, THE MAN AND HIS WORK

Brian Croke

As it stands, in eighteen books, the chronicle of Malalas covers the period from creation to A.D. 563, where Ba (= Oxford, Baroccianus 182, the single manuscript that preserves the bulk of the chronicle; see chapter 9, pp. 245-9) breaks off;<sup>1</sup> the chronicle originally continued to the death of Justinian in 565, possibly even as far as 574. The books vary in length, by far the longest being XVIII which is devoted to the reign of Justinian. The first fourteen books cover different expanses of time, while XV to XVIII are each concentrated on the reign of a single emperor (XV: Zeno; XVI: Anastasios; XVII: Justin I; XVIII: Justinian). Book I begins with Adam, includes a summary account of Noah and his progeny and takes the story forward to the Egyptians. Books II-IV then incorporate the earliest history of Greece (the kingdoms of Argos, Athens and Thebes) and V concentrates almost exclusively on the Trojan War. Book VI covers the Babylonian captivity and the kingdoms of the Lydians and Persians, as well as introducing Roman history through Aeneas. The foundation of Rome is the main subject of VII while VIII treats Alexander and the Hellenistic kingdoms. The basic framework for the first eight books is the chronology of Hebrew history from Adam to the high-priesthood of Addous. Sections covering stretches of other history such as that of the Greeks and Persians and the early history of Rome are set within this central chronological structure, beginning with Adam and continuing through the kings and high priests right down to the time of Christ. Such a pattern had long been established in Christian chronographical writing and in this respect Malalas was more or less following his predecessors (see chapter 2, pp. 30-33). Although frequently dismissed as an amorphous miscellany of information without any evident purpose, Books I-VIII follow a well-defined path and fit consistently within the author's stated intention.

In his preface (P 5) Malalas explains that his purpose is twofold: firstly, to set out the course of sacred history as interpreted by the Christian chronographic tradition (Africanus, Eusebios, Theophilos and Domninos, amongst others); secondly, to provide a summary account of events from Adam to Justinian. The first explicit purpose is largely covered by Books I to VIII. Book IX treats of Roman republican history culminating with Augustus and the incarnation of Christ. This spills over into Book X which includes an important chronological digression explaining that Christ was born in the year 5967 and crucified in the year 6000 from the creation, before continuing on from

<sup>1</sup>The abbreviations used for the witnesses to Malalas are included in the list of Abbreviations (p. xi ff.) and the texts themselves discussed in chapter 9 (p. 245 ff.).

Tiberius to Nerva (A.D. 14-98). Books XI and XII embrace the emperors from Trajan to the Tetrarchy (A.D. 98-305), covering little more than the activities of successive emperors in Antioch. The Christian empire begins with Constantine and Theodosius I in Book XIII while XIV covers the years from Theodosius II to Leo II (A.D. 402-474), and XV-XVIII from Zeno to Justinian (A.D. 474-565). In other words IX to XVIII continue I to VIII in following the second purpose Malalas indicated in his preface – a summary version of events right up to and including the author's lifetime.<sup>2</sup>

This chapter will endeavour to ascertain what can be known about the author and his background.

### 1. *Nomenclature and era*

Except for his citation by contemporaries or near contemporaries (Evagrius and John of Ephesos: cf. chapter 9, pp. 250 and 304-6), all that is known of the author of the chronicle has to be gleaned from the work itself. The preface (as preserved in P) tells us only that his name was John and, following the sole testimony of the Slavonic version, that he came from Antioch:

A report of John, descended from the time of Constantine the Great, beginning from the time of the creation of the world.

*report*: 'account of world history' Slav.

*John*: perhaps 'John Malalas' Slav (see the next lemma).

*descended from the time of Constantine the Great*: 'originally from the city of Antioch the Great in (Lesser) Syria' Slav (one should probably conjecture 'Malaly' genitive of Malalas, for 'Malyya', 'Lesser').<sup>3</sup>

Immediately we are confronted by the profound textual difficulties which aggravate study of the chronicle: is the preface a considerably syncopated version of the original or is it complete? If it is complete, then what does 'descended from the time of Constantine the Great' mean? Is it a reference to John's own family? If it reflects a scribal abbreviation then does it somehow refer to the content of the chronicle itself or to the city of Antioch in particular? Or does it simply indicate that, as so often, the opening page of the exemplar available to P was illegible? And what about the Slavonic at this point? Does it reflect the original more closely than the Greek? If so, then we can be sure that the author was from Antioch and was known as John Malalas (as is indicated in the apparatus quoted above). If not, then this probably reflects the inference or knowledge of the translator. It has to be admitted that certainty is not possible. Nonetheless it is reasonable to accept the combined testimony of the Greek and Slavonic that the author's

<sup>2</sup>Note, however, that Scott, 1990, argues suggestively that the chronicle is structured in triads of three six-book sections. Scott has passed on a suggestion from Michael Daniel that the work is also structured in three groups of six books each based on an aspect of Byzantium's triple heritage, Books I-VI providing the Hebrew/Old Testament background, Books VII-XII covering Roman history (Book VII having the foundation of Rome both as its title and principal subject) and Books XIII-XVIII (beginning with Constantine) treating the Christian Roman empire. This could be summed up as Jerusalem, Rome and Constantinople.

<sup>3</sup>Translation and apparatus for this and all passages from Malalas cited elsewhere are taken from Jeffreys/Jeffreys/Scott, 1986. References to this 1986 translation are by book and paragraph, together with a page reference to Dindorf's Bonn edition of 1831 (= Bo).

name was John, and there is no difficulty in accepting the ascription to Antioch since it is an inevitable inference from the content of the work.

The earliest attested use of the chronicle comes from the church historians John of Ephesos writing in the 580s and Evagrius writing in the 590s (as is also discussed in chapter 9, pp. 304-6 and 250). The author is called 'John of Antioch' by John of Ephesos, while Evagrius refers to Malalas as 'John the Rhetor' (ῥήτωρ). It is clear that subsequently, if not already, he was known primarily by the Syriac epithet 'Malalas' which is used even by Greek writers such as John of Damascus in the eighth century (PG 94, col. 1369). Besides 'John Malalas' John of Damascus also calls him 'John of Antioch'. Other later writers who used the chronicle, such as the twelfth-century John Tzetzes in his *Chiliades* (II, 33) and the tenth-century Constantinian excerptor (in the relevant passages in *De virtutibus* and *De insidiis*), call the author 'John Malalas' (or 'Malelas'), distinguishing him from 'John of Antioch'. One can only assume that the author's name was clearly stated in the manuscripts with which these later writers were familiar.

The Syriac root 'mll' is one with a complex philological history; some of its derivatives, with connotations of eloquence or learning, come close to being equivalent to the Greek word 'rhetor': this point is discussed in chapter 9 at p. 306 and note 108. It would nevertheless seem that the author was distinguished by a title denoting a man of reasonable education in his day, at least well read in the available instruction in rhetoric and possibly too in law. It was an education designed to equip one for the mainstream of governmental or ecclesiastical service. Evagrius, a trained lawyer himself, did not misunderstand the term 'rhetor' or use it lightly. He also applied it to the church historian Zacharias, advocate and bishop (Ev II 2, 39.17; II 10, 61.30; III 5, 104.20; III 9, 109.5). Zacharias studied grammar, rhetoric, and philosophy at Alexandria, as well as law at Beirut, before joining the bar in the imperial capital (PLRE 2, 1194-6); one of his fellow students was Severus from Sozopolis, who later became patriarch of Antioch (512-518). If Evagrius is consistent in using the term 'rhetor', then John Malalas was fairly well educated by contemporary standards. The implications of this fact have not always been appreciated, except by those such as Hody (1691) and Sotiriadis (1888) who have interpreted it as a sign that, since an educated man of the sixth century could never have written such a pedestrian work, then it must belong to some later period. Furthermore, the fact that John was consistently known by the Syriac rather than the Greek title would appear to suggest that not only was he a Syriac speaker but also that he was identified with his native Syrian culture. Until now the implications of this fact have never been explored either: first steps in this direction are taken in chapters 3 (pp. 59, 65-66) and 4 (p. 80).

Besides his name the other vital piece of information contained in the preface is the period of his lifetime. Malalas tells us that he has set out to provide 'as truthfully as possible a summary account of events that took place in the time of the emperors up till the events of my own lifetime which came to my hearing, I mean indeed from Adam to

the reign of Zeno [474-91]<sup>4</sup> and those who ruled afterwards'. He does not say that he was actually born during Zeno's reign, that is before 491, although that would appear to be the impression he seeks to convey. What he is saying is that for the period up until 474 (Zeno's accession) he was able to make use of written sources of information but that from then onwards he had the additional advantage of being able to verify information because he had heard about the events he is recording. This does not necessarily mean that he must have been an adult for all or most of Zeno's reign. He probably means that from memory Zeno's reign was as far back as he could go. It would be fairly safe to conclude therefore that Malalas was born in the 480s (or perhaps even the 470s). At the time he was born the living memory in a city such as Antioch, perhaps even in his own family, would have stretched back to the 420s, just as in the 1980s it stretches back to the 1920s. Yet, as we shall see (below, pp. 18-22) Malalas was researching and writing in the 530s, half a century later. The old-timers of the 530s (born in the reigns of Marcian and Leo) would have been young adults in the reign of Zeno when Malalas was a boy, in other words the generation of Malalas' parents. They could provide him with valuable first-hand testimony for the period from Zeno onwards but only rarely before. So what Malalas says in his preface should be understood literally: he was born in the reign of Zeno and for the period beforehand was obliged to resort to written sources. How precisely this claim is reflected in the chronicle we shall see later (p. 8). If, for argument's sake, we say that he was born in the period 480-490 he would have been 10 to 20 years old during the Persian war of Anastasios, 35 to 45 when the great earthquake struck Antioch in 526, 50 to 60 when the Persians invaded Antioch in 540 and 75 to 85 when Justinian died in 565. On these calculations – and they cannot be far out – he was a slightly younger contemporary of Justinian and about the same age as John Lydus, so that when he completed the updated edition of the chronicle in the 560s or 570s he will have been an old man.

Although tenuous, there are a few traces of the author's physical and mental context in the chronicle. Above all there is the significant fact that he wrote in Antioch, or at least composed the first edition of his work there. This was the city he knew best and which provided a point of reference for his knowledge of the rest of the world and especially its past. Perhaps he was born and educated in Antioch or in its hinterland. His familiarity with the city is reflected particularly on those occasions when he refers to historic buildings and statues still standing in his day (see chapter 5, pp. 98-102) – even though some of his references were purely literary – and to local customs and traditions such as the festival of Io (II §7, Bo 29). This is explored further in chapter 3, pp. 58-59.

Malalas was acquainted, however, with the wider world. There are precise indications of his being in two places far apart – Thessalonike in Macedonia and Paneas in Palestine. In Book VII he includes an unusual story, a product of several accretions, of the origin and meaning of the month of February. This story which is based on a conflict between a certain Februarius and Manlius Capitolinus (properly Camillus) is used to explain the contemporary custom whereby sacks of straw were thrown out of the city. 'I found this

<sup>4</sup>This is the reading of P; the Slavonic omits the words 'Adam to' and thus reads simply 'from the reign of Zeno'.



account', says Malalas, 'in the city of Thessalonike, and when I had read it I found the title of the book was the *Account* of Brunichius, the Roman chronicler' (VII §12, Bo 187). Here we have Malalas at some stage in Thessalonike, purpose undisclosed, noting the contents of rare works. The same applies to his visit to Paneas (Caesarea Philippi) on the main highway from Damascus to Tyre. On this occasion he reports the story (derived from *Mark* 5.25-34) of a petition by Veronica to King Herod II to erect a statue of Jesus who had cured her of haemorrhage. Malalas quotes the full text of the petition claiming that he 'found this document in the city of Paneas in the house of a man called Bassus, a Jew who had become Christian' (X §12, Bo 239). Moreover, Veronica's petition was successful. A bronze statue was erected which Malalas may have seen since he tells us that the statue remains but has been moved from the centre of the city, where it originally stood, to a chapel where it had presumably become an object of special devotion. This is consistent with the tradition that this famous representation which Eusebios knew (*HE* 7.18) was broken up by the emperor Julian but later reassembled by the Christians in a local church where it was displayed by the mid-fifth century (Soz, *HE* 5.21).

Both these glimpses of Malalas suggest a man interested in searching out documents, especially those which throw light on modern customs and works of art. By any standards this is real research, although it is impossible to know if at this stage he already had in mind (or was actually engaged in) writing the chronicle. The difficult problem, however, is to determine how much else in the chronicle is the product of first-hand experience, given Malalas' wholesale use of written sources (as indicated in chapter 7). Since he was at Paneas it is very possible he also knew Tyre, the metropolis of the province of Phoenike, and may even have witnessed the annual re-enactment of the invasion of Tyre one evening from the sea by king Tauros of Crete and his abduction of Europe, daughter of the Tyrian king Agenor. 'The people of Tyre', according to Malalas, 'have performed a memorial rite for that evening to the present day, calling it "Accursed Evening"' (II §8, Bo 31). So too he may have known Tripolis on the road from Antioch into Palestine. Malalas records the work of reconstruction at Tripolis by the emperor Marcian after an earthquake, noting in particular the two bronze statues of Ikaros/Daedalos and Bellerophon/Pegasos which he describes as 'a wonderful sight' (XIV §29, Bo 367). He may also have passed through Scythopolis, metropolis of the province of Second Palestine, where there was a statue of a girl called Nyssa, sacrificed by Iphigeneia, with a dedicatory inscription which 'remains until now' (V §65, Bo 139). Although such claims may merely have been copied by Malalas from his source (and the status of these phrases is discussed further in chapter 7, p. 206-7), nonetheless in his day there was a ready acceptance of heroic Greek relics, as Prokopios notes in explaining his sightings of the tusks of the Caledonian boar in Benevento (*Wars* VIII 15. 8), the inscription to Artemis set up by Agamemnon (VIII 22. 28), and the tomb of Apsyrtos (VIII 2. 14). Elsewhere too Prokopios shows his faith in mythical topography (VIII 22. 19; VIII 2. 30-33; VIII 5. 23-5; V 11. 2; cf. chapter 4, pp. 70-71).

It is also unlikely for a Christian in the sixth century who travelled from Antioch to Palestine not to have gone as far as the main pilgrim's destination of Jerusalem, although

Malalas gives no indication of first-hand knowledge of the city. Similarly, to get to Thessalonike he may have passed through Asia to Constantinople, if he travelled overland. He may therefore have actually seen at Iconium (mod. Konya) the statue of Perseus and the Gorgon which 'stands there until the present' (II §17, Bo 36), or again this is perhaps a literary device only. Further, he possibly saw for himself in Kyzikos the large bust of Hadrian on his temple 'which remains to the present day' (XI §16, Bo 279). Constantinople is one place where he will definitely have stayed on a journey which took in Thessalonike and this is evident enough from the chronicle. So when he reports that 'some of the people of Byzantion say that it is still there' (XIII §7, Bo 320), referring to the palladion buried under the column of Constantine in his forum, Malalas is echoing what he himself heard in the city. His contemporary Prokopios heard exactly the same claim (*Wars* V 15. 14). Personal experience probably also lies behind his account of Theodosius I's demolition of pagan temples on the Acropolis: the temple of Helios became a courtyard for the 'Great Church' and is 'called the "Courtyard of Helios" to the present day'; the Temple of Artemis was turned into a gaming room known as "the Temple" to the present day and the street nearby is called "The Fawn"' (XIII §39, Bo 345). While in the imperial capital Malalas may have witnessed the great celebrations commemorating annually the foundation of the city on 11th May. He describes how Constantine decreed that at the anniversary race meeting in the hippodrome a wooden statue of himself 'should be brought in, escorted by the soldiers wearing cloaks and boots, all holding candles; the carriage should march around the turning post and reach the pit opposite the imperial *kathisma* and the emperor of the time should rise and make obeisance as he gazed at this statue of Constantine and the *tyche* of the city'. Malalas concludes by observing that 'this custom has been maintained to the present day' (XIII §8, Bo 322), as indeed was possible (cf. Cameron/Herrin, 1984, 216 and 243). At Constantinople too he may have heard the chronicler Fortunus explaining the creation (I §1, P 6), an issue of great contemporary philosophic and scientific concern (Sorabji, 1987), and it was probably there that he encountered Marinus the Syrian, the emperor's chief financial adviser and then Praetorian Prefect of the East (PLRE 2, 726-8). It is arguable that Malalas' detailed version of the Greek fire used against Vitalian in 515 came from Marinus; likewise Marinus may have been the source for Malalas' account of the monophysite riot in Constantinople in 512 in which his own house was put to the torch (see also chapter 7, p. 209). If so, Malalas may have been in the imperial capital around 515-520.

## 2. Antioch

A central feature of the chronicle is its Antiochene focus. Antioch was the city of Malalas' life. In Malalas' time in the late fifth and the earlier part of the sixth century Antioch was a major cosmopolitan capital of the Roman east. Above all it was a key centre for both the civil and military administration, being the headquarters of the *comes Orientis* (who was responsible to the emperor, through the Praetorian Prefect, for the whole Eastern diocese), the *magister militum per Orientem* (commander-in-chief of all the forces in the East including those in the Persian frontier zone) and the proconsul of the

province of Syria I, the local province. To function effectively in Antioch one required a knowledge of Greek and Latin, the languages of the office and the army, as well as Syriac, the language of the markets. Social and intellectual life was woven from the mingled strain of Roman and Graeco-Syrian culture (Ciocan-Yvanescu, 1969, 53-73; Devreesse, 1945, 108-123; Liebeschuetz, 1972, 101-18). The Roman republic was long ago and far away and Malalas' knowledge of it was mainly confined to the background to some of the ancient festivals which were still being celebrated: the Brumalia (VII §7, Bo 179), the Consilia (= Consualia; VII §9, Bo 183), the Februalia (VII §12, Bo 187) and the indefinite one in the 'Campus Martius' (VII §3, Bo 173). Furthermore, he notes other traditional Roman customs such as a consul's clothing (II §9, Bo 33), a type of army punishment (II §36, Bo 50), and the imperial plural formula for introducing laws and decrees (VII §2, Bo 172; on all this, see also chapter 3, pp. 59-60).

Local history and customs were of greater interest. Apart from the material on the mythical origins of Antioch and its Seleucid foundation, Malalas provides a systematic account of the involvement of Roman emperors at Antioch concentrating almost exclusively on the buildings they erected (cf. chapter 5, pp. 91-93). From Caesar onwards he had better sources of information than for the previous period. It appears likely that most of this information came from Domninos (see chapter 7, pp. 197-98) but it must remain an open question whether the errors and rationalisations which occur in these accounts were the responsibility of Domninos or of Malalas himself. On one occasion Malalas was able to evaluate critically and discount the information of Domninos but he may not always have been in a position to do so (cf. XII §26, Bo 297). The principal category of error probably attributable to Malalas is the ascription of a building to the wrong emperor which stems from the fact that he uses the word 'built' (ἔκτισεν) in the sense of 'completed', even where the bulk of the construction occurred in a previous reign. At the same time he gives the impression of having consulted inscriptions at first hand when he evidently did not (Downey, 1935; see also chapter 7, p. 200-1).

What may actually be the defect of his source Domninos is the tendency of Malalas to associate necessarily some construction at Antioch with the imperial presence in the city. Thus Agrippa is incorrectly stated as accompanying Augustus to Antioch in 31 B.C. while a trip there by Antoninus Pius is invented to explain his building. Similarly, the imperial presence is explained by a fictitious campaign against the Persians: this is the case with Tiberius and Constantine, while Trajan counteracts a fictitious Persian invasion. In addition to these shortcomings Malalas frequently confuses emperors of similar nomenclature which leads him to attribute Valerian's work to Gallienus and Galerius' to Maximian, Theodosius II's to Theodosius I and perhaps Antoninus' to Caracalla. There are also confusions with his accounts of the Antiochene activity of Claudius, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian and Diocletian, as well as Valens, probably due to the fact that epigraphic records lie behind them (Downey, 1935). Nonetheless the chronicle is a fundamental and generally reliable source for the construction of Antioch. Malalas' method, or the method of his source Domninos, was apparently to record the local time-worn tradition which surrounded a particular building in the city or to infer its origins from the building itself in the absence of verifiable records. In that sense it is not

unlike the later patriographers of Constantinople and Malalas' contemporary Hesychios (cf. chapters 2, p. 36 and 5, p. 96-8). Beside the buildings of Antioch the other systematic and detailed record of Antiochene history in the chronicle is that concerning the celebration and discontinuance of the Olympic games at Antioch (XII §§3-10, Bo 284-8; cf. von Stauffenberg, 1931, 412-443). Again there are some elements of rationalisation and confusion in this material but it is basically sound. Again too, it was probably to be found in Domninos, a comprehensive writer whose material covered the whole of Antiochene history from the remote past to at least the time of Diocletian, when he is last cited, and perhaps to the mid-fifth century where the last account of a local building (the 'Basilica of Anatolius' [XIV §13, Bo 360], restored by Theodora in 527 [XVII §19, Bo 423]) occurs.

From around the mid-fifth century there is a discernible shift in the nature of the Antiochene material included in the chronicle. The turning point seems to be Malalas' lengthy and detailed account of the earthquake of September 458 (XIV §36, Bo 369), though this is no longer preserved in Ba. This immediately highlights a special problem: by this stage the version of the chronicle preserved in Ba is considerably abbreviated and the process of abbreviation would appear to affect especially the Antiochene material. The Tusculan Fragments (TF) show us that the original chronicle included an account of John Chrysostom (TF 2, at XIII §45, Bo 348) and a more detailed account of the empress Eudokia's sojourn in Antioch (TF 2, at XIV §8, Bo 357) while from Evagrius, supported by John of Ephesos as preserved in Pseudo-Dionysios, we see that the earthquake of 458 was recounted at length; the Slavonic version preserves the reputation of Mammianos for his work at Daphne (XV §11, sub-text). From this point onwards it would appear that Malalas' source was not a previous narrative account but rather the local records of Antioch, including what is usually described as the city chronicle or *acta urbis* (for details, see chapter 7, pp. 203-5).

By now too we are in the period of Malalas' own lifetime when he claims to be relying on first-hand accounts of events, that is, things he witnessed himself or at least heard about. Since he never actually indicates direct observation of events at Antioch these first-hand accounts can only be guessed at. Yet even though he may originally have lived through an episode recorded in the chronicle, it does not preclude the use of written sources at the time he came actually to write the chronicle in the 530s. He would have been only a young boy when Antioch became the base for the bold declaration of Leontios as emperor in 484, when Mammianos graced Daphne with new buildings (XV §11, sub-text) and the occasions when the city was engulfed in the fury of factional violence (XV §15, Bo 389-90; XVI §2, Bo 393). As he came to manhood, however, he could have seen the activity generated by the conduct of a war with Persia, the imposture of John Isthmeos (XVI §5, Bo 395), the strife between the Blues and Greens in 507 (XVI §6, Bo 396-8) and the reconstruction of the basilica of Rufinus (XVI §8, Bo 398). As he grew older he probably lived through the rebellion of Vitalian at Constantinople, as we have seen, and then again events in Antioch. It should be remembered that Malalas probably saw for himself the giant Cilician woman in Antioch in 519 (XVII §7, Bo 412), the great fire in 520 (XVII §16, Bo 419-21), the faction riots in 522 (XVII §12, Bo 416-

7), the devastating earthquakes in 526 (XVII §14, Bo 417) and 528 (XVIII §27, Bo 442), the 'bearded comet' (XVII §4, Bo 411) and the building activity of Justinian (XVII §19, Bo 423). Soon after, Antioch was once again preoccupied with catering for the conduct of a war with Persia and this occupies most of the remaining space in the first edition of the chronicle. Clearly the war was of major concern to him.

The account of the earthquake of 458 is the first of such detailed descriptions in the chronicle. Although only summarily recorded in Ba (XIV §36, Bo 369), the version of Evagrius (II 12, 63.9-64.15) is taken from Malalas and is sufficient to indicate the detail involved. It records precisely the extent of the damage and the emperor's response to the disaster. Such documents were usual in the Roman world, that is, earthquakes were investigated by imperial officials and reports compiled for dispatch to the court which then provided relief in the form of cash or tax remissions (cf. chapter 8, p. 228, for some of the phrases used). Malalas' account is probably based on such a document which he will have found in the local archives of Antioch, probably in the files of the *comes Orientis*, the chief civilian official in the city. The same applies to his account of the earthquakes of 526 and 528, even though he experienced them at first hand. These local archives will also have contained acclamations accompanying the movement of the emperor's representative in the city, copies of all laws promulgated in Antioch, and of all inscriptions, and that is probably where Malalas located them. For the period of his lifetime he quotes several imperial laws and it has been shown that he based his description of them on their publication at Antioch (Scott, 1981a and chapter 7, p. 202).

Archives at Antioch will not have contained documents pertaining only to Antioch. They will also have included documents relating to the whole region, both military and civilian, administered from the city. Thus it is quite likely that they would contain reports of earthquakes in Gabala (XV §4, Bo 378) and Anazarbos (XVII §15, Bo 418) and it was probably from the archives that Malalas derived his detailed account of the earthquake in Phoenicia (XVIII §112, Bo 485), rebellions at Caesarea (XV §8, Bo 382-3) and in Isauria (XVI §3, Bo 393-4), floods in Edessa (XVII §15, Bo 418-9), the construction of a fortress such as Dara (XVI §10, Bo 399) and the negotiations with Caucasian potentates (XVII §9, Bo 413-5) which may have been conducted at some stage through the office of the *comes Orientis* in Antioch. Local archives, as has been established for the laws referred to by Malalas, included documents and accounts of events from beyond Antioch's administrative reach but which were reported in the city. It is on such a report from Constantinople that Malalas bases his version of the Nika riot. This account blames the episode on 'avenging demons' and 'the devil' (XVIII §71, Bo 473-4) and portrays it as the suppression of a usurpation, rather than a deep-seated and factional rebellion incompetently managed by the authorities. Malalas' view, which is that of 'a spectator in the town' (Bury, 1897a, 94), therefore reflects the public version of events promoted by the imperial court in the aftermath of the riot (cf. Cameron [A.M.], 1985, 65; Scott, 1981a, 17-18) and sent to all the cities of the East, including Antioch, as Malalas notes (XVIII §71, Bo 476). Although based on the governmental report Malalas clearly added details of his own, such as naming a local Antiochene victim of the revolt, Antipatros (XVIII §71, sub-text), the city's chief official (*vindex*) who was probably in

the capital on public business. Other happenings in the imperial capital which were noted in the local records at Antioch and included in the chronicle are the accession and flight of Zeno and subsequent events including the later rebellion of Illus and Leontios (XV §§2-6, Bo 377-81), the death and translation of Simeon the Stylite (XIV §37, Bo 369), the trial and conversion of Isokasios (XIV §38, Bo 370), an earthquake (XV §11, Bo 385), a riot (XVI §4, Bo 394-5) and the elevation of Justinian (XVII §18, Bo 422).

As a rhetor John Malalas of Antioch was well equipped to function as one of the thousands of officials in the civilian and military bureaucracy at Antioch in the sixth century. Indeed, one of the overt features of the chronicle is its pervasive bureaucratic outlook and phraseology (see chapter 8, pp. 225-30) and the way this contemporary frame of reference is used to describe events of long ago. So we find anachronistic use of terms such as *limes* or 'exarch' or 'senators' (see also chapter 3, p. 61). For more recent centuries, however, it must be admitted that Malalas' use of technical terminology of government and court is precise and consistent, far more so than one otherwise finds in sixth-century authors. His correct use of the Greek terms for the various *magistri militum* (e.g. *magister militum praesentalis*: στρατηλάτης πραισέντου, XIV §46, Bo 375; senior *magister militum praesentalis*: στρατηλάτης τοῦ μεγάλου πραισέντου, XV §3, Bo 378; etc) and praetorian prefects (e.g. praetorian prefect of the East: ἑπαρχὸς πραιτωρίων ἀνατολῆς, XVI §9, Bo 398), not to mention other less exalted positions, together with his attention to the creation and division of provinces and their metropoleis, suggests an author attuned to the style and habits of the apparatus of government (see chapter 7, pp. 205-6 and chapter 8, pp. 226-8). In addition, especially in the contemporary books (XV-XVIII), he displays a fairly substantial interest in precisely the sort of things with which the provincial government at Antioch was concerned (war with Persia and the Arabian tribes, building, disasters, rebellions, local publication of imperial laws and decrees, and so on). Above all, Malalas provides a virtually complete source for all the *comites Orientis* of this period; for some he is the only source (see chapter 6, pp. 160-2).

One gets the impression that what lies behind the later books is a record of the major happenings of the East Roman world, as filtered through Antioch. Frequently events are recorded as being reported from Antioch to the emperor in Constantinople, or from the capital to Antioch and the East. The area of jurisdiction of the *comes Orientis*, stationed at Antioch, comprised the provinces of Isauria (metropolis: Seleukeia) and Cilicia (metropolis: Anazarbos), Osroene (Edessa) and Mesopotamia (Hierapolis), Syria I (Antioch) and II (Apamea) and Phoenicia I (Tyre) and II (Damascus), Palestine I (Caesarea) and II (Scythopolis), Arabia (Bostra) and Cyprus (Salamis). Notices of such matters as rebellions in Palestine or Isauria, earthquakes throughout the region and a flood at Edessa frequently appear in the chronicle couched in the language of official reporting to the court from Antioch. It is worth observing too that in describing events throughout the East in XV-XVIII Malalas frequently refers to specific documents (see chapter 7, pp. 204, 208). In some cases he even cites them verbatim. Many of these are imperial laws and, as noted previously, it is evident that he is relying on copies posted or preserved at Antioch. Likewise, in copying out the decree announcing the proclamation of the usurper Leontios

in 484 (XV §13, Bo 389; the decree is preserved in *De insidiis*, the Slavonic texts and Theophanes, though not in Ba), Malalas is relying on an Antiochene copy. Most of the other references to documents are to letters to and from the Persian king and the Roman emperor who conducted business with each other through Antioch. For all the documents and the majority of other information Malalas would have had good access to local records, probably those of the *comes Orientis*.

In the light of these considerations it makes sense to visualise Malalas as a middle to high ranking official in the imperial bureaucracy at Antioch – probably in the office of the *comes Orientis* for which he provides such valuable and exclusive information. That is precisely the sort of work a 'rhetor' was trained to execute – handling the paper-work of the imperial administration, reporting to the emperor on developments in the region, receiving and publishing reports from the imperial capital, ensuring the smooth functioning of court officials in the field, especially diplomats such as Hermogenes and Rufinus. In Malalas' day the office of the *comes Orientis* comprised some 600 officials with a bar (*advocati fisci*) of 40 who were required to have undertaken some regular course of legal study (Jones, 1964, 509, 512, 592). It is not necessary to suppose that Malalas was one of the *advocati*, though it is not impossible. His interest in law has been noted in other contexts (Scott, 1981a, and chapter 7, pp. 202) and it has to be remembered that in the sixth-century East it was no longer necessary for a lawyer or civil servant to know Latin (cf. Jones, 1964, 987-90), nor was a thorough legal knowledge required or expected even for *advocati* (Liebeschuetz, 1972, 247-52).

Finally, we may even suppose that a 'rhetor' such as John Malalas was in fact himself involved in the conduct of many of the transactions recorded in the chronicle. He would appear to have had close contact with eminent imperial officials such as Marinus and Hermogenes (see also chapter 7, pp. 209-10) and this may have stemmed from his own occupation in the office of the *comes Orientis*. Indeed, if he was employed in the bureaucracy of the *comes* it might be further supposed that the particular bureaucratic perspective of the chronicle would have appealed to other like-minded people. The vast ranks of civil and military officials in sixth-century Antioch were possibly the prime audience Malalas had in mind when he set about writing the chronicle.

### 3. *Religious Views*

Chronicles were originally developed and became popular because they fulfilled a religious function, that is, they explained the pattern of God's providence for mankind in a complete and organized chronological framework. The chronicle of Malalas was little different in this respect. In the first place it integrated the whole of Hebrew and classical history in a way reminiscent of gnostic and Manichaean traditions and was firmly located in the context of the religious world of the sixth century. In addition it is evident that Malalas relied for his information mainly on Christian sources and the Christian scriptures, including what are now regarded as apocryphal writings. Most important of all, however, the backbone of the chronicle itself is the chronographical thesis expounded by the writer, namely that by any reckoning the portentous year 6000 has passed (see Jeffreys, 1990 and chapter 6, pp. 111-20). According to Malalas, the year 6000 actually

passed with the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ who was born in the year 5967 from creation (X §2, Bo 228-9). This was a very radical thesis, completely out of step with the established Byzantine chronology which placed the year of creation at 5500 years before the birth of Christ (5508 by modern counting). By the reckoning of this so-called 'Byzantine era' the year 6000 began at the very outset of Anastasios' reign. Malalas apparently provided a chronological summation at the end of XV, on the death of Zeno (XV §16, Bo 391), though most of the details have failed to survive in Ba and the text has to be reconstructed from Theophanes and Michael the Syrian (see chapter 6, pp. 117-8). The purpose of this summation would seem to have been to counteract the calculation of the year 6000 at this point, just as another summation was included at 528/9 to counteract the passing of the year 6000 then by some other (as yet unidentified) calculation. The background to this latter calculation is now obscured from view but it appears to have emerged from local Syrian apocalyptic fears accentuated by a series of natural disasters, culminating in the Antiochene earthquake of 526 (see Harvey, 1988; Jeffreys, 1990). Malalas' cosmic chronology was clearly novel but ultimately unpersuasive, to judge by the way later writers who used the chronicle ignored or consciously altered its chronological statements. Nevertheless, in the 530s it was considered very important.

Malalas' own religious background and views are more complex and it is difficult to assess how typical they are for sixth-century Antioch. Of special concern, as already indicated, is the need to date accurately the time of Christ. In describing the events of Christ's lifetime Malalas is especially punctilious. For the incarnation (IX §25, Bo 226), birth (X §1, Bo 227), the preaching and beheading of John the Baptist (X §11, Bo 236), the events of Thursday of Holy Week (X §14, Bo 240), the crucifixion (X §14, Bo 240), resurrection (X §14, Bo 241), ascension (X §14, Bo 241) and Pentecost (X §15, Bo 242) he records the precise hour, day of the week, day of the month (including, sometimes, the lunar month), consulship, and year of Antioch (see chapter 6, pp. 120-22). This concentration of detailed dating is unusual for the chronicle and again underscores the significance of accurate chronology in describing crucial cosmic events. These very dates were to prove especially significant for a later writer in the West – the author of the *Laterculus Malalianus* who used some version of the chronicle in his own treatise on the incarnation (see chapter 9, pp. 287-99). The apostolic period is treated rather selectively. There is Paul at Athens (X §30, Bo 251), Antioch (X §15, Bo 242) and Rome (X §37, Bo 257), James in Jerusalem (X §42, Bo 258), John exiled to Patmos (X §48, Bo 262), then recalled to Ephesos (X §54, Bo 268), only to disappear soon after (XI §2, Bo 269) with Africanus and Irenaeus quoted as authorities. Of special interest is the lengthy account of the encounter at Rome between Peter and Simon Magus, based on the apocryphal version surviving in the *Acta Petri* (Lipsius, 1891, 45-103). Malalas' use of other apocrypha probably lies behind his report of Pilate (X §36, Bo 256), though it is not to be found in the extant *Acta Pilati* (cf. Mavromati-Katsouyiannopoulou, 1988), and his curious statement on the disappearance of John from Ephesos, for such alternative versions circulated in Antioch (Severus, *Ep.* 93; PO 14, 343). These apocrypha had long been an integral part of the literature and intellectual tradition of Syrian Christianity.



Outside Jerusalem Antioch (with its large Jewish community) was the next most important city in the development of Christianity, the place where many of the significant differences of opinion between Peter, Paul and James emerged. It later became the cradle of great theologians and bishops as well as of a distinctively historical school of exegesis; but it was also an important intellectual entrepot where the influence of Mesopotamian and Iranian ideas infiltrated the local gnostic Christian tradition. Moreover, Antioch stood in close exchange with Edessa where the indigenous bilingual Greek and Semitic culture nurtured the development of peculiar Syrian ways of thought and religious practice (Drijvers, 1984). Not all the versions and elements of these interpretations of Christian history and theology can now be recovered. Were that possible we would probably find that many of Malalas' apparent novelties of interpretation and emphasis merely reflect well-developed contemporary ideas, e.g. his understanding of the 'mystic knowledge' with which he endows Picus Zeus (I §13, P 16), Herakles (IV §22, Bo 86) Sampson (IV §17, Bo 81), Kirke (V §50, Bo 118), Cleopatra (IX §10, Bo 219), Augustus (X §6, Bo 232), the *magoi* who brought gifts to the newborn Jesus (X §4, Bo 229) and the count Maurianos (XV §16, Bo 390; cf. chapter 3, pp. 63-64).

It must be remembered that at the time the chronicle was being written (in the early 530s) Justinian was engaged in a decisive persecution of Manichaeans and other pagans. Antioch was particularly affected. Malalas was clearly interested in one of the most significant manifestations of the Syrian religious tradition, that is, Manichaeism, or at least it was thought important enough to be recorded in the chronicle. Like the patriarch Severus (*Ep.* 27; PO 12, 259), he links Mani and Marcion by smearing the dualist Marcion, an important influence in Syrian theology, as a 'Manichaean' (XI §19, Bo 279-80), while his account of Mani himself is misplaced (X §54, Bo 268) – probably because he thought he must predate the obviously Manichaean Marcion – and he provides no details. Further on he records a certain Manichaean preacher named Kerdon (XII §31, Bo 301) and in Diocletian's reign another named Boundos (XII §42, Bo 309-10). Malalas apparently thought it worth explaining that this man preached a new doctrine which appears to reflect the dualist strand of Syrian theology, namely that 'the good God [Christ?] had made war on the evil one and had conquered him and that it was necessary to honour the victor'. He goes on to say that Boundos taught this doctrine in Persia where it was known in the local tongue as 'that of the Daristhenoi' (see Lieu, 1985, 86). Here we see Malalas, as so often elsewhere (and especially in Book I), displaying a familiarity with Persian language, customs and ideas (cf. chapter 3, p. 65-66).

Manichaeism was particularly persecuted in the time of Malalas. He notes the persecution by the emperor Justin in 523 (XVII §21, Bo 423) and relates at some length the origins in 529 of the campaign against Manichaeans launched by the Persian king, who summoned all Manichaeans to the palace on a false pretext where they were herded together and put to the sword. Malalas concludes by acknowledging that he owes this information to a Persian courier who subsequently converted to Christianity and took the name of Timotheos (XVIII §30, Bo 444). It is not clear whether these details were contained in some written account or whether Malalas himself met Timotheos. What is

likely, however, is that Timotheos' description came to his attention in Antioch in the course of routine diplomatic activities with the Persian court. Timotheos was perhaps one of the Persians who travelled back and forth to Antioch on Persian imperial business. He may also therefore be the source for the remission of persecution at the accession of the new king Chosroes in September 531 (XVIII §69, Bo 472). Malalas sets this particular item in the context of the exchange of documents establishing the truce which led to the formulation of the 'Endless Peace'. It is easy to envisage a role for Timotheos in this process and to appreciate how Malalas encountered him, or at least his information. It is also arguable, though rather unlikely, that he is to be identified with the chronicler Timotheos, one of Malalas' major sources (chapter 7, p. 195-96).

In Antioch long exposure to the ideas and practices of Mani, Zoroaster and the traditions of Oriental magic and divination, such as those contained in the Chaldaean Oracles, the Hermetic Corpus and the Tübingen Theosophy, had inevitably shaped (and been shaped by) the development of Christian thought especially in bureaucratic circles (Fowden, 1986, 192). All these threads, old and new, became entwined with gnostic and orthodox Christian strains of thought in Syria and Mesopotamia to form the sort of amalgam which pervades the chronicle. That is why Malalas singles out for mention in their appropriate place authors like Julian the Chaldaean (XI §30, Bo 282), Theon (XIII §36, Bo 343) and Iamblichos (XII §47, Bo 312), the most 'Gnostic' of the neoplatonists. The Alexandrian mathematician and astrologer Theon is noted as an interpreter of Hermes Trismegistos and Orpheus (Fowden, 1986, 180), both of whom Malalas quotes at length and at second hand. Here again is revealed a nexus of authors and ideas of special interest to Malalas by the way their theogony is interpreted as foreshadowing the consubstantial Trinity. Christian doctrines, according to some, were prefigured in classical thought especially in the Hermetic literature (Fowden, 1986, 181-3): this is the import of the 'pagan oracles' contained in the Tübingen Theosophy and which were well known to Malalas and apparently to John Lydus too (Fowden, 1986, 211; see also chapter 7, pp. 182-3). An instructive picture of the strength of pagan, magic and theurgic practices in late fifth-century Syria – in this case among law-students from Beirut, who included future 'rhetores' and 'scholastikoi' – is drawn by Zacharias Scholastikos in his *Life of Severus* (PO 2.1, 57-9).

Although Antioch was an intensely theological city with a strong Christological tradition, Malalas himself shows little interest in theology. The Arian struggles of the fourth century which so embroiled Antioch are scarcely evident, except to note Valens' allotment of churches to the heretics (XIII §34, Bo 342) which was subsequently revoked by Theodosius I (XIII §37, Bo 344). Then there is the persecution of Arians by Leo (XIV §41, Bo 372) and the final confiscation of their churches in 538 (XVIII §84, Bo 479) after an earlier reprieve (XVIII §8, Bo 428). The emperor Constantius (XIII §17, Bo 325) and the Gothic king Athalaric are labelled Arians (XV §10, Bo 385). The council of Nicaea (XIII §11, Bo 323) is not discussed at any length and the same goes for the Council of Constantinople (XIII §40, Bo 346) and the important fifth-century councils at Ephesos (XIV §25, Bo 365) and Chalkedon (XIV §30, Bo 367). There is no explanation at all of Chalkedon; and all that is said of Ephesos is that it marked the demise of the 'heretic'

Nestorios, which is at least a clear sign that Malalas is no Nestorian. Nonetheless, this very passage has been taken to suggest that Malalas was a partisan of Nestorios (Patzig, 1898, 112). Not so. All Malalas says here is that this represented the heyday of Nestorios; he is correct and there is nothing special or partial in his phraseology at this point.

Despite his theological reticence Malalas does show some interest in the patriarchate of Antioch, especially in his own lifetime. The patriarchate covered the same extensive region as the civil administration (except for Palestine). The patriarch, seated in the metropolitan capital of Antioch, therefore exercised episcopal jurisdiction over the provinces of Isauria and Cilicia, Syria, Phoenicia, Arabia and Mesopotamia. In earlier generations Malalas mentions the Antiochene bishops Euodios (X §24, Bo 246-7) and Ignatios (XI §10, Bo 276-7) but no others before Peter the Fuller (XV §6, Bo 380; cf. the list in chapter 6, pp. 162-63). Malalas records in a single passage the deposition and exile of Peter to Euchaita, his replacement by Stephen, the murder of Stephen and the exile of his successor Kalandio followed by the recall of Peter. Now Peter, a long-standing friend of the emperor Zeno, was appointed to the patriarchate in 475 by Basiliskos who had deposed Zeno. On the restoration of Zeno in 476 Peter was exiled and replaced by the monophysite John Kodonatos. Three months later John was replaced by the orthodox Stephen who was killed by the monophysites in 479 and replaced by the orthodox Kalandio. In 484 Kalandio was deposed for supporting the usurpation of Leontios and Peter the Fuller was recalled. In this compressed passage (XV §6, Bo 380) Malalas recounts the fortunes of the patriarchate over a turbulent decade.

It is primarily on the basis of this passage that it is stated that Malalas was himself a monophysite (Krumbacher, 1897, 331 and most recently Hunger, 1978, I, 320; cf. too chapter 9, p. 300). The phrase 'as a Nestorian' which he attaches to Stephen and Kalandio is taken to be the jibe of a monophysite, that is to say, only a monophysite could possibly call these orthodox patriarchs 'Nestorian'. What Malalas is doing here, however, is not intruding his own theological views but simply reporting the factual situation in local terminology (Patzig, 1898, 115-7), and the facts are these: 'Nestorian' was a label freely applied in Antioch at the time – the orthodox Martyrios was called a 'Nestorian' (Th 113-4; Zach. Mit. 4.11) so too were Stephen (Theod. Anag. 418 = 116) and Kalandio (Zach. Mit. 5.9). There is no special significance in Malalas' wording. The same applies to his account of the later patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch (XVI §11, Bo 400): Euphemios and Makedonios were exiled from Constantinople as 'Nestorians' as was Flavian at Antioch (cf. JN 129). Euphemios had quarrelled with Anastasios and was indicted as a heretic, labelled in fact a 'Nestorian' by the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem (Th 139), while Makedonios was accused by the monophysites Philoxenos and Severus of Nestorianism (Th 158). Flavian too was subject to a powerful monophysite putsch, led by Philoxenos of Hierapolis, and replaced by Severus who was himself forced to flee on the accession of the orthodox emperor Justin (XVII §6, Bo 411). Severus' successor Paul was a staunch Chalcedonian (*ibid.*) which led to his supporters being cast as Nestorians. A vigorous persecutor of monophysites, Paul died soon after resigning the see in 521 (XVII §11, Bo 415). Euphrasios was the next patriarch (XVII

§11, Bo 416) until he was killed in the earthquake in 526, to be succeeded by Euphraimios who was still patriarch at the time that the first version of the chronicle was written in the 530s. He appears leading the people of Antioch in supplication after the earthquake in 528 (XVIII §27, Bo 443) and ransoming captives in 531 (XVIII §59, Bo 460).

The chronicle therefore presents a consistent account of the patriarchate of Antioch: sketchy for the most part but (with two exceptions; see chapter 6, pp. 160-62) complete for the lifetime of Malalas, from Zeno to Justinian. Moreover, it is not a theologically sensitive or passionate record; rather it is simple, factual and clearly orthodox. Certainly there is no special support for the monophysite Severus and no mention at all of the other monophysite heroes such as Kodonatos and Philoxenos who was responsible for the demise of Flavian. Instead detail is reserved for the persecutors of the monophysites, Paul and Euphrasios. Nonetheless, it is claimed that another sign of Malalas' monophysism is his reference to the monophysites in 522 as 'those known as Orthodox' (XVII §11, Bo 416). Again it is the Antiochene context which makes sense of this phrase. If one looks at the style and vocabulary of the chronicle as a whole, 'known as' (λεγόμενος) is not a weighty phrase; it is explanatory, even when self-explanatory, and it qualifies. It is used to clarify some unusual or ambiguous, or just plain technical, term (see chapter 8, p. 226). Here Malalas is simply drawing attention to the fact that in sixth-century Antioch those we call 'monophysite' called themselves 'orthodox' – an unremarkable statement with an ironic touch – just as contemporaries label the Chalcedonians as 'Nestorians' (Patzig, 1898, 118-9). Indeed the monophysites were labelled by their enemies as 'hesitants' (διστακνόμενοι) while they in turn branded the orthodox as 'Nestorians' because they saw no substantial difference between them in terms of Christology. From the monophysite point of view both Chalcedonians and Nestorians believed that Christ was 'in two natures' (ἐν δύο φύσεσιν).

Two further arguments have been adduced in support of the case for a monophysite Malalas. The first argument concerns the way he describes the riot at Constantinople in 512 instigated by an imperial decree adding a decidedly monophysite verse to the *Trisagion*, the 'Thrice Holy' liturgical chant. Malalas' failure to condemn the clause openly is taken as partisanship for the monophysites (Gleye, 1896, 446-7; Chernousov, 1926, 70). Yet there is no need to expect such a condemnation from Malalas. He is more concerned with simply reporting the dangerous civil unrest which ensued than with vindicating or impugning the emperor. Although he probably relied for his account of events on the monophysite Marinus, that does not necessarily mean that Malalas himself was monophysite. The other argument is similar and concerns the way in which Malalas describes the rebellion of Vitalian in the period 514-516. By not representing the rebellion as an orthodox crusade against a monophysite emperor, Malalas is accused of condoning the monophysite position (Gleye, 1896, 445; Chernousov, 1926, 69-70). Yet such an expectation is anachronistic. Contemporaries, even orthodox opponents of Anastasios' religious policies such as the chronicler Marcellinus, could not countenance the actions of Vitalian on political grounds. Nor could Malalas, and that is why he can ascribe Vitalian's defeat to the triumph of God's will (Patzig, 1898, 126).

Malalas was not inclined to dwell on contemporary theological developments and ecclesiastical discord. The chronicle contains occasional mention of some episode in a saint's life, together with the changes in the see of Antioch described above, but not a great deal else. One gets a good measure of the extent of this gap in Malalas by comparing his chronicle with those of later writers who used him, such as the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes. Both of these, especially the *Chronicon Paschale*, include large amounts of material on religious legislation, church councils and the political intricacies of doctrinal and ecclesiastical wrangles. They supplement Malalas by gleaning this information from other identifiable sources, primarily saints' lives and the church historians. Of more concern to Malalas were the liturgical context of public ceremonial and the living legends of the Church's great spiritual athletes: there is the persecution which gave rise to the martyrdom of Babylas (XII §35, Bo 303), Kosmas and Damian (XII §36, Bo 304), Gelasinos (XII §50, Bo 314-5), Domitios (XIII §19, Bo 327) and Simeon the Stylite (XIV §37, Bo 369). Constantine's conversion is briefly covered (XIII §2, Bo 316) and his undertaking of the Great Church in Antioch (XIII §3, Bo 318), together with Helena's discovery in Jerusalem of the Cross from which point 'Christianity prospered' (XIII §5, Bo 319).

A person so apparently careless about the burning theological issues of his day and so evidently lacking in his knowledge of Christian literature and thought could hardly be expected to be a patriarch, let alone patriarch in the imperial capital. Yet it has been argued (Haury, 1900) and accepted (most recently, though with reservations, by Hunger, 1978, I, 320) that Malalas is to be identified with John Scholastikos, patriarch of Constantinople from 565-577. Certainly there is a degree of correspondence between them: both were Antiochenes, both transferred to Constantinople and both were known as rhetors. Of course, too, both were known as John, but it was probably the most common name of that time. More decisive, however, are their differences. Firstly, John Scholastikos was a sophisticated and learned theologian as demonstrated by his various letters and decrees as patriarch (Grumel, 1932, I.1, 184-8) and by his collection of ecclesiastical canons (see Schwartz, 1933). This suggests an altogether different world to that of Malalas with his cursory attention to church councils, as mentioned previously. Secondly, one might expect those (such as John of Ephesos) who may have known both the chronicler and the patriarch to have indicated or implied the fact if they were one and the same person. That they were not is surely decided by Evagrius who distinguishes John Scholastikos the patriarch (IV 38, 189.20) from John Rhetor the chronicler (I 16, 25.29; II 12, 64.11; II 10, 109.10; III 28, 124.19; IV 5, 156.8), and to a lesser extent Theophanes who does not associate the two Johns when he may well have.

#### 4. Editions and date of composition

In eighteen books the chronicle of Malalas covers the period from creation to A.D. 563 where Ba breaks off, although it actually continued to the death of Justinian in 565, possibly even as far as 574. Writing in the 590s, however, Evagrius used the chronicle extensively but in an edition that apparently ceased after describing the great earthquake at Antioch in 526, for he explicitly states that the chronicle terminated at that point (IV 5,

156.8) Since there is nothing in the chronicle as transmitted to our day to suggest that it did in fact terminate in 526 (or at the end of XVII, in the following year) perhaps what Evagrius meant to say was that the Antiochene earthquake was the last major event of significance to Antioch in the chronicle. It is no less possible (as we shall see below) that the manuscript of the chronicle which Evagrius used was incomplete just as Ba has long been; that is, his manuscript may not have included any part of XVIII at all. It has also been argued that the *Chronicon Paschale*, written in the 630s, used an edition of the chronicle similar to that of Evagrius and which probably terminated in 527, certainly before the Nika riot in 532 (on the status of the texts available to Evagrius and the *Chronicon Paschale*, see also chapter 9, pp. 250, 253). Bury (1897a, 95-8, 101, note 3; 1897b, 211), however, was able to show that Malalas' account of the Nika riot was based on a report received in Antioch, followed by the *Chronicon Paschale*, and did not therefore imply a work written in Constantinople. Nonetheless we may suppose that a prior edition (or editions) of the chronicle did conclude at some time in the late 520s/early 530s and that it was of an Antiochene character, in contrast to the remainder of the chronicle which is so obviously and almost exclusively Constantinopolitan.

The problem is to determine at what point the original edition (or editions) of the chronicle ended. At one stage it was proposed that the chronicle ended in 531 just before the description of the Nika revolt (Gelzer, 1885, II, 129ff, recently revived by Hunger, 1978, I, 320); all that preceded was Antiochene and monophysite, all that followed Constantinopolitan and orthodox. Normally, however, it has been considered that the break occurred most naturally not before the Nika riot or at the end of XVII but with the apparent chronological summation (XVIII §8, Bo 428-9) at the beginning of Justinian's reign (Patzig, 1890/1, 21; Gleye, 1896, 424; Bury, 1897b, 209; Krumbacher, 1897, 331; Moravcsik, 1958, 329). Yet this need not be so. The chronological passage is not so much a logical terminus, in the manner of other chroniclers, as a digression for a specific purpose. It is designed as a counterpart of a previous discussion in Book X concerning the calculation of the era of the incarnation and crucifixion. The special point of this excursus, in accord with Malalas' chronological thesis, is to demonstrate that Christ was born in the year 5967 (not the usually accepted date of 5500) and suffered in the year 6000 so that by 529 the beginning of the sixth millennium has long since passed (see chapter 6, pp. 118-9). Consequently there is no need for contemporaries to be afraid that the recent disasters, especially the devastating earthquake of 526, heralded the end of the world and the coming of the kingdom of God in the sixth millennium. This digression took its purpose from its local Antiochene context. It was designed to allay the fears of Antiochenes by showing them how their anxieties were based on fallacious chronology. Further, as normal with digressions, there is a resumption signal ('as we said') at the conclusion of the digression. This too would appear to reinforce the discursive purpose of this passage rather than signify a new beginning. So, if (on the basis of the Slavonic) the text is to be emended at this point to read 'in the present seventh indiction' (Franklin, 1987) it will mean in the seventh indiction (1st September 528 to 30th August 529) of the present fifteen-year cycle of indictions (with the cycle running from 1st September

522 to 30th August 537) but with no implication for the year in which the passage was written.

Another possible terminus occurs in the year 528 (at XVIII §13, Bo 431 to be precise), since that is where the Slavonic version breaks off. Unfortunately, we do not possess the original Slavonic translation of Malalas (see chapter 9, pp. 277-78). Instead that is the terminal point of the version of Malalas which was used as a source by the 'Hellenic and Roman chronicler'. Yet XVIII §13 (Bo 431) would appear to be a curious mid-stream place for the chronicle to end (early 528). There is no discernible difference in the nature and style of the entries which precede and follow XVIII §13, whereas there is such a difference between those which precede and follow another possible ending point at XVIII §76 (Bo 478), as is discussed below. It would therefore appear more likely that the version of Malalas used by the 'Hellenic and Roman chronicler' was based on an incomplete manuscript of the chronicle (cf. chapter 9, pp. 284-5), and the evidence of the Slavonic version (as preserved in the 'Hellenic and Roman chronicler') does not necessarily imply that an edition of the chronicle of Malalas ended in 528.

This original edition of the chronicle (wherever it ended) was obviously the one used by Evagrius and the Slavonic translator. Other later writers, however, used an extended edition. This has generally been characterised as a Constantinopolitan, as opposed to an Antiochene, work. If we accept the established and self-evident claim that the principal difference between the earlier and later editions of the chronicle is one of geography, then we should be looking for a geographical rather than a chronological turning point. The most likely terminus in that case becomes the conclusion of the Endless Peace between Rome and Persia in 532 (XVIII §76, Bo 478). It is from precisely this point that the chronicle takes on its overtly Constantinopolitan flavour. There are but two Antiochene references after that – the earthquake of 532 (XVIII §79, Bo 478) and the momentous fall of the city to the Persians in 540 (XVIII §87, Bo 480) – both of which, however, would have been reported in the imperial capital. Nor, after 532, is there a single back-reference. (These points are also discussed in chapter 7, pp. 211-4.) The Endless Peace was, at the time, a highly significant achievement. It marked, as Malalas himself noted, the resolution of a conflict between the two superpowers of the sixth century which had lasted over thirty years.

Malalas would himself, through his probable position in the office of the *comes Orientis* at Antioch, have been involved in events leading up to the peace. It would not be surprising for such a person to make this event the crescendo of his world chronicle, just as two years later Marcellinus chose the reconquest of Africa by Justinian's army as the occasion to extend and republish his chronicle. The bulk of the previous pages in Malalas' chronicle was taken up with describing the war and the path to a peace settlement, drawing on the information of the key participants such as Hermogenes (cf. chapter 7, pp. 209-10). The war was clearly of central concern to Malalas and it should not be surprising to find that he chose its successful resolution to close his chronicle. There would have been a ready audience in Antioch in 532/3 for a local chronicle which paid so much attention to the recent war with Persia. For a city which always played a pivotal role in Rome's relations with Persia and which was especially affected when these

empires clashed (Liebeschuetz, 1972, 163), the Endless Peace must have seemed like the dawn of a new era, a propitious moment for Malalas to present his chronicle. Such a political impetus for the work also provides a better appreciation of Malalas' audience than the traditional view that he was an ill-informed monk compiling a garbled collection of trivia for the less educated elements of society, monks in particular (Krumbacher, 1897, 326; Moravcsik, 1958, 330; Hunger, 1978, I, 323). It also suggests more forcefully that he was writing not long after (*circa* 533), with the peace fresh in people's minds. A variety of other dates has been postulated, but without argument, for the time of composition: post 533 (Patzig, 1901, 47); 528-540 (Krumbacher, 1897, 331); 530-540 (Bury, 1897b, 209); 548 (Haury, 1900, 340; Moravcsik, 1958, 329) and 550 (Bury, 1923, 435). None of these proposed dates is linked precisely to any definable circumstances, and most are broad enough to incorporate a date of composition of *circa* 533.

It might be objected too that the author of the *Chronicon Paschale*, the Slavonic translator and others did in fact use different editions, or drafts, with different terminal points, thereby indicating that Malalas kept updating his work every year or two after its original completion in 526/7 (the ending implied by Evagrius). Yet lengthy works such as Malalas' chronicle were not usually reproduced at short intervals in an up-dated form, which would have resulted in a plethora of different original editions with different endings in circulation at any one time. Instead the practice was to update the original work some years later. What did tend to happen, however, was that individual manuscripts of chronicles were easily extended by other hands, or abbreviated or truncated whenever they were copied. Obviously the chronicle was conceived, shaped, researched and written over a lengthy period (though perhaps months rather than years) but there is no need to suppose that successive drafts or alternative versions were put in circulation in advance of what the author regarded as the *definitive* edition. In the case of Malalas, on internal evidence there is a profound shift in 532 (around XVIII §76, Bo 478), leading to the hypothesis of an edition ending there. Evagrius implies (but not absolutely exactly) an edition ending after the Antiochene earthquake in 526 while the Slavonic translation appears to imply an edition ending in February 528 (XVIII §13, Bo 431). However, it is no less likely that both Evagrius and the Slavonic translation behind the 'Hellenic and Roman chronicler' used an edition of Malalas which ended in 532. In which case either their manuscripts of the chronicle were incomplete or else their own works did not require them to cite any of the entries between XVII §16, Bo 419-421 (Evagrius) or XVIII §13, Bo 431 (Slavonic) and the evident terminus of the original edition (XVIII §76, Bo 478) in 532.

Apart from the contemporary references discussed above, the chronicle reveals a strong identity for its author. Throughout the work the reader detects the author's sense of purpose and organisation of material and cannot but feel that this is no aimless and incoherent chronicle. The frequent back references (e.g. II §4, Bo 26; II §7, Bo 28; II §13, Bo 34; II §13, Bo 35; III §6, Bo 59; IV §3, Bo 69; V §50, Bo 120; VI §13, Bo 159; VI §22, Bo 167; VII §7, Bo 180; VII §14, Bo 188; VII §17, Bo 189; VIII §19, Bo 204; X §27, Bo 248; X §53, Bo 268; XIII §14, Bo 324; XIII §23, Bo 332; XVIII §8 and 9, Bo



429), for example, indicate the author's conscious method in linking different sections of his work and in keeping the reader on the right track. More revealing though are the various critical statements made by Malalas in the chronicle. On some occasions he explains that he has preferred one version of events to another (I §2, P 7; II §2, Bo 24; II §7, Bo 29; IV §15, Bo 81; V §50, Bo 121; XII §26, Bo 297; XVIII §8, Bo 428), on other occasions he rejects a version outright (IV §17, Bo 83) or points to inconsistencies and contradictions (II §8, Bo 30; V §49, Bo 117; IX §10, Bo 220; XIII §25, Bo 334; XIV §10, Bo 359; cf. chapter 7, pp. 214-6). Malalas' chronicle was a lengthy and complex document and required considerable preparation, even if it may actually have been written in a hurry with little verification of references (cf. chapter 7, pp. 169-72). Despite all the abbreviation and paraphrasing of the subsequent manuscript tradition the chronicle retains the clear stamp of its author.

The edition of the chronicle to 532 was perhaps the one used not only by Evagrius and the Slavonic translator but also by the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* writing in the time of Heraclius. Others, beginning with John of Ephesos in the 580s (see chapter 9, pp. 305-6), knew the chronicle of Malalas in an edition which covered the whole of the reign of Justinian to 565. Thus, there was a second edition that postdated the death of Justinian. This edition, it must be remembered, was composed over thirty years after the previous one – an unusual case in any age. The additional segment from 532 to 565 is quite different in character from the previous edition. Its entries are uniformly brief (at least in the abbreviated form in which they are preserved in Ba when compared with the Tusculan Fragments and *De insidiis*) and its focus is considerably narrower, indeed almost entirely on events in Constantinople, and there are no sources indicated although we may presume a heavy dependence on the so-called city chronicle of Constantinople (chapter 7, pp. 213-4) or other official pronouncements (Scott, 1981a, cf. Scott, 1985). Further, this section contains no contemporary references (of the sort '... until the present', granted that these may have been present in one of Malalas' sources; see chapter 7, p. 206) and no back-references; it is also far better informed on western affairs, as reported in the capital (XVIII §81, Bo 479; §88, Bo 480; §97, Bo 483; §110, Bo 484-5; §116, Bo 486; §140, Bo 492). Indeed, because of this different character scholars have been inclined to doubt that this section could have come from the same author as the rest of the chronicle (e.g. Stein, 1949, 703). They have therefore proposed that it represents the work of an anonymous Constantinopolitan continuator. It has even been suggested that this continuator's orthodox theological views contrasted with the monophysite ones of the author of the original chronicle (e.g. Gelzer, 1885, II, 129). Such an argument, as we have seen above, is unjustifiable. So too it has been suggested that there are signs of stylistic differences between the versions (Gleay, 1896, 426; Rütger, 1895; see chapter 7, pp. 212-3).

On the other hand there is a strong case for asserting that this section from 532-565 was in fact the work of the same person who wrote the previous edition, even though this would mean he must have been advanced in years at the time of writing. There is, it must be admitted, a certain element of stylistic disjunction between the earlier and later editions even though anyone's style might be expected to change somewhat over a thirty

year period. Although there are a few minor changes there is no clearly demonstrable shift in vocabulary and syntax (as indicated in chapter 7, p. 212). One must add to this the fact that in the tradition the whole of the chronicle to the death of Justinian is ascribed to Malalas. John of Ephesos, for example, does not indicate a different author for the period beyond 532 and the Constantinian excerptor noted 'the end of the chronicle of John Malalas' after material taken from towards the end of Justinian's reign. In short there appears to be no good reason to doubt that the whole of the chronicle to 565 was indeed the work of a single man although it was composed in two stages three decades apart.

Quite obviously, however, by the time of writing the updated edition Malalas had long ago left Antioch behind him. He was no longer there in 540 when the Persians invaded and no longer concerned with events in the frontier region. Precisely when he left is not clear but it is worth suggesting a possible context, or at least a more cogent one than that proposed by Downey (1961, 528, note 111, cf. 530, note 117), who has him forsaking Antioch after the great earthquake in 526. In 535 as part of the extensive provincial reorganisation of Justinian the office of the *comes Orientis* at Antioch was abolished and its title was applied to what had been the proconsul of Syria (*Nov.* 8.5, with Jones, 1964, 281). It is plausible that Malalas' position in the office of the *comes* was abolished, and since his information on Antioch dries up after the first edition in 532 it is likely that he abandoned the city not long after. 535 is therefore a possible date for Malalas' relocation. From Antioch he would appear to have moved to Constantinople. By the time he produced an updated edition of his chronicle he would have been in the imperial capital at least thirty years. The Constantinopolitan section of Book XVIII reflects the boisterous and precarious life of the city in the reign of Justinian, written by someone who had lived through the events described.

In terms of content this section of the chronicle is perfectly consistent with the sort of material contained in the original edition, and with other chronicles in the Byzantine tradition: the great state occasions such as the dedication of churches (XVIII §86, Bo 479; §113, Bo 486; §137, Bo 492; §143, Bo 495) and statues (XVIII §82, Bo 479; §94, Bo 482), as well as the Chalke (XVIII §84, Bo 479), the death of an empress (XVIII §104, Bo 484), the arrival of ambassadors from foreign nations (XVIII §106, Bo 484; §125, Bo 489), the celebration of a triumph and an imperial consulship (XVIII §80, Bo 478). Then there are the natural disasters which threaten the security of daily life: earthquakes (XVIII §77, Bo 478; §93, Bo 482; §102, Bo 483; §112, Bo 485; §118, Bo 486-7; §123, Bo 488; §124, Bo 488), plagues (XVIII §92, Bo 482; §120, Bo 488; §127, Bo 489), comets (XVIII §122, Bo 488), dangerous weather (XVIII §103, Bo 483-4) and drought (XVIII §139, Bo 492), as well as shortages of food (XVIII §121, Bo 488) and drink (XVIII §95, Bo 482), a currency devaluation (XVIII §117, Bo 486), a curious miscalculation of the date for Easter (XVIII §96, Bo 482-3) and the prophecy of the ecstatic woman (XVIII §90, Bo 481). Other local events he deemed worth recording were the dredging of a harbour (XVIII §114, Bo 486), the establishment of the new posts of praetor and quaestor (XVIII §85, Bo 479) and the deposition of two city prefects (XVIII §89, Bo 480; §134 Bo 490). At the same time he included notices of the regular disturbances among the factions (XVIII §99, Bo 483; §105, Bo 484; §108, Bo 484; §135, Bo 490-1; §138, Bo 492; §144,

Bo 495; §150, Bo 496; §151, Bo 496) and a plot to kill the emperor (XVIII §141, Bo 493).

This pattern reflects the tradition of chronicle writing inherited by Malalas and transmitted to subsequent generations (see chapter 2). Likewise Malalas provides little coverage of the intense contemporary theological and ecclesiastical debate, and in this respect too he is consistent with his approach in the original edition. Clearly he has lost touch with the East for there is no sign of the growing appeal and persecution of the monophysite belief in his native Syria. Instead he confines himself to the patriarchal succession at Constantinople (XVIII §83, Bo 479; §98, Bo 483; §100, Bo 483; §107, Bo 484; §115, Bo 486) and the appearance of Pope Vigilius in the city (XVIII §97, Bo 483; §111, Bo 485), the proclamation of important ecclesiastical edicts (XVIII §78, Bo 478; §84, Bo 479; §142, Bo 495) and the arrest of pagans (XVIII §136, Bo 491), but appears to have ignored the ecumenical council of 553 just as he scarcely noticed the fifth-century councils.

Perhaps, like the majority of his contemporaries, his theology was uncomplicated and uncontroversial. He was more concerned with practice than belief. In introducing his notice of the plague of 542, for example, he observes that 'the Lord God saw that man's transgressions had multiplied and he caused the overthrow of man on the earth leading to his destruction in all cities and lands' (XVIII §92, Bo 482). Plague was simply divine punishment, as were earthquakes, and they were both controlled by the will of God. So it was during the earthquake in the eastern Mediterranean in 551 that the sea receded and 'at God's command the sea was restored again to its original bed' (XVIII §112, Bo 485). Participation in the routine supplication rituals created by these disasters were what he preferred and in his lifetime he will have experienced many of them, including those at Constantinople recorded in the chronicle. When he sat down to continue his chronicle in the mid 560s or 570s he was essentially describing events he must have witnessed or heard about at first-hand, just as indicated in the preface to the chronicle, although he may have been dependent on written sources at the time of writing. It is possible that lengthy official reports lie behind his description of the great earthquake of 551 (XVIII §112, Bo 485), the Samaritan revolt of 556 (XVIII §119, Bo 487-8) and the unsuccessful conspiracy against Justinian in 562 (XVIII §141, Bo 493) about which he appears to be intimately informed. Given that the work had been in circulation for so long it is unlikely that in producing the updated edition Malalas would have modified much of what he had previously written. The full length of Justinian's reign had to be recorded at the beginning of XVIII (§1, Bo 425) and it is possible that at this stage he added the retrospective conspectus of Justinian's anti-pagan legislation (XVIII §7, Bo 428). There are no other indications of variations to the original edition. He does not, for example, update his list of the patriarchs of Antioch. Malalas records the creation in 529 of the province of Theodorias with Laodikeia as metropolis and notes that the local bishop will still remain subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Antioch (XVIII §39, Bo 448), but he does not indicate the death of the patriarch Euphraimios in 545 or his successors.

This brings us back to the problem of where the chronicle ended and when it was written. Once again the preface provides a useful guide for it is there that Malalas

specifies as his lifetime 'the reign of Zeno, and those who ruled afterwards', that is, Anastasios, Justin and Justinian at least. 'My successors', he goes on to say, 'must complete the story relying on their own ability' – thereby inviting others to continue where he himself leaves off. Whether this invitation was included in the preface to the original edition in the 530s is not known. It may have been. Nonetheless, in accordance with the usual practice of late Roman and Byzantine chroniclers it would not be unusual to find the chronicle of Malalas continued anonymously, even in copies of the manuscript bearing his name. This practice makes it doubly difficult to determine (and not just for Malalas) where one chronicle ends and another begins. Notwithstanding these problems the evidence tends to suggest that the chronicle ended with the death of Justinian in 565.

As we have seen, Book XVIII included the whole of the reign of Justinian. The single most complete witness to the text (Ba) breaks off in 563 in the course of describing the expedition sent by Justinian in January to quell a Moorish rebellion (XVIII §151, Bo 496). How much further the chronicle continued in Ba is not certain. It would seem, however, that the two pages missing at the end of Ba comprised a total of seventy lines which, to judge from the prevailing coverage at that point (e.g. the year 562 goes from XVIII §§127-143, Bo 489.15-495.16), would have dealt with the events of two or three years only (cf. Neumann, 1880, 360 and chapter 9, p. 246). This would bring us to the end of Justinian's reign, a neat point at which to conclude. Additional reasons may be adduced to confirm this supposition. Firstly, it has long been observed (see Jeep, 1881, 356-9) that Theophanes followed Malalas closely as a source and that the character of the source shows through patently in Theophanes. A change of character in Theophanes' text can therefore be confidently ascribed to a change in source. A shift of character and style in Theophanes can probably be detected from the beginning of the reign of Justinian's successor Justin II (Th 241.26), though the situation is by no means clear cut. Secondly, the editor of the *De insidiis* extracts who was drawing on a complete text of Malalas records a faction riot which gave rise to the appointment of Julian as city prefect in 565 (*De insid* 51), not long before the death of Justinian on 14th November. The excerptor follows this extract with the note that this is the end of Malalas' description of events which could be classified as *De insidiis* (against this, cf. chapter 9, p. 262). This notice, taken together with the fact that Theophanes records under the year 569 (Th 243. 4-9) a faction riot which one would suspect would be a perfect candidate for inclusion in *De insidiis*, suggests that the chronicle of Malalas ceased between the time of one riot (565) and the other (569); this point is discussed further in chapter 7, pp. 169, 211-2. Again the death of Justinian seems the most natural and likely terminal point.

Nonetheless, it has been argued that the chronicle must have continued to the ninth year of Justin II, 574 (Mommsen, 1895, 487-8 followed by, among others, Haury, 1900, 340 and Hunger, 1978, I, 320) because a certain eighth-century manuscript, evidently based on Malalas, recorded the duration of imperial reigns down to 574 (the *Laterculus Malalianus*, in Cod. Vat. Lat. 277; see chapter 9, pp. 292, 298). The evidence from the Syriac Pseudo-Dionysios that supports the possibility of an ending in 573/4 is ambiguous and almost certainly to be disregarded (see chapter 9, p. 304). What has not been noted, however, is that any continuation beyond 565 should probably have been

contained in an extra nineteenth book, since XVIII covered only the reign of Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425). However, there can be no certainty that the Latin version, which from Gaius onwards lists only the emperor's name and reign-length, was not based on a Greek exemplar that itself continued Malalas' chronicle – as he himself had anticipated in his preface – or which contained a statement to the effect that the chronicle was written (or the manuscript copied) 'in the ninth year of Justin'. It is no less likely that the Latin version was based on a Latin addition to a prior translation of Malalas which had actually concluded in 565. The evidence of the *Laterculus*, therefore, for the extent of Malalas' chronicle is never likely to be decisive.

All in all, then, it looks as if the chronicle ended with the death of Justinian. Consequently, the aged Malalas will probably have written it not long after 565. His motive is irrecoverable. Perhaps he wished to commemorate the passing of such a long and eventful reign by including a record of it all as part of his previous work written in Antioch in 532/3; or perhaps as a celebrated author he was pressured (before mortality should intervene) to construct a record of the past thirty years in the mould of his previous work. His audience was now the imperial capital and their response ensured the influence and survival of both editions of the work, including its eventual incorporation into both the Syriac and Slavonic traditions of chronicle writing.



# BYZANTINE CHRONICLE WRITING

## 1: The early development of Byzantine chronicles

Brian Croke

The exact title of Malalas' work is not clear as there is no authentic manuscript heading preserved in any of the versions of the chronicle; perhaps it was entitled χρονική ιστορία since later writers refer to it both as χρονογραφία (John of Damascus; PG 94, col. 1369) and as ιστορία (in the titles to the Constantinian excerpts *De virtutibus* and *De insidiis*), while the work's preface calls it an ἐγκύκλιον. This imprecision is not, however, a matter of major concern or import. It merely reflects the fact that from the seventh century onwards in the Byzantine world, as in the West, there was a less meaningful and consistent distinction between history and chronography, reflected in the titles of works, than suggested by modern handbooks which separate them emphatically. In fact the weakness of such a distinction is already evident in the time of Malalas who tends to use the term χρονογράφος to cover a range of writers who might otherwise be separated into historians, chronographers and others (e.g. Africanus, Arrian, Bottios, Charax, Clement, Didymos, Diodoros, Domninos, Eirenaïos, Eusebios Pamphilou, Eustathios, Eutropius, Eutychianos, Fortunus, Josephos, Licinius, Magnus, Nestorianos, Palaiphatos, Tatian, Theophilos). In his preface Malalas claims to be setting out firstly to provide a summary account of what amounts to Old Testament history derived from the works of Africanus, Eusebios, Pausanias, Didymos, Theophilos, Clement, Diodoros, Domninos and Eustathios among others, and secondly to 'relate as truthfully as possible a summary account of events that took place in the time of the emperors up till the events of my own lifetime ...' (P 5). In effect what he provides is a summary of world history from a sixth-century viewpoint organised around a central chronographical framework and informed by an overriding chronographical argument. By describing and analysing the tradition of chronographical writing which influenced the chronicle, the first section of this chapter is designed to explain why Malalas wrote the sort of work he did. The apparent novelty and originality of Malalas' work are diminished somewhat when it is placed in its full historiographical context. The second part of this chapter looks more closely at the development of Byzantine chronographical writing after Malalas and the extent to which his chronicle influenced subsequent works.

By Malalas' day chronographical writing had a long and respectable heritage. Throughout the first half of the chronicle Malalas was obliged to synchronise the events

described in the Old Testament with what was known in the sixth century A.D. about the history of the Near East and Greece. This need to synchronise the history of various ancient nations which used completely different dating systems was what had provided the original impulse to chronographical writing many centuries before (cf. the survey in Adler, 1989, 15 ff.). In essence it was the emergence of the cosmopolitan civilization of Hellenistic times, especially in Alexandria where Greeks were confronted with Jews and Egyptians, that brought the need to synchronise by a uniform reckoning the history of various nations. Originally, throughout the Near East and Greece individual kingdoms and city-states dated events by their own local methods and for posterity compiled, sometimes in stone, a record of their rulers or office holders. Although he did not use them at first hand, Malalas cites some of these ancient lists of kings from Argos, Sikyon, Tyre, Corinth and Sparta as well as Phrygia, Lydia, Macedonia, Egypt and Italy (see chapter 6, pp. 124-35). It was not really until the third century B.C. that the Greeks and others seriously grappled with the problem of reconciling the different lists and chronological methods of different places. One of the first scholars to synchronise successfully the Egyptian dynasties with the chronology of the Hebrews was a third-century Egyptian priest Manetho whom Malalas actually cites (II §3, Bo 25; III §6, Bo 59) but obviously from one of the later chronographers who had utilised him.

The example of Manetho was followed by subsequent scholars, especially Jewish ones such as Demetrios and Eupolemos, who slowly expanded and refined a synchronous reckoning of Greek, Egyptian and Hebrew history spurred on by the cultural imperative of establishing the priority of Moses (argued by the Jews) or Plato (argued by the Greeks). All this research eventually enabled the Alexandrian Eratosthenes to produce a pioneering work of Hellenistic chronography in which he was able to set out a chronology for the whole of Greek history from the time of the Trojan war, using for the most part the sequence of Olympiads as the unifying chronological framework (FGrH IIB 241). He was followed by another influential scholar, Apollodoros, whose chronography was based on a different dating system (Athenian archons) and included destruction of cities, migration of races, games, alliances, treaties, deeds of kings, lives of famous men and other matters (FGrH IIB 244). In terms of content we can see here, and in the famous chronicle on the Parian marble (FGrH IIB 239), the pattern of material contained in chronographical works down to the time of Malalas, although he does not cite either Eratosthenes or Apollodoros. Subsequently, versions of Apollodoros were produced which incorporated Eratosthenes' Olympiad system while the works of both scholars were combined, excerpted, summarised, extended and corrupted into a variety of versions for a variety of purposes. By Malalas' time their works were long superseded although much of their original data was preserved in more recent works.

As the dominance of Hellenistic cultural and political hegemony came to be reduced at the hands of the Romans from the second century B.C. the chronology of universal history developed by the Alexandrian scholars had to make room for Roman chronology, although it was still not fully developed. Like many of the Eastern and Greek states before them the Romans dated by the cumbersome method of eponymous lists of annual office-holders; 'consuls' in the Roman case. This method of recording the passing of



time remained the central chronological method used throughout the Roman period and was still current when Malalas came to write his chronicle but it was finally abandoned in the period between the original and later editions of the work (Bagnall/Cameron/Schwartz/Worp, 1987, 7-12). Malalas dates events in Roman history by consuls even though consular dates before his own lifetime were derived from the various sources he was using rather than a separate consular list (see chapter 6, pp. 148-9). The Romans themselves depended on the Alexandrian works and some of their own early attempts at chronography, such as Nepos' *Chronica* in the first century B.C., were not much more than a translation of Apollodoros' chronicle or some redaction thereof (Peter, 1906, 25-6). At the same time, however, years from the foundation of the city became the usual era in Roman history, while the Romans developed their own tradition of annalistic writing based on the annual records of the priests. Further, some Roman annalistic chronicles were inscribed on stone in the imperial period (Croke, 1990).

As Roman history writing was taking final shape universal histories in the Hellenistic tradition continued to be written. In the first century B.C. Diodoros of Sicily produced a full-scale universal history (based on a Roman perspective and the Stoic ideal of the brotherhood of man) which Malalas cites as one of his chief sources. It seems unlikely, however, that Malalas would have used Diodoros directly (chapter 7, p. 177). Diodoros was a popular source of information for later chroniclers and it is more probable that Malalas' version of Eusebios supplied the facts attributed to Diodoros. Much the same situation applies to the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysios of Halikarnassos which covered the early centuries of Roman history and which is also cited in the chronicle (chapter 7, p. 178), and to Dionysios' contemporary Kastor of Rhodes whose attempt to harmonize the chronology of East and West produced lists of kings and officials which were also raw material for later chroniclers (chapter 7, pp. 184-85). Of special interest here is Phlegon of Tralles whose *Chronica* went from the first Olympiad (776 B.C.) to A.D. 141 and which resembled the late Roman chronicles in terms of format and content. Among his entries was an eclipse at the time of Christ's crucifixion which is mentioned by Malalas (X §14, Bo 240) but which is a traditional item probably derived from the chronicle of Eusebios (Eusebios/Jerome, 1956, 174d and chapter 7, p. 190).

Meanwhile, the traditional polemic between Greeks and Jews, especially in cities like Antioch and Alexandria, further advanced the Hellenistic chronological systems. Josephos (known to Malalas only at second-hand), for example, in his treatise against Apion (I. 4-8) repudiated the very documentary basis of claims for the antiquity of Greek history. When Christianity emerged in the Hellenistic cities of the Roman empire it brought increasing sensitivity to the importance of chronology, and Christian scholars (culminating with the *Chronicle* of Eusebios) invested much ingenuity in refining the traditional chronology of universal history.

As Christianity came to be adopted by more and more of the educated elite of the Roman world it needed to accommodate its thinking and its traditions (including its understanding of time) to the powerful influence of classical culture. In the course of a long debate between Christian and non-Christian scholars concerning the genesis of certain central ideas and principles of human behaviour, it became important to turn once

again to the question of the relative antiquity of Moses and Plato. The successive efforts of Christian scholars, taking advantage of a strong thread of Greek and Jewish chronographical research, developed a set of arguments for eventually establishing the priority of Moses (Croke, 1983, 120-123).

One of the first to build on the Hellenistic arguments for the priority of Moses over Plato was Justin Martyr in the mid-second century and he was followed by his pupil Tatian. It was Tatian, probably writing in Antioch, who described Moses as the first historian and used the full range of ancient lists and synchronisms to show that Moses predated Homer. Malalas follows this tradition in quoting Moses as historian without qualification (see chapter 7, p. 187). A more detailed chronological discussion was produced by an Antiochene contemporary of Tatian – Theophilus, the bishop of the city. In his treatise to a certain Autolycus Theophilus utilises the Hebrew scriptures, Manetho, Josephos and others to assemble a detailed chronological argument. As indicated in Malalas' preface, Theophilus is one of the main authors cited by him. However, there are some difficult problems in determining his use of Theophilus (see chapter 7, p. 194). At best it seems that he probably only used Theophilus through some intermediate author, and that the chronological points attributed to the Antiochene bishop were either contained in works other than that to Autolycus or were subsequently refined by the intermediate author. It may even be that the Theophilus of Malalas is a different person altogether, perhaps the fourth-century bishop of Alexandria whose Easter table was dedicated to the emperor Theodosius I (Grumel, 1958, 37-8). More detailed argument about the relative date of Moses was provided by Clement of Alexandria whose *Miscellanies* (or *Stromateis*) contained a virtual chronicle of universal history to his own day as part of his case in favour of dating Moses before Plato. As with Theophilus, Clement is described by Malalas in the preface as one of his major sources yet his actual citations of Clement cannot be definitely identified and were probably taken from some other work which had itself used Clement (cf. chapter 6, p.117 and chapter 7, pp.175-76).

Clement was succeeded in Alexandria by an even more formidable scholar, Origen, who was equally conscious of the significance of developing a sound universal chronology. Origen, in turn, attracted to Alexandria a scholar known as Julius Africanus whose five volume *De temporibus* (compiled circa 221), now preserved only in fragments quoted by later writers, was to represent a major step towards a complete chronology of universal history. Using all the previous chronographical researches available Africanus developed a list of synchronisms between Greek and Hebrew history and tied them together over long periods. In addition he presented a chronology which began with Adam and which developed a generational system of reckoning from Adam and which located the incarnation in the middle of the sixth millennium (5500 from creation) and the passion in 5531 (fr. 50 and 51 in Routh, 1846, 297-306). He also included lists of Egyptian dynasties from Manetho and used the classical chronographers to determine his chronology of events. Africanus' work was cited by Malalas in his preface as a major source and was used for various ruler lists but again it does not appear that Malalas knew at first hand the work he cites (see chapter 7, pp. 172-73). Nor is it necessary to attribute Malalas' dates from Adam (see chapter 6, pp. 111-20) to Africanus since that dating

system was in wide use by the sixth century. In Rome about a decade later than Africanus, Hippolytos, another acquaintance of Origen, produced a chronicle in which he included a generational reckoning from Adam and capped his work off with a list of Roman emperors and their reign lengths (Grumel, 1958, 9-17). Hippolytos' purpose was to demonstrate that the seventh millennium was still a long way off, which he did by calculating a total number of years elapsed since creation, commencing with the generations contained in *Genesis*. Although effectively superseded by later works, Hippolytos' calculations (known as the *Liber Generationis*) were used by writers such as that of the *Excerpta Barbari*. It was such a chronicle which Malalas used extensively for his own chronology (see chapter 6, pp. 124 ff.). The tradition of Christian chronography built up around the school in Alexandria was transplanted to Caesarea when Origen transferred there, and was later developed further by Eusebios in the late third and early fourth century.

In his large and complex work called the 'Preparation for the Gospel' (*Praeparatio Evangelica*) Eusebios advanced a new technique (based on certain epochal dates) for establishing the date of Moses and his chronological priority, that is, compared to Plato. This chronology was embedded in the *Chronicle* which first appeared in the late third century. Eusebios' chronicle was an important and influential work. It was divided into two parts: the first set out a list of rulers (kings, archons, consuls etc.) of the successive ancient nations (Chaldaeans, Egyptians, Persians, Greeks and Romans) derived from the traditional sources (including Kastor, Josephos, Africanus, Diodoros and Dionysios of Halikarnassos) and loosely connected by occasional synchronisms between one list and another. This part survives today only in an Armenian version but it provides a valuable collection of extracts for many otherwise lost authors and the extracts would have been useful to later writers such as Malalas. The more important second part of Eusebios' work was known as the canons or *Chronicle* proper, and that survives in a multitude of translations and versions none of which preserves the exact format of the original. Whereas Africanus had presented Hebrew history by linking it where possible with some dated event of Greek history, Eusebios produced a full-scale chronicle recording each year successively from the birth of Abraham to the time of writing (A.D. 277/8). In terms of design the chronicle consisted of a series of parallel columns of years for individual kingdoms or nations with some columns dropping away as nations passed and other columns starting up when a new nation emerged. Attached to the exact year, therefore, Eusebios placed the events of sacred and profane history which he wished to record. Enveloping the whole chronicle was a twofold dating system: years from Abraham with every tenth year marked in the far left-hand margin, and Olympiads with each Olympiad heading separately recorded from 776 B.C. Eusebios did not believe a reliable annalistic chronology for the period before Abraham could be constructed so he made no attempt to cover it, thereby spurning the efforts of Africanus and others (cf. Adler, 1989, 46-50). Nonetheless, in the first part of his work he did include a generational reckoning from Adam based on the Septuagint (Schoene, 1875, 79ff). The novelty and popularity of the chronicle of Eusebios' work meant that it was soon being adapted and amended, extracted and summarised and combined with other works. The Latin translation of Jerome which

was executed *circa* 380 is a good example of this process in action. Not only did Jerome simplify the Eusebian format, but he also supplemented Eusebios with extra entries for the Roman period and then he continued the chronicle to A.D. 378.

In the early fifth century at Alexandria, where there was clearly a lively interest in Christian chronology, two monks Panodoros and Annianos each produced chronicles based on Eusebios but which attempted to advance a new chronological system (explained in more detail below). Neither work survives, unfortunately, and we are dependent on later writers for the little we know about them. Panodoros' chronicle, it seems, recast Eusebios' work to embrace a 'From Adam' dating framework instead of the original system of years from Abraham and introduced a systematic account of primordial history, while Annianos took over Panodoros' version of Eusebios with its dates from Adam but took issue with his predecessor's world era (Adler, 1989, 72-105). The chronicle of Eusebios was a complex work and did not lend itself to copying as readily as other texts. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the chronicle preserved in such a bewildering variety of shapes and styles in different languages (Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian). Numerous different versions, reflecting the different uses to which the chronicle may be put, were evident early on and were doubtless multiplied throughout the fourth and fifth centuries. It was presumably one such version of Eusebios which, two and a half centuries later, Malalas was able to use. Although Malalas' manuscript may have attributed its contents to Eusebios, his version of that chronicle clearly had affinities with the chronicle of Annianos for it placed the incarnation at 5500 which may also mean that it incorporated the From Adam dating system as other versions of Eusebios had done. Malalas cites Eusebios in the preface as one of his major sources and there are several instances in his chronicle where his ultimate dependence on Eusebios can be identified (see chapter 7, p. 180). Although Malalas' use of Eusebios does not always correspond to the modern edited text of the chronicle (surviving in Latin and Armenian only), it is not necessary to conclude that he did not know the chronicle; rather his version of Eusebios could have been one of those which had been considerably modified and embellished over the intervening period (cf. Bickerman, 1951, 71-2). If so, then it is possible that many of the other sources which Malalas almost definitely knew only at second hand were incorporated in his version of Eusebios who had used them himself.

As noted, the chief advantage of the tabular format of Eusebios' chronicle was that it could be consulted as a ready reference work for establishing the relative chronology of any past event. Yet with the establishment of Christianity from the fourth century, and its gradual rapprochement with classical culture, it was no longer vital to convince others of the priority of Moses. The Eusebian pattern could now be taken for granted so that for the most part the chronographical successors of Eusebios in the East did not need to repeat the format of his chronicle; instead it could now be summarised and simplified, or reworked and expanded (as in the case of Panodoros and Annianos), which probably explains why a Greek version of the chronicle does not survive. Certainly Malalas follows the Eusebian structure and chronology up to a point, but with the striking difference that Malalas sets out his chronography in narrative format. He diverged yet further from the Eusebian pattern in structuring his work by individual books which, for

the Roman imperial period, were organised by imperial reigns after the pattern of historians and epitomators. With the loss of most of the chronographical literature from the period between Eusebios and Malalas, it would be a mistake to regard Malalas as the inventor of a new form of chronographical writing which adapted Eusebios' tabular layout to a more narrative approach. Instead, in terms of format and perhaps of content too, he was probably only following the model of other chronographers in the intervening two and a half centuries.

We know that Eusebios had many imitators and continuators in the East besides Panodoros and Annianos, but little can be said about them. From the fourth and fifth centuries there survive papyrus fragments of two illustrated Greek chronicles (Weitzmann, 1942/3, 132-3), as well as the Latin translation of a similar work. This translation which is known as the *Barbarus Scaligeri* (after its original editor) or the *Excerpta Barbari* bears many affinities with the chronicle of Malalas (noted in chapters 6 and 7, *passim*) and is a likely source for much of the chronological material in Malalas. From the fifth century another chronicle which may have been a model for Malalas is the Χρονική ἐπιτομή of a certain Helikonios which also commenced with Adam (and possibly utilised a From Adam dating) and continued to the reign of Theodosius II (Su I, 247). In addition Malalas used what he at least called the 'chronographers' Nestorianos and Domninos. Nestorianos (see chapter 7, p. 187), who may well have been known personally to Malalas, wrote a work which terminated in 474 and which Malalas used for the Constantinian period and presumably for subsequent events. Domninos was listed in the preface as one of the major sources for the chronicle and was clearly used extensively (see chapter 7, pp. 178-79). He was probably a local Antiochene writer and had a strong interest in explaining the context of mythical Greek history. Domninos, therefore, may have been responsible for some of the dates by the Antiochene era; in any event, a local era was obviously familiar to Malalas and he frequently dates events by the Antiochene era right up to his own time (cf. chapter 6, pp. 151-53), as well as by imperial years and indictions.

The sort of material contained in Malalas, particularly in the early books, was also found in other works. One of these, that of Eustathios of Epiphaneia, was definitely used by Malalas. Eustathios wrote a bipartite 'Επιτομή χρονική, the first section covering the period up until the fall of Troy, the second continuing to the reign of Anastasios (Ev V 24). The document known as the *Excerpta Barbari* was actually put together in Malalas' own generation for it continues until the time of Anastasios and it was illustrated, just as it has been proposed (quite unconvincingly) that there was an illustrated version of Malalas (Weitzmann, 1942/3, 112-116). Then there was the Χρονική ιστορία of Hesychios which again shows definite affinities with Malalas; in fact, both works may have had the same title. It is likely that some or all of the above chronographic successors of Eusebios had condensed the format of their prototype into a more easily manageable narrative.

At the same time, it is likely that the Eusebian chronicle was adapted by the supplementation of extra sources of information, as Jerome did in the course of translating it into Latin. In Malalas' very generation there is the example of Jordanes who in his *De summa temporum vel origine actibusque gentis Romanorum* (usually, but

misleadingly, known as the *Romana*) combined the chronicle of Eusebios/Jerome (his main source) with other sources such as Florus and Orosius in a narrative rather than a tabular way. Of special interest in the case of Jordanes is that he apparently used a version of Eusebios' chronicle which began with Adam and which included an incarnation date of 5500, as well as other material from the Alexandrian tradition (Mommson, 1882, xvi-xix, xxvii-xxviii).

While the Christian world chronicle originally grew out of the demand to establish a precise unified chronology for the whole of human history, once it had been established and accepted the original rationale soon passed. Chronological research then proceeded to focus on resolving special issues such as the year of creation and the chronology of Christ's life. Determining both these dates involved the construction of world eras based on three fundamental considerations: 1. the totality of time being 6000 years to parallel the days of creation, and since 1000 years are but a day in the sight of God (*Psalms* 90. 4, cf. 2 *Peter* 3. 8) with the incarnation occurring in the middle of the sixth millennium (5500); 2. the need to coincide the Friday of Christ's passion with the Easter moon; 3. the need to connect the cycles of the moon with the age of the moon at creation.

It was in 258 that Anatolios of Laodikeia constructed a cycle which commenced with the new moon at the spring equinox (22nd March) of that year. He then traced back from 22nd March 258 a total of 303 lunar cycles of 19 years and added a precyclic year to arrive at a total of 5759 years. In 304 the Alexandrians changed the beginning of the year to 29th August which made the inaugural year of each new cycle, from the original new moon of 29th August 284, eight years later than by Anatolios' count. This new Alexandrian era was the one used by Panodoros who arrived at the year 5494 for the incarnation and 5526 for the passion. Annianos, however, in revising the system of Panodoros fixed the incarnation at 25th March 5501 and the resurrection at 25th March 5534 (with 25th March being also the date of creation) but employed a world era of 5492. Besides the Alexandrian reform of Anatolios' cycle, there was a Byzantine reform as well. This took place in 353 and consisted of adjusting the cycle of Anatolios to commence not on 22nd but on 21st March which put it eight years earlier. So rather than beginning in 353 when the next Anatolian cycle was due to start, it began in 345. By this reform what became known as the 'proto-Byzantine' era placed the incarnation in 5509 and the passion in 5540. Consequently, by the mid-fifth century there were several world eras in operation in the East.

An inevitable consequence of such millennial reckoning was the determination of the end of the world and the Second Coming. The earliest Christians had considered the *parousia* as relatively imminent but with the passing of years and further reflection on the chronological message of the scriptures, especially *Revelation* with its one thousand year reign of Christ and his elect (*Rev.* 20. 6), pious hopes were replaced by attempts at chronological definition (Kyrtatas, 1989). Particular attention was concentrated on explaining the chronology of the seventy weeks of years contained in *Daniel* 9. 24 in works such as Hippolytos' *Commentary on Daniel*, with the general result that the nativity was placed in the middle of the sixth millennium. This allowed another 500 years before the reappearance of the Lord. Protected by the safe assurance that the end was

generations away there was no overwhelming impetus to question the accepted methods of calculation in any fundamental way, especially since they were scripturally based. Instead students of chronography concentrated on refining the traditional calculations by linking the incarnation or passion with the moment of creation.

By the reckoning of most of the world eras devised in the fourth and fifth centuries the end of time or the coming of Christ's kingdom on earth (i.e. the year 6000) could be expected around the turn of the sixth century: precisely 491 (proto-Byzantine era) or 507 (Annianos) or 508 (Panodoros). Naturally the level of anxiety could be expected to increase as the portentous date drew nearer (Alexander, 1967); even in the West, where the allegorical interpretation of *Revelation* had long held sway, the anti-Christ was reported in 493 and 496 (*Paschale Campanum*, s.a. 493, 496; Mommsen, 1892, 746-7). Furthermore, the deepening theological and cultural divisions which developed in the fifth century heightened the sense of anxiety by making the precalculated end a tool of apocalyptic polemic. The end of time and the signs that preceded it became an article of faith for some, especially the Syrian monophysites who interpreted the series of natural disasters in the early sixth century as the sure sign of the expected apocalypse (Harvey, 1988, 298-302). Anxiety, it appears, gave way to confusion as the predicted doomsday came and went. Like all such prophecies and expectations ever since, recalculation and a re-examination of the fundamentals of Christian chronology were now called for. The mind of the Lord, as contained in scripture, had clearly been misread; maybe more weight could be given to other sources of divine wisdom in this regard, such as oracles.

Unfortunately, as with most of the chronological literature of the fourth and fifth centuries, there are no extant world chronicles dating from this time. There are, however, some traces of involvement in chronographical discussions and the development of new chronicles. Eustathios of Epiphaneia (PLRE 2, 435-6), whom Malalas called a *χρονογράφος* (XVI §10, Bo 399), was clearly a scholar with a wide historical vision. Besides his universal history in which he summarised sections from a whole range of Roman historians, we now know that he was particularly concerned with chronology and had been excerpting relevant items from Josephos' *Jewish Antiquities* going back to Adam, which may have provided the basis of a new calculation of Christian chronography now that the year 6000 had passed (Allen, 1988, 1-11). In the fluid world of religious ideas in early sixth-century Syria other sources such as the oracles contained in the so-called Tübingen Theosophy were being employed to interpret the apocalyptic significance of contemporary events (Jeffreys, 1990; cf. chapter 6, p. 119). It appears that one of Malalas' most important but elusive sources, Timotheos, emerged from this general background; while another, a chronicle closely related to the original of the Latin *Excerpta Barbari*, belongs around the same time.

Both Timotheos and the chronicle behind the *Excerpta Barbari* provided material and possibly a model for Malalas. Another similar work which shared Malalas' concerns and which was probably written just before Malalas is the *Chronike historia* of Hesychios of Miletos (PLRE 2, 555) which apparently concentrated on Roman history to A.D. 519 but which began in the pre-Trojan period (Photios, *Bibl.* 69). Only fragments of it survive (cf. chapter 5, p. 96). Although not mentioned by Malalas, Hesychios' chronicle may

also have provided a model for Malalas' own chronicle since it was divided into six books, the last covering the period from 330 to 518; so too the *Χρονική ἐπιτομή* of Helikonios which was divided into ten books (Su I, 247). Whether any or all of the productions of Helikonios, Eustathios, Timotheos and Hesychios were narrative chronicles like that of Malalas, rather than tabular ones like that of Eusebios, is not known. It is not unlikely that they were and had they survived in full we might not find Malalas so abruptly different.

From these uncertain and ill-documented times there appear to have arisen some new ways of construing the traditional Christian chronology in order to yield different results. With the advantage of hindsight it could be seen that some of the traditional sources, such as Theophilos of Antioch, Clement of Alexandria and Eusebios of Caesarea, could be reinterpreted in order to produce a different sum or that some manuscripts with different numerical readings were preferable to others. One such reinterpretation, perhaps even the most radical one, sought to dissolve the whole issue by arguing that the year 6000 had not passed only recently (or was soon to do so) but as long ago as the crucifixion of Christ. In other words the present times were not to be found at the edge of the sixth millennium but half-way through the seventh. This confident recalculation meant that there was no longer any need for anxiety. If there was still meaning in millennial reckoning then the end was, once more, centuries away. How, when and by whom this particular chronology was invented cannot be known. It was, however, included by Hesychios in his sermon on the nativity in the course of a full discussion of the chronology of the birth and crucifixion of Christ (Hody, at Bo lii-liii) and it was also used by Malalas in similar wording to Hesychios (Jeffreys, 1990, 124-5). As explained in detail elsewhere (chapter 6, pp. 113, 118-9 and Jeffreys, 1990), one of the central features of the chronicle of Malalas (perhaps its very purpose) was to explain world history in the context of the crucifixion at the year 6000. This enabled Malalas to draw attention to the pointlessness of previous calculations which put the Second Coming of Christ in the recent past (or immediate future). Further, he claims that Clement, Theophilos and Timotheos (but not Eusebios) agree on this calculation, which appears at odds with the extant texts of Clement, Theophilos and Eusebios. We may conclude from this that Malalas' manuscripts or versions of his predecessors differed from ours (which is quite possible in the case of Eusebios; cf. Bickerman, 1951, 71-2), or else that is how these authors were construed in Timotheos' lost work. If so (but it is only speculation), then Timotheos may be the source for Malalas' chronology as for so much else in the chronicle (cf. chapter 7, p. 195). In short, Malalas may not have been the inventor but a publiciser of this new chronology of world history. Just as the figures of Eusebios and others were 'corrected' to conform to conventional practice, Byzantine chroniclers and scribes (even some modern scholars) have done the same subsequently to Malalas' numbers which explains why his chronology has been obscured and misunderstood until now.

In the first half of the fifth century the philosopher and historian Eunapius of Sardis asked pointedly what chronology had to do with history (fr. 1 [Blockley, 1983, 8, 10] = FHG IV, 12). Although addressing the Athenian philosopher Dexippos, he may also have



been reacting to what appeared to him a curious Christian obsession. The answer to any such question, from the Christians' point of view, was that chronology had everything to do with history; it was chronology which made sense of history. Indeed that is why the third-century scholar Porphyry set out to demonstrate in his attack on the Christians that their chronology upon which they placed so much store was flawed (Croke, 1983a, 168-184). By now chronicles and histories had come to exist side by side serving different functions but not necessarily different audiences (Mango, 1980, 189-200). There is simply no evidence for the common claim that in late antiquity chronicles were written for the masses (or presumably the literate masses – a problem in itself) while educated readers shunned chronicles in preference for more literary and stylised forms of historiography (e.g. Hunger, 1978, I, 257 ff.; Browning, 1980, 34). In particular, there are difficulties in assuming that Malalas was Justinian's mouthpiece to the masses (as argued by Irmscher, 1969, 471; cf. Cameron [A.M.], 1985, 27). Likewise, there is no evidence for the corresponding assumption that histories were written by the properly educated but chronicles simply represented the best efforts of ill-educated monks (cf. Beck, 1965, 188-197). Malalas has often been taken to be a monk for no better reason than that he wrote a chronicle (Mavrogordato, 1948, 234; Barker, 1966, 296).

So too one must be careful not to dismiss too readily the content of late antique chronicles, such as that of Malalas, as trivial and miscellaneous (cf. Cameron [A.M.], 1985, 26). The very pattern of content (wars, inventions, cosmic phenomena, natural disasters, imperial births, deaths and marriages, etc.) also had a long tradition, reflected originally in the local records of city states, then in chronicles as diverse as those of Apollodoros, the Parian marble, Phlegon and Jerome. There is, for the most part, a serious unifying element, namely that of public religious ceremonial or events of religious significance. Most of the events traditionally recorded in chronicles from classical Athens to the time of Justinian and which form the backbone of Malalas' work were the great civic or imperial occasions. Even earthquakes and other prodigies gave rise to elaborate ceremony and ritual which is why they find a place in such a chronicle (Croke, 1990).

In Malalas' generation, and in those preceding it, histories in the mould of Thucydides continued to be written but the Christianisation of the Roman world had given rise to two new modes of representing the past: church history and chronicle. Although there were originally strong formal distinctions in style, form and subject matter between each of these genres, with the passing of time each genre came to show traces of the other although they remained recognisably distinct. History, church history and chronicle may each have been quite different in purpose and style but they all served the same audience or largely the same audience. Chronicles in particular were works of reference and polemic while histories were for instruction and edification. Chronicles were important to Christians irrespective of rank and social status because, by themselves or as part of larger works, they contained a full picture of human history in the context of God's plan for mankind. Coverage and perspective, the progress and pattern of history, understanding the place of the present were all more important than accuracy in antiquarian research. In fact the euhemerising and historicising treatment of ancient

history reflected in Malalas is evident also in Prokopios (cf. chapter 4, pp. 70-75), not that Malalas was necessarily capable of writing like Prokopios but it is instructive to compare their treatment of a common episode – Justinian's first Persian war (Sotiriadis, 1888, 114-125). Chronicles such as that of Malalas with their straightforward style and diverse subject matter arguably reflect the reality of late Roman life more accurately than do, say, the histories of Prokopios or Agathias.

Malalas' readers would not have found his work so unusual. They would have been familiar with the problems and preoccupations of chronology emphasized in his chronicle; no less familiar to the sixth-century literary public would have been the nature of events recorded in the work, its chronological scope and its treatment of the, by now remote, classical past. The fact that Malalas' approach to describing and explaining the past was largely shared by his audience would have enhanced the historiographical authority it is accorded by writers such as John of Ephesos and Evagrius (cf. chapter 9, pp. 250, 304-6).

In attempting to delineate the originality of Malalas' chronicle it therefore needs to be remembered that in terms of the range of content, particularly in the earlier books, and the narrative structure, Malalas was probably following his chronographical predecessors. So too, as argued below (see chapter 3, p. 58 and chapter 4, *passim*), many of his apparently novel interpretations of classical mythology and culture were widely shared at the time. Malalas was not so much the inventor as the reflector of the newly emerging Byzantine view of the past. He was presenting a summation of world history to his own day and invited others to continue the story from where he left off (P 5). How, and why, the chronicle survived and proved so influential, despite the repudiation of its chronology, is explained in the following section.

## 2: The Byzantine chronicle after Malalas

Roger Scott

The next two chronicles after Malalas about which we have any knowledge are the Ἐπιτομή χρονῶν, better known as the *Chronicon Paschale*, and the chronicle of John of Antioch, both works of the seventh century.<sup>1</sup> Of these the *Chronicon Paschale* survives almost intact in a single manuscript. Probably completed in 630 and certainly extending to 629, it survives apart from a few gaps to April 628. Of John of Antioch's chronicle, we have only fragments, though these do include most of the first two books (see below and chapter 9, pp. 251-2). Both the *Chronicon Paschale* and John of Antioch undoubtedly

<sup>1</sup>In this brief survey I confine myself to the Byzantine chronicle in Greek. For the Syriac tradition, in addition to chapter 9, pp. 299-310, see Brock, 1979/80, 1-30 and Witakowski, 1987, 76-89. For the Greek tradition my debt to the major surveys will be obvious, especially to Krumbacher, 1897, Moravcsik, 1958 and Hunger, 1978, I. For information in English the most useful and succinct guide is that by R. Browning in Dudley/Lang, 1969, 179-216, to which I am also indebted.

made use of Malalas but the *Chronicon Paschale* certainly and John of Antioch probably were attempting something rather different and certainly neither was slavishly dependent on Malalas. The avowed object of the *Chronicon Paschale* was to provide an accurate chronological framework which would demonstrate the accuracy of calculations for Easter and other Christian festivals by setting out a brief account of events from Adam or at any rate from the creation of the world (CP 31; cf. Beaucamp *et al.*, 1979). It provides, or rather relies on, several chronological systems (the lifespan of patriarchs since Adam, the calling of Abraham, the years of the post-captivity high-priests and of the Ptolemies, Olympiads, consuls, indictions and regnal years of emperors) to provide the years since Adam, and its concern is very much more with these than with narrative. Blank years are marked equally with those for which an event is recorded. So it differs from Malalas both in its lack of narrative and in its concentration on providing a running set of calculations for the years since creation, and in its more comprehensive coverage of religious and theological matters. Since it relies considerably on Malalas for such narrative as it does supply, one could surmise that the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* felt he could concentrate on his own chronological framework, abbreviating or adapting Malalas' narrative as appropriate.

The 'Ιστορία χρονική of John of Antioch (Hunger, 1978, I, 326-8), was also a world chronicle, which originally ranged from Adam to Heraclius' accession in 610. We know nothing about the author except, as his name implies, that he came from Antioch, but his work seems to have been much more in the tradition of Malalas than was the *Chronicon Paschale*, and indeed he has often been confused with Malalas (cf. Patzig, 1901 and 1901a; Pigulevskaya, 1941, and chapters 9, pp. 251-2, 302 and 11, pp. 327-36). Much of what has survived does so because it was excerpted for the encyclopaedic handbooks commissioned by Constantine Porphyrogenetos, especially *De Insiidiis* and *De Virtutibus*, which consequently imposes a biased and somewhat arbitrary restriction on our knowledge of the subject matter, though one manuscript (Paris, Gr. 1630, ff. 236-239 = B in the subtext of the 1986 translation) does provide most of Books I and II. This is enough to make it clear that the chronicle was wide in scope, including rationalised versions of Greek mythology, biblical material, and both oriental and Roman history. Even though there is a further problem in that we may be dealing with two separate authors (a true and a pseudo John of Antioch; cf. Hunger, 1978, I, 327), it also appears that for the late Roman empire or early Byzantine period our author or authors used where possible not Malalas but classicising historians such as Eunapius, Priskos, and Zosimos, the ecclesiastical historian Sokrates and a Greek translation of Eutropius which interestingly appears to have been 'a more faithful one than that of Paianios, perhaps the lost translation of Capito' (Walton, 1965, 237). John of Antioch also appears, however, to have had access to even earlier sources. For instance, he made use of Plutarch's *Life of Sulla* to expand the scant information available to him in Eutropius, and does this faithfully and competently (Walton, 1965, 238 and 242) and he also had access to Diodorus Siculus. His language, though clear and simple and not aggressively classicising, is nevertheless more elegant and sophisticated than that of Malalas, which makes him of limited use in reconstructing Malalas' text, even where he has relied on

Malalas. His language and his use of sources also suggest that we need to be careful about drawing conclusions about an author's linguistic preferences and education based on a rigid modern distinction between historians and chroniclers.

The remainder of the seventh century and the whole of the eighth century, the traditional dark age of Byzantium, have left us no world chronicles, just as they have left us little of anything else. There were no doubt some works written, such as perhaps the so-called Great Chronographer, if that is to be attributed to this period,<sup>2</sup> and a work covering at least the years 668-769 (if different from the Great Chronographer) which has to be postulated as a common source for Nikephoros and Theophanes in the ninth century, while the Souda (T 901; Su IV 582) tells us that the patrician Trajan flourished under Justinian II (685-695 and 705-711) and wrote an excellent chronicle (χρονικὸν σύντομον πάνυ θαυμάσιον) about which we have no details. From the beginning of the ninth century, however, we have five works of rather different character: the Χρονογραφικὸν σύντομον attributed to the patriarch Nikephoros, his Ἱστορία σύντομος or *Breviarium*, two interrelated works (the Ἐκλογή χρονογραφίας of George Synkellos and the Χρονογραφία of Theophanes) and a work generally known as the *Scriptor incertus de Leone*.

This last work unfortunately only survives in a fragment preserved in an eleventh-century manuscript. The fragment covers the reign of Leo the Armenian (813-820) while Henri Grégoire demonstrated that the complete work also included the reign of Nikephoros (1936a, 417-427). Grégoire showed that this work was used in a later world-chronicle, that of Pseudo-Symeon, and argued from this that the *Scriptor incertus* was another world-chronicle and the last continuator of Malalas (1936, 420). But Browning, after a close comparison with the unpublished Pseudo-Symeon, has argued that Pseudo-Symeon in fact did not have much more of *Scriptor incertus* than we have (1965, 410) and that therefore the *Scriptor incertus* was probably not a world-chronicle but an 'historical monograph dealing with the reigns of Nicephorus, Stauracius, Michael I and Leo V' (Browning, 1965, 411). He further suggests that 'to assume that the art of writing pragmatic history was lost in the 'dark ages' and had to be rediscovered through painstaking study of ancient texts ... is an oversimplification' (*ibid.*).

Of Nikephoros' works, the *Chronographikon Syntomon* is little more than a list of chronological tables from Adam to Michael II. In some manuscripts there are revisions and a continuation to 944 and 976 respectively (Hunger, 1978, I, 346).<sup>3</sup> These tables include the 'emperors' of the Jews, Persians, Ptolemies, Romans and Byzantines (including Byzantine empresses) and the five patriarchs. There is no narrative and no attempt to provide a list, let alone synchronise the dates, of important events in foreign empires. From now on the Byzantines show little interest, as far as recent history is concerned, in the activities of anyone but themselves, while they gradually narrow their perspective of the distant past to what is considered relevant to their Roman and Christian

<sup>2</sup>So Whitby, 1982/3, but some fragments (e.g. nos. 12, 13, and 14) appear to be derived from Theophanes and Nikephoros rather than to be their source.

<sup>3</sup>It is worth noting that Anastasius, the papal librarian, translated it into Latin in about 870, and an old Bulgarian translation is also known.

background. The *Breviarium* on the other hand is only concerned with recent events, covering the period from the death of Maurice to the marriage of Leo IV (602-769), and, perhaps more importantly, it seems more concerned with a classicising style than with information.

The other two works of this period do provide between them a world chronicle from Adam to the authors' lifetime, George Synkellos covering the period from Adam to A.D. 283 and Theophanes continuing the work of his friend down to A.D. 813, and very probably merely publishing posthumously at Synkellos' direction what was mainly Synkellos' work (Mango, 1978). What is most distinctive about these two works is their combination of narrative and a remarkably detailed set of chronological information for each year. We are given in Theophanes, sometimes in full and sometimes in an abbreviated form, the year of the world i.e. since creation, the years since the incarnation (i.e. the A.D. date, though calculated in accordance with the Alexandrian model and not our Dionysian model) and the name, length of reign and year of office for the Roman and Persian emperors and the five patriarchs. Then follows the narrative of the events for the year. Not only is this in stark contrast to Nikephoros, it is difficult to find a model for it in Greek chronography.<sup>4</sup> The most likely hypothesis is that their model for this chronological framework was Syriac chronography which still retained in a rich chronicle tradition the Eusebian method of synchronised columns of years with narrative entries linked to years. For Theophanes it has long been accepted that for much of the seventh and eighth centuries he was dependent on a Syriac chronicle although until recently it has been assumed that this was through a Greek translation that may have been available in Constantinople (Brooks, 1906, 578-587). More recently Cyril Mango (1978, 9-17) has suggested that it was Synkellos rather than Theophanes who had access to the Syriac material through contacts made while he lived in Palestine. It will be argued elsewhere that Theophanes made use of Syriac material spasmodically throughout his chronicle, especially where his Greek sources were thin. The point however is that the Synkellos/Theophanes chronicle reintroduced to the Byzantine Greek chronicle a breadth of scope, subject matter and chronological detail that had been lacking since Eusebios (although it should be remembered that most of the successors to Eusebios are lost), and that the influence behind this innovation was not Greek but Syriac.

The source of the innovation may explain why it was not followed by Theophanes' successors. It has already been pointed out that the *Chronographikon Syntomon*, which was almost contemporary with Theophanes, showed little interest in anything other than the activities of the Greek-speaking world as did most if not all later chroniclers in the Greek-speaking Byzantine world.

One of the features of Theophanes' chronicle is his use of sources. For much of the first 305 of the 503 pages of de Boor's edition we still possess the sources which Theophanes used, which means that, although for these parts Theophanes is of no value as a primary source, we can evaluate how he used the material available to him. Two

<sup>4</sup>The *Chronicon Paschale* might be considered here but there is no certainty that it was available to Synkellos or Theophanes while its concentration on chronology at the expense of narrative shows that it did not serve as their literary model.

features are noticeable. For the most part Theophanes merely copies his source verbatim and seems to be simply pasting together a dossier of passages. This would suggest that there was no attempt at an interpretation of the period. But the other feature is the apparent care expended on altering some passages of the primary material, especially by the addition of coloured or loaded adjectives or phrases or by rearrangement of chronology, apparently to help his reader to interpret the material in the right way. For instance, when describing the activities of the Arian emperor Valens at *anno mundi* 5860 he adds 'illegally', 'illegal', 'impious' and 'unholy' to his source and there are similar additions for almost every heretic and 'bad' emperor. Anastasios is 'the one who ruled wickedly' (A.M. 5982 and 5983) while Zeno 'administered the empire harmfully' (A.M. 5966). He describes Justin I as 'an ardent champion of the orthodox faith and successful in battle' (A.M. 6011), so linking orthodoxy to success. Here even though he provides nothing in his narrative to back up this judgement, which in this case goes back to the sixth-century ecclesiastical historian Theodore Lector, he is nonetheless careful to arrange his narrative in such a way as to exclude Justin from blame; at A.M. 6012, for instance, Theophanes deliberately separates Justin from any involvement in the murder of the 'extremely orthodox' Vitalian (as he is described at A.M. 6011), by ascribing this to the 'people of Byzantium' and omitting a reference to the execution taking place in the palace.<sup>5</sup> This would suggest that Theophanes was attempting rather more than just a dossier, and, as we have suggested for Malalas and for the *Chronicon Paschale*, the chronicle was not a simple, disinterested and objective compilation of statements about the past.<sup>6</sup>

Although the chronological framework of the Synkellos/Theophanes chronicle was not imitated, later chroniclers certainly used it as the basis for their compilations and its view of the past gained a kind of formal recognition in the next century which also provides a link or overlap between chronicles and more formal history. The emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (905-959) commissioned several authors to produce a work now generally known as Theophanes Continuatus, which began where Theophanes left off in 813 and originally covered the period to 886. Constantine himself wrote the fifth and final book on the reign of his grandfather Basil I (867-886). A later continuation (Book VI) dealt with the period 886-961. Although the authors of Theophanes Continuatus take Theophanes as their starting point, the work is not at all like Theophanes in character except that it takes the reigns of individual emperors as its basic historical unit and it is also certainly history written with a purpose. The first four books are directed against the predecessors of the Macedonian dynasty, while Book V is full of praise for Basil, the founder of the dynasty since, as Romilly Jenkins observed, 'the reigns of the emperors who immediately preceded Basil I could not be represented as

<sup>5</sup>It would be out of place to go into the details of Theophanes' handling of Malalas in this area, which would require an article in itself. For instance, in his presentation of the emperor Justinian Theophanes is careful to select, conflate and rearrange material (most notably chronological details) from both Prokopios and Malalas in a way that provides a more even distribution of material across the reign, changes difficult terminology, plays down war with Persia (though drawing attention to Belisarios' successes) and emphasises military victory, especially in Africa.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. for the Syriac parallel, Fiey, 1984/5, 253-64.

anything other than uniformly disastrous, because it was part of the imperial myth that Basil supervened to bring salvation after fifty years of uninterrupted decline' (Jenkins, 1954, 18, cf. 1948, 71-77). This version is admittedly achieved with little, if any, distortion, while a wealth of detail ensures the value of the work as a source for the ninth century. As Romilly Jenkins also pointed out, the characters (as distinct from the reigns) 'receive a treatment which, though less objective than they deserve, is a good deal fairer than they could have received in any other epoch since antiquity, given the political exigencies of the historian's time' (Jenkins, 1954, 18-19).

What really distinguishes the work from its chronicle predecessors is the quality of the writing, especially in the portrayal of character where, instead of the chronicle technique of an accumulation of epithets, the authors exploit the rediscovered skills learnt from a study of ancient biography. It becomes a moot point whether we are now dealing with history, biography or chronicle, and the same question remains with the two works that are virtually the continuation of Theophanes Continuatus. Leo the Deacon, writing at the end of the tenth century, dealt with the reigns of Romanos II, Nikephoros II Phokas and John Tzimiskes, that is, from 959 to 976. It is not a chronicle but avowedly a history, written in an archaizing language and full of classical allusions. On the other hand Psellos, who wrote a continuation of Leo from 976, entitled his work *Χρονογραφία*, though in fact he provides a history to 1078 through the medium of acutely observed, graphic and sometimes malicious biographical studies of fourteen emperors. It is written in a language that is certainly stylish but not archaizing. In turn in the next century, the twelfth, Psellos' *Chronographia* is followed by, and is in part a source for, the most avowedly classicising of all Byzantine histories, the *Alexiad* of Anna Komnene, which obviously has a biographic (and eulogistic) emphasis in its account of the author's father, the emperor Alexios I (1081-1118).

Although the Byzantine historiographical tradition from Malalas' chronicle to Anna Komnene's *Alexiad*, via Theophanes, Theophanes Continuatus, Leo the Deacon and Psellos' *Chronographia* is clear, the final product could hardly be more different from the original. It is also worth pointing out that there is virtually nothing in the way of straight classicising history from Theophylakt Simokatta early in the seventh century for four centuries until Michael Attaleiates in the late eleventh century and Nikephoros Bryennios writing in the early twelfth century, so that, even while remembering Browning's strictures mentioned above, it is the chronicle rather than classicising history that is the dominant genre. I have discussed elsewhere how little Byzantine classicising histories owe to classical historiography, though they do testify to an interest in classical literature in general and biography in particular (Scott, 1981). Classicising biographical histories continued to be written in Byzantium after the twelfth century and indeed perhaps supplant chronicles during the Palaeologan period, as will be discussed below, but it is now time to return to world chronicles.

The ninth century produced a further three chronicles that are worthy of note. First of all there is a work entitled *Ἐκλογή τῶν Χρονικῶν* (*Extracts from chronicles*: referred to as A in Jeffreys/Jeffreys/Scott, 1986), which is discussed in more detail in chapter 9, pp. 260-1. Here it suffices to note that it was a world chronicle which announced in its title

that it was compiled successively from John (i.e. Malalas; from Adam to Julius Caesar), Synkellos (to Diocletian), and Theophanes (to Leo V) and that it ended in the reign of Michael (i.e. Michael I Rangabe; 811-813). This suggests that it must have been written only shortly after Theophanes chronicle became available. Unfortunately the manuscript breaks off in the reign of Trajan.

Another fragmentary ninth-century chronicle of relevance to the text of Malalas, *Ἐκλογὴ ἱστοριῶν* (identified as C in Jeffreys/Jeffreys/Scott, 1986) is one which claims in its preamble to have been written in 886 but which, according to its title, covered the period from Adam to Anastasios. Only one large fragment of 65 printed pages, in Cramer's edition, survives in a late thirteenth-century manuscript. The chronicle deals mainly with Old Testament history as far as king Ozias (Uzziah) but also includes *inter alia* Greek mythological history, the Trojan war (based on Diktys of Crete), the Olympic games and the introduction of chariot racing and the circus colours to Rome, which is credited to Romulus and for which Charax is cited as the source. In all this there are interesting parallels to and differences from Malalas (see chapter 9, p. 260). Although the traditional dating of the chronicle has some problems and invites reconsideration, the ninth-century date does seem to be secure,<sup>7</sup> but what is then odd is that we appear to have a ninth-century chronicle which only attempted to reach the beginning of the sixth century. All other known chronicles appear to continue down to the author's lifetime (the

<sup>7</sup>It is worth examining the traditional dating, which is based on the following passage:

*From then [i.e. from Alexander of Macedon] until Gaius Julius Caesar, the first sole-ruler among the Romans in the 183rd Olympiad [accepting Gelzer's emendation, 1885, II, 299, of the nonsensical manuscript reading of 100 and 283rd] was 275 years. From him until the 12th or 13th <year> of illumination [i.e. a reference to his supposed early and orthodox baptism in Rome] of Constantine the great and first emperor of the Christians, when the Byzantines first received and acclaimed <him>, was 365 years. From the establishment (πῆξις) of the emperor of the Byzantines, which the thirteenth year of his reign, indiction 6, acclaimed, until my age, which was the nineteenth year of emperor 54, just when he was dying, was 569 years.*

It was natural for Cramer in his *editio princeps* of 1839 to date our work by adding 569 to 320, which he took to be Constantine's 13th year, and get a date of 889. Since 889 was the third year of Leo the Wise, Cramer made a small emendation to 886, the nineteenth and final year of Basil I. This is accepted by both Gelzer, 1885, II, 300 and Hunger, 1978, I, 333. Indeed there would have been no need to assume any error had Cramer noticed that Theophanes dated Constantine's 13th year to 316/7, which is also consistent with our author's calculations of the years from Adam (Gelzer, 1885, II, 299), which would seem to confirm 886 as the date of our chronicle.

We are left with queries over the reference to emperor  $\nu\delta' = 54$  (further confused by being printed as emperor  $\gamma\delta' = 34$  in Cramer's introduction). Both Cramer and Gelzer took the leucers somehow to be a corruption of the emperor Basil's name rather than a numeral. A check with the lists of sole Eastern emperors in Grumel's handbook (1958, 355-7) indicates that Basil I could be numbered the 54th emperor from Constantine. On the other hand, a figure in the fifties could conceivably refer to Anastasios; if 'the first emperor of the Byzantines' could in fact refer to Julius Caesar rather than Constantine (with the 569 years then referring to the period between Caesar's first consulship in 59 B.C. and Anastasios' 19th year in 509/510) and if  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}$  could here mean 'ends' rather than 'dies', then we could abandon the ninth-century date for our chronicle and have a chronicle written in Anastasios' 19th year (509/510), which would make more sense. But as this involves both special pleading and forcing the Greek considerably, and as our author's numerals are all internally consistent with the ninth-century date, the late date, however odd for a chronicle ending in the sixth century, seems secure.



one notable exception – Synkellos – can be explained easily enough if we regard Theophanes as simply carrying out his friend's original intention) and indeed the reason for writing often was, as Malalas himself suggests in his introduction, to bring existing chronicles up to date. But even if we cannot explain the purpose of this chronicle, assuming the ninth-century date is correct, nonetheless the chances are that it either represents or has incorporated a chronicle that was written in the reign of Anastasios or not long after. As such it must have been close to being contemporary with the first edition of Malalas but was most likely to have been a little earlier (assuming a first edition of Malalas shortly after 532), in which case, rather than being a user of Malalas as we have naturally assumed,<sup>8</sup> it may represent one of Malalas' sources. Any further speculation on the identity of this writer needs to be recognized at this stage as being just that, but natural candidates would include the shadowy Timotheos (see chapter 7, pp. 194-5),<sup>9</sup> Hesychios whose chronicle originally ended with the death of Anastasios and who certainly has interesting correspondences with Malalas (see earlier in this chapter and chapter 5, p. 96), or Eustathios of Epiphaneia, whose epitome, according to Evagrius (V 24), reached the twelfth year of Anastasios (502/503).<sup>10</sup>

In 866/867, and thus about fifty years after Theophanes, George Monachos or, as he is entitled in several manuscripts, George Hamartolos (the Sinner), a common epithet of monks, probably completed his *Χρονικὸν σύντομον* which extended from Adam to 842 although he originally intended to extend it to 867. Some 800 pages long in the de Boor/Wirth edition and in many ways the natural successor to Theophanes, certainly more so than Theophanes Continuatus, it was a very popular work to judge by the number of surviving manuscripts (thirty are listed by de Boor/Wirth, 1978) and by the use made of it by later chroniclers and lexicographers. George's aim was to edify, providing material that was to be 'essential and very useful' and so, rejecting any value in the classical past, he concentrated on biblical and ecclesiastical history, culminating in a polemically anti-iconoclastic account of the restoration of images, which is the most detailed section of his chronicle. As J.B. Bury (1912, 453) put it, 'his account of the reigns of Leo V, Michael II, and Theophilus has no pretensions to be a historical narrative; it is little more than the passionate outpouring of a fanatical image-worshipper's rancour against the iconoclasts.' He did include some mythological material, based on Malalas (and as a result Dindorf, like Chilmead before him, used George to supply Book I which is missing in Ba; on which cf. chapter 9, p. 247), but he could not manage to fit in even Malalas' scraps of real Greek history, while his narrative of Roman and indeed Byzantine history highlighted major events in Christian history such as the incarnation, the crucifixion, the reign of Constantine and theological issues under Justinian. His history thus is far from being a

<sup>8</sup>Either way it is still of considerable relevance for the study of Malalas in Greek; see chapter 9, pp. 260-1.

<sup>9</sup>Since one of Timotheos' chief characteristics was an interest in the pagan foreshadowings of Christ and our author gives the Argonaut passage without the oracle, he might appear to be ruled out, as Elizabeth Jeffreys points out to me, but it would be rash to regard such evidence as conclusive.

<sup>10</sup>On Eustathios see now Allen, 1988, especially for the text and discussion of a previously unknown but important fragmentary work.

mindless collection of whatever information about the past could be collected. Indeed it is clear that he used quite a wide range of sources and, even though he tended to copy these uncritically, he certainly culled what he wanted from these sources deliberately and to some purpose. His language is simple and reflects a similar deliberate bias, since, as he puts it, 'it is better to stammer truthfully than to lie in the style of Plato'.

In all of this, one suspects, both Malalas and Theophanes would have sympathised: 'My successors must complete the story relying on their own ability', as Malalas put it. But although George used Theophanes he abandoned entirely Theophanes' chronological framework and the breadth of subject matter that Malalas, Synkellos and Theophanes had made available. He does do more than Nikephoros' *Chronographikon Syntomon* by providing a narrative (and indeed a very lengthy one) but it is a narrative built on a framework that in approach has much in common with that of Nikephoros. It is this same more limited framework, if not quite to the same degree, that is characteristic of future chroniclers, such as those of Pseudo-Symeon and of Symeon the Magister and Logothete, which, however, present problems of their own.

The chronicle of Pseudo-Symeon covers the period from creation to the death of Romanos II in 963. The bulk of it (to 813) still awaits an edition, but falls into segments according to the source followed. After apparently following, though not verbatim, a variety of sources down to Julius Caesar such as Malalas, John of Antioch, Synkellos and a version of the so-called *Epitome* (see next paragraph), he relied on the *Epitome* for the period from Julius Caesar to Diocletian, while the section from Diocletian to Michael I (284-813) is taken almost verbatim from Theophanes. The earliest section, from creation to Julius Caesar, differs from the rest of the work not only by using a variety of sources, but because of its concentration on biblical history, which is where Pseudo-Symeon's interests seem to lie (see chapter 9, p. 263 and Markopoulos, 1978, 52-98).

The Logothete chronicle presents one of the great difficulties of Byzantine historiography. It is a chronicle which in various redactions provides an extension to 948 of an earlier chronicle from Adam which may have reached 713, though the only evidence for this is that the first version of Nikephoros' *Breviarium* stopped then. This earlier chronicle, sometimes known as the *Epitome*, appears to have existed in two separate redactions and is attributed by some to the patrician Trajan (Moravcsik, 1958, 516; Hunger, 1978, I, 355) though for no better reason than that he was alive at the right time and wrote a history (see above, p. 40). Later it was continued to the end of the reign of Theophilos (842) and later still to 948. Versions of this last extension survive both anonymously and as the work of various authors of different periods, most frequently as the work of a Symeon who may be the tenth-century Symeon the Magister and Logothete, but there are also versions attributed to Theodosios of Melitene, who also probably lived in the tenth century, Leo Grammatikos, whose version was completed in 1013, and Ioulios Polydeukes, though this last name appears to have been taken from the second-century author of an onomasticon and attributed by Andreas Darmarios in the sixteenth century to three otherwise anonymous versions. While the main problem of sorting out the interrelationship of these chronicles continues to baffle and thwart lucid

analysis, this complex interplay is testimony, if not to the vigour of the chronicle tradition, at least to the continuing widespread acceptance of their view of world history.

In the tenth century George's chronicle was also extended to 948 and this was interpolated with material taken from the imperial official Genesios, another tenth-century writer who continued Theophanes, even though Genesios attempted to write in a classical style with a proper appreciation of mythology, so failing to conform with one of our basic assumptions about the distinction between chronicle and history. Genesios' chronicle covered the years 813-886. George's chronicle (both original and continuation) was translated into Old Slavonic in the tenth or eleventh century and the original into Georgian in the eleventh or twelfth century. The eleventh century saw the production of another long world chronicle, that of George Kedrenos. This covered the period from Adam to 1057, but is entirely derivatory, being based on Pseudo-Symeon (up to the ninth century), Theophanes, George Monachos, the Logothete and, for recent events, John Skylitzes, whose chronicle covered 811-1057 and whom Kedrenos follows almost word for word. But Kedrenos does also occasionally provide dates for the early section drawn from George Synkellos and the *Chronicon Paschale*.

The twelfth century produced three world-chronicles of note. Most important by far is that of John Zonaras, a high court official (he was a Grand Droungarios and Protoasecretis before retiring as a monk to the small island of Hagia Glykeria), whose chronicle, the Ἐπιτομή ἱστοριῶν, from Adam to 1118 is a work of far greater scholarship than other world-chronicles in that he sought out sources not normally used. Thus for biblical and early Greek history he made use of Josephos' *Jewish War* and *Jewish Antiquities*, Eusebios' *Chronicle*, Theodoret's *Church History*, Xenophon's *Cyropaedeia*, Plutarch's *Lives*, Herodotos and Arrian. For Roman history he relied on the early books of Dio Cassius, which are now lost, for the period from Aeneas down to the destruction of Corinth and Carthage in 146 B.C. when he tells us his sources gave up, after which he appears to have used Plutarch's *Lives* of Pompey and Caesar to the death of Caesar so that his version of the late Roman Republic shows the characteristic Byzantine weakness on the period, but with the significant difference that Zonaras was aware of this. After the death of Caesar he returned to Dio Cassius, whom he used up till the reign of Nerva, supplemented by Plutarch, Eusebios, Josephos and Appian. His use of Dio is most notable and can be compared with the epitome of Dio made by John Xiphilinos in the late eleventh century. Whereas Xiphilinos kept close to Dio's actual wording and abbreviated simply by omission in such a way that his narrative is quite frequently scarcely comprehensible, Zonaras 'is rather more coherent and intelligible ... He is less prone to transcribe sections of Dio almost literally and, although he too omits much material altogether, he is more successful in abbreviating passages while retaining the sense'.<sup>11</sup> Unfortunately from Trajan to Alexander Severus Zonaras has used Xiphilinos' epitome without consulting Dio. His sources for the remainder of the third century and for the fourth century appear to have been Peter the Patrician and Eusebios' *Ecclesiastical History*, after which he mainly relied on the standard fare of Byzantine chronicles, though

<sup>11</sup>Millar, 1964, 3; at 195-203 Millar provides a valuable comparative table of Xiphilinos' and Zonaras' epitomes of Dio Book 54.

still making use of good material from elsewhere including what appears to be accurate information from sources which are unknown to us (Hunger, 1978, I, 417-8). It is an impressive work.

The other two twelfth-century chronicles work at an altogether lower level though each is noteworthy in its own way. They are that of Michael Glykas, a learned and intelligent – though heretical – theologian and poet, whose chronicle (Βίβλος χρονική), like that of Zonaras, extended to 1118, but is so superficial that it serves as a useful reminder yet again that chronicles do not necessarily imply a naive author or an uneducated audience (he is, however, noteworthy for his brief introduction in which he attacks historians, whom he separates from chroniclers, for the diffuseness of their presentation); and that of Constantine Manasses, who in a chronicle from Adam to 1081 revamped the approach but not the subject matter by writing it in verse and enlivening the narrative with descriptive passages, speeches and literary allusions (cf. Jeffreys, 1979).

The intellectual quality of Zonaras marks a high-point in Byzantine chronicle-writing. But such quality not only stands in contrast to other chronicles of the twelfth century but was not to be repeated in world-chronicles during the next three centuries which have little to offer. There is the chronicle (Χρονογραφία ἐν συνόψει) of Joel, who covered the period from creation to 1204 in 64 pages in the Bonn edition and who seems to have known just enough to make it possible for us to distinguish the work from sheer fiction. Ἐπιτομή ἀρχῆς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐπικρατείας, ‘A short history of the Roman empire’, is the title of a work running from Aeneas to 1323 which almost certainly is to be attributed to Constantine Akropolites, the son of the thirteenth-century historian George Akropolites. It is a precis of Zonaras to 1118, with little to say about the next two centuries. In the second half of the thirteenth century Theodore Skoutariotes wrote a chronicle (Σύνοψις χρονική, previously known as the *Synopsis Sathas* from the work’s first editor), from Adam to 1261. A member of the court of Theodore II Laskaris and a zealous supporter of Michael VIII Palaiologos’ policy of church union, he became bishop of Kyzikos after the Union of Lyons in 1274, but was deposed by Andronikos II, which gave him the leisure to write his chronicle. He makes some use of Malalas in his cursory coverage of the early period, and is similarly brief down to 1081, but is more detailed for the period of the Komnenoi, including an extensive amount of Alexios’ decree on church property, as well as the only eastern evidence, dubious though it is, that Alexios I actually invited the First Crusade (Charanis, 1949, 17-36, especially 30-34). Perhaps more important for our purposes than his actual content is his preface where, rather like Glykas, he sets up a polemical discussion on the superiority of chronography to history; history is accused of using confusing technical language and unnecessary detail so that the reader has to go through whole books just to find out about a single reign, whereas the chronicler sticks to the basic, most important facts expressed in everyday language (cf. Hunger, 1978, I, 253 and 477-478).

The verse chronicle of Ephraim, of uncertain title and surviving in a single manuscript, belongs to the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. It contains 9,558 twelve-syllable lines and, as we now have it, extends from Caligula to 1261, though it may well have originally begun with Caesar or Augustus. It skims over the early period

at great speed, reaching Constantine before line 300. Constantine himself has over one hundred lines devoted to him, much more than other traditional favourite emperors (Theodosius I receives 25 lines and Justinian 33), though even the most minor emperors get a mention, but the work does become much more detailed for the Komnenoi (cf. Hunger, 1978, I, 478). Of greater importance and quality is a chronicle attributed to one Michael Panaretos and entitled 'The Great Komnenoi, the emperors of Trebizond'. It covers the period 1204 to 1426, providing a unique account of Trebizond's empire as well as being an excellent source for early material on the Ottoman Turks. It includes references to the author's life from 1320 to 1379 with eyewitness accounts for some events. From 1390 to 1426 it abandons its annalistic framework, presumably the result of a change of author (cf. Hunger, 1978, I, 480-81). There also exist well over one hundred smaller works from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries generally known as the 'short chronicles' which correspond in their annalistic form with the chronicle of Panaretos. Many of these likewise are local chronicles which are important for the information they provide on the provinces of the Byzantine empire but they are also significant as evidence that something of a shift had taken place away from the large-scale world chronicle (cf. Hunger, 1978, I, 481-82).

Against this decline in the quality and quantity of world chronicles and shift of interest and content in the short chronicles in the last centuries of Byzantium there are two counterbalancing factors which need to be noted.

First, there is the growth in the number of histories, works which were more ambitious in intellectual endeavour and literary style, in these centuries. A summary account will suffice. The history (*Χρονική συγγραφή*) of George Akropolites (1217-1282) provides a sober and mainly first-hand, if not entirely impartial, account of the period 1203-1261; it is continued by George Pachymeres (1242-ca.1310) whose history (*Συγγραφικὰ ἱστορία*) of the reigns of Michael VIII and Andronikos II (1261-1308) again makes much use of his own observations while holding various high offices. The *Roman History* (*Ἱστορία Ῥωμαϊκή*) of Nikephoros Gregoras (1290-1360) gives a decidedly partisan account of the years 1204-1359, again relying much on his own involvement for the later part as well as using now lost sources for the earlier part. His support for Andronikos II is counterbalanced by the history (*Ἱστορία*) of the emperor John VI Kantakouzenos (emperor 1347-1354, died 1382) which, if aimed largely at justifying his own actions, nonetheless exploits both private and official documents (but also included invented speeches in the classical manner) in a narrative covering the years 1320-1356. This personal involvement in the subject matter of their own history is a little less emphatic in the *Historical Demonstrations* (*Ἀποδείξεις ἱστοριῶν*) of Laonikos Chalkokondyles (ca.1423-ca.1490) which analyses as much as relates the growth of Turkish power from 1298 to 1463 along with the fall of the Byzantine empire. Also notable for its apparent impartiality, despite a moving account of the fall of Constantinople in 1453, is the history of Doukas (ca.1400-ca.1470) for the years 1341-1462 (the title is lacking in the unique manuscript). The historical work of George Sphrantzes (1401- post 1478) has the title of *Χρονικόν* but formally is not so much either chronicle or history but memoirs based on a diary covering the period 1413-1478.

(There also exists an expanded version known as the *Chronicon maius* which, though not by Sphrantzes, covers the period 1258-1478.) Finally the *History* (Ἱστορίαι) of the period 1451-1467 by Michael Kritoboulos (ca.1400 – post 1467) makes especially clear Byzantine use of history as something other than straight narrative, on this occasion pro-Turkish, with its account of Mehmet II and the capture of Constantinople, presumably with the aim of currying favour with the conqueror. Whether Mehmet ever read the presentation manuscript, the only one surviving, which is still preserved in the Seraglio library, is unknown. Overall then, in addition to matters of language, classical imitation and technique, the characteristic of history-writing that especially distinguishes it from the chronicle is the involvement of the author in the subject-matter and, for these centuries, the high level of intellectual endeavour.

Second, there is the number of manuscripts of earlier chronicles or close approximations to them which were copied in these centuries, which testifies to there still being an audience for these works. In addition to the early manuscripts from the tenth and eleventh centuries, George Monachos survives in three twelfth-century manuscripts, three thirteenth-century, three fourteenth-century, a fifteenth-century, some of uncertain date and at least nine sixteenth-century manuscripts. Kedrenos exists in four twelfth-century manuscripts and five from the thirteenth or fourteenth century. For Skylitzes there are two twelfth-century manuscripts and seven from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, not counting his survival in excerpts and manuscripts of Kedrenos. For Zonaras there are no manuscripts earlier than the thirteenth century but the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries give us six manuscripts. Joel only survives in a single fourteenth-century manuscript, the manuscripts of Symeon are all from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries while for the *Epitome*, with Leo Grammatikos and Theodosios Melitenos surviving in one manuscript each from the eleventh century, the tradition is strengthened considerably by the late manuscripts ascribed by Andreas Darmarios to a fictitious Ioulios Polydeukes which at least show that the chronicle was being read in these late centuries. For Malalas we need note another manuscript of the thirteenth century, Vaticanus Graecus 163, a manuscript of the *Epitome*, which provides a supporting account of the closing of the Academy in Athens, though with the subsidiary variant that it was astrology and not the teaching of law that was also forbidden: the precise relationship of this manuscript to the text of Malalas needs elucidation. Likewise the chronicle we have called C (see above, p. 44) only survives in a thirteenth-century manuscript. These may not appear to be large numbers, but given the number of Byzantine works, especially histories, that survive only in a single early manuscript, it is surprising that there are any late manuscripts of chronicles at all, since a new manuscript of a chronicle, especially of one more than two hundred years old, generally resulted in a new chronicle rather than simply a copy. It is perhaps a case of the old chronicles being still read, and, in those economically straitened times, new short chronicles being produced as separate works rather than being incorporated into old chronicles at great expense. Further testimony to the interest in Byzantine chronicle-writing is shown by the number of works which were translated into other languages in this period. In addition to the Slavonic Malalas, there were translations into Slavonic of George Monachos (tenth or eleventh century), the

continuation of George (tenth or eleventh century), Zonaras and Symeon (both in the fourteenth century); into Georgian of George Monachos (in the eleventh or twelfth century); and into Old Bulgarian of Nikephoros' *Chronographikon Syntomon*.

Old versions of Byzantine world-chronicles thus continued to be copied (and so presumably read) right up to the fall of Constantinople with perhaps briefer continuations to the present being produced for local areas, while occasional complete new versions from Adam continued to be written, if somewhat distorted by abbreviation or transformation into verse. In general the story does not change much from that provided by Malalas, but such changes as do occur show a significant pattern. So far as the Byzantines were interested in the ancient world that interest was confined to what they saw as significant in their own past. In short, this was their twin inheritance from the biblical (Old Testament) past and from Rome. Greece, already a minor element in Malalas, is progressively forgotten. If anything survives from Greek history, it tends to be the Trojan war but that is only to provide the story of Aeneas as a precursor to the foundation of Rome. But early Roman history, which too is given short shrift in Malalas, also gets reduced even further so that the topics that survive are biblical history and imperial Rome (cf. Jeffreys, 1979).

But if the view of the past in Byzantine chronicles varies to some degree across a millennium, this change is not because of some lowering in the intellectual or social standing of writers of chronicles. Zonaras' career and writing provide the clearest indication of the inappropriateness of Krumbacher's label of *Mönchschronik*, in so far as that implies that Byzantine world-chronicles were written by people of little education for an unsophisticated audience. As H.-G. Beck (1965) has shown, even where Byzantine chroniclers were monks at the time of writing, this was often in retirement (voluntary or forced) after a distinguished public career and, far from being uneducated, Byzantine chroniclers, where we have any indication about their background, generally appear to have come from wealthy families and so presumably had received the best education available. The question of audience is always a difficult one but again there is no reason to assume that the audience differed much if at all from that for other works of Byzantine literature. Here we should note first that the attitudes and assumptions of chroniclers do not seem to differ from those of contemporary writers (cf. chapters 1, 3 and 4 for Malalas' position); second, given the expense of books and of book production after the seventh century, it was presumably only the more affluent and hence better educated who would have owned or had access to chronicles (cf. *Byzantine Books and Bookmen*, 1975); third, although the degree of literacy in Byzantium continues to be debated (e.g. Browning, 1978; Mango, 1980, 236-239), if the argument that the reading public was limited to a very small percentage of society is correct, this would suggest that the readers of chroniclers came from much the same background as the readers of other literature; finally, there are occasional signs of interaction between the two genres of History and Chronicle (for example, chroniclers, or those whom we would regard as chroniclers, sometimes entitled their work 'history' and vice-versa; there is the occasional shift or alleged shift in level of language, as in the cases of John of Antioch, Nikephoros' *Breviarium* or Genesios' attempt at writing a chronicle in a classical style which should

be contrasted with Niketas Choniates' false claim in the preface to his history that he would write in simple language because he aimed at getting his message across to workmen, soldiers and women) and the criticisms of history made by Glykas and Skoutariotes, again suggest that the audience for both genres is similar.

The Byzantine world-chronicle was revived sometime after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453 with a work known as the Βιβλίον Ἱστορικόν attributed to one Dorotheos of Monemvasia and probably first compiled late in the sixteenth century and with continuations and variations added for later versions.<sup>12</sup> Its text is extremely unstable, which explains the absence of any modern edition – possibly individual monasteries had their own copies which they updated every now and again according to their own interests.<sup>13</sup> It adds material both from relatively recent history, such as an excursus on the origins of the Turks, and of popular interest, such as a full account of pilgrimage sites in the Holy Land, but its omissions are more noteworthy. The emphasis of its early history is almost entirely on biblical and Jewish history with scarcely a mention of Greece and little enough on Rome until the empire. (Apart from the omission of ancient Greece and early Rome its material, structure and organisation closely follow Kedrenos.) Even rationalised myths have disappeared. The nearest we get is one Greek and one Byzantine myth, neither of which actually mentions Greece and neither of which is expanded: 'When Amos was king of the Jews, Midas, king of the Phrygians had asses' ears' (p. 117; interestingly there is no reference to Midas at all in Malalas) and, a little later 'when Josias was king of the Jews, Byzas, the king of Thrace, founded Byzantion' (p. 118). In both these cases Dorotheos' source is almost certainly Kedrenos (Bonn ed., 195-197) and the use is instructive. In Kedrenos Phrygians are synonymous with Trojans, so there is no suggestion that Midas really has anything to do with Greek myth. Kedrenos does however link Byzas' foundation of Byzantion correctly with Megara. It is the only phrase from his source that Dorotheos drops, so it becomes difficult to reject the notion that Dorotheos deliberately removed all references to early Greece from his work. It is only when Dorotheos reaches 'the end of the kingdom/empire (βασιλεία) of the Persians and the beginning of the empire of the Greeks', to quote his section heading (p.145), that we discover that for him Greek history means the Macedonians. On the previous page he had pointed out that the Persian empire had lasted for 630 years from the first Kyros until the empire of Alexander. Now he almost immediately tells us that 'after the death of Kranaos, 23 other kings ruled and died and after them Philip the father of Alexander became king and there were then as teachers and poets of the Hellenes, Sophokles, Herakleitos, Euripides, Herodotos, Sokrates, the great Pythagoras, Isokrates and Demosthenes'; this is an almost verbatim conflation of two passages in Malalas (VI §16, Bo 161; VI §27, Bo 169), although it may well have been taken from another source. Greek history for Dorotheos only finishes at the death of Cleopatra 'when the empire of the Egyptians was destroyed by the might of the Romans'

<sup>12</sup>For literature see Moravcsik, 1958, 412-414 *s.v.* Manuel Malaxos, to whom the chronicle is sometimes attributed. For useful brief comments, Mango, 1981, 54-55. I am extremely indebted to Constantine Sakellariopoulos for much of what follows. References are by page to the 1631 edition.

<sup>13</sup>I owe this interesting suggestion to John Wortley.



(p. 151) after 290 years, so leading to the empire of the Romans (and thus Roman history). It is at this point that Dorotheos inserts his account of the Trojan war (dated to the reign of King David), so emphasising that its significance was purely for Roman history and not Greek. Elsewhere Dorotheos' knowledge of Malalas is not obvious, but nonetheless the work presents a picture of world history that fits easily into the Byzantine world chronicle tradition.

So world chronicles continued to be written even beyond the end of the Byzantine empire and to provide at least Greek speakers with a Malalas-like picture of world history perhaps until the formation of the modern Greek nation and Greek independence in 1821 (cf. Mango, 1980, 193; 1981, 54-55). The first printed edition of Dorotheos was in 1631 after which it went through, at a minimum, a remarkable 33 editions until 1818<sup>14</sup> as well as surviving in part in at least 58 manuscripts (see Stanitsas, 1986), mainly connected with monasteries, particularly those on Mount Athos. It is clear that the world chronicle, as represented by the *Biblion Historikon*, was extremely popular, providing many Greeks with their understanding of the past and their place in history, for in addition to four editions by 1654, at least one edition appeared in every decade from 1676 to 1818, apart from a half-century gap between 1691 and 1743. In addition to Dorotheos there is the chronicle of Kigalas, printed in 1637 and again in 1650 with a narrative continuing somehow to 1648 even though Kigalas probably died in 1642<sup>15</sup> and there are also manuscripts of the huge tripartite (Jewish, Roman and Mysian i.e. Ottoman) history of Alexandros Mavrokordatos (1642-1709), of which just the first part was printed posthumously in 1716.<sup>16</sup> Both Kigalas and Mavrokordatos contain much the same kind of material as Dorotheos, although Kigalas shows rather more interest in ancient Greece, that is, in Malalas-like euhemerised accounts of Greek myths. Although Kigalas' chronicle appears not to have been reprinted after 1650, there are many manuscript translations of it into Roumanian. If these manuscripts could be dated, they may possibly explain the gap in editions of Dorotheos between 1691 and 1740 (albeit not in Greek) while the slight difference in emphasis from Malalas may reflect the attitudes of the highly influential Greek community in Jassy, though elsewhere Phanariot historiography (e.g. Mavrokordatos) appears to show even less interest in ancient Greece than does Malalas.

It is into this context – of the Phanariot intellectual circles of Moldavia – that the translation of Malalas into Modern Greek by one Gregorios Phytianos should be set.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup>Constantine Sakellariopoulos has found references to printings of Dorotheos in the following years, though he stresses that in some cases he has yet to find supporting evidence of their existence: 1631, 1635 (?), 1637, 1654, 1673, 1676 (*ter*), 1681, 1684 (*bis*), 1685 (?), 1686, 1691, 1740, 1742, 1743, 1750 (*bis*), 1761, 1763, 1764, 1767, 1778, 1781, 1785, 1786, 1792, 1798 (*bis*), 1805, 1806, 1814, 1818. There is some evidence for editions also in 1671, 1680, 1808 and 1813.

<sup>15</sup>Oikonomides, 1959, 139-142 citing Russo, 1939, 53-86.

<sup>16</sup>Mavrokordatos, 1716; cf. Mango, 1973, 53-54.

<sup>17</sup>Athens, MIET (Μορφωτικό Ίδρυμα Ἑθνικῆς Τραπέζης) 27; see also chapter 10, p. 321. Thanks are due to Cyril Mango for drawing my attention to this text, to Agamemnon Tselikas and Maria Sakellariadou-Politi of the Cultural Foundation of the National Bank of Greece for their kindness in providing sample photocopies, and to Katerina Giannaki for her help with the negotiations. This manuscript has recently been purchased by the Cultural Foundation.

Dated to 1727 – but very possibly drafted some years earlier – and dedicated to two prominent Phanariots, it is a careful version of Chilmead's *editio princeps*, published in Oxford some 40 years previously (cf. chapter 10, p. 321). Its existence testifies both to the activities of the Greek Enlightenment and to the continuing importance of Malalas in the historiography of the Byzantine and post-Byzantine world.

Although we should also mention the world history of Nektarios of Jerusalem, written in 1659 and printed six times in Venice between 1677 and 1805 (Manoussakas, 1947, 291-332), and the slightly more educated Βίβλος χρονική of Ioannes Stanos, a history to the Ottoman conquest in six volumes published in Venice in 1767 (Svoronos, 1939, 233-242),<sup>18</sup> nonetheless Dorotheos was in effect the textbook of world history for many Greeks for the whole period of the *Tourkokratia*. And just as Malalas exercised an influence on the chronicle tradition in Russia, so Dorotheos may have helped shape the continuation of that tradition, having been translated into Russian in 1665 by order of the Czar.<sup>19</sup> It appears as if it was only the creation of the independent modern Greek state in 1821 that finally put an end to the lingering influence of the Byzantine chronicle's picture of world history,<sup>20</sup> in which Ancient Greece played such a minor role. For, apart from one remarkable exception, there were to be no further editions of Dorotheos or Kigalas. But a last version of world history in the style of Malalas did appear in 1910 with the publication in Cyprus of a version of Dorotheos' chronicle sponsored by Haralambos Nikolaou. This appears to have been published as genuine history for popular consumption (Papadopoulos, 1912, 410-454). Whether such a publication had anything to do with Cyprus' special place in the Greek tradition remains to be investigated, but the longevity of our genre is indeed remarkable.

<sup>18</sup> Other works, which provided a history of the more recent past, appear at least to have assumed the existence of the world-chronicles, e.g. the chronicle of Athanasios Komnenos Ypsilantis in ten books, of which the first seven books, surviving in a single manuscript at Mt. Sinai, are yet to be published (the last three under the title *Τὰ Ἐκκλησιαστικά καὶ Πολιτικά μετὰ τὴν Ἀλωσιν* were published in 1789); Cyril Lavriotes wrote a *Πατριαρχικὸν Χρονικὸν* (ed. M.J. Gedeon, 1877, with notes by Petrides, 3-52 [text], 253-258 [notes]), which covered the period 1453-1794; Neophytos Mavromates is the likely author of a brief world-chronicle written in the mid-eighteenth century, and a little later Kaisarios Dapontes wrote a *Book of Emperors* in political verse, for which he drew his material from Dorotheos (Krumbacher, 1897, 401-402).

<sup>19</sup> Strahl, 1828, 207; Schaefer, 1957, 14 ff.; Laskaris, 1925, 335-6. The post-Christian section of Kedrenos too appeared in a Russian translation in 1794 (Sopikov, 1904, 24, entry no. 273; this lists Russian books printed in Russia prior to 1813).

<sup>20</sup> Constantine Sakellaropoulos has, however, also noted an application made in October 1832 by a Greek publishing house to the censorship board of the Austrian authorities in Vienna for the reprinting of the 1818 edition of Dorotheos.

# MALALAS' WORLD VIEW

Elizabeth Jeffreys

Averil Cameron has shown us recently (1985) how Prokopios, ostensibly a classicising and rational writer, is a product of his time and that his works have to be understood in terms of sixth-century society: he must not be judged by Thukydidean measures, however greatly the extensive linguistic mimesis tempts one to do so. How much more, then, is this going to be true of Malalas, who is so obviously not working within the tradition of classical historiography, nor by rules immediately apparent to twentieth-century observers. Malalas has been moulded by the environment in which he lived and does not, or cannot, or does not see the need to, step outside it. The most significant elements of that environment are (as has been brought out in chapter 1) that Malalas, a Christian of Syrian background, is an inhabitant of Antioch, one of the major cities of the East Roman empire and open to influences from Mesopotamia and Persia as well as the Graeco-Roman world. Syriac and not Greek was very probably his first language, though Greek would have been the language in which he was educated. We can see all these elements playing a part in the world view to be observed in the chronicle. These comments, however, and the rest of this chapter, apply chiefly to Books I-XVIII §76, that is, to the first edition of the chronicle, for the continuation that makes up the second edition, though linguistically unified and showing many of the same preoccupations as the earlier sections, is more narrowly focussed on Constantinople and does not have the same scope.

It might be objected that conclusions drawn about the world view – or intellectual environment – that is discussed in the following pages refer not to Malalas himself but rather to his sources. While chapter 7 (pp. 167-216) which discusses Malalas' sources gives some idea of the extent of his indebtedness to his predecessors, it also provides some indication of his eclecticism and idiosyncracies; Malalas both criticizes the material available to him and imposes his own interpretation on what he found. The number of occasions on which it has to be noted that Malalas' version of an event does not agree with that found elsewhere is an index of his intellectual independence, if of nothing else.

Probably the most central of the elements in Malalas' world was his Antiochene connection. This emerges in several ways. He seems to have been keenly aware of the street scene – the buildings, the festivals, the rituals of civic life – going on around him. This is apparent in his account of imperial reigns, by which his chronicle is structured from Book X onwards. What Malalas deems worth recording are imperial visits to Antioch, e.g. that of Julius Caesar in 49 B.C. (IX §5, Bo 216), especially significant for the proclamation of Antioch's autonomy, Augustus (IX §14, Bo 222), Tiberius (X §8,

Bo 232), Vespasian (X §45, Bo 260), Trajan (XI §4, Bo 271; but note that much of Malalas' narrative on Trajan's activities is uncorroborated by other sources and is probably fictitious), Hadrian (XI §14, Bo 278), Valentinian I (XIII §30, Bo 339), Theodosius II (XIV §13, Bo 360) etc.; or buildings erected by imperial command, e.g. the building work done by Salianus, and subsequently by Pontous and Varius on behalf of Gaius (X §18-19, Bo 243-4) after Antioch's second major earthquake, the basilica erected by Rufinus for Constantine (XIII §4, Bo 319) or that erected by Anatolius for Theodosius II (XIV §13, Bo 360). This emphasis not infrequently leads Malalas to suppose an imperial visitation, not attested elsewhere, had taken place; good examples of this would include the activities attributed to Antoninus Pius (XI §22, Bo 280) in Helioupolis, Laodikeia, Alexandria, Antioch, Caesarea and Nikomedeia when it is not known from other sources that he visited these places (Downey, 1938a, 299); or Constantine's purported visit to Antioch to inaugurate the building of the Great Church after a campaign against the Persians that he is not known actually to have undertaken (Downey, 1961, 348, note 138; though in this case the visit may be genuine, cf. Barnes, 1982, 76). All major building activities, both in Antioch and elsewhere, are attributed to imperial intervention. While this is probably not far short of reality, Antioch – like other cities – did not lack wealthy and public-spirited benefactors; Herod, for example, paved major streets in Antioch (IX §17, Bo 223, though there is confusion with building work attributed to him and that undertaken by Tiberius, X §8, Bo 232), and Mammianos built extensively in both Daphne and Antioch (at XV §11, Bo 385, as preserved by Evagrius and not Ba; cf. Evagrius' references to Memnonios, Zoilos and Kallistos at XIV §13, Bo 360). Also of interest to Malalas are imperial donations in time of earthquake, especially when applied to Antioch but not unworthy of notice in connection with other cities too since this is part of the pattern of traditional imperial behaviour (cf. chapter 5, pp. 93-96, and 8, p. 228), and also led to major building works. Thus, donations are noted by Gaius (X §18, Bo 243), Claudius (X §23, Bo 246), Hadrian (XI §16, Bo 279), Commodus (XII §11, Bo 289) etc.: reference to the list of earthquakes given in chapter 6 (pp. 155-60) will demonstrate the pattern, both linguistic and presumably practical.

The result of all this is that we are told surprisingly little about imperial activities that does not revolve around a sequence of imperial *processus*, military campaigns, triumphal entries into cities and building works. Much of this has to do with Antioch and we are left with a very limited perspective on the role of the emperor. The pattern, however, begins to change in the fifth century with, for example, the extended narrative on Theodosius II and his marriage, though even here there is an Antiochene connection since Eudokia, herself a native of Antioch, made a conspicuous visit to the city before ending her days in Jerusalem (XIV §§3-9, Bo 352-8; Holum, 1982, 186).

Perhaps connected with his interest in the buildings, of imperial construction or otherwise, is the attention Malalas pays to statues, which would have been a conspicuous feature of the Antiochene streets (cf. chapter 5, pp. 98-107). Some appear in connection with episodes from the legendary past of Antioch (e.g. the statue Malalas calls the 'Runaway', V §67, Bo 142, is said to be of the ungrateful Orestes after his release from madness, and is an aetiological element in the naming of Mount Amanos behind

Antioch); others have a more historical context (e.g. the horse's head with a gilded helmet near it, VIII §17, Bo 202, is said to have been set up by Seleukos – possibly at the suburb later known as Hippocephalum – to mark his victory over Antigonos). Others appear to be prominent monuments for which Malalas seems to feel an explanation is needed; e.g. the scorpions purported to have been set up by Apollonios as talismans against noxious insects (X §51, Bo 264; cf. the storks, tortoises and horses Apollonios is also said to have set up in Byzantion); or the anti-earthquake talisman attributed to Debborios (X §51, Bo 265) which had been shattered by lightning and which sounds like the rationalization of an existing monument (a broken column) whose original purpose had long been forgotten; or the apotropaic rock-carving known as the Charonion, designed to protect the city from plague (VIII §22, Bo 205; cf. Downey, 1961, 103-4 and plate 16).

One especial class of statues is made up of the *tychai* which for Malalas are an obligatory part of the establishment of a city (cf. chapter 5, pp. 105-7). First mentioned in connection with Tauros and the foundation of Gortyn, the ritual is completed by the sacrifice of a maiden who is then commemorated by the statue – the *tyche* – named for her.<sup>1</sup> Exceptionally, Trajan erects a statue, following the sacrifice of a maiden, to mark the completion of the theatre in Antioch and Augustus made a similar sacrifice at the establishment of the province of Galatia, though with no mention of a statue. The last mention of a *tyche* comes at Constantine's founding of his new capital, and here the *tyche* Anthousa is specifically stated to be set up with bloodless sacrifices, and its name

<sup>1</sup>References to a city's *tyche*, usually occurring in connection with the city's foundation and the sacrifice of a girl and usually in the form of a bronze statue, are found at:

II §8, Bo 31: Tauros built Gortyn and named the *tyche* Kallinike, after the sacrificed girl;  
 II §17, Bo 36: Perseus made Amandra a city and named the *tyche* Persis, after himself;  
 V §65, Bo 139: Iphigeneia and Orestes renamed Trikomia Nyssa after the sacrificed girl and had a *tyche* set up;  
 VIII §13, Bo 201: Seleukos sacrificed Aimathe and erected a *tyche* for Antioch;  
 VIII §14, Bo 201: Seleukos erected the *tyche* of Antigonias;  
 VIII §18, Bo 201: Seleukos sacrificed Agave at the foundation of Laodikeia and set up a statue of her as *tyche*;  
 IX §5, Bo 216: Julius Caesar set up the *tyche* of Rome in Antioch;  
 X §53, Bo 268: Zarbos sacrificed Kepara and set up a statue of her as a *tyche* of Anazarbos;  
 XI §9, Bo 276: Trajan sacrificed Kalliope and set up a statue of her in the guise of Antioch's *tyche* in the theatre;  
 XIII §7, Bo 320: Constantine made a bloodless sacrifice and called Constantinople's *tyche* Anthousa (previously called Keroe).

At VII §10 (Bo 184: the *tyche* of the Romans), XVI §16 (Bo 405: the *tyche* of Anastasios) and XVIII §77 (Bo 477, app.: the *tyche* of the Christians), *tyche* seems to be used in an abstract sense.

On other occasions there is reference to the sacrifice of a girl at the foundation of a city without mention of a *tyche*; e.g. II §18, Bo 37: Perseus sacrificed Parthenope at Tarsos; VIII §1, Bo 192: Alexander sacrificed Macedonia at Rakoustis when he rebuilt it as Alexandria the Great; IX §13, Bo 221: Having founded Ankyra, Augustus sacrificed Gregoria and created the province of Galatia.

That there is a purification element involved is stated at II §18 and IX §13 and XI §9. Occasionally the sacrifice is made in connection with the erection of a building rather than a city, as at XI §12, but with no mention of a *tyche*: e.g. X §10, Bo 235: Tiberius sacrificed Antigone while rebuilding the theatre in Antioch.

changed (XIII §7, Bo 320); this was presumably intended to mark the Christian nature of the foundation and the break with the Hellenic past (Dagron, 1974, 43-5). For Malalas, then, a city needed a symbolic tutelary figure – for him presumably represented by the famous *tyche* of Antioch made by Eutychides of Sikyon early in the 3rd c. B.C. (referred to at VIII §13 and XI §9 in the list in note 1; see Downey, 1961, 73-5) and the rituals he considers to have been part of its creation reveal an attitude that is somewhat ambiguously Christian.

Malalas cites a number of inscriptions in connection with statues he mentions. The status of these as evidence for what was visible in Antioch in Malalas' day is discussed in chapters 5 (pp. 98-101) and 7 (pp. 200-1) where the conclusion is reached that these must have been derived from literary sources. Thus, despite his evident interest in this aspect of Antiochene life we cannot say that Malalas collected monumental inscriptions for himself. A corollary of this is the conclusion that the not infrequent statement that an object (or custom) persists 'to the present'<sup>2</sup> is equally unreliable as a comment on sixth-century practice and must be used with caution when attempting to assess Malalas' own views and actions.

Malalas' Antiochene focus has also been one factor that has moulded his selection of material from the Hellenic mythological past, or legendary history. Many of the persons, or events, that he mentions have aetiological connections with Antioch or the surrounding region. Thus the giants (I §3, P 7), according to local legend, were located at Pagrae outside Antioch (Strabo, XVI, 7-8) and Typhon's battle gouged out the bed of the Orontes, originally called Typhon (Strabo, XVI, 8; cf. Malalas, V §67, Bo 141, VIII §10, Bo 197); the plain of Amyke is named for the daughter of Salaminos of Cyprus and wife of Kasios, who according to Libanios (*Or.* 11. 52-56), though not Malalas, founded the settlement of Kasiotis on Mount Silpios (VIII §15, Bo 202); the legend of Io, which plays a complex aetiological role in Malalas' narrative (II §7, Bo 28-9), accounts for Iopolis, a settlement on Mount Silpios, and the Iopolitai;<sup>3</sup> Marsyas (IV §11, Bo 76) is the name of a river near Chalkis (Strabo, XVI, 2. 18); the name of Kinyras (I §9, P 13) was associated with a cult of Adonis at Byblos; the story of Orestes and Iphigeneia provides aetiological histories for Scythopolis, Nyssa and the Amanos mountains, as well as statuary in Antioch (V §§65-67, Bo 139-142); Meleager is the name of a ravine outside Antioch (Strabo, XVI, 2. 8); the disproportionately long account of Antiope (II §§31-34, Bo 46-49) is very likely prompted by the presence of statues of Zethos and Amphion, her sons, displayed prominently in Antioch (X §10, Bo 234); the transfer of the palladion from Troy to Rome and then to Constantinople<sup>4</sup> is probably designed to show the continuity of talismanic authority and helps to explain the disproportionate amount of

<sup>2</sup>A full list of these phrases is given in chapter 7, pp. 206-7.

<sup>3</sup>Given in this form only by Malalas (though note that he refers to the inhabitants as Ionitai and not Iopolitai); for Libanios (*Or.* 11. 61) the settlement was called Ione.

<sup>4</sup>The palladion is made by Asios (V §43, Bo 109), quarrelled over by Diomedes and Odysseus (V §§43-46, Bo 109-114), taken by Diomedes to Italy (V §52, Bo 122), taken from Diomedes by Aineas to Albania (VI §§24-5, Bo 163-9), taken by Albas to Silva (VI §29, Bo 170), removed by Romus to Rome (VII §1, Bo 171), and finally taken by Constantine to Constantinople (XIII §7, Bo 320) where it is placed under the statue of Constantine in the forum; cf. chapter 5, p. 98.

space given to the Trojan war.<sup>5</sup> This is only a selection of Malalas' references to Hellenic mythology, and one must admit that not all the episodes that he uses can be tidied up and accounted for in this way – his other major technique, which euhemerizes the Olympian deities into mortal men, will be discussed shortly.

Of the civic festivals that seem unique to Antioch Malalas gives much detail on the Olympic Games; he records their initial establishment from a bequest by a certain Sosibios in the reign of Augustus (IX §20, Bo 224), their subsequent re-establishment under Claudius, combined with the purchase from the Pisaians in Hellas of the rights to their Olympic games, a transaction for which there appear to be no parallels (X §27, Bo 248-9) and notes their staging on several occasions (at times in great detail; e.g. under Commodus [XII §3-10, Bo 284-8], Diocletian [XII §44, Bo 310-11] and Maximian [XII §46, Bo 311-12]). Most of this information would have come from one of the Antiochene local historians to whom Malalas was extensively indebted, in this case presumably Domninos who clearly used the Pausanias cited at X §27, Bo 248 for the details of Sosibios' will (cf. chapter 7, pp. 178, 188-9), but many of Malalas' points can be corroborated, for the fourth century at least, by references to the Games in Libanios' correspondence. The Games were held for the last time within Malalas' lifetime, in 520 (XVII §13, Bo 417) and it may be doubted that the programme of events still bore much resemblance to the accounts given for the Games of the fourth century. Nevertheless, Malalas would seem to have considered that this festival remained an important and distinctive element of Antiochene life. (On the Games, see von Stauffenberg, 1931, 412-441; Downey, 1939a; Liebeschuetz, 1972.)

Other festivals of which we hear include the Maioumas (XII §3, Bo 284 and XIV §17, Bo 362), an apparently orgiastic ceremony held every three years in honour of Dionysios and Aphrodite; it was funded by Commodus (176-192) when he revised the finances for the Olympic Games and then again by Antiochos Chouzon (praetorian prefect, 430-1). Malalas is our major source of information for this festival (cf. PW 14, cols. 610-2).

Rituals, as opposed to festivals, are revealed in the account of the anti-mosquito talismans to be carried during the chariot races of Graste on 7th June (the beginning of the mosquito season?; X §51, Bo 265). Of greater interest for the light it sheds both on the integration of Hellenic legend and myth into everyday life and the interaction of the diverse linguistic and ethnic groupings in Antioch is Malalas' explanation of the door-knocking ritual carried out annually by Syrians of Antioch on the houses of the Hellenes (II §7, Bo 29): they are re-enacting the Argives' search for Io (which gives yet another reason for the presence of this legend in Malalas' history).

The Roman element in Malalas' Antiochene background comes out in the attention he pays to the civic practices concerned with the city's administration. It has been suggested earlier (chapter 1, p. 11) that Malalas was a functionary in one of the *scrinia* operating in Antioch, perhaps attached to the office of the *comes Orientis*. Certainly he seems to have been intrigued by the trappings of Roman ceremonial, and thus gives

<sup>5</sup>Other possible reasons for Malalas' emphasis on the Trojan war include its use by Eusebios as a chronological staging pivot and the prominence of Homer in literary culture.

explanations for the origins of, for example, Roman dress and the use of purple dye for imperial robes (II §9-10, Bo 32-4), the use of the imperial plural in legal pronouncements and the custom of displaying imperial busts when the magistrates were in session (VII §2, Bo 172), and the symbolism behind the hippodrome ceremonial (VII §4-5, Bo 173-177). The extent to which he shares some of these concepts with his contemporaries is discussed in chapter 4, p. 67 ff. He is also concerned to give the origins of what he claims are certain specially Roman festivals or rituals: why, for example, a scape-goat is beaten in February (VII §12, Bo 186-7), why gifts are exchanged at the Consualia (VII §9, Bo 183), why the emperor holds feasts at the Brumalia with guests invited in alphabetical order (VII §7, Bo 179-80),<sup>6</sup> or why drums are beaten in the streets (XI §4, Bo 272; an origin is found for this in an episode in Trajan's war with Parthia,<sup>7</sup> a largely mythical series of events in Malalas' version; Lepper, 1948). These Rome-derived civic activities would seem to have been as significant to Malalas as the Hellenic-based ritual of the search for Io.

Although working in a Roman provincial capital where Latin would have remained in common use, Malalas shows very little knowledge of that language. He cannot, for example, be shown to have used any of his Latin sources directly (see chapter 7, p. 171). The Latin he quotes in XII §2, Bo 285, which has survived the inevitable mangling in transmission surprisingly well, was probably already in Domninos, and the same would apply to the garbled etymologies of VII §5, Bo 176, in connection with the symbolism of the hippodrome factions. None of the etymologies or partial translations that he gives (e.g. VII §12, Bo 186 for *vernaculi* and *Exi, Februarie* or VII §13, Bo 187, on month names) demonstrate convincingly that Malalas understood the phrases. Other Latin terms, which form a small but significant part of Malalas' vocabulary (Körting, 1879), are technical military or bureaucratic phrases which had passed into Greek: e.g. *conventus*, *cuspos*, *dux*, *factionarius*, *limes*, *magister*; a number of these are listed in chapter 8, p. 223. This ignorance of Latin could perhaps be used as an argument against Malalas having been a member of a *scrinium* where Latin might have been expected to be in frequent use. However, Latin had long since ceased to be the official language of administration in the East (Jones, 1964, 601), and Lydus' complaints that his carefully honed skills in Latin were not appreciated are indicative of that language's status.

Malalas would seem to have viewed the past and the present as a seamless whole: though he could envisage civic customs as having had an origin at a specific point in time, he does not seem to consider either that these customs could subsequently change in any way or that the community in which they were developed could have differed radically from the one he knew. Thus a state of any sort must be ruled by a βασιλεύς, an emperor: all rulers in the early books of the chronicle are referred to in this way with the title used subsequently of the rulers in Rome and Constantinople. A state that is

<sup>6</sup>The origins of this custom are attributed to Romus but there is some evidence (e.g. Agathias, V 3) that this practice had been current since at least the time of Anastasios; Lydus (*De Mens.* IV 158) implies that the festival is old but that the alphabetical element is a recent innovation; Crawford, 1914/19.

<sup>7</sup>Gagé, 1953, 319-20, has suggested, very plausibly, that the drum-beating might derive from a Persian purification rite.



ἄβασίλευτος, without an emperor, is one that is not civilized (like Italy before the arrival of Picus Zeus; I §9, P 13) or not really a state (like Rome under the consuls; IX §1, 2, Bo 214-5). With the advent of a single ruler – Julius Caesar – normality was restored (IX §2, Bo 215). The βασιλεύς must be accompanied by his senate and senators (e.g. Lykourgos in Kadmeia, II §28, Bo 44; Perithous is Aides' senator, III §10, Bo 62; etc); who take part in a *conventus* (e.g. the warriors at Troy summon a *conventus* to sit in judgement on Achilles, V §11, Bo 102); the court is attended by *cubicularii* (e.g. Helen's handmaidens, V §5, Bo 95); armies set out for the *limites* (e.g. Tyre is undefended because Agenor is absent at the *limes*, II §8, Bo 30; Iphigeneia and Orestes flee to the Saracen *limes* to reach Palestine, V §65, Bo 139; etc.).<sup>8</sup> On a different level Palamedes invents *tavla* (V §22, Bo 103, a board game with cosmic symbolism; the modern *tavli*?); the hippodrome is organized by the emperor Romus as plainly no city with imperial connections can function without a hippodrome (VII §5, Bo 175; cf. Humphrey, 1986); *pandoura*-players accompany revellers at the Brumalia (VII §7, Bo 179, ostensibly in the time of Romus, the reality – as suggested above – is likely to be the sixth century). Yet, though the role of the emperor and his court is projected back in time, Malalas does seem to acknowledge that there was discontinuity: Caesar, for example, brought back rule by a single person after the interlude of the consuls. In other words, there is a tacit admission that, despite the elements of similarity he seeks to present, the Roman state could not always have been as Malalas observed it in his own day; perhaps it is in this context that the palladion, discussed earlier, plays a role in Malalas' historical thinking.

On a more general level there are signs that Malalas reconstructs legendary history in terms of events from the recent past. For example, Picus Zeus' division of the world into eastern and western regions (I §§9-10, P 13-15) reflects the divisions of Malalas' own day, or perhaps the Theodosian arrangement for Honorius and Arcadius; Iocaste's diplomatic marriage to Oidipous to provide Thebes with a strong ruler 'for the good of the people and the senate' (II §39, Bo 52) bears a strong resemblance to the marriage of Zeno's widow Ariadne to Anastasios (for further examples of this point, see Scott, 1990).

Pinpointing the first appearance of an object or practice or belief in an unchanging world was of concern to Malalas, as indeed it was for other chroniclers (including Eusebios). Thus he notes, for example, the origin of hunting (invented by Nimrod, I §7, P 12), astronomy (invented by Seth, I §1, P 6), fire-worship (devised by Perseus, II §20, Bo 38), the first statue (in honour of Ares, I §12, P 16), monogamy (under Hephaistos, II §2, Bo 24; then Kekrops, IV §6, Bo 71), image-worship (instituted by Seruch, II §43, Bo 53), pagan or Hellenic beliefs (introduced by Hellen, son of Picus Zeus, II §45, Bo 55), and chariot-racing (VII §6, Bo 178). This is, in fact, simply another facet of the attitude which wishes to explain how the patterns of urban life and civic ritual came into existence.

As part of the same attitude, and perhaps also arising out of his administrative perspective, Malalas notes the creation of provinces, the institution of their *metropoleis*

<sup>8</sup>On the status of these phrases as evidence that *limes* had come to mean simply 'the eastern desert', see Isaac, 1988, 138.

and the granting of city status.<sup>9</sup> Here we see another aspect of Malalas' aetiological reasoning. As for Kratylos, the name and the object for Malalas are inextricably linked, or – to put it another way – punning etymologies are meaningful. So, as is also pointed out in chapter 7 (p. 205), a province, or region, needs an eponymous founder: thus Polemo for Pontus Polemoniacus (X §39, Bo 257) and so forth. But the process is not confined to the establishment of provinces. Elsewhere we find Phoenix responsible for Phoenicia, Tyro for Tyre, Syros for Syria, and Kilix for Cilicia (II §8, Bo 30-31), Lakon for Lakonia (IV §17, Bo 81), Lykaon for Lykaonia (IX §13, Bo 222), Carus subjugated Caria and founded Carrhae (XII §34, Bo 302-3); the connection of Hellen with Hellenic worship has just been mentioned; the fact that Perseus first put the sole (ταρσός) of his foot to the ground there gave Tarsos its name (II §18, Bo 37); the image (εἰκών) he left at Amandra caused its name to change to Iconium (II §17, Bo 36). Though this is not made explicit, one suspects that there is an etymological connection between brides (νύμφαι), the Nymphaion (essentially a fountain house) and Malalas' odd remark about young girls, 'called nymphs', gushing milk unexpectedly (IV §6, Bo 71); after all, according to Malalas, Alexander named the fountain at Daphne after his mother Olympias, with the comment that he had drunk his mother's milk there (X §10, Bo 234).

Malalas' attitude to Hellenic mythology has been mentioned already several times. It needs to be remembered that his approach is regularly euhemerizing. Leaving aside the question of what existed in his sources (for Malalas clearly took his information on Zeus from several different places), in Book I Zeus, for example, is rationalized as Picus Zeus, a man, a ruler who founds a dynasty; he is also harmonized into an Old Testament and Christian framework by being said to be of the tribe of Shem (I §8, P 12) and elsewhere appears as Danae's wealthy suitor (II §13, Bo 34); this does not mean that he is not referred to as a cult figure (Zeus Ammon: VII §17, Bo 189; Zeus Asterios: V §5, Bo 94; Zeus Bottios: VIII §13, Bo 200; Capitoline Zeus: X §10, Bo 234; Zeus Kasios: VIII §12, Bo 199, VIII §24, Bo 207, XIII §19, Bo 327; Zeus Keraunios: VIII §12, Bo 199, VIII §31, Bo 212; and Olympian Zeus: IV §25, Bo 90, VIII §23, Bo 207, XII §1, Bo 283, XII §38, Bo 307). To take other examples, Dionysios becomes an aristocratic youth with swashbuckling tendencies not dissimilar to those of Perseus, and of additional interest because of an aetiological connection with Nyssa (II §24, Bo 41; V §65, Bo 139);<sup>10</sup> Aphrodite, at one point a philosopher (I §9, P13; but named after the planet), and Poseidon (II §8, Bo 30) are treated in a matter of fact way as mere mortals. Any version of a Hellenic myth or legend which is other than rationalizing is rejected firmly in favour of one that is more rational: thus at V §50, Bo 120, Homer's account of Kirke, which is referred to scornfully, is rejected in favour of Pheidaios' allegorizing version. At II §43-44, Bo 54-55, Malalas gives us his explanation as to how and why the habit developed in previous generations of deeming mortal men to be gods – it was out of gratitude for benefactions and inventions, a euhemerizing interpretation that in its expression goes back at least to Diodorus Siculus.

<sup>9</sup>A full list of these is given in chapter 7, p. 205, note 22.

<sup>10</sup>Reinert, 1981 but especially Reinert, 1985.

Malalas' treatment of the names of the planets is indicative of his approach. In I §1, P 6, Seth names the five planets Kronos, Zeus (Hera: P), Ares, Aphrodite and Hermes (the naming of the sun and the moon is reserved for God). These are the names that had been current in the Hellenic world since the early fourth century B.C. (Cumont, 1935, 12).<sup>11</sup> A little later these names, specifically noted as the names of the planets, are assigned to the first rulers of Italy and Egypt (and to an early philosopher; I §§8, 9, 11, 13, P 12-17). The effect is to euhemerize the Olympian deities as men – rulers possibly, but men none the less – having first removed any question of divinity since the names had originally been invented by another mortal man, Seth.

Malalas' thought world nevertheless allows considerable scope for the supernatural. He is certainly Christian: the framework of years From Adam (see chapter 6, pp. 111-20) and the pivotal role given to Christ's life on earth in the structure of the chronicle (IX §25, Bo 226; X §1 ff., Bo 227 ff.) are sufficient to demonstrate that. His sectarian affinities are not so obvious but, as discussed in chapter 1, pp. 11-17, he must have been an orthodox Chalcedonian; the fruitless, and now largely discarded, efforts to discern a monophysite recension of the chronicle are detailed in chapters 1, pp. 15-16, 9, p. 300 and 11, p. 335. It remains remarkable that, living as he did through savage sectarian strife, so little evidence of it emerges in Malalas' chronicle.<sup>12</sup> But what does permeate the entire chronicle is a strand of the gnostic-Hermetic-Orphic elements which clearly made up more of the 'theology' of Christians of late antiquity than the theologians would have preferred (cf. chapter 1, p. 14). Thus, Adam's son Seth is prominent in Book I, naming the stars and setting up his pillars of wisdom to be found after the flood (I §1, P 6; I §5, P 10); since the publication of the Nag-Hammadi codices much more is known about Sethian gnosticism (see e.g. Klijn, 1977; Layton, 1981) and, while one might be tempted to consider that Malalas for some parts of his chronicle had access to some specifically Sethian texts, it seems more likely that he is doing no more than reflect the general mix of ideas current in the first part of the sixth century. Much of what Malalas says on Seth can be paralleled from the apocryphal *Book of Jubilees* or the *Book of Enoch*; it is very likely that this information was filtered to him through his source that was derived from Africanus (as is discussed further in the forthcoming commentary).

*Magoi* recur – as Persian priests (II §20, Bo 38; VI §3, Bo 151; XVIII §30, Bo 444; XVIII §69, Bo 472), Moses' wonder-working opponents (III §11, Bo 63), the wise men at Christ's nativity (X §4, Bo 229-231), as Simon Magos (a noted gnostic figure; X §32-4, Bo 252-5).<sup>13</sup> Mystic wonder-workers weave magic and work theurgic displays; those with mystic knowledge include such figures as Picus Zeus (I §13, P 16), Hephaistos (I §15, P 19), Dionysos and the Bessoï (II §24, Bo 42), Hellen (II §45, Bo 55), Endymion (III §7, Bo 61), Joshua and his trumpet (IV §3, Bo 69), Sampson (IV §17, Bo 81),

<sup>11</sup>Malalas is aware elsewhere of an alternative set of names, derived ostensibly from Manetho (II §3, Bo 25) and based on Chaldaean terminology; cf. Lydus, *De mens.* II 4-12. These Chaldaean names had dropped out of use after the second century A.D. (Cumont, 1935, 40).

<sup>12</sup>He mentions the successive depositions and appointments of patriarchs in Antioch with barely a hint of the doctrinal strife over which they presided; almost the only suggestion of dissension comes with his narrative on the *Trisagion* riot of 512 in Constantinople.

<sup>13</sup>Some of the subsequent roles of the *magos* are dealt with in Abrahamse, 1982.

Herakles and Antaios (IV §22, Bo 86), Kirke (V §50, Bo 118; she suspected that Odysseus had similar powers), Cleopatra (IX §10, Bo 219), the *magoi* at Christ's birth (X §4, Bo 229) and Augustus (X §6, Bo 232); the next figure after Augustus to be distinguished in this way is the *comes* Maurianos who foretold Zeno's successor (XV §16, Bo 390).

Part of this pattern of thinking is provided by the pagan oracles foretelling Christ's incarnation and the Trinity, attributed to Plato, Sophokles, and Hermes Trismegistos (amongst others). These texts circulated freely in para-theological areas of religious speculation. Based in many instances, as can now be demonstrated, on genuine oracular utterances of the first and second centuries A.D. (Robert, 1971; cf. Lane Fox, 1986, 186 ff.), versions of the texts that Malalas reproduces existed soon after that period and appear in a wide variety of apologetic contexts. The form that was available to Malalas would seem to have been compiled early in the sixth century (Erbse, 1941; Brock, 1983). That Malalas responded to them is yet another example of his acceptance that past and present were inextricably woven together.

There are hints that theurgic manifestations were also present in the background of Malalas' religious assumptions. How else can one interpret the reference to the displays Picus Zeus used to seduce women (I §13, P 16)? Does this also explain Malalas' interest in metempsychosis (VII §16, Bo 188-9)? If one can often suspect that some of the references to Hellenic mythology were introduced because of an Antiochene aetiological connection, so on occasion one suspects that some curious features would be best explained by a gnostic or Hermetic meaning (which can no longer be traced): consider, for example, the references to Io as the secret name of the moon (II §7, Bo 28), Hephaistos' mystic tongs that introduced iron-working to men (I §15, P 19), Endymion's mystic endeavours to learn the name of the moon (III §7, Bo 61), the rites that Perseus performed over Medusa's head (II §14, Bo 35) or the mystic name attached to the statue in the Zeuxippon in Constantinople (XII §20, Bo 291).

The thought world that accepts this level of magic and supranatural intervention would find the talismanic role assigned to Apollonios' statues very reasonable (X §51, Bo 263-6). It should be noted that the reactions Malalas displays to these magic, but not yet haunted, statues has still to reach the paranoia present in the eighth-century *Parastaseis* (Cameron/Herrin, 1984, 31-4; cf. Mango, 1963). Perhaps something of a developing ambiguity towards statuary and images in general, in both religious and secular contexts, is reflected in the passages at the end of Book II and the beginning of Book III (II §43-45, Bo 53-56; III §1, Bo 57) on Seruch who introduced idolatry, Tharras (father of Abraham who made gods from stone and wood) and Abraham who rejected his father's statues (cf. chapters 4, p. 68 and 5, p. 99).

For Malalas some of the mystic wonder-workers were also philosophers (e.g. Endymion: III §7, Bo 61; Asios, who made the palladion: V §43, Bo 109; Jesus, according to Nero: X §30, Bo 250; Debborios, who had made an anti-earthquake talisman at Antioch: X §51, Bo 265). Some of those whom Malalas calls philosophers cause no surprise: e.g. Demokritos and Hippokrates (IV §20, Bo 85), Thales (VI §4, Bo 152), Plato (VII §15, Bo 188), Iamblichos (XII §47, Bo 312), Theon (XIII §36, Bo 343),

Hypatia (XIV §12, Bo 359), Proklos of Athens (XVI §16, Bo 403). Occasionally Malalas' categories become a little broad: thus at VI §16, Bo 161 Sophokles, Herakleitos, Euripides, Herodotos, Sokrates and the great Pythagoras are all swept together as poets and philosophers (cf. Hippasios, the Pythagorean philosopher who is somehow classed with Isokrates, Perikles and Thoukydides at VI §27, Bo 169). Generally, however, 'philosopher' is used of one who leads a chaste and sober life, reflecting the Byzantine use of φιλόσοφος to refer to a monk (cf. Dölger, 1964; Malingrey, 1961; Hunger, 1981, 40-1); e.g. Marcus Antoninus (= Aurelius; XI §28, Bo 281), Leontios, father of the future empress Eudokia (XIV §4, Bo 353), Kyros of Panopolis (XIV §16, Bo 361) or Isokasios the *quaestor* (XIV §38, Bo 369). The word can, however, be applied to some unexpected figures (e.g. to Aphrodite and Adonis [I §9, P 13-14], Marsyas [IV §11, Bo 76], Teiresias [II §23, Bo 40] or Cheiron, father of Thetis [V §7, Bo 97]), though even here it would seem that the criteria of sobriety and chastity are being observed. Nevertheless it remains a little odd that Domitian is said both to have been a consummate philosopher and to have been murdered because of this (X §§48, 52, Bo 262, 267).

Malalas' mixture of Christian awareness of the other world with the magic of gnostic-Hermetic beliefs perhaps reaches its climax in his reactions to the fears and expectations aroused by the anticipated ending of the sixth millennium and the beginning of the seventh. The evidence for this comes in the chronological excursuses of which two are extant, one at X §2, Bo 228, and another at XVIII §8, Bo 428, while one arguably also once appeared at XV §16, Bo 391: in these passages Malalas is taking the line that anxiety is unnecessary since the sixth millennium had long since ended, at Christ's passion (and atonement) by his preferred calculation, but certainly had passed without perceptible disturbance by other calculations too. These points are discussed in connection with the full sequence of dates From Adam in chapter 6, pp. 111-20. This preoccupation with the possible passage of the millennium and its attendant catastrophes seems to have been a minor but persistent undercurrent in Syria, as demonstrated by several chronicle writers (Harvey, 1988; Jeffreys, 1990 and cf. chapter 1, pp. 11-12).

Only in the last paragraph has it been suggested what evidence there might be that Malalas moved in an environment that was other than Graeco-Roman. There are interesting signs that one other strong influence in Malalas' thought-world came from Persia. Malalas, for example, is aware of the importance of fire-worship in Persian religious practices (II §20, Bo 38) and of the role of Zoroaster (I §11, P 15; cf. I §7, P 12). He tells of Perseus' exploits at length and one of the main purposes of that narrative seems to be to give an etymology for the names Persia and Mede. The possible Persian origin of the drum-beating ritual described at XI §4, Bo 271-2, has already been mentioned. Later on Malalas has a Persian informant – Timothy, the Persian carrier – on the fate of Persian Manichees (XVIII §30, Bo 444), and he has excellent knowledge of the Persian wars of 529-533, based probably on first-hand testimony (cf. chapters 1, p. 19 and 7, pp. 209-10). The term Assyria in Malalas' usage seems interchangeable with Persia (cf. Books III-IV) and it would seem not implausible in this context to suggest that the reason for the long account of Sennacherib's descent on Jerusalem (V §§70-72, Bo 144-149), which is taken almost verbatim from *Isaiah* 36-7, reflects a contemporary

apotropaic reaction to the prospect of a similar Persian onslaught on Antioch (which took place eventually in 540).

The Syrian element in Malalas' background is much less obtrusive. His name is connected with the Syriac root meaning 'rhetor' (as is discussed in chapters 1, p. 3 and 9, p. 306 and note 108), but this in itself shows that he had followed the Greek educational pattern (there was no other; cf. Brock, 1982). To find further evidence of Syriac influence within the text deeper excavation has to take place. One feature has already been mentioned: the millennial fears which seem to have been current in (largely monophysite) circles in the early sixth century. Malalas clearly wrote his chronicle to combat expectations that the sixth millennium had ended, whether in 491 or 492 or at some other point. The usual assumption seems to have been that the end of the millennium would be marked with disasters and catastrophes, and it is this pattern that can be perceived in the Syriac chroniclers (especially Joshua the Stylite and John Rufus' *Plerophories*; cf. Harvey, 1988). The correlation between the unusual date for Christ's resurrection, which Malalas puts on 26th March (X §14, Bo 241), and Easter of 528 (also falling on 26th March), the year with which his last chronological excursus overlaps, suggests the likelihood that there was a sect in Syria which expected the millennium to end in that year, with unpredictable consequences: Malalas was writing to allay these fears. Other signs of a Syriac background emerge in Malalas' equation of Zoroaster and Nimrod, which seems to find a parallel only in the *Cave of Treasures*, which uses sixth-century sources (Cumont-Bidez, 1938, II, 120). Tantalising but as yet inadequately precise resemblances exist with the Pseudo-Clementine Romance, which also has a Syriac background, though earlier than that of Malalas. But this is an aspect of Malalas' chronicle which awaits further exploration.

Indeed, in general, much more needs to be done on the anomalous features of Malalas' chronicle. Illuminating parallels can be drawn between his attitudes and those of Dioscorus of Aphroditto, who also moved between different cultural areas, in his case those of Hellenic and Coptic Egypt (MacCoull, 1988). Investigations made so far into the different strands of Malalas' cultural background indicate that the results of further work are likely to demonstrate just how deeply intertwined in his chronicle are the diverse features of the culturally complex society of which he was a product.

# MALALAS AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

Roger Scott

To the modern reader the view of world-history that Malalas provides may seem quaint, but this same representation of the past, or something closely akin to it, continued to be read throughout the Byzantine state whether in Malalas or in chronicles adapted from Malalas. Malalas too asserts that his version of the past was one which was supported by other writers and had been summarised as exactly as he could from earlier chronicles.<sup>1</sup> This would mean that Malalas received an interpretation of the past that had already been shaped, to which he added his own contribution from the reign of Zeno, and passed this all on to later chroniclers who would adapt and continue the story to their own times. Since we do not possess the earlier chronicles used by Malalas (see chapter 2, pp. 27-38) and since it is sometimes plain that Malalas produced his own independent line, we should be on our guard against accepting too readily this claim to have been merely traditional. Nonetheless the natural assumption must still be that Malalas' picture, at least in outline, made sense not only to later chronicle-writers but also to his own contemporaries. This assumption cannot be tested in any precise form, but we do need to examine the degree to which his contemporaries may have shared his attitudes, his approach to the distant past and his treatment of more recent history. A varied literature has survived from the sixth century and it is against this background that Malalas' outlook needs to be examined.

It is worth opening with a brief review of certain facets of Malalas' approach, some of which are treated in greater detail elsewhere in this volume. There is his acceptance of myth as fact, his treatment of the Olympian gods as kings, and, more importantly, his dehellenizing of them by locating them all outside Greece (Mango, 1980, 189; cf. chapter 3, p. 62). He uses the mortals of myth to provide him with almost all of his narrative of Greek history, which is thus limited to the history of monarchies.<sup>2</sup> Thus almost all reference to the fifth century B.C. is omitted and with it any account of Greek democracy. In effect Malalas' presentation of real Greek history is restricted to the Macedonian kings

<sup>1</sup>'I thought it right, after abbreviating some material ... to relate as truthfully as possible a summary account of events ... Thus the majority of writers on world history have given an account like the following' (Preface, P 5).

<sup>2</sup>Malalas' acceptance of euhemerized versions of myth (that is, a rationalizing myth treated as factual) perhaps deserved a separate chapter in this volume. We have not done this because several studies of different aspects of Malalas' approach already exist, most notably Reinert 1981 and 1985 (cf. also Jeffreys, 1979; Hörling, 1980; Mango, 1980; Scott, 1990).

Philip and Alexander together with a few lists of great names. In contrast to this dehellenized view of the past, Roman history is much more important to Malalas, but his treatment of it is similar. Notice of a sort is given to Aeneas, to Romulus (who appears as Romus) and Remus and to the early kings, but after the expulsion of the kings and the establishment of the consulship little information is given until Julius Caesar and the Roman emperors, so that in effect the Roman Republic is largely omitted. The logic behind this truncation of the past is that only under a monarchy can a nation exist; from Malalas' treatment of Egypt, Persia and Israel, the other regions covered by his narrative, this view extends to these areas also.

Within this framework Malalas has particular interests. One is world chronology (cf. chapter 6, pp. 111-20). Another is the Christian underpinning to this world. While Malalas does not appear to be interested in doctrinal issues, he still makes Christianity play a pre-eminent part in shaping the work, both structurally (Christ's incarnation is arguably the pivotal point of the chronicle's structure; Scott, 1990) and thematically; a recurrent element, for example, is the material on the pre-Christian sages and oracles which, derived from the collection surviving in the Tübingen Theosophy, shows foreknowledge of the Trinity and the coming of Christ. Noteworthy too is his concern over the distinctions to be drawn between icons and image-worship in Books II and III, and his insistence throughout the chronicle that certain, rather unlikely, figures have mystic powers (see chapters 1, pp. 11-17 and 3, pp. 63-65 for various aspects of Malalas' religious outlook). Many of the recurrent themes are linked with the function of the emperor or monarch, even in the first nine books that deal with the period prior to the Roman empire. This is a history conceived in terms of monarchy, especially as exemplified by the Roman emperor, and with a structure that draws attention to the major empires (i.e. kingdoms) of the world that are absorbed into the Roman empire and thus, eventually, into the Christian Roman empire. Monarchy and the functions and duties of the monarch were a cause for debate in the sixth century.<sup>3</sup> So too was the notion that the Christian world was coterminous and identical with the Roman empire.

Several initial points can be made. First, Malalas' approach was evidently traditional in sixth-century terms, his selection of information being dependent, as he himself points out, on the earlier chronicles and histories which had already shaped that tradition. Second, Malalas shared many of his views with his contemporaries, though he also offers his own idiosyncratic views. Third, we need to be on guard against imposing on our view of Malalas the bias of modern notions of a classical past which highlights the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. and the first centuries B.C. and A.D. as the 'classical' periods of Greek and Roman civilisation and has relegated earlier and later periods as being either primitive or decadent. So we should not be too surprised at Malalas' emphases and omissions. Fourth, the fact that major writers of the sixth century, such as Prokopios and Agathias, took classical writers, such as Herodotos and Thukydides, as their models for style, language and structure, does not also mean that such writers regarded the period

<sup>3</sup>Averil Cameron describes Justinian's reign as one which 'provoked an unusually high level of theorizing about the political order and the role of the emperor.' See her discussion, 1985, 242-260.



that their models wrote about as important or that they knew the history of those periods well. In the absence of other evidence it is likely enough that even classicising writers of the sixth century relied on world-chronicles for their knowledge of the shape of the past. Nor should we assume that the greater literary and linguistic sophistication of the classicising writers implies that such writers belonged also to a more sophisticated section of society than the chronicler or writers of other non-classicising genres.

Although it might seem sensible to treat thematically the parallels to Malalas that can be found in other writers, to do so would distort the nature of the links. I will not be attempting in what follows to show that Malalas' ideas, taken separately, can be found in exact parallels in the works of his contemporaries, but rather that, despite the differences in genre and the rich variety of writing that survives from the sixth century, there are similarities in outlook and assumption that Malalas shares with his contemporaries.<sup>4</sup>

Unfortunately we possess virtually nothing of Hesychios of Miletos, the sixth-century author of a world chronicle, who may have had most in common with Malalas among his contemporaries. What little we know of Hesychios' life (given in Photios, *Bibl.* 69) is discussed in the next chapter (pp. 96-98), which also shows how both Malalas' and Hesychios' world chronicles, which may well have had the same titles and similar structures (cf. chapter 2, pp. 33, 35-36), fit into the tradition of the genre of *patria*, including the use of similar legendary material. It is also likely, though not absolutely certain, that Hesychios was writing a little earlier than the first edition of Malalas (cf. chapter 2, p. 36) and so may possibly have been used by him. There also survives a fragment of Hesychios (text at Bo li-liii) which is supposedly taken from a sermon by him on the nativity but which one suspects may also have come from his chronicle. This fragment dates Phalek to the year From Adam 3000 and the crucifixion to From Adam 6000, that is, it provides those dates which, as is pointed out in chapter 6, pp. 116-20, are crucial for understanding Malalas' structure and probably his purpose in writing (cf. also chapter 1, pp. 11-12). Thus the existence of a work by a contemporary and possible source of what we have taken to be Malalas' most fundamental departure from traditional Byzantine chronology, taken together with the similarity between the writers, ought to be sufficient warning that Malalas' apparent eccentricities may not have been regarded by his contemporaries as in any way odd.

The major historian of the sixth century, and arguably the major writer of the century, was Prokopios who wrote a lengthy account of Justinian's wars in eight books (*Wars*), a vehement attack on Justinian and his general Belisarios and their respective wives in *Secret History* and a sycophantic account of the emperor in *Buildings*. Prokopios' reputation has rested largely on *Wars* with his other two works being regarded as unfortunate curiosities which may be useful to the historian but do little credit to the author. Because of this, modern scholarship has also tended to concentrate on *Wars* but recently Averil Cameron has inverted this approach. By paying more attention to the two minor or, at any rate, shorter works, she has found a 'more homogeneous and a more Byzantine Procopius, in the sense that he will seem more closely related to his own

<sup>4</sup>For an excellent review of the literary background see Cameron (A.M.), 1985, 19-32, 242-260.

culture and less of a stray from classical historiography who happened to reveal his Byzantine origins in an unfortunate lapse' (1985, 4). In all three of Prokopios' works and not only *Wars*, his language is an artificial classicising Greek and he is writing in a recognisable classical genre: *psogos* (invective) for *Secret History* and panegyric for *Buildings*. What has appeared to separate *Wars* is the more obvious close imitation of the work of his classical predecessors, not only in vocabulary and the use of particular episodes as models (such as the proemium and the plague, the use of invented speeches and a Thukydidean chronology), but also its structure and content, especially the apparent attempt at a detached account of public events, concentrating on diplomacy and war. This might seem to separate him from Malalas not only in readership and literary terms but also in outlook. But one of the factors that makes Cameron's study important for our purposes is that she shows how unhelpful it is to attempt to draw a distinction between élite literature and popular literature in the sixth century, at least when it is a question of examining its audience, seriousness of purpose and complexity of ideas. Another is that the classicism of Prokopios is no longer seen as representative of the mainstream of Byzantine sixth-century culture.<sup>5</sup> Elsewhere I have shown that the *Secret History* has many correspondences with Malalas for contemporary events, though written from a diametrically opposed viewpoint, and I suggested that the two authors represent opposing sides in political advertisement or propaganda (Scott, 1985). But nonetheless Prokopios' assumptions and interests are often close to those of Malalas, even in *Wars*. The most obvious work for comparison is *Buildings* which naturally has the same linking of building with imperial activity. The emperor is given the credit for all such activity, which is sometimes inspired by God directly and sometimes by a dream or vision. But there is a similar prominence given to the emperor also in *Wars* and *Secret History*, and Prokopios in various places also shows an interest in such matters as aetiological stories, statues, dreams, holy men, costumes and uniforms, buildings and above all a Christian interpretation of history.

Prokopios' classicising *Wars* belongs, of course, to a different genre from Malalas' world chronicle. Because *Wars* is such a long work it is difficult to compare it with Malalas except by generalisations that are too broad to have much meaning, so it may be instructive to examine just one small section. In *Wars* Book VIII Prokopios stated unequivocally that mythology had nothing to do with history.<sup>6</sup> But there his reason for doing so was to emphasise the difference in genre and so excuse himself from including myths. That was reasonable enough, but the very need for this explanation suggests that Malalas' acceptance of and reliance on mythological stories in history or at least in accounts of the past was commonplace. This is reinforced by Prokopios' next few pages after his rejection of myth in history where he keeps returning to the Argonauts' story with references to Jason, Medea, Aeetes, the Argo and the Golden Fleece, all apparently treated as factual rather than mythological (*Wars*, VIII, 2, 12-15, 30-31). In the midst of this there is, admittedly, a denial of the historicity of the Amazons, but Prokopios

<sup>5</sup>But cf. Whitby, 1988, 354-355 for a contrasting view.

<sup>6</sup>*Wars*, VIII, 1.12-13. For a discussion of the complexities of Prokopios' account, see Cameron (A.M.), 1985, 216-219.

promptly accounts for the myth with a rationalization in terms of real history which is not dissimilar to Malalas' kind of history (*Wars*, VIII, 3. 5-11).<sup>7</sup> The whole section exhibits another typical sixth-century trait, its confidence in maintaining the superiority of modern times over antiquity, for the whole digression amounts to an attack on ancient writers. The same few pages also include a reference to the creator and by implication a Christian interpretation of history (*Wars*, VIII, 6. 29; cf. VIII, 3. 18-21; VIII, 25. 13), an aetiological explanation of the name of a river (*Wars*, VIII, 2. 8), together with an attempt to explain the name of the village Athenae which is comparable to Malalas' city *tyche* stories and is given complete with an eponymous maiden and her still visible tomb (*Wars*, VIII, 2. 10). The remainder of Book VIII works in references to Aeneas, Anchises, Agamemnon, Artemis, Atreus and other mythological figures from lower down the alphabet and there are explanations of victory in terms of God (*Wars*, VIII, 12. 34, cf. VIII, 14. 21), emphasis on the need for churches, bishops and priests (*Wars*, VIII, 3. 18-21; VIII, 4. 12) and a report of a portent (*Wars*, VIII, 14. 38-40), while a story about using the squeals of a suspended pig to repel an attack by elephants (*Wars*, VIII, 14. 34-37) might well be thought to be beneath the dignity of a classicising historian and more appropriate to Malalas' chronicle. (Enlivening details can of course be found often enough in the classical historians but Prokopios' narrative at times takes on the characteristics of a ripping yarn, for instance the whole battle narrative at *Wars*, II, 26-27.) There are, of course, individual examples of these features which we would more readily associate with Malalas on a greater scale elsewhere in Prokopios, in *Buildings*, *Secret History* and in the rest of *Wars* but not in such concentration. (The narrative of Chosroes' invasion in *Persian Wars* II, in which bishops play a prominent role, reveals most obviously a Christian interpretation of history akin to that of Malalas, while *Gothic Wars* provides most information about monuments and mythology.) While all this is probably more revealing about Prokopios than it is about Malalas, consideration of this small section of Prokopios should be enough to show that in outlook it is Malalas rather than Prokopios who reflects the sixth-century norm: Prokopios' acceptance of this norm is demonstrated by his attempts to conceal it.<sup>8</sup> But perhaps more important than any formal parallels between Prokopios and Malalas is the fact that Prokopios, for all his classical training and imitation, remains an extremely superficial and limited interpreter of events, as Averil Cameron shows so well (1985, *passim*). The absence of historical interpretation in Malalas is not what separates his work from that of Prokopios.

Prokopios' attitudes and interests seem to cut across any supposed differences in social status or intellectual level between him and Malalas. We will find similar attitudes in a range of writers from 'Christian fundamentalists' such as Dionysios the Areopagite or Cosmas Indicopleustes to anti-classical writers such as Romanos Melodos and to the classicising or archaizing writers such as John Lydus and Agathias and the other poets of

<sup>7</sup>See the brief but illuminating comments by Bowersock (1989) on the renewed respectability of mythic history in the 1st and 2nd cc. A.D. as demonstrated in the works of historians such as Kephallion and Charax whose work, though now almost entirely lost, is clearly part of the historiographical tradition within which Malalas and Prokopios were working.

<sup>8</sup>Against this, stressing classicising histories as against chronicles, see again Whitby, 1988, 355.

Agathias' *Cycle* surviving in the *Greek Anthology*. If we are right about Malalas' career as a civil servant with a background in rhetoric and law (see chapter 1, pp. 3, 10-11), the obvious choice for comparison in outlook ought to be John Lydus who not only served loyally for forty years in the legal branch of the praetorian prefecture but also wrote a surviving history of this branch of the civil service (*De Magistratibus*) as well as surviving antiquarian works on the calendar (*De Mensibus*) and on signs from heaven (*De Ostentis*), in addition to panegyrics, some poetry and a history of Justinian's first Persian war, which have not survived.

The two civil servants share various characteristics. Admittedly Lydus' language, though almost as inelegant as Malalas', is far more sophisticated, and he frequently emphasises his literary training. His works are akin to handbooks and as such belong to genres that are exempt from the demands of a rhetorical, classicising style, though he wanted his readers to be well aware that he had read widely. Like Malalas, he emphasises in his preface to *De Magistratibus* that his work is reliable because he has followed what has been transmitted from antiquity (τὰ πάλαι δοθέντα), and that he is filling a gap by widening the coverage of previous studies. This exhibits once again the peculiar self-assurance of sixth-century authors that they were doing something new.<sup>9</sup> There is also a confidence that the past can be uncovered by research and an awareness that some books have already disappeared (*De Mag.* Proemium) and that archival work is needed and that more could no doubt be discovered and included but for the limitations of time and space (*De Mag.* I, 23.3). Lydus assures us that he was a busy man.<sup>10</sup> But there is also, as a balance, a sense of obligation because of the destructiveness of time, a notion which Lydus harps upon and which is also present in Prokopios and in Justinian's legislation. This kind of awareness may partly explain the intense interest in remote antiquity, though one could also argue that it resulted from such an interest. But Lydus certainly does assume an audience which shares this interest in antiquity. For instance, at *De Mag.* II, 25.2 he refers those who want to make good a gap in their knowledge to the works of Peter the Patrician, 'a great thinker in all things and a firm instructor in general history' (trans. Bandy, 1983, 121).

Of Lydus' works *De Ostentis* tends to be studied simply for being 'valuable for our knowledge of ancient astrology, for it presents a historical survey of it along with the sources of Lydus' knowledge',<sup>11</sup> and it certainly is testimony again to the efforts of a busy sixth-century scholar to seek out abstruse information about the ancient world. At least part of its contents is also of considerable, if perplexing, interest to the sixth century. In one section, which purports to be a translation from Nigidius Figulus of the

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Cameron (A.M.), 1970, 18 on Agathias' *Cycle*, 'Agathias and his friends were conscious that they were doing something new – they were the νέης γενεῆς ἀοιδῆς (*AP.* IV, 3, 114)'. Cameron defends the poets' view. A similar self-confidence in handling and adapting 'the classics' is to be found in Anthemios of Tralles' editing of a theorem by Archimedes (Huxley, 1959) and Prokopios' playful opening to *Wars*, I (Scott, 1981, 73). The Justinianic law codes abound in statements asserting the superiority of the modern over the ancient world.

<sup>10</sup>*De Mag.* I, 22, p. 37 (Bandy), 'And perhaps it is needful, instead of many, to mention a moderate number of instances of such a kind, for I am not at leisure to idle over such an investigation, which, even by itself alone, is sufficient to occupy very large volumes'.

<sup>11</sup>Bandy, 1983, xxix.

works of the Etruscan mythological sage Tages, it provides in the form of a calendar the significance (and hence likely accompaniment) of thunder on any day of the year. Whether or not Lydus believed this to be a genuine source, what is noteworthy is the frequency with which thunder is to be accompanied by a civil disturbance of one kind or another. Dissemination of such information is not likely to have met with the approval of civic authorities. Unfortunately we do not know whether *De Ostentis* was written before or after *De Magistratibus* which was probably begun in late 554. If *De Ostentis* is the earlier work, it is notable that Lydus has suppressed any reference to it in the later work despite his predilection for citing his own works;<sup>12</sup> if *De Ostentis* is the later work, then it fits well into the context of disillusion and subversion of the last years of Justinian's reign, which is perhaps also reflected in Malalas' scanty treatment in the latter part of Book XVIII.

Overall, however, there is a confidence in Lydus about dealing with the past which is similar to that of Malalas. Lydus certainly knows a good deal more about the Roman Republic than Malalas reveals, and is certainly more interested in it and more positive about it. Nonetheless Lydus still has a tendency to associate the republic with bad government in contrast to monarchy, even though Lydus is still more hostile to dictatorship and tyranny. Lydus' subject matter naturally limits what he reveals of the past to Roman history, but he does still emphasise the Byzantine identity with Rome 'the mother of our civilisation' (*De Mag.* III, 12) with Latin being 'our ancestral language' (*De Mag.* III, 42.1); Aeneas is the 'eldest and most honorable of all' (*De Mag.* I, 1, trans. Bandy, 1983, 11); his explanation of 'consul' shows not only his Roman bias but also interestingly reveals a Malalas-like recognition of Assyria and Israel as the other major empires of the past by explaining that a reference to an Assyrian consul in the Septuagint version of *Daniel* is in fact a mistranslation of the Hebrew (*De Mag.* I, 31). (This also illustrates again the sixth-century confidence in criticising the past while also acclaiming it, as does his put-down of the second-century lexicographer Diogenianos at *De Mag.* I, 5.1.) His account of the etymology of 'consul' also carefully undermines Greek tradition (*De Mag.* I, 30.1), although a classicising and hellenizing ambivalence is shown elsewhere (e.g. 'For since the Romans had emulated the Athenians in all things, they also classified their people in this way'; *De Mag.* I, 47.5, trans. Bandy, 1983, 77). Lydus' information usually does not correspond with that of Malalas. Interestingly, they do have similar accounts of the derivation of the *cuspos* (*De Mag.* I, 46.4, cf. Malalas, II §36, Bo 50), but in *De Magistratibus* that is about all. Yet the similarity of interests is clearer. Lydus opens Book I with various calculations for the length of time from Aeneas to the founding of Rome, the period of the kings, the republic, the emperors to Constantine and then on to Anastasios (with a warning seemingly against double-counting Constantine's first nine years, which reminds us of Malalas' similar warning against double-counting overlapping reigns in XVIII §8, Bo 429; cf. chapter 7, p. 215), but the figures differ from Malalas' at all points (Carney, 1971, Book II, 35). There is also a similarity in

<sup>12</sup>Cf. Carney, 1971, Book II, p. 11, who assumes that *De Ostentis* is the earlier work and that Lydus wanted to suppress both any indication of his interest in astrology and his links with the prefect Gabriel.

emphasis. For Lydus the major figures of Roman history are Romulus, Caesar, Augustus, Trajan (to a lesser degree) and Constantine with little awareness of anyone in between (cf. Carney, 1971, Book II, 38). Of these the reigns of Caesar, Augustus and Constantine are certainly focal points for Malalas while Trajan, if not a major figure, receives more attention than we might expect in the narrative as well as being included in the title of Book XI. Lydus' narrative also reveals an interest in the meaning of technical terms, in costumes or rather uniforms and in ceremonies and their origins. (Half of Lydus' description of Augustus at *De Mag.* II, 3-4 is concerned with his clothing for official roles.) He does on occasion introduce oracles into his narrative. There are various other elements that are common enough in Malalas. History for both of them tends to be interpreted in terms of great men rather than issues and the great men are seen as stereotypes of qualities (Carney, 1971, Book II, 37-39). (We are reminded not only of Malalas' lists of great figures but also of his descriptions of both emperors and Homeric heroes by stereotyped lists of qualities; cf. chapter 8, p. 231-44.) They both see fear and severity as a good thing (*De Mag.* III, 16-17; cf. Scott, 1985, 103-104). They both recognize the importance of statues for the historian, Lydus reporting the existence of one about which he had found a notice in the city archives (III, 35), and making use of another to demonstrate by visual evidence (so common in Malalas) that the praetorian prefect had always worn a sword (II, 9). Lydus makes use of mythological stories, admittedly more to adorn his narrative than as historical evidence, but on occasions the myth is treated as fact to explain a current phenomenon. For instance there is the explanation of the σάνδυξ and Herakles' epithet Σανδών in terms of the ancient Lydians being 'rich in gold' (III, 64, cf. III, 58, citing Euripides on 'the gold-glutted fields of the Lydians'), while elsewhere he makes no distinction in historicity between Phaleris and Busiris (III, 58). These accounts are often accompanied by garrulous explanatory stories, sometimes introducing a myth which seems similar to Malalas' aetiological narratives and digressions, though Lydus uses them as much to parade his own learning as to explain a custom.

The most interesting parallel to Malalas comes in Lydus' *De Mensibus*.<sup>13</sup> Here there is an account of the origin of the hippodrome, the races and the four colours that has much in common with Malalas (VII §3-6, Bo 173-178), but also much that is different. The differences include a discussion of the establishment of the hippodrome in Byzantion by Severus (with aetiological explanations of its layout), and, outdoing Malalas, an aetiological explanation of its origins in Italy by Kirke (Circe; hence Circus), in honour of Helios, whom she boasted (wrongly, Lydus suggests) was her father. (Kirke was in Italy at the time of Odysseus' wanderings and, ravished by Diomedes, became mother of Auson, who later became ruler of the West, hence Ausonia.) Horse-racing had its origins of course in Greece, Lydus assures us, the two-horse chariot being introduced by

<sup>13</sup>*De Mens.* I, 12 (Wuensch, 1967, 3-7). Most of this is missing from Roether's 1827 edition and consequently from Bekker's 1837 Bonn edition, where what it does contain is at III, 25-26 (Bonn, 43). Lydus also has a separate discussion of the origins of the colours at *De Mens.* IV, 25.3-5, which is discussed by Cameron (A.D.E.), 1976, 59; so too Corippus, *In Laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*, I, 314-344, ed. Cameron (A.M.), 1976, 45-46 and commentary 143-147. See also Lyle, 1984, 827-41.

Poseidon's son Enyalios in the time of Moses and the quadriga later by Oinomaos, which leads to a euhemerised version of the myth of Hippodameia and the consequent renaming of the kingdom of Greece as Peloponnesos. Malalas clearly knew about this myth too but omits it, only referring (twice) to Pelops' victory over Oinomaos and the consequent renaming of the kingdom (IV §16, Bo 81, and §19, Bo 84-5), for which he gives the second-century historian and consul Charax as his source, and again differs in the length of a reign, allowing Pelops 32 years as against 38 in Lydus, but places this in its 'proper' chronological and historical setting without making any link with chariot-racing. Lydus' account of the origins of chariot-racing clearly differs from Malalas' in many of the details (Malalas claims his account is again from Charax), but this episode is the clearest possible demonstration that in their general approach to myth, history and monuments the two bureaucrats have much in common.

What seems to emerge from all this is that, although Malalas' approach to his subject matter fits easily into a contemporary context, as we might have expected, he was nevertheless pursuing his own line with his own set of facts and interpretations. The variety of interpretations of ancient history available in the sixth century, or rather the opportunity to assert or invent facts and interpretations of history, is perhaps most clearly seen in the prefaces to various of Justinian's *Novels* dealing with provincial administration. As Michael Maas has recently shown, these provide a remarkable amount of historical information. 'Many legends are recounted, and there is a striking emphasis on ancient titles of magistracies, methods of provincial administration, and ties between Rome and the provinces in the Roman republic and in earlier times. These sketches of Roman history are detailed but quite often inaccurate' (Maas, 1986, 18). The approach (and the result) is thus somewhat akin to that of John Lydus and, apart from the interest in the republic, to Malalas. Maas goes on to point out that even though 'overtly Christian references are infrequent throughout', the prefaces exploited the past (or the version of it that was created) so that 'secular expressions of legitimacy and power ... were made accessible within a Christian framework. Here lies the significance of the historical prefaces. They do not speak for a classicism independent of Christianity. Instead a controlling Christian theory is paramount and demonstrable'. Again this is not dissimilar to Malalas who, despite an apparent lack of interest in theological issues, wrote a world history that clearly relied on a Christian eschatological framework, however idiosyncratic his version was.

The creation of the 'right' past as a way of strengthening one's case in the present is also to be found in another highly important genre for the sixth century, hagiography. Here certainly theological points and point-scoring are present. The most influential of the sixth-century's hagiographers was Cyril of Scythopolis. In a forthcoming study Cynthia Stallman shows how across various *Lives* Cyril has presented an 'excessively, even distortedly, favorable impression of [the princess] Eudokia'. The explanation is that 'doctrinal considerations are clearly at work. Cyril seems to have selected and presented his material so as to promote the Chalcedonian Orthodox cause, a process which involved careful handling of any situation not creditable to it'. Elsewhere Cyril appears to take his line directly from imperial policy. Perhaps the clearest example of this is the *monogenes*

hymn which Justinian wrote and which is in effect paraphrased by Cyril as if he were describing an event rather than reflecting an argument. This same reflection of imperial viewpoint appears in another example of Malalas' own genre. The Latin chronicle written by Justinian's courtier, the *comes* Marcellinus, frequently promotes the imperial version of an event (most notably on the Nika riots), while Malalas himself for contemporary events seems to have been dependent on official notices. An equally tendentious, even polemical, view of events can be found in contemporary ecclesiastical historians, especially in monophysite works such as Zachariah of Mytilene and John of Ephesos. Likewise the chronicle by bishop Victor of Tunnuna presents as fact a highly tendentious North African view of sixth-century religious disputes. Indeed the nearest to an exception among ecclesiastical historians was Evagrius who, writing at the end of both the sixth century and the tradition of ecclesiastical history, in a period of fusion in both literature and society manages to avoid Eusebios' distinction between political and ecclesiastical material and who, as a neo-Chalcedonian, does attempt to find common ground with the monophysites (Allen, 1981, 105) even overcoming the problem of using a polemical monophysite source (Zachariah of Mytilene). But despite the fact that 'piety and Chalcedonian belief are not automatically synonymous for Evagrius' (*ibid.*, 15) and that he 'shows a certain broadmindedness' (*ibid.*, 9) in his acceptance of some monophysite interpretations, Evagrius is also 'committed to refuting the anti-Chalcedonian views' (*ibid.*) of Zachariah, and did this largely by 'a polemic of omission' (*ibid.*, 268).

These authors come from a variety of genres. With the exception of the *Secret History* and the monophysite histories, none of these works could be described as polemical, yet all are quite clearly doing more than simply presenting the facts. They are interpreters of the past, using history to demonstrate, with varying degrees of honesty, the truth of some cherished belief. Malalas' chronicle has for long been considered a bland, if too frequently unreliable, collection of supposed facts arranged in chronological order. It has recently been suggested strongly that the chronological arrangement was contentious even to Malalas' contemporaries, and that it was deliberate, doggedly and tendentiously demonstrating that popular opinion about the Second Coming or the end of the world was misconceived, and doing all this while at the same time avoiding polemic (Jeffreys, 1990; cf. chapters 1, pp. 11-12, 3, p. 65, and 6, pp. 116-20). Given the practices of his contemporaries, it becomes easy enough now in context to accept that Malalas need not have been simply an innocent and objective compiler of facts.

To those who have been brought up on the importance of the classical world of Greece and Rome and who see Byzantine civilisation only as the conduit for the continuity of the classical Greek tradition, one of the more perplexing aspects of Malalas' vision of world history is his lack of interest in classical Greece. In a society in which education still concentrated on classical Greek texts with a special place for Homer, where highbrow literature imitated classical models and apologised for any intrusion of non-classical vocabulary, where poetry still attempted to force classical metres and vowel-lengths on a language for which these were now highly artificial, we might have expected a world-history to be Hellenocentric, emphasising the glories and grandeur of Ancient



Greece. Instead Malalas gives us his dehellenised location of the Olympian Gods, some myths about mortals which he tends to date in 'history' by a supposed contemporary from the Old Testament, a few lists of Great Men and a version of the Trojan war drawn not from Homer but from Diktys. What is stranger still is that it was Malalas' version of classical Greece that remained the orthodox view in the Byzantine and post-Byzantine tradition. It is this that makes it likely that even Malalas' classicising contemporaries may have depended on chronicles for their knowledge of the history of the ancient world, so far as they were interested in the ancient world as anything more than a quarry for literary style. Here we need to remember that, despite the impression we might get from classicising writers, classical Greece belonged to the very distant past, a millennium ago, and that Malalas and his Christian contemporaries thought of themselves as Romans, that is, as members of the Roman empire, and not as Hellenes, which in any case by now had the pejorative meaning of 'pagan' and perhaps 'dissident' as well.

Contemporary hymns help emphasise this point and make Malalas' picture more understandable, for they may well reflect a more widely-held contemporary viewpoint. The *Akathistos* includes the following lines in its praise of the Virgin:

Hail, to you who show the philosophers to be fools;  
 hail to you who prove men of letters to be men of no wisdom;  
 hail to you, for able disputers have been shown to be idiots;  
 hail to you, for the fashioners of fables have been made to wither;  
 hail to you who have torn apart the intricate schemes of the Athenians.<sup>14</sup>

The *Akathistos* may or may not belong to the sixth century but its anti-classical sentiments are certainly present in the hymns of Romanos who does belong and who probably reflects not only a popular viewpoint but also that of the court (Topping, 1976, 1-15).

Why do the Greeks snort and chatter?  
 Why do they make a show of Aratus, the thrice-accursed?  
 Why are they led into error by Plato?  
 Why do they love Demosthenes, the weak?  
 Why do they not see that Homer is a flitting dream?  
 Why do they keep talking about Pythagoras who justly is to be muzzled?<sup>15</sup>

Malalas' neglect of classical Greece is mild in comparison with the pugnacious derision of the *Akathistos* and Romanos. But both Romanos and the author of the *Akathistos* show signs that, despite their hostility to pagan learning, their writing, their training and education had been influenced by classical rhetoric. The organisation of material, the structuring of the hymns (Topping, 1977), the portrayal and development of character (Topping, 1982), the awareness of the rhetorical treatment of panegyric (Topping, 1978), kingship and *adventus* (Topping, 1977a) all reveal this influence, whether direct or indirect. It has even been argued, though none too convincingly, that Romanos' vocabulary shows the influence of Euripides (Tomadakis, 1974, 401-2). But even if we disregard this last element it is clear enough that the place of the pagan world

<sup>14</sup>Trans. Trypanis, 1971, 384-385.

<sup>15</sup>Kontakion 33, *On Pentecost*, strophe 17; trans. Carpenter, 1970, 367.

and the classical tradition was somewhat ambiguous in the sixth century. In this context it is worth remembering that Malalas is our only narrative source for Justinian's supposed closing of Plato's Academy at Athens.<sup>16</sup> Whatever the truth of that and whatever the motive, it is also clear that a classical education continued to be available during the sixth century (though probably taught increasingly by Christians rather than pagans<sup>17</sup>), but interest in the classics was rather dangerous and could lead to a charge of paganism. Modern scholarship has for the most part moved from applauding Justinian for bringing about a revival of learning and sees him much more as a persecutor of intellectuals who led 'an offensive against every cultural manifestation that could be seen as dissent'.<sup>18</sup>

A similar hostility to classical learning is just as apparent in other sixth century works, such as the recently edited Homilies of the presbyter Leontios (Allen/Datema, 1987) and in the fundamentalist flat-earther Cosmas Indicopleustes who determinedly argued that the world was constructed on the plan of the tabernacle. The varied works of Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite, with their hierarchical and mystical arrangement of the universe, also belong to a similar context and they were undoubtedly influential and popular. And yet Pseudo-Dionysios, who clearly had absorbed much from Neoplatonism, and Cosmas, if largely by his opposition and contempt, both show the influence of classical learning. Cosmas was also very much involved in some of the major issues of the day (Cameron, [A.M.], 1985, 27-8). Both might well have argued vigorously with Malalas on his interpretation of history, sticking dogmatically and tenaciously to their own views, and yet they both would have shared his rejection of the importance of classical Greece and both manifestly belong to the same culture. Cosmas, in particular, had much in common with Malalas, with his lively accounts of the marvels he witnessed in his travels, for instance, the rhinoceros (XI, 1), giraffes (XI, 4) and the yak (XI, 5) and the even greater marvels he just missed seeing such as the hippopotamus, though he had acquired and sold hippopotamus teeth (XI, 9), and the unicorn, for which he had been forced to base his drawing on a statue he saw in the palace of the king of Ethiopia (XI, 7). But more importantly Cosmas also shares with Malalas the notion of the succession of kingdoms; no doubt many others also still subscribed to this theory although it was probably not as prevalent as it had been in the fourth century. According to this, after the destruction of the pre-Christian kingdoms (the Babylonian, the Median, the Persian and the Macedonian; II, 70), the succession of kingdoms culminates in the Roman empire: 'For while Christ was yet in the womb, the Roman empire received its power from God as the servant of the dispensation which Christ introduced, since at that very time the accession was proclaimed of the unending line of the Augusti by whose command a census was made which embraced the whole world ... The empire of the Romans thus participates in the dignity of the Kingdom of the Lord Christ, seeing that it transcends, as far as can be in this state of existence, every other power, and will remain unconquered

<sup>16</sup>Cameron (A.D.E.), 1969; Blumenthal, 1978.

<sup>17</sup>Cf. Moffatt, 1973, 17-18; Whitby, 1988, 354-358.

<sup>18</sup>Cavallo, 1978, 212, cited from Cameron (A.M.), 1985, 23, cf. 20-22 for discussion. For similar views of Justinian see Honoré, 1978, ch. 1; Mango, 1980, 135; Lemerle, 1971, 68-73 (=1986, 73-79). Against this, Bandy, 1983, ix: 'Justinian fostered at Constantinople a highly favorable atmosphere in the area of the liberal arts and sciences'.

until the final consummation, for he (i.e. the prophet Daniel) says that *it will not be destroyed for ever*' (II, 74; trans. McCrindle, 1897, 70-71). Cosmas also has a fondness, like Malalas, for referring to ancient sites that were still visible in his own day, such as the spot where the Egyptian chariots entered the sea in their pursuit of Moses, a site known also to Orosius and Philostorgios: 'Now that very place is in Clysma, as they call it, on the right hand as you go to the mountain, where also the wheels of their chariots are visible, and can be traced for a considerable distance as far as the sea, and are preserved to the present day, as a sign to unbelievers and not to believers' (V, 8; trans. McCrindle, 1897, 142).<sup>19</sup> It was also for the sake of unbelievers, he assures us, that Hebrew inscriptions made by Moses and the Israelites still survive in Sinai, which he himself had seen, 'having travelled in these places' (V, 53; trans. McCrindle, 1897, 159). The Israelites, having just recently acquired the art of writing, continually practised writing their names on stones 'just as with ourselves there are travellers who scribble their names in the inns where they have lodged' (*ibid.*). But he is also well aware of the strength of his opponents in the classical camp, notably the philosophers Plato and Aristotle, who can be cited not only for their 'entirely fictitious, fabulous sophistries' (Hypothesis 4; trans. McCrindle, 1897, 4, cf. Wolska-Conus, 1968, 259) and their incompetence and ineffectuality as forecasters (for instance in failing to warn against building in earthquake-prone areas (Cosmas was very interested in earthquakes), not only at 'Antioch but Corinth also, which has close at her hand the mob of the philosophers' (I, 22; trans. McCrindle, 1897, 18), but also on the occasions when they were on the right track. Garrulous and aggressively self-confident, Cosmas thus shares with Malalas an hostility to classical culture, an interest in the exotic, an interest in teleological Christian interpretation of history and the succession of empires, a fondness for describing and explaining still visible ancient monuments, an interest in earthquakes and an argumentative (and possibly irascible) nature.

One of Malalas' more delightful stories concerns the traveller Andreas and his blind dog (XVIII §51, Bo 453). Apart from making a good story, this interest in oddities is paralleled by Cosmas Indicopleustes' interest in marvels and perhaps by the fictitious love-letters, including those from prostitutes, concocted probably near the beginning of the century by Aristainetos (Mazal, 1971; cf. Beck, 1986, 88-89) and, in the next century, the remarkable nineteen topics, in the form of a Platonic dialogue, investigated by Theophylakt Simokatta in his *Quaestiones Naturales*. These include such wonders of nature as 'why goat's blood softens adamant, ravens do not drink in summer, stone curlews cure jaundice, or the frogs of Seriphos are mute' (Whitby, 1988, 34). An audience that appreciated material such as this would also, one imagines, have enjoyed the kinds of information that Malalas worked into his chronicle, whether this was the euhemerised accounts of early legends, the fairy-tale accounts both of Eudokia's rise from poverty to princess and of her fall following the episode of the huge apple (we are reminded of the Herodotean-type stories that Prokopios included at the beginning of *Wars*, Book I to delight rather than inform his audience; cf. Scott, 1981, 73) and especially and

<sup>19</sup>Note, however, that a certain caution must be exercised with Malalas' 'to the present' phrases; cf. chapters 1, p. 5 and 3, p. 58, and especially 7, pp. 206-7.

more importantly of Malalas' fondness for telling us about buildings and their links with the past, while Averil Cameron (1985, 203) has drawn attention to Prokopios' touristic interest in the ancient monuments of Rome. This curiosity about the physical world around them, combined with delight in a good story, can also explain the interest for pilgrims and tourists in a short work attributed to the sixth century, the anonymous *Breviarius de Hierosolyma* or *Short account of Jerusalem*,<sup>20</sup> which provided somewhat imaginative explanations for various sites, buildings and other monuments in the Holy Land in much the same way as Malalas did for Antioch. It has been suggested tentatively that the *Breviarius* could have been intended as publicity material to be used by shipping agents (Wilkinson, 1977, 5), but whatever its precise purpose it does confirm contemporary interest in the kinds of information on monuments which Malalas so frequently inserts into his chronicle. The novel of late antiquity could also have been catering for a similar taste among its audience with its standard fare of romance, adventure story and travel in exotic lands.<sup>21</sup> Even though we have no sixth-century examples of the genre, such works remained popular through much of the Byzantine period.<sup>22</sup>

Another factor that needs to be noted here is that the Byzantine empire was not just a Greek-speaking or Greek-and-Latin-speaking zone and culture (Mango, 1980, 23-24). There was certainly a great mixture of languages and cultures, some of which were indifferent or hostile to Graeco-Roman traditions. The extent to which non-Greek influences affected Byzantine literature remains an intriguing question, but here we need only note the existence of a rich Syriac literature in the sixth century of chronicles, ecclesiastical histories, hymns and theological tracts and sermons and that Romanos, who was born at Emesa on the Orontes, almost certainly spoke Syriac as his native language as well as having perhaps been a Jew by birth, while Malalas' probable Syriac background is discussed elsewhere in this volume (chapters 1, p. 3, 3, pp. 65-66 and 6, pp. 119-20). For other languages with some claim to a place in sixth-century Constantinopolitan literary culture there is of course Latin (for instance, Corippus) and Coptic (used along with Greek by Dioscorus of Aphrodito). In this context it is also worth noting that even those major writers of the century whose native language was presumably Greek often hailed from places far from Constantinople and were very likely exposed to non-Greek influences, such as Prokopios of Caesarea, Prokopios of Gaza, John of Gaza, John Lydus (Philadelphia), Agathias (from Myrina), Hesychios (Miletos) and Cosmas (Alexandria).

Although an indifference to Hellenism was no bar to being Byzantine in the sixth century, there is the question of the writers' self-awareness. Here it has been suggested that the ninth-century chronicler Theophanes, though supposedly conscious of the classical tradition because of his programmatic preface, deliberately separates himself from that tradition in that he 'consciously kept his personality in the background and omitted

<sup>20</sup>Weber, ed., 1965, 105-112; partial trans. Wilkinson, 1977, 59-61.

<sup>21</sup>For the audience of the ancient novel and its connection with content, see Perry, 1967, 56-65, 149-186; Scott, 1968, 70-72.

<sup>22</sup>Beck, 1986, 85-86, who also links Nonnos' *Dionysiaka* and hagiography with a similar audience.

any detail that might make it possible to evaluate him as an historian' (Kazhdan/Constable, 1982, 100, drawing on I.S. Cicurov). Kazhdan/Constable see 'this apparent rejection of individuality and [this] humility' as a new concept for *homo byzantinus* 'differing radically from the antique tradition' (*ibid.*, 101). In the case of Malalas textual problems obscure what he did include in the preface, so we cannot be sure what he said about himself. But it was hardly an extensive discourse and he certainly does not explain why he wrote, beyond saying that he 'thought it right'. Certainly it is a feature of the classical preface for the author to state his name and subject and perhaps to refer to his predecessors, but although this is hardly enough to give Malalas a place in the classical tradition, especially given Malalas' actual list of named predecessors and sources, he is still also a long way from any suggestion that he is suppressing his individuality and personality (cf. chapter 1, p. 20). That as an idea does not yet appear to have entered the Byzantine tradition, not even for the author of a saint's *Life* such as Cyril of Scythopolis. *Homo byzantinus* in the sixth century, though already prepared in some cases to reject Hellenism and classicism, wrote because he as an individual had something to say and makes little attempt at concealing his individuality in saying it, and so would have rejected entirely any suggestion that the author be 'considered not as a creative personality but as an impersonal tool in the hands of the Holy Spirit' (Kazhdan/Constable, 1982, 101; cf. Cameron [A.D.E.], 1970a).

What is more interesting is that there is no sign in Malalas' preface of a patron who would both have encouraged and benefitted (as a result of praise) from the work. A number of sixth-century writers do mention their patrons, enough to suggest that the practice was common. These include, for instance, Agathias who thanks Eutychianos the younger, 'a leading member of the imperial secretariate', for urging him to write his history (Preface, 11; trans. Frendo, 1975, 3) and who prefaces his *Cycle* with praise of the emperor and Theodosios the decurion. Menander Protector makes it clear that the emperor Maurice, a patron of both poetry and history, encouraged him to write his history, 'offering financial inducements to stimulate slothful intellects' (frag.1.1, trans. Blockley, 1985, 41).<sup>23</sup> A patron for Prokopios is more elusive but it is generally accepted that Justinian commissioned *Buildings* while Belisarios may have encouraged *Wars*. For John Lydus we have a patron, the prefect Gabriel,<sup>24</sup> for both *De Mensibus* and *De Ostentis*, while in *De Magistratibus* the Lydian points out that his literary career began through the patronage of the praetorian prefect, Zotikos, who paid him the handsome price of a gold piece for each line of a verse encomium, and continued with a history, commissioned by the emperor, of the first Persian war. The seventh-century historian Theophylakt Simokatta almost certainly had as his patron the patriarch Sergius (Whitby, 1988, 32-3), who may also have been the patron of the *Chronicon Paschale* (Krumbacher, 1897, 337; Whitby, 1989). The poet Corippus may have been less successful, but in his *In laudem*

<sup>23</sup>For imperial patronage of literature at either end of this period, cf. Anastasios who encouraged men of literary pursuits (Lydus, *De Mag.* III, 50) and Heraclius' encouragement of the philosopher Stephen of Alexandria (Whitby, 1988, 40), and presumably George of Pisidia.

<sup>24</sup>Cf. Carney, 1971, Book II, 11. Gabriel is also mentioned at *De Mag.* III, 38 while Leontios Scholastikos wrote a poem for his statue (*AP.* XVI, 32).

*Iustini* he still appeals both to the emperor and to the quaestor Anastasios (with side appeals to the emperor's mother, the emperor's wife and the Mother of God) to help him in his weary old age, even as almost twenty years earlier in the *Iohannid* he had pointedly contrasted the wealth of his epic's hero, the general John Troglita, with the poverty of the unfortunate poet. Paul the Silentiary prefaced his *Hagia Sophia* with addresses to both the emperor and the patriarch, which probably implies patronage. Justinian may have encouraged the *comes* Marcellinus' chronicle and it would be surprising if patronage does not also lie behind various panegyrics such as the deacon Agapetos' *Ekthesis* (cf. Viljamaa, 1968, 60-62). Cyril of Scythopolis dedicated his hagiographies to the monk George. Cosmas Indicopleustes dedicated at least part of his work to the monk Pamphilos which is confirmed by Photios, although the seventh book is addressed to Athanasios, the tenth to Peter with other works addressed to Constantine and the pious deacon Homologos. Jordanes likewise appears to have had several patrons (cf. Momigliano, 1966, 191-7; Goffart, 1988, 44-6 and 102-5). In addition to these new works of literature we should note the patronage of Anicia Juliana who commissioned at the very least several churches and a lavishly illustrated copy of Dioscorides' *Medicamina*. We cannot of course extend this to suggest that a writer would not undertake the expense of producing a large work without the support of a patron, but it was probably abnormal to do so and the fact that Malalas does not even give a hint of a patron provides at least some support to the notion that Malalas may have had a strong conviction about some issue that drove him to produce the chronicle even without a patron: as noted previously, it has been suggested that the debate on either the Second Coming or the end of the world may have been the stimulus which lies behind the chronicle (Jeffreys, 1990; cf. chapter 1, pp. 11-12, 18, chapters 3, p. 66 and 6, p. 118-20).

The function of an emperor was much debated in the sixth century (Cameron [A.M.], 1985, 246-255), mainly on the issue of whether the emperor was God's vice-regent on earth (with the result that kings should be considered the images of God on earth who took their power and authority from God), or whether man, having free will, was responsible for his own political system and government. The debate probably in part reflects the struggle through Justinian's reign between aristocracy or senate and the emperor, although our literary evidence comes from writers who are not directly involved in politics (so far as we know), such as Agapetos and Corippus on one side and the anonymous author of a treatise on political science and the Alexandrian philosopher and Christian teacher Philoponos on the other, though there also exists criticism of individual emperors, muffled or disguised in the case of living emperors and more direct in the case of dead ones. In all of this, however, there is no suggestion that any system other than autocracy was viable, though the Anonymous does stress the role of the senate. Malalas does not seem to enter the debate on the qualities of an emperor just as he does not enter the debate on orthodoxy or on classicism. Yet although he is either not interested in these issues or regards them as irrelevant to his chronicle, their presence is sufficiently pervasive in the chronicle, even if in an adulterated form, to suggest strongly that Malalas was well aware of them: he either accepted them or was influenced by at least the popularised version of the current debate. His world history, as noted above, is a history

of empires and emperors, or at least these provide him with his framework on to which other material is grafted. His chronicle is a work of the sixth century and reflects contemporary views. This awareness of contemporary issues has its influence even for topics where Malalas reveals a personal point of view that is at odds with prevailing culture, most notably (we suspect) on the years From Adam and the date of the incarnation and the Second Coming, where Malalas' idiosyncratic position may well provide the *raison d'être* of his chronicle. For here it is because Malalas was aware of the contemporary view that he has chosen to register his disagreement. Our commentary will reveal, we trust, some other examples. Not surprisingly Malalas was a man of his times and his chronicle in general reflects this.

We consider elsewhere in this volume the vexed question of the dates of composition for the chronicle (chapter 1, pp. 17-25). From that discussion it is clear that there was an original version which reached to early in Justinian's reign (we suggest 532), and was probably completed not long afterwards, and that there was a continuation down to 565 or 574. The problem for anyone examining Malalas and his contemporaries is whether to consider that the contemporaries are those of the early Justinianic period or those of late Justinian and Justin II. This might appear to be a pedantic quibble, but over the intervening thirty to forty years there is a noticeable change in attitude and outlook.

The early years of Justinian's reign are marked by feverish activity and with it a self-confidence and optimism that increased with success and was believed to reflect divine support:

So great is the forethought of divine humanity in our favour, that it always deigns to sustain us with its eternal liberality. After having terminated the Parthian wars by a lasting peace, and having overthrown the nation of the Vandals, and for a second time united Carthage, nay indeed all Libya with the Roman empire; we, by our care, have caused the ancient laws, already oppressed with age, to be invested with new beauty and suitably compiled. (*Const. Tanta*; trans. Scott, 1932.)

An Endless Peace was established with Persia in 532; Vandal Africa was conquered by 533 for which Belisarios celebrated the first civilian triumph for 600 years in the following year; Rome was regained in 536; Justinian, who recently had himself been largely responsible for restoring communion with Rome, had established a colloquium with the monophysites in 532 (Brock, 1980); Hagia Sophia was rebuilt energetically after the Nika riots (work began just five weeks after the riots and was completed in under six years) and in addition to its splendour there were the new churches of St Sergius and St Bacchus, St Eirene and the Holy Apostles; there had been a thorough reorganisation of provincial administration; Prokopios was probably at work on the *Histories*, Lydus had produced his commissioned encomium of Justinian's Persian wars, Agapetos with his *Ekthesis* had produced the prototype of the *Mirror for Princes* genre, Romanos' hymns were exuding a similar confidence; and perhaps the greatest achievement of all had been the mammoth work of the codification of the *Laws* (first edition 529, second edition 534) and the publication of the *Digest* and the *Institutes* (533), all requiring a remarkable degree of energy and organisation whether in collecting books and material, selecting suitable staff and distributing them in appropriate committees with the least interference to their

normal activities, developing an excerpting and card-filing system and establishing (and maintaining) a timetable for the completion of the work (Honoré, 1971, 1974, 1978). Any one or two of these achievements in a reign would have justified some degree of self-congratulation and confidence. It is not surprising that the language of the Codes so frequently not merely compares the present to the glorious achievements of the past but even suggests that the present has surpassed them by correcting their errors.

The list could be continued, but the middle and late period witnessed disasters and failure and with this went a change from optimism to pessimism. The wars in Italy and Africa dragged on; in 540 the Persians sacked the rich cities of Syria, including Antioch, almost unheeded while there were no doubt still memories of the Nika riot with about 35,000 dead (Malalas XVIII §71, Bo 476); the monophysite problem was not only not solved but intensified. There was a crop of natural calamities, earthquakes, droughts, plagues of locusts (cf. Mango, 1980, 66-67) and above all there was the disastrous plague of 542 and its various recurrences. 'Such, then, were the calamities which fell upon all mankind during the reign of the demon who had become incarnate in Justinian while he himself, as having become emperor, provided the causes of them' (*Secret History*, XVIII, 36; trans. Dewing, 1914-40, vol. VI, 223). So Prokopios now wrote in *Secret History* and perhaps Romanos' account of the Antichrist should also be dated to this period. Agathias certainly reports that some believed the end of the world was nigh in December 557 (*Historiae*, V, 5. 2) and I have suggested above that Lydus' *De Ostentis* could be understood in this context.

How does Malalas fit into this? An answer will not throw further light on the vexed question of the dates of composition, but it will add some meaning to the discussion of the earlier and later versions of Malalas. Quite apart from the evident break between the earlier and later editions (the move from Antioch to Constantinople, the change from a detailed to a brief narrative), it is perhaps possible to detect, or at least suggest, a difference in approach, though this really just involves expanding a little on the change from a detailed to a summary approach (in Bo the text of Malalas takes 54 pages to cover the first six years of Justinian's reign, i.e. 527-533, and only eighteen pages to deal with the next thirty years, so cutting down from roughly nine pages a year to a little over half a page). The characteristics which we have suggested that Malalas shares with his contemporaries (confidence in handling the past; having a purpose in writing; a penchant for incidental narrative; making use of visual evidence and so on) all belong to the first edition, i.e. before 533 say. The remainder of Book XVIII lacks these characteristics. Their absence also in the later users of Malalas shows that this is not simply a result of our defective text. Whoever was responsible for the remainder of Book XVIII, whether an aged Malalas or another (cf. chapter 1, pp. 22-24 and 211-16), appears to have been affected by the gloom of the latter part of Justinian's reign and so produced a desultory list of unconnected events rather than the jaunty and somewhat tendentious, even provocative, assertions that characterise the first seventeen and a bit books.

Sixth-century literature was written and survives in a variety of genres and literary and linguistic styles derived from a multiplicity of backgrounds and cultures. Malalas shows links with much of that culture while at the same time producing a work that is



different, with its own idiosyncracies. To what extent that is due to the vagaries of survival we cannot tell, but one characteristic of sixth-century literature that can be emphasised again is its confidence in attempting something new, even where the novelty consists in reworking the old. That is perhaps why Malalas' chronicle remains both somewhat idiosyncratic as well as fitting well into the chronicle tradition and contemporary culture.



# A RECORD OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND MONUMENTS

Ann Moffatt

Malalas' chronicle is an important source for the study of the buildings and monuments of ancient cities, especially for Antioch and Constantinople. The material, however, was recorded selectively. Consequently for a proper use and appreciation of the material the factors influencing Malalas' selection and presentation should be considered. At the same time an examination of this aspect of the chronicle can illustrate the value a sixth-century chronicler, and to some extent his predecessors, placed on recording the construction and repair of public buildings and amenities in a city. It can also illustrate the way he himself looked upon the history of his city and its monuments.

## *Scope of the chronicle*

This chronicle from the time of Adam is presented essentially in terms of generations of family history for the Old Testament and legendary period (Books I-V) and thereafter with reference to rulers, first to the most prominent of the Assyrian, Persian and Seleucid rulers, and then, from Book IX on, to Julius Caesar and ostensibly all the Roman emperors in turn down to Justinian (cf. chapter 1, pp. 1-2). References to buildings and monuments throughout the first part in particular are linked to accounts of the foundation of cities, to religious cults and festivals. From the time of Alexander the Great on, building enterprises are most frequently attributed to the initiative of the ruler, often in response to disasters: earthquakes, flood or fire, riots or Persian attacks. Buildings are also mentioned incidentally, to establish a location. There is a marked interest throughout the chronicle in the setting up of statues, some of them with apotropaic powers. This preoccupation with the symbolism of statues is also reflected in his account of the origins of idolatry (II §43 - III §1, Bo 53-57). Reference to other works of art such as ceremonial carriages and dress, silver plate, and even an elaborate gold bridle, can arise either in the context of anecdotal material or in small-scale *ekphraseis*.

The context in which the works are mentioned has largely shaped the selection of material. Most of it concerns Antioch and its suburb of Daphne and their immediate environs, but buildings in Jerusalem and Caesarea Maritima are mentioned several times, especially in connection with Jewish and Samaritan revolts. Some specific buildings are also noted in Laodikeia, down the coast from Antioch, and in Nikomedeia, the largest city in the vicinity of Constantinople. However, in its time the city of Constantinople attracts attention almost comparable to that given Antioch. Beyond these horizons the

material often seems to have been included as a news item, reporting on major earthquake damage, for example. Other references are to subjects of general knowledge, like the 'seven wonders' (the Colossus of Rhodes, the lighthouse at Alexandria, the temple of Hadrian at Kyzikos and the temple of Zeus at Helioupolis/Baalbek), or topics of learned interest like the explanation of the symbolism of the hippodrome (VII §4, Bo 175), or the name of the sculptor Pheidias appearing in a list of famous ancient Greeks. This chronicle, which goes back to the time of Adam, is thus fundamentally a 'city chronicle', but set in a framework of a sixth-century Antiochene's view of history and of Antioch's place in the late Roman empire. This explains its focus on Antioch and on the capital of the empire.

There are two major shifts in the work affecting references to buildings and monuments. The first is at the end of Book VIII at the point where Antioch and the old Seleucid kingdom came under direct Roman rule as the province of Syria, after Pompey's successful campaigns against Mithridates of Pontos and Tigranes of Armenia. From Julius Caesar on the building achievements are generally listed for each ruler, following the practice of the genres of biography and encomium, but limited to the eastern part of the empire, with only an occasional reference to Rome. The second shift occurs in the last book. The last detailed reference to Antioch is the description of the earthquake of 526 which left about a quarter of a million dead (XVII §16, Bo 419-21), while the Persian sack of 540 (XVIII §87, Bo 480) is treated cursorily. Indeed the chronicle proceeds in only summary form after the description of the Nika riot in 532 and the establishment of the Endless Peace with Persia (XVIII §76, Bo 478). It seems that Malalas completed the first version of his chronicle at this point and moved shortly afterwards to Constantinople (chapter 1, p. 22 and 7, p. 211). Although there is evidence of the chronicle continuing to at least the death of Justinian in A.D. 565 it does not, in its present form, refer to the rebuilding of Antioch after the sack of 540. Malalas' contemporary, Prokopios, on the other hand, devoted considerable attention to this rebuilding (*Buildings*, II, 10. 19-25). In those last pages it ceases to be a chronicle of the city of Antioch and the focus moves to Constantinople.

When we ask why specific material is included in the chronicle and the form it takes we are brought immediately to the questions, dealt with in other chapters, of the nature of Malalas' sources (see chapter 7), his own circumstances (see chapter 1), and the components underlying the genre of the world chronicle, first developed by Eusebios (see chapter 2).

### *The legendary period*

For the legendary period the buildings Malalas refers to are temples and tombs closely associated with Greek myths, such as the temple of Artemis at Aulis where Agamemnon left Iphigeneia before sailing for Troy (V §8, Bo 98, following Diktys' account) and Zeus's tomb on Crete (I §13, P 16; Evans, 1901, 119-122; cf. chapter 7, p. 177), both existing in historical times, constructed because of the legends. Others, such as the temple of the Sun on Kirke's island of Aiaia are completely mythical, like the island itself (V §50, Bo 117, again following Diktys). Two temples built by the

Argonauts were said to have been converted into churches by Malalas' day. At Kyzikos a temple of Rhea, the mother of the gods, often identified with Kybele, became a church of the Theotokos in Zeno's reign. Janin suggested the site might be identified with a monastery of the Theotokos on Mt Dindymos which survived into this century (IV §12, Bo 77f.; Janin, 1975, 203-205). The connection between temple and church is emphasised by the story that the Argonauts consulted the oracle at nearby Pythia Therma and recorded in an inscription on the temple the prediction that the word of God would be conceived in an innocent girl, Mary, and this would be her house.<sup>1</sup> Shortly afterwards, as they were approaching the Black Sea, they were attacked, but they saw an apparition, a great winged figure, which assured them of victory. The place was named Sosthenion from their being saved there and they built a temple as a thank-offering, with a statue of this winged victory figure. Constantine, with a nice appreciation of iconography, identified the statue as the Archangel Michael and renamed the shrine accordingly (IV §13, Bo 78 f.; Janin, 1969, 346-50; cf. Mango, 1984, 57-60 who suggests that this statue 'in the clothing of a monk' was of Attis wearing a cowl-like Phrygian cap). The church was famous in Malalas' day when Agathias the historian wrote an epigram about an icon which he and his fellow law students dedicated to the Archangel at Sosthenion (AP, I 35). Temples are the focus for activity in this picture of the early Greek world, even to the extent that Orestes' trial before the Areopagos took place in the temple of Athene (V §61, Bo 135, following Dikty) instead of on the hillside.

Malalas provides a distorted view of the development of Rome, being attracted primarily by etymological explanations of the names of buildings. The term for the imperial residence, the palace, was derived from 'Pallantion', the name of the house of Pallas, son of Evander (VI §24, Bo 168). This building was restored by Romulus and Remus and they built the temple of Zeus (Jupiter) which they called the Capitol, 'that is, the head of the city' (VII §1, Bo 171). A temple of Mars, the month of March and the Campus Martius were all mentioned together because of the linguistic association (VII §3, Bo 172 f.). He also read the situation of his own day back into the past not only in focusing on the palace but also in explaining that Romulus and Remus built the hippodrome (circus) to divert the population of Rome from civil riots. The colours of the circus factions, with the blues and the greens preeminent, were also given a venerable antiquity, being traced back to Oinomaos, and introduced to Rome by Romulus. The idea that the four colours reflected the four elements and that the design of the hippodrome was a symbol for the world is appropriate to imperial Rome and was not peculiar to Malalas (Dagron, 1974, 330-38; Lyle, 1984; see chapter 4, p. 74). Such were the original buildings of Rome. This is the sort of material to be found in accounts of the foundation of a city and patriographic writing. Beyond this Malalas mentions the rebuilding, of the Capitol by Augustus (IX §23, Bo 225), which is attested by the *Res Gestae*, and Domitian's murder there in the temple of Jupiter, an error apparently due to the fact that this temple which he had restored after a fire was, quite ominously, struck by lightning just before his death (Suetonius, *Aug.* 5 and 15). An aqueduct built by Antoninus Pius is mentioned briefly, without explanation, the context now lost, perhaps due to the

<sup>1</sup>This oracle is also attested in the Tübingen Theosophy; Erbse, 1941, 180, paras. 53-4.

abridging of Malalas' text (XI §26, Bo 281). It may have been the Aqua Antoniniana of the fourth-century inventories (Nordh, 1949, 101). Aurelian's walls (XII §30, Bo 299 f.) and Alaric's and later Geiseric's plundering of the palace (XIII §49, Bo 349; XIV §26, Bo 366) could be classified as general knowledge and included as such. The monuments of the great early Christian city are all but ignored. Reference to a balustrade built around the spot where Simon Magus fell to his death when he challenged St Peter as a miracle-worker is a detail in an extended account of their rivalry which was variously elaborated by the Greek Apologists (X §34, Bo 255). Justin Martyr (*First Apology*, 25) believed there was a statue of Simon in Rome, apparently on the basis of an inscription which came to light again on the Tiber Island in 1574 (CIL VI, 1 [1876], no. 567, p. 108; Wartelle, 1987, 264). St Peter's is mentioned only in the context of the emperor Leo's problems when the Western emperor Anthemios was killed there (XIV §45, Bo 373 f.). Thus Malalas' prime interest in the buildings of Rome was as the predecessor of Constantinople, with its palace, Capitol and hippodrome.

### *The Hellenistic period*

For the Hellenistic period the focus is on the foundation and early buildings of Alexandria and particularly of Antioch and Daphne. Alexander gave Alexandria a *tyche*, a temple to Serapis Helios, a public bath called 'The Horse', and other temples (VIII §1, Bo 192). Malalas credits Honorius, rather than his father Theodosius, with closing the temple of Serapis, a conspicuous event in the triumph of Christianity over paganism (XIII §48, Bo 349). The bath building could have been attributed to Alexander if the horse after which it was named was thought to be a representation of Boukephalos. The bath is referred to in a lemma to an epigram by John the Grammarian, probably a sixth-century poet in the *Cycle* of Agathias. This suggests that it was a statue restored by an emperor, who might therefore be identified with either Justinian or Justin II (*AP*, IX 628; Cameron [A.D.E. and A.M.], 1966, 12 and 1967, 131). Only city walls, a temple of Zeus Bottios and statues are mentioned specifically in Seleukos Nikator's founding of Antioch, and only walls and a *tyche* for Laodikeia and Apamea (VIII §§13-19, Bo 199-203). At Daphne, formerly Herakleis, he planted cypresses, following the example of the city's legendary founder Herakles. It is implied that temples of Apollo and of Athene were already there in Seleukos' day (VIII §20, Bo 204). It was Antiochos IV Epiphanes (175-163 B.C.) who provided Antioch with its Bouleuterion, a council chamber (VIII §22, Bo 205), and a new district of Epiphaneia, between the original walled settlement by the river and Mt Silpios. The only other buildings mentioned apparently predating Roman control of the city were a temple of Ares and a Pantheon (IX §5, Bo 216 f.) and a synagogue in the Jewish quarter of Kerateon (VIII §24, Bo 207). Even this last reference may be anachronistic since it reads like a gloss, and in any case the earliest archaeological remains of a synagogue found to date are at best of the first century B.C. (Levine, 1987, 10 f.; cf. Bickerman, 1951 and Fishman-Duker, 1977, for Malalas as a source for Jewish affairs). This paucity of references to buildings in Antioch in contrast to the many statues which Malalas linked with the foundation of the city may be a clue to the type of material he or his sources were drawing on for the Seleucid era. It savours of the legends

contained in the *patria* rather than the historical record. Indeed, there is a general paucity of evidence for the history of Antioch in this period (Downey, 1961, 112).

### *Jerusalem*

The Temple in Jerusalem is mentioned several times in the chronicle. Malalas traced the major events affecting the history of this building with the very conspicuous exception of Herod the Great's vast building enterprise on the Temple Mount although this had been described in considerable detail by Josephos. The Temple built by Solomon containing the bronze Cherubim and Seraphim (10th cent.; V §69, Bo 143) was destroyed by the Assyrians (i.e. Babylonians) under Nebuchadnezzar (597 B.C.) and rebuilt in the time of the Persian king Artaxerxes after Nehemiah had rebuilt the city and the walls (mid 5th cent.; VI §1, Bo 150 and VI §15, Bo 160). The next 'destruction', or at least desecration, came after control of Jerusalem had passed to the Seleucids (200 B.C.). In putting down the revolt led by Judas Maccabaeus Antiochos IV plundered the Temple and converted it into a temple of Zeus and Athene, polluting it with pig flesh. He then killed the high priest and the Maccabees whom he had taken as captives to Antioch (VIII §23, Bo 206 f.). Shortly afterwards their remains were handed over and buried in the quarter of Kerateon and the Temple returned to the Jews and purified (see above; VIII §24, Bo 207; Bikerman, 1951). While the omission of Herod's rebuilding of the Temple may be the result of damage to the text of Malalas' chronicle, it is more likely that it is an oversight, reflecting the sources Malalas turned to at this stage in his writing. The Old Testament was no longer a guide to influence his selection of material and the Antiochene focus had become more pronounced at about this point when Antioch came under Roman rule. Indeed, Herod's paving of the highway outside Antioch is not overlooked (IX §17, Bo 223). When it comes to the account of Titus' sack of Jerusalem, while Malalas gives the broad picture and mentions the destruction of the Temple, he concentrates on how Antioch, Daphne and Caesarea Maritima benefitted from the spoil. The theatre at Daphne and an odeon at Caesarea were said to have been built as a result, and on sites previously occupied by synagogues (X §45 f., Bo 260 f.). The interest in Jerusalem is not sustained. Helena's visit and discovery of the relic of the True Cross and five nails is mentioned (XIII §5, Bo 319), but not the building of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. And the empress Eudokia's retirement to Jerusalem is told as the end to the tale of her gift of an apple to Paulinos and Theodosius' suspicions about their relationship, with only a passing mention of her lavish building program in the Holy Land and that in the context of a play on the meaning of her name (XIV §8, Bo 356 f.).

### *The destruction and restoration of buildings*

A number of other times Malalas records the destruction or changed use of buildings and their contents in changed religious circumstances. Sometimes this was accompanied by an act of desecration or purification. Thus following the Babylonian capture of Jerusalem Nebuchadnezzar's son, Belshazzar, used the Jews' priestly vessels for mixing wine for himself and his concubines, with dire consequences (VI §3, Bo 151 f.). In Antioch, perhaps under Valens, the temple of Ares, or at least its precinct, was converted

into a market (*macellum*), the one place where pig meat was butchered (IX §5, Bo 216; XII §7, Bo 287; Downey, 1961, 406 f.). Three temples on the Acropolis of Constantinople were treated even more contemptuously by Theodosius the Great: the temple of Helios was made over to Hagia Sophia and the colonnades of its courtyard converted into dwellings; the temple of Artemis became a gaming room for dice players; that of Aphrodite the praetorian prefect's carriage-house, with rent-free accommodation for penniless prostitutes built nearby (XIII §39, Bo 345). Theodosius also converted many temples into churches and destroyed the huge temple of Zeus at Helioupolis (Baalbek) built by Antoninus Pius and considered 'one of the wonders' of the world (XI §22, Bo 280; XIII §37, Bo 344) while his son Honorius closed the famous temple of Serapis in Alexandria (XIII §48, Bo 349 f.). Christian buildings also replaced synagogues. After a Samaritan rebellion Zeno converted the Samaritans' synagogue on Mt Garizim into a church of the Theotokos and under Anastasios, during anti-Jewish rioting at the Olympic festival at Daphne, the synagogue was burnt and subsequently converted into a Christian martyrion (XV §8, Bo 382 f.; XVI §6, Bo 396). In most of these cases Malalas speaks of modifications and reuse, rather than the razing of buildings. This is practical, but also implies a lack of extreme religious fanaticism both on the part of those taking such actions and of Malalas in recording them. The same was true with the reuse, or reinterpretation, of statues.

Such deliberate demolition or adaptation of buildings to new purposes have their parallels today. So too do Malalas' reports of vast relief operations and rebuilding after earthquakes and fire, with the death toll and the amount spent on disaster relief recorded as a major news item. Less common today is the practice of listing public buildings and public works as significant achievements of a government; but in ancient and medieval histories such a list formed a stock item in the biography of a ruler or church leader. A good example is Suetonius, who usually sets such a paragraph in the latter part of each of his biographies, along with paragraphs on other philanthropic activities, listing the building activities in a block rather than in chronological order. The *Liber Pontificalis* for Rome and Agnellus' similar work for the bishops of Ravenna follow the same model with variations as appropriate. Romilly Jenkins (1954) has shown, in his study of the *Life of Basil* in the tenth-century chronicle of Theophanes Continuatus, how this literary form, which allowed great flexibility of approach, as described in the rhetorical handbooks, was perpetuated in Byzantium. In Malalas' treatment of imperial reigns certain elements are almost standard, like the accession notice and a description of the emperor's personal appearance (see chapter 7, p. 141), and the wars that were waged, whether against foreign powers or rebellions. In the case of the building achievements some flexibility is shown in whether they are listed in isolation or placed in the context of disaster relief, or victory celebrations, or an emperor's presence in a city. The absence of such a paragraph on buildings for the reign of Leo is clearly a fault in the text as we now have it (Downey, 1961, 476, note 3). Had Malalas' chronicle been written for an audience in the capital it is likely that no more comprehensive a view of imperial building initiatives would have been the result. Judging from the very abbreviated form in which the chronicle survives for the last years, when Malalas seems to have moved to



Constantinople, a transposition occurred. No buildings are referred to outside the capital except for general references to damage as a result of earthquake or riots. But although the chronicle gives us a view from the provinces, this does not mean that that view is utterly parochial, for Antioch was often host to the emperor and his entourage. Antioch was also the major base from which relations with Persia were conducted, and it was only by about the sixth century that Constantinople became clearly the leading city of the East, while Alexandria and Antioch were still large cities and very influential when Justinian came to the throne. Even so, because the chronicle has an Antiochene focus reports of imperial building initiatives concentrate on local projects and only the most significant or newsworthy from other towns, and then usually only those towns of which the Antiochenes were likely to have some knowledge. As a result even such important cities of the Eastern empire through to the sixth century as Ephesos and Gaza do not rate a mention of any sort.

#### *The imperial period and imperial biography*

Most buildings of the imperial period occur in Malalas in the context of the building achievements of the emperor. Little heed is paid to private patronage or to the architects, the officials and the labour force responsible for carrying out the work. Even when individuals endowed or supervised the work, the credit was given ultimately to the emperor (Downey, 1938a, 8ff.). The buildings which attract imperial patronage range from the ornamental fountain at Daphne to market buildings, road works, the water supply and fortifications. Because the approach is by imperial reigns and this is ostensibly a comprehensive history, there is little attempt to trace the development of individual cities or to place the buildings in their setting, an approach which would better suit a eulogy of a city. Even then, however, the tendency is to assume the audience is familiar with the city and a eulogy such as Libanios' for Antioch does not take the structure of a modern guide book. However, looked at across its whole span some shifts of emphasis within the chronicle are clear and not surprising, since they are supported by the archaeological record generally. There was lavish building in the second century, notably by Trajan, Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, and again in the fourth, when Valens redeveloped a central area as a new forum. The festivals, notably in Antioch the Olympic Games and the provincial games, but also the Maiouma and Kynegia and the performances of mimes, were a stimulus to building. By the sixth century the emphasis had shifted to fortifications, arms factories and essential repairs and services. This emphasis corresponds to that of Prokopios' *Buildings*. It is difficult, because of the propaganda focus on new buildings or major rebuilding, to visualise the juxtaposition of the old, the new and the derelict and to add the component of housing, temporary street stalls and transient structures, trees and garden plots, overcrowding and open spaces.

#### *Antioch and Constantinople*

Antioch's urban development followed closely the fortunes of the Roman empire. The first action Malalas mentions when Pompey seized control of Syria and Antioch was the rebuilding of the ruined Bouleuterion. This may symbolise in Malalas the restoration

of sound government in Syria. Just as a great transformation of Rome took place under Julius Caesar and Augustus, so it was from Julius Caesar and especially Tiberius on that Antioch began to acquire the amenities that lent distinction to a Roman city. Colonnaded streets, basilicas, bridges, aqueducts, baths and nymphaea, monumental gates, tetrapyla rather than victory arches, hippodrome, athletics centre, theatre and library, a mint, arms factory, and granaries must be set alongside a palace, temples, synagogues, churches and martyria, sculptural adornment, some mosaic work, and honorific statues. The evidence for these has been carefully examined by Glanville Downey in many publications and brought together in his major study of 1961.

Thus, apart from the account of the foundation of Antioch under the Seleucids, with its walls and gates and Bouleuterion, Malalas concentrates on the public buildings of the Roman period. Most of the information is given in the systematic listing, emperor by emperor, in connection with imperial patronage, which may suggest that there was a long tradition of Roman imperial history written from an Antiochene point of view. It seems, at least for the Roman books down to the 530s, that Malalas relied heavily on this tradition.

The case of Constantinople is very different from that of Antioch. Malalas preserves a record of the focal points of the early city: the Acropolis with its three temples of Artemis, Aphrodite and the Sun (Helios), flanked by the theatre and the Kynegion which was an amphitheatre (Mango, 1985, 18). The temples of Artemis and Aphrodite were attributed to Byzas and Phidaleia, the legendary founders of the city of Byzantion, and the other buildings to Septimius Severus, to whom Malalas attributes the development of the city in the Roman period. The Strategion, reconstructed by Septimius Severus, was the ancient agora, which Mango would place near the Prosphorion harbour on the Golden Horn (1985, 19). It was so named, according to Malalas, because here Alexander the Great 'practised his generalship' (στρατηγέω) before campaigning against the Persian Dareios (VIII §1, Bo 193 and XII §20, Bo 292). Such an explanation has the virtue, in Byzantine eyes, of an etymological basis and the association of Alexander with the city. Similarly Alexander was associated with Antioch prior to its foundation through the explanation that the Olympias spring nearby had been named after Alexander's mother because he had been refreshed there as though by his mother's milk (X §10, Bo 234). The early city had another large open area, the Tetrastoon, to which the Baths of Zeuxippos were later added. These baths and the hippodrome were begun, according to Malalas, by Septimius Severus, but completed and furnished with statues by Constantine when the city was rededicated as Constantinople (XII §20, Bo 291 f.). The old walls attributed to Byzas were renewed and extended by Constantine (XIII §7, Bo 319 f.). The later walls of Theodosius II are mentioned only in the context of the damage both walls suffered in the earthquakes of 554 and 556 (XVIII §118, Bo 487 and XVIII §124, Bo 488 f.) and the Long Walls on the occasion of the Huns and Slavs breaking through in 559 (XVIII §129, Bo 490). Constantine was to add to the city his palace and forum and the Regia, the colonnades linking the two which were embellished with statues and marble (XIII §§7, 8, Bo 321-2). The Regia was sometimes referred to as the public colonnade (XVI §4, Bo 395; XVIII §71, Bo 474). He also laid out a square called the Augusteion

which probably encroached on the site of the Tetrastoon (Mango, 1985, 19) and built a basilica called the Senaton facing onto this. He does not, however, mention the other senate house built by Constantine to the north of his forum, a duplication which is yet to be explained (Janin, 1964, 154-6). All this material from Byzas to Constantine is concerned with the establishment of the city which was to be Constantinople.

Malalas does not then list the new buildings of the city and restoration work under the reign of each emperor, as he does for his own city of Antioch. Instead buildings are mentioned only incidentally in anecdotes or in the context of destruction due to earthquakes, fires, riots or incursions. Thus he mentions variously in passing the Church of St Stratonikos outside the Rhegion Gate, the colonnade of Moschianos, otherwise unknown, the Troadic Colonnades, the Bronze Tetrapylon, and the Praetorium which was burnt in the Nika riot of 532 when the fire spread from there to Hagia Sophia, the Chalke Gate of the palace and the public colonnade. The considerable building activity in the reign of Theodosius II is mentioned only because of the story that the populace gave the credit to the city and praetorian prefect Kyros, to the chagrin of the emperor (XIV §16, Bo 361 f.). When a vast fire swept through the city and threatened the palace Leo spent six months at St Mamas, a suburb of the city on the European shore of the Bosphoros, where he built a harbour and colonnade (XIV §43, Bo 372). Other sources also refer to a palace and hippodrome there (Janin, 1964, 141).

It is only with Justinian's reign that Malalas again lists an emperor's buildings in the capital. The building achievements of Septimius Severus and Constantine were described essentially as part of the account of the development and then the refounding of the city. The account of Justinian's building there follows, however, the pattern of other emperors in relation to Antioch. Malalas mentions Hagia Sophia several times in the reign of Justinian, for all that the chronicle is in a very abbreviated form from A.D. 532. He notes very briefly the dedication of the new church replacing the one destroyed during the Nika riots, and also notes the rebuilding of the Chalke, destroyed at the same time (XVIII §§85, 86, Bo 479), but he then pays rather more attention to the repairs to and eventual rebuilding of the dome damaged by the earthquake of 557 and the rededication of the church in 562 (XVIII §128, Bo 489 f.; XVIII §143, Bo 495). Other building works in Constantinople attributed to Justinian were a granary and cisterns near the palace (XVIII §71, Bo 477), the completion of the bath of Dagistheos begun under Anastasios, and the construction of the cistern under the Basilica to be fed from Hadrian's (also known as Valens') aqueduct which he reconstructed (XVIII §17, Bo 435 f.; Mango, 1985, 20).

A number of other churches in the capital are alluded to, usually not for their significance as major monuments, but because of events associated with them during the reign of Justinian. Some happened to be used by people seeking sanctuary (the churches of the Virgin at Blachernai, St Laurence, Holy Apostles, St Sergius in Hormisdas, and Hagia Sophia itself), or they were the location of some incident (St Diomedes in Jerusalem, and St Thekla and St Konon at Sykai across the Horn), while others were newsworthy because of a dedication (church of the Holy Martyr Theodora) or a translation of relics (St Eirene at Justinianai and the Holy Apostles).

This relative wealth of detail about the buildings of Constantinople in the latter part of the reign of Justinian, as distinct from any reign since that of Constantine, is best explained by Malalas' move from Antioch to the capital in the 530s. For the information about the early city Malalas was probably drawing not on material organized by consecutive reigns but a tradition of writing about cities which tends readily to blend legend with history. This is the genre of *patria*. Malalas was not alone in incorporating such material into his chronicle. From what survives it appears that the chronicle of Malalas' contemporary, Hesychios of Miletos, may have been similar.

*The foundation of cities and the patria genre*

According to Photios (*Bibl.* 69) the 'world history' by Hesychios, now lost, covered the period from the reign of the Assyrian 'emperor' Bel, that is, the god Bal whom Malalas equated with Ares (I §10, P 14; I §12, P 16), to the death of Anastasios, A.D. 518.<sup>2</sup> Hesychios also wrote another work on the achievements of Justin (cf. Malalas, Book XVII), including how he was proclaimed on the death of Anastasios. However he stopped this work after an account of the proclamation and achievements of Justinian, some years into the reign, having lost heart, according to Photios, because of the death of his son John. Thus Hesychios' combined account apparently ended, like the first version of Malalas's chronicle, in the earlier years of Justinian's reign (cf. chapter 2, pp. 35-36). It possibly differed from Malalas's account in giving more emphasis to Italy and the Roman Republic, but unfortunately Photios does not specify in any detail the focus of the third and fourth parts of Hesychios. For this period Malalas moves quickly from the Roman consuls and the Republic to concentrate on the Seleucid rule in Antioch. Furthermore, as Hesychios' history did not begin with Adam one may speculate whether the early folios of Photios' copy of the text were lost, as in the case of the Baroccianus for Malalas, or whether the work lacked the Old Testament material. If there was a focus on a particular city, as there is on Antioch in Malalas' chronicle, Photios gives no hint.

What seems to be a substantial extract from Hesychios' history survives, apparently taken from the end of Part 5 or the beginning of Part 6 (ed. Preger, 1901, 1-18; Dagron, 1984, 23-29). It gives a picture of the development of the city of Constantinople from its legendary days following its foundation by Byzas to the building achievements there of Septimius Severus and Constantine. In the tenth-century manuscript (Heidelberg, Pal. 398) it is given the title of *Patria*. This is defined in the contemporary Souda (Su IV 68-

<sup>2</sup>It consisted of six parts. The first two described events prior to the Trojan war, corresponding to Malalas' Books I-IV, and then from the taking of Troy to the foundation of Rome (Malalas, V-VII). The next two spanned the period from the foundation of Rome to Julius Caesar. Of these Part 3 dealt with the overthrow of the kings and the establishment of consular rule (i.e. traditionally 753-510 B.C.), on which Malalas is brief, concentrating on the foundation of the city and the rule of Romulus (Romus) (VII §§1-9, Bo 171-182). The fourth part dealt with the period of rule by the consuls until the dictatorship of Julius Caesar (Malalas, VII §9 – end VIII, Bo 182-213). Part 5 corresponded to Malalas' Books IX-XII, from Julius Caesar to the time when Byzantium became famous 'at the beginning of the 277th Olympiad' (A.D. 324/5, allowing for inclusive reckoning) and Part 6 corresponded to Books XIII-XVI, from Constantine to Anastasios. Thus the structure corresponds closely to the six-part structure which Roger Scott has suggested was used by Malalas (Scott, 1990; cf. chapter 1, p. 2, note 2).

69; Π 803), here in the context of ancient Greek rhetoric, as a work which deals with customs and usages and rites and festivals (τὰ ἔθη καὶ τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τὰ μυστήρια καὶ τὰς ἐορτάς). This genre had a considerable influence on the content of Malalas' chronicle. On the evidence mainly of Photios and the Souda, *patria* were produced in some numbers for the cities of late antiquity. Hesychios and Malalas stand in this tradition, as indeed does Libanios with his *Oration in Praise of Antioch* (Or. XI).<sup>3</sup> Some of Hesychios' material about the city of Byzantion-Constantinople down to the reign of Constantine appears in much the same vein in Malalas, especially in Books XII and XIII, where it is drawn together under the reigns of Septimius Severus and Constantine.<sup>4</sup> Moreover the foundation legends of Constantinople as recounted by both Hesychios and Malalas have much in common with Malalas' account of the origins of Antioch.<sup>5</sup> This

<sup>3</sup>A list can give some idea of the popularity of this genre in Greek in late antiquity. Kallinikos from Petra, a sophist at Athens in the late 3rd century, wrote a *patria* for Rome (fragments published with Polemon, ed. Hinck, 1873, 43 f.); Eustochios in the 4th century, an antiquarian work described as an 'archaeology' of Kappadokia; Ulpian of Emesa of the 4th to 5th century, a *patria* for Emesa, Helioupolis and the Bosphoros region; Metrophanes, of about this date, wrote on his native Phrygia; Claudianus, of the late 5th century, and distinguished from the panegyrist, wrote *patria* for Tarsos, Anazarbos, Beirut and Nikaia; Hermeias, date unknown, for his native city of Hermoupolis; Flavius Horapollon, son of Asklepiades and grandson of Horapollon, a teacher of philosophy and grammarian of the second half of the 5th century, for Alexandria; Diogenes or Diogeneianos, a grammarian, date unknown, for his native Kyzikos; Christodoros of Koptos of the 5th to 6th century, for Constantinople, Thessalonike, Nakle, Miletos, Tralles and Aphrodisias. To these might be added authors like the 4th-century Palladios of Methone who wrote on the festivals of the Romans. See Berger, 1988, 35-37; Christ/Schmid/Stählin, 1924, II, 2, 960, 973, 1039; Cameron (A.D.E.), 1965, 492.

<sup>4</sup>For example, the following monuments and records are referred to by both authors: the Argonauts' temple at Sosthenion (IV §12, Bo 78; H 33); Apollonios of Tyana's talisman against storks (X §51, Bo 263 f.; H 23-25); Byzas' temple of Artemis and Phidalia's of Aphrodite (XII §20, Bo 292; H 15); Septimius Severus' baths of Zeuxippos and hippodrome (XII §20; Bo 291 f.; H 37); the walls of Byzas (H 12 f.) reconstructed and extended by Constantine and the city renamed Constantinople (XIII §7, Bo 319 f.; H 39); Constantine's forum with his statue on a porphyry column (XIII §7, Bo 320; H 41); Phidalia (XIII §7, Bo 320), wife of Byzas (H 18 f.) and daughter of Barbysios the toparch and warden of the port (H 3: Barbyses a stream feeding into the Golden Horn), called the *tyche* Keroe (H 8 f.: Io bore a daughter by Zeus called Keroessa at the upper reaches of the Golden Horn and she in turn bore Byzas by Poseidon); Constantine built the Senate and decorated it with statues (XIII §8, Bo 321; H 41); Constantine set up a statue of his mother Helena and called the place the Augusteion (XIII §8, Bo 321; H 40); Constantine's May 11th celebrations for the birthday of the city (XIII §8, Bo 322; H 42).

<sup>5</sup>In explaining the various stories about the origins of Byzantion Hesychios expressed a preference for carrying the story back to Io, the daughter of the Argive king Inachos (H 6-8), who was transformed into a cow (*bous*) by a jealous Hera, and whose child by Zeus, Keroessa, was born when she reached the Golden Horn. Keroessa in turn bore Byzas, the child of Poseidon. An eagle, snatching the heart from a bull which Byzas had sacrificed, led him to the site for his city on the point of the Bosphoros opposite Chrysopolis (H 11). This story succeeded in accounting etymologically for the names of the Bosphoros, the Horn and Byzantion. For Antioch Malalas likewise gave prominence to a story tracing the origins of the city back to Io. In his account Io ended her wanderings on Mt Silpios, at the foot of which Antioch was later built (II §7, Bo 28 f.). Io's kinsmen came from their native Iopolis in Greece and founded a new settlement of the same name on the presumed site of her grave, building a shrine to her and a temple to Kronos. The inhabitants, the Ionitai, were incorporated into the city of Antioch when it was founded by Seleukos. The story as Malalas and Libanios tell it (II

inclusion of legendary material about the foundation of cities was apparently a major element of *patria* and the genre itself, it seems, could be, like *ekphraseis*, a component within a larger work such as a chronicle. Finally, still assuming that the *Patria* of Hesychios was excerpted from his history, some idea can be gained from that of the scale of the whole work, which may even have been comparable to that of Malalas.

The other city whose foundation legends are treated with some elaboration by Malalas is Rome. Here the emphasis falls on two stories. One is the progress of the palladion from Troy to Rome, anticipating the account of its transfer subsequently by Constantine to Constantinople (cf. chapter 3, p. 58). The palladion, a miniature statue of Pallas Athene, endowed with the power to protect a city, was in this respect the precursor of the *tyche* associated with the foundation of cities (see below, p. 105-7). However, Romulus' building of the hippodrome in Rome and establishment of chariot-races with four factions competing in a festival in honour of the Sun is given even greater prominence in Malalas' account, and the hippodrome is seen as a symbol of the whole world (VII §4, Bo 173 f.). The two elements of the story of the foundation of Rome are woven together in Constantinople. Not only was the palladion from Troy placed in Constantine's forum, but under a porphyry column topped by a radiate bronze statue of the Sun, also from Troy, but now made to represent Constantine himself (XIII §7, Bo 320; Mango, 1963, 57, cf. *ibid.*, reprinted 1984, Addenda et Corrigenda, 1). In the hippodrome, on the anniversary of the foundation of the city, a gilded wooden statue of Constantine bearing the *tyche* of Constantinople, Anthousa, was paraded around and set up to be revered by the reigning emperor (XIII §6, Bo 321).

#### *Statues and the patria genre*

Apart from the legendary history of a city a strong element in the *patria* genre is the history and interpretation of its bygone and surviving statues. Material of this sort appears throughout Malalas' chronicle and ranges in type from comments based on inscriptions to stories anticipating some of the more fabulous accounts like the eighth-century *Parastaseis* (Cameron/Herrin, 1984, intro. 3), the anonymous compilation (Treu, 1880) and the anonymous tenth-century *Patria* (Preger, 1901, II, 151-209).

Thus the Assyrians are credited with the invention of sculpture, setting up a statue of their warlike ruler Tharras, also named Ares, or in Persian, Bel or Baal, whom they worshipped as a god (I §12, P 16). Of this generation the chronicle also mentions Hephaistos discovering tongs (I §15, P 19), and Herakles as the first to expound the art of wrestling (VIII §20, Bo 204) and to discover purple dye (II §9, Bo 32). But Malalas'

§7, Bo 28-30 and Libanios, *Or.* XI, 44-51) has less to recommend it in terms of Byzantine antiquarian values, with its focus on the etymology of place-names, than when told for Byzantion. This might suggest that an attempt was being made to give Antioch, whose origins were known to date back only to Seleukos I's foundation in 300 B.C., or with a stretch of the imagination to Alexander the Great, at least a legendary antiquity to match that given Constantinople. But the story of Io was also linked by Malalas to a later annual rite in Antioch of knocking at the houses of the Greeks, reenacting the Argives' search for Io, and saying 'May the soul of Io be saved'. For Malalas' likely sources for these legends, see chapter 3 above.

interest is not so much in the invention of the various arts as the development of idolatry from the introduction of sculpture. Another Tharras, Abraham's father, carved statues of the Jews' ancestors, 'especially those who discovered writing and the arts', our text apparently reflecting here an awareness of the popularity in Hellenistic and Roman times of statues of famous poets and philosophers and the Muses. These statues of mortals, we are told, were looked on as gods and the practice then spread to other peoples, particularly the Greeks, but meanwhile it was condemned as idolatry by Abraham (III §1, Bo 57; cf. chapters 3, p. 64, 4, p. 68 and Scott, 1990).

Nevertheless, and perhaps in part for this very reason, the late antique world as represented by Malalas and his sources shows a considerable fascination in the symbolism of statues or the attribution to them of special powers. Otherwise they are rarely mentioned except in a list of a ruler's building achievements.

#### *Portraits of citizens and emperors*

Statues of prominent citizens, so well attested for some of these eastern cities in our epigraphical sources and even surviving in considerable numbers, are almost ignored in the chronicle. Artabanes, a great benefactor to his fellow citizens and alytarch in the Olympic Games when they were reestablished at Antioch under Commodus, was commemorated with a statue at Daphne (XII §§5, 6 and 12, Bo 286, 290). An inscription is cited by Malalas and may account for the survival of his name in history. Indeed the dearth of inscriptions from Antioch today, attributed by the excavators to the frequent rebuilding of the city because of earthquakes, may explain the paucity of references to statues of its citizens. For all that, a more important factor in preserving the name of Artabanes must have been the emphasis given by Malalas to the Olympic festival at Antioch. The other example of a statue of a citizen relates to Constantinople. Here Jacob, nicknamed Psychristos, an eminent doctor and favourite of the emperor Leo, was so popular that the senate had set up a portrait (*eikon*) of him in the Baths of Zeuxippos (XIV §38, Bo 370). However, this statue is mentioned only incidentally to stress the important position Jacob held.

Statues of emperors are mentioned far more frequently, as might be expected in a chronicle structured around the reigns of emperors. But these were probably not the source of Malalas' descriptions of the emperor's personal appearance which occur as a stock element at the beginning of his account of each reign. His immediate source for these is almost certainly literary (see chapter 8, pp. 241-42), but their ultimate origin probably lies in public portrait sequences like the pre-iconoclastic series in Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and the imperial and patriarchal series in the monastery of St George of Mangana, which cannot be earlier than the eleventh century (Mango, 1960, 76). Such descriptions are also a feature of Agnellus' account of the bishops of Ravenna, but he occasionally shows that these have been derived from or checked against individual portraits, some of which survive in mosaic today, like that of Maximianus in San Vitale. Thus a complete series is not essential for the development of the tradition as a series could easily have been built up from individual monuments in the city and in the imperial *scrinia* or through coins and maintained through an ongoing literary tradition. In some

details at least Malalas' literary portraits are supported by the artistic record, e.g. Gaius' delicate features and Nero's beard, even if it was not 'bushy'. Vespasian was bald, or at least balding, 'with a broad face', and Nerva was curly-headed though not represented with a 'bushy beard'. The Antonines are correctly described as bearded and Commodus' curly hair certainly warranted mention. Thus the literary descriptions are not entirely reliable.

In his chronicle Malalas refers less systematically to actual statues of emperors. Statues of Augustus at Laodikeia and Tiberius at Antioch are mentioned in association with the building of lavishly decorated tetrapyla in a way that suggests either that one city was thus deliberately trying to rival the other in the form of its imperial patronage or that there are the remnants of a doublet in our text (IX §15, Bo 223; X §8, Bo 232 f.). Vespasian was commemorated by a marble statue in the theatre he built at Daphne (X §45, Bo 261) and Hadrian by a bust (*stetharion*) on the pediment of his great temple at Kyzikos (XI §16, Bo 279). A statue of Commodus is recorded, again at Antioch and in association with the establishment of the Games. Out on the Syrian frontier statues of Diocletian and his Caesar, Galerius, would have reinforced the imperial commitment to the defences and likewise the statues of Anastasios set up in the key fortress city of Dara when it was renamed Anastasioupolis (XII §40, Bo 308; XVI §10, Bo 399). There were perhaps as many as three statues of Valentinian in the restored Kaisareion in Antioch, as well as one of Julius Caesar, after whom the building was said to have been named (IX §5, Bo 216 and XIII §30, Bo 338 f.). All of these references occur in a context of imperial patronage. Only the reference to several statues of Valentinian and the use of the plural in relation to the statues on the frontier hint at the actual proliferation of imperial statues in Roman cities, known from the number surviving and from texts like the *Parastaseis*. The statue of Helena, Constantine's mother, is mentioned seemingly to explain the name Augusteion for the square in which it was placed, but also to draw attention to the trilogy of place-names there, the Regia, Senaton and Augusteion, perhaps symbolising the history of Roman government successively by kings, senators and emperors (XIII §8, Bo 321).

Other imperial statues in Constantinople are mentioned because they occupied prominent locations and fell or were damaged during earthquakes, or were set up subsequently as replacements. But rarely do these accounts lack an element of symbolism. Thus the statue of Julian in the harbour of Julian fell and was replaced by a cross. This patently symbolises the triumph of Christianity over Julian's paganism. At the head of the list of almost unmitigated disasters with which Malalas summarises the last two decades of Justinian's reign is the description of the spear falling from the famous statue of Constantine on the porphyry column in his forum (XVIII §118, Bo 487), and penetrating the ground to a depth of three cubits. Another statue, which fell in an earthquake in 557 and was driven, according to Theophanes, eight feet into the ground (XVIII §124, Bo 489; Th 231), was probably an imperial statue, since it stood on a porphyry column beside the Secundianai (i.e. Iucundianai) palace. If the statue was of Justinian, to whom Prokopios attributes the building of the palace (*Buildings*, I, 11. 16-17), Malalas' reticence in naming the emperor would be understandable. Both of these incidents read as omens of the disasters towards the end of Justinian's reign. The same



may be true for the statue of Poseidon which had served as a talisman against earthquakes in Antioch. It came to light when Constantine appointed a Christian, Ploutarchos, as governor of Antioch and made him responsible for supervising the building of the Great Church, the basilica of Rufinus and a hospice. Ploutarchos had this statue melted down and made into a statue of Constantine, set in front of the praetorium, and inscribed 'To Constantine the Good' (XIII §3, Bo 318). If this action was seen as heralding the earthquakes which were to devastate Antioch, the source of the story was a pagan one. In just the same way, but in an optimistic vein, the adapting of a statue of the Sun to represent Constantine at the foundation of Constantinople was a symbol of the beginning of a new and enlightened era. Such an interpretation of the use of spolia is matched by the appreciation now that for his arch in Rome Constantine appears to have quite deliberately reused sculpture from monuments of emperors of the 'golden age', Trajan, Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius. Malalas also refers to an equestrian statue of Justinian being formed from one of Arcadius in the Forum Tauri (XVIII §94, Bo 482; cf. Prokopios, *Buildings*, I, 2. 5-12) and set up in A.D. 543 in the Augusteion. If this is indeed the statue illustrated in a Renaissance manuscript (Mango, 1959, 335; cf. *idem*, 1963, 63, note 52) Arcadius must be an error for Theodosius. But either Arcadius or Theodosius the Great would have been a very appropriate choice for Justinian to adapt to his own image as the promoter of Christianity and an orthodox church since both campaigned against pagan cults.

*The 'mystical' power and the destruction of statues*

Malalas gives other examples, too, of the deliberate destruction of statues. He tells of old statues which had been brought to Constantinople by Constantine to adorn the streets being melted down to produce a very large statue of Anastasios. This replaced one of Theodosius the Great which had fallen from its column in his Forum Tauri (XVI §13, Bo 400 f.). This story follows immediately on the account of Anastasios' reform of the currency and the introduction of the new copper follis, implemented by the *comes sacrarum largitionum* John, aptly called 'the Paphlagonian' ('the windbag'; Cameron [A.D.E.], 1970, 3 and 245) and 'Caiaphas', since he melted down metals and formalised the end of a regular silver currency which had effectively been abandoned in the course of the fifth century (Hendy, 1985, 476). It is tempting to think that at some stage the two stories were linked and that the destruction of the old statues and the changes to the currency were viewed unfavourably (Marcellinus *comes*, s.a. 498). Disapproval was certainly intended in reporting how the Vandal Geiseric plundered bronze statues from the palace in Rome (XIV §26, Bo 366). There is no sign in Malalas, with one exception, of hostility to or destruction of statues because of pagan or Jewish associations though, as with buildings, they might be converted to another use. This lack of censure of pagan statues is typical of Byzantium, as Mango has noted (1963, 60). Thus Malalas says that after Titus' sack of Jerusalem the Cherubim and Seraphim from the Temple were taken to Antioch and Vespasian built outside the south gate 'what are known as the Cherubim for he fixed there the bronze Cherubim' (X §45, Bo 261). Since these no longer existed at the time of the sack it seems that the story was invented to explain the name of a place or

building in the southern, Jewish quarter of the city called the Kerateon, just as a statue in honour of Selene with four bulls facing Jerusalem, was said to commemorate the taking of Jerusalem by moonlight (cf. Downey, 1961, 206, 554 and 614 f.). The one reference to the deliberate destruction of pagan statues occurs in the summary notes covering the end of Justinian's reign, where it is recorded that Justinian arrested 'Hellenes'. 'Their books were burnt in the Kynegion, together with pictures and statues of their loathsome gods' (XVIII §136, Bo 491); priests were arrested according to Michael the Syrian (MS, IX 33 [271]) and the implication is that the destruction was of objects actively used in pagan rites rather than pagan books and statues generally.

The mystique of imperial power being represented in the emperor's portraits is given ancient origins in the story of Romulus setting up a gold portrait bust of his brother Remus, whom he had slain, on his now empty throne, and sending out images of the two rulers to the magistrates in the provinces (VII §2, Bo 172), a familiar practice in the late Roman Empire and well attested from the *Notitia Dignitatum*. That gold and porphyry were appropriate for imperial portraits is highlighted by the note that his descendants ruling in Italy acknowledged Herakles' rule there by setting up gold and porphyry statues in his honour (VI §16, Bo 161). Statues of Romulus and Remus in Antioch were seen as symbols of Roman power in the East. Tiberius set a statue of the wolf suckling the children on the Eastern Gate in the walls he had constructed (X §10, Bo 235) and Trajan placed a similar statue on the Middle Gate to show 'that the building was Roman' (XI §9, Bo 275). A similar function would have been served by the bronze statue of the *tyche* of Rome, set up by Julius Caesar, with his own statue in the Kaisareion he built in the centre of the city (IX §5, Bo 216 and XII §7, Bo 287).

Two sculptural groups are mentioned in the context of edifying Christian stories. The statue identified as Christ with a suppliant Veronica was said to have been erected with Herod's permission by Veronica herself at Caesarea Philippi (Paneas, modern Banyas) in the Golan as a thank-offering for being cured of her haemorrhaging; it was probably originally a pagan statue, perhaps of Zeus and Niobe. The statue was known as early as Eusebios who claimed to have seen it, as did Malalas or his source, who also saw Herod's authorization for it to be set up, included in a document which contained the *Lives* of the rulers of Judaea (X §12, Bo 237 f.; Eusebios, *HE*, VII 18 and cf. chapter 7, p. 174). By the fifth century the statue had been badly damaged (Philostorgios, VII 3; Sozomen, V 21). The other tale is set in the context of those martyred under Trajan, the most notable of whom was Ignatios, bishop of Antioch (XI §10, Bo 277 f.). It seems to be an even-handed joke. Five women about to be martyred placed their faith in the resurrection of the body. Trajan, to prove them wrong, had their bodies cremated and the ash incorporated with the bronze from which urns for hot water were then cast and used in the baths he had just built in Antioch. But when people went to bathe they became dizzy and had to be carried out. The emperor regretted his action, cast new urns for the baths and recast the old ones in the form of the five women who had been martyred, responding to taunts from the Christians with the claim: 'Look, it is I who have resurrected them as they said, and not their god'. Five statues, almost certainly of pagan origin, which were said to stand at the baths may have prompted the joke. That is the extent of references to

statues specifically associated with Christianity, and neither group was in fact originally of Christian inspiration. However, this situation is different from the case of the statues of citizens, since the absence of evidence of Christian statuary is matched by the late antique archaeological record generally. Sculpture in the round was avoided for Christian themes, it seems, with the exception of some statuette (Grabar, 1966, 219; Weitzmann, 1979, nos. 364 and 469). Relief sculpture, where Christian themes are presented, did not normally attract the attention of ancient writers.

### *Urban embellishment*

There are very few artworks mentioned in our literary source to match the wealth of evidence in the surviving floor mosaics for the popularity of classical motifs in Antioch and Daphne and local villas (Levi, 1947; Campbell, 1988). Domitian's bath was known as the Medeia because of a statue in it of this tragic heroine (X §50, Bo 263). Another may have received its name from a representation of Adonis (XVII §14 sub-text, Bo 417; JN 90.24-5; Downey, 1961, 520 note 76) just as the second-century *nymphaion* associated with the Mouseion gained its name from a mosaic of Okeanos (XI §30, Bo 282 and XII §33, Bo 302). Further south, at Tripolis the summer baths were decorated with two bronze groups, of Daidalos and Ikaros and of Bellerophon and Pegasos (XIV §29, Bo 367). At Daphne Hadrian completed his work on the aqueduct and an elaborate fountain by setting up in a Shrine of the Nymphs a large statue of Zeus enthroned and holding an orb. Judging from Malalas' wording, this was accompanied by an inscription since the statue is described as 'in honour of the Naiads: a thank-offering for having completed such a tremendous task' (XI §14, Bo 278). There had been at least one other statue of Zeus in Antioch, a Zeus Keraunios, but of the Hellenistic period, since it was removed to Rome, along with the Athena associated with the foundation of the city, soon after the Romans gained control (VIII §31, Bo 212).

But references to the decoration of streets and public buildings, notably of fountains, colonnades and tetrapyla, with sculpture, mosaics and paintings suggests an urban environment in which such artistic embellishment was normal. Malalas mentions that Constantine decorated the hippodrome, colonnades and Baths of Zeuxippos in Constantinople with bronze statues and marbles and columns as part of the adornment of his city, along with the construction or upgrading of the essential buildings of a major city, including a splendid new palace, senate-house and forum (XIII §7 f., Bo 320 f.). If he failed to describe the classical taste and subject matter of this statuary and decoration in any detail, some of which was imported from other cities, the picture can be supplemented from other sources. Moreover the interest of late antiquity in such traditional themes, and particularly of Malalas' own generation, is borne out by the Antiochene and other floor mosaics in the Eastern Mediterranean and also, indeed, by the emphasis in Malalas's chronicle on the legendary period of world history.

*Interpreting statues*

Occasionally statues were mentioned in the context of a play on words. Etymological explanations, often wildly inaccurate, were much in vogue. That the Rhodians after building the Colossus, the huge bronze statue of the sun-god Helios, called themselves Kolossians is one such case (V §73, Bo 149). A similarly forced explanation is given for Ikonion, modern Konya, which received this name because it was founded by Perseus carrying the icon, that is the portrait, of the Gorgon; Perseus had set up a statue of himself with the Gorgon's head outside the city (II §17, Bo 36; cf. chapter 3, p. 62). It is tempting, too, to see a macabre play on words involving the statue in the middle of the antiforum in Antioch which was known as the 'Kolonisios' (cf. κόλον, the 'colon' or 'gut'); the Green faction tied the body of the night prefect Menas to it after ripping him open and disembowelling him during riots under Anastasios (XVI §6, Bo 397 f.).

Some statuary was linked to the foundation stories of a city. The most prominent in Malalas are the statues of the *tyche*, the female personification of the city which functioned like the palladion of Troy as the protectress of the city. But besides its *tyche* Antioch boasted some other memorials to its early years (VIII §§13-17, Bo 199-202). Its founder, Seleukos I Nikator, had transferred to his new city the Athenians who only recently had been settled at nearby Antigoneia, the foundation of Seleukos' enemy Antigonos Poliorketes. Seleukos was said to have established a bronze statue of Athena in Antioch for their sake. He also created a bronze *tyche* of Antigoneia for Antioch out of the spolia from the city he destroyed and he set it in a shrine. Thus, it seems, those uprooted were to be compensated for their move. There was, moreover, a horse's head and gilded helmet with accompanying inscription explaining that these commemorated Seleukos' successful escape on horseback and then ultimate victory over Antigonos. Just outside the city, across the river, a stone statue of an eagle was a reminder that an eagle had indicated the site for the city by dropping the meat from a sacrifice at Antigoneia on Mt Silpios, below which the new city was then built. Inside the Romanesion Gate was a statue of the priest Amphion who had officiated at the sacrifice and at the foundation of the city. It may be only a coincidence that the priest bore the same name as the lyre-player (II §§33-35, Bo 48 f.) one of the twin sons of Antiope who were commemorated in statues set up by Tiberius outside his temple of Dionysos near the mountain (X §10, Bo 234). Alternatively there could have been two stories circulating to explain the one statue. Similarly, granted the fame and multiple copies in the Roman world of various classical statues of Athena, no special story was in fact needed to explain the presence of an Athena in Antioch. The *tyche* of Antigoneia, so inappropriately produced for the new foundation of Antioch, might have been a misunderstood statue of the tragic heroine Antigone. There may have been such a statue of Antigoneia or Antigone associated with the theatre (X §10, Bo 235; Downey, 1961, 180). A horse's head and a helmet sound like the fragmentary remains of a monument to a hero or to a victory. The clearest case of an over-elaborate attempt to explain a statue is the story of Orestes developed to explain a statue with right arm raised in a gesture of pointing and locally known 'till the present' as 'The Runaway' (V §67, Bo 141). For this Malalas cites Domninos as his source, which

suggests that the statue on the outskirts of Antioch might no longer have existed in his day and in any case that he was copying his source almost verbatim, including the phrase 'till the present' (cf. chapter 7, pp. 206-7).

### *The tyche*

Most of the interest in statues expressed in Malalas is due to the legends which had built up around them and the usually beneficent powers attributed to them, ensuring the safety of the city. In Athens the goddess Athena performed this function and was seen in some respects as a female personification of the city. But not all cities were blessed with such an eminent patron with an established iconography. Roma, likewise bearing the name of the city, was given some of the iconography of Athena, helmet, spear (or staff or sceptre substituted) and shield, and appeared thus on the coinage and in sculpture, as on the base of the column of Antoninus Pius in Rome. As with Athena a distinction can be drawn between the goddess Roma and a city *tyche* (Toynbee, 1947, 135; MacCormack, 1975, 140; Dagron, 1974, 43-47). Constantinople, as the New Rome, also sometimes adopted this iconographic type, for example on the coins of Constantine. Britannia was based on the same model. The other element contributing to the city *tyche* was the personification of good fortune as a virtue and without any specific association with a city (Shelton, 1979, 29). This was a recognisable type by the fourth century B.C. As a city symbol the *tyche* was often given the attribute of a turreted crown representing the city walls. Thus the notion of a protectress with divine powers, bestowing prosperity on a city was given a new iconographical type, with some further attributes added, without always being consistent, to help distinguish the particular city (Cutler, 1984, 59-64). On coinage this was less important because the obverse and legend also contributed to identifying the coin. But when figures of *tyche* are found isolated from their original context or grouped together, as on the Anastasios dish in the Sutton Hoo treasure or with the statuettes in the Esquiline treasure, identification can be difficult.

In the case of the *tyche* the magic power was conferred through the sacrifice of a virgin who was then represented by a statue. Malalas presents this ritual as a stock element in his accounts of the foundation of cities (see chapter 3, pp. 57-8 for a full list). Examples of these *tychai* have survived, the most famous being a marble copy in the Vatican Museum of the bronze *tyche* produced by Eutychides soon after 300 B.C. for the foundation of Antioch (Dohrn, 1960). By Malalas' day the name of the virgin sacrificed was also known, Aimathe, a name perhaps deliberately chosen for its bloody connotations (VIII §13, Bo 200). In founding Ikonion Perseus had sacrificed Persis, 'the Persian', named, like the country, after himself, and in the case of Tarsos, 'an innocent girl named Parthenope', that is, appropriately, 'the maidenly one' (II §18 f., Bo 37 f.). Some *tychai* represented by statues have names familiar from Greek tragedy or the Muses, suggesting that an old statue gave rise to the legend of a *tyche* or was adapted as such. Thus at Laodikeia Seleukos was said to have sacrificed a girl named Agave and set up a bronze statue of her as the city's *tyche*. At Antioch Tiberius began extensions to the theatre and sacrificed a girl called Antigone (as indicated above). In this case a statue is not mentioned but might be assumed (X §10, Bo 235). Trajan sacrificed a Kalliope to purify

the city after the earthquake he had experienced there and in the proscenium of the theatre he placed a gilded bronze statue of her which was modelled on the *tyche* of Eutychides with the additional figures of Seleukos and his son Antiochos crowning her (XI §9, Bo 275). A sense of history may lie behind the account of Alexander the Great sacrificing Macedonia at the town of Rakoustis when he rebuilt it as Alexandria (VIII §1, Bo 192). Constantine also gave Constantinople a new *tyche* in place of Byzantion's Keroe (see above, p. 98) to mark the consecration of his city. But the emperor, we are told almost prudishly by our author who was writing in a more thoroughly Christian era, achieved this with 'a bloodless sacrifice to God'. The *tyche* was called 'Anthousa', 'flower', that is 'Flora' (XIII §7, Bo 320) whose festival was in the spring. It was this *tyche* which featured in the city's anniversary celebrations in the hippodrome in the spring, on 11th May. This is the last statue of a *tyche* mentioned by Malalas and may well have been the last formally acclaimed because of a city *tyche*'s association with pagan sacrifice and with other goddesses like Rhea (Hesychios 15) and Kybele and Atargatis (Weitzmann, 1979, nos. 164 and 160). Soon after Malalas' day, by the early seventh century, the image of the Virgin had assumed the role of the special protectress of the city of Constantinople and other cities had their miracle-working patron saints, like Demetrios in Thessalonike (Cameron [A.M.], 1978; Lemerle, 1981, 73-81). When Anastasios defeated the rebel Vitalian it was 'Christ the Saviour and the emperor's *tyche*' who won the victory (XVI §16, Bo 405). *Tyche* here probably carries only its basic meaning of 'good fortune', the good fortune best explained by the use of Greek fire against the enemy, first attested in this passage.

Archaeological evidence, including coins, increasingly supports Malalas' picture of the popularity of figures of the city *tyche* in late antiquity as they survive in gold, silver and bronze, ivory, painting, mosaic, limestone and marble and in copies of manuscripts and on the coins of many cities of the Greek East (e.g. see Weitzmann, 1979, nos. 153-156; Toynbee, 1947, 135-144; Dohrn, 1960, 52-57; Downey, 1961, 74 f.). There have been recent discoveries.<sup>6</sup> A substantial marble *tyche* of the second century A.D. was unearthed in 1972 at Caesarea Maritima which can be matched with a coin of Faustina the Younger with the *tyche* of Caesarea on the reverse and with a bronze cup with enamelled scenes in incrustation technique including a similar *tyche* (Holum/Hohlfelder, 1988, 11-16). More recently a mosaic of a *tyche* was found in the House of the Deer at Apamea in 1983 (Balty, 1984, 458). At Madaba on a mid-sixth century floor of the Room of Hippolytos, recently uncovered by Piccirillo under the Church of the Virgin, there are figures inscribed Roma, Gregoria and Madaba, where the text of Malalas may answer the problem encountered of identifying Gregoria (Buschhausen, 1986, 125 f.): 'He (Augustus) fortified a village known as Arsine and made it into a city, which he called Ankyra because it is in the middle of two seas, the Pontic and the Levantine sea. After sacrificing a virgin girl, named Gregoria, as a purification rite, he created the province of Galatia' (IX §13, Bo 221). Coins are useful not only for establishing the attributes of a particular *tyche* but also for illustrating the setting in which the statues were placed. Thus a

<sup>6</sup>I am grateful to my colleague Priscilla Henderson for drawing my attention to the finds at Caesarea Maritima and at Madaba.

Trajanic coin of Caesarea Maritima shows the *tyche* of that city in a four-columned shrine preceded by an altar, as Malalas described the *tyche* of Antigoneia at Antioch (VIII §14, Bo 201; Price/Trell, 1977, fig. 367). A mid-third century Antiochene coin shows the *tyche* in a shrine which is fitted with carry-bars at its base, illustrating one type of carriage in which a statue might be paraded, as Constantine's was, with the *tyche*, in the hippodrome of Constantinople, escorted by soldiers wearing cloaks and boots and holding candles, on the city's anniversary (XIII §8, Bo 322; Price/Trell, 1977, fig. 42). The *tyche* of Anazarbos, Kepara, a country girl according to Malalas, drawing this conclusion from the name, is represented in a shrine on a coin of that city (X §53, Bo 268; Price and Trell, 1977, fig. 339) and the *tyche* of Tarsos, Malalas' Parthenope, on its coins (II §18, Bo 37; Price/Trell, 1977, 277).

### *Talismans*

While the *tyche* received its power from the sacrifice of a maiden other statues were endowed with more specific powers by men with magical gifts. The most famous of these wonder-workers was Apollonios of Tyana in the time of Domitian (X §51, Bo 263-266). But he had a less effective predecessor at Antioch in Debborios who, after an earthquake in the reign of Gaius, had set up a porphyry column with a marble bust on top of it inscribed 'unshakeable, immovable' to be a talisman against earthquakes. But the bust fell when the column was burnt by a fire ball caused by lightning. Apollonios, however, had the foresight not to attempt a replacement. He came to Antioch with the experience of setting up talismans in Constantinople against storks, against the flooding of the river Lykos, one for the tortoise and one for horses. In Antioch he set a talisman at the East Gate (i.e. north-east) against the north wind. One in the city against scorpions took the form of a bronze scorpion which he buried under a small column. The problem of mosquitoes was overcome by some talismans and a procession at the beginning of summer on the day when chariot-races were held. The citizens were instructed 'to carry on canes small busts of solid lead with the features of Ares and a shield of red leather hanging down on one side, and on the other a red dagger equally hanging, both tied on with a linen thread'. And they were to exorcise the mosquitoes by chanting 'No mosquitoes in the city' and then putting the talismans in their houses. Very similar processional crosses, with small busts at the top and bunches of grapes suspended from them, are represented in a second to third-century fresco from Ostia in the Vatican's Museo Sacro (Borda, 1958, plate on 314). The talisman against storks may have been connected with the Stork Street in Constantinople mentioned by Prokopios (*Buildings*, I, 9. 15). Hesychios (§25) described it as three storks carved from stone looking out in different directions. A marble tortoise, said to have 'walked the streets by night and consumed all the refuse', is attested in a seventeenth-century chronicle and may refer to Apollonios' talisman (Mango, 1960, 74 f.). But it was to Justinian that the tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople (Preger, 1901, 165: §28) gave the credit for placing on or near the Chalke Gate of the palace two statues of horses from the temple of Artemis at Ephesos as a talisman to prevent horses from quarrelling with each other. The twelfth-century al-Harawi, however, attributed them to Apollonios and said they were to prevent horses from 'being noisy and neighing

at the emperor's door' (Preger, 1901, 165: §28; Mango, 1959a, 100 f.). The talisman to guard against the flooding of the local stream in Constantinople is matched by one in Antioch which took the form of a stone box containing a talisman made by the wonder-worker and priest, Ablakkon (or Ablabon, 'averting harm'?),<sup>7</sup> added by Tiberius to his bronze statue which stood on a porphyry column at the centre of the city's colonnades (X §8 f., Bo 233). There was also a more basic talisman at the Omphalos in the centre of Antioch in the form of an eye (*ophthalmos*) carved in relief in the stone to ward off evil (X §8, Bo 233). Up on the rock-face of Mt Silpios there is to this day a colossal relief of a veiled figure with two smaller figures above its right shoulder which was known as the Charonion and was said by Malalas to have been carved in the time of Antiochos IV on the instructions of a seer called Leios to avert a plague (VIII §22, Bo 205; Downey, 1961, 103 f. and fig. 16). This belief in the magical properties of statues, granting them an active role in the life of the city, remained a lively one in Constantinople, as attested by the Byzantines themselves and by visitors to the city like Robert of Clari and the Russian pilgrims. There are still some ancient carvings in Rome famous for this reason, notably the Pasquino and the Bocca della Verità (Naval, n.d., 46 and 197). However Malalas does not give any hint of the later passion for reading predictions about the fall of the city and the end of the world from the ancient reliefs and statues in Constantinople, notably from the relief sculpture on the columns of Theodosius in the Forum Tauri and of Arcadius and the equestrian statue of Justinian and the series of portraits of the emperors (Mango, 1960, 72-77 and 1963, 59-64).

#### *The decorative arts*

The genres both of imperial biography and of the *patria*, which form a significant element of Malalas' chronicle, contain details which incidentally provide evidence for some of the more spectacular of the minor arts. Officialdom, embassies and festivals all involve occasions for ostentatious display in terms of dress, processions and wealth, some of it accessible to the whole populace. Justinian, for example, made a gift to the citizens of Antioch of his toga with its imperial jewels and it was displayed in a local church (XVIII §45, Bo 450), perhaps because it was thought to have healing powers (Downey, 1961, 531). Officials of the administration had special carriages (XIV §16, Bo 361) and splendid silver tableware. The notoriously wealthy Marinus the Syrian had such a collection of silver that the mob who plundered it used axes to divide it up (XVI §19, Bo 407). Such silver is known today from hoards buried in late antiquity, often near the frontiers of the Empire (Kent/Painter, 1977), but apparently such hoards were also found in antiquity. An 'alchemist' and imposter from Amida, in the area of the Persian border, tried to pass off as a find of gold treasure fragments of gold statuary and a bridle he claimed was of solid gold, with a muzzle inlaid with pearls; but his forgery could not dupe the astute emperor Anastasios (XVI §5, Bo 395). Ceremonial dress was also magnificent. The alytarch who presided over the Olympic Games at Antioch was dressed in special white robes with gold threads and a crown. The crown worn by the

<sup>7</sup>The kappa and beta are easily confused in early minuscule; cf. Downey, 1961, 181 note 85 who suggests the name derives from the Greek *aulax*, a [water] course.



*amphithales* was of laurel with a gold bust of Zeus set in the middle (XII §§7-8, Bo 286 f.). Foreign embassies such as that of Ztathios, emperor of the Laz and the Byzantine embassy to the Axoumite emperor gave rise to special descriptions which verge on being small scale *ekphraseis*. Ztathios was magnificently attired by Justin when he came to Constantinople to be crowned (XVII §9, Bo 412 f.), while the ambassadors to the court of the Axoumitai in Ethiopia were impressed by the gold fabric, pearls, many bracelets and collar and turban worn by the Axoumite emperor as he stood in a carriage borne by four elephants (XVIII §56, Bo 457 f.).<sup>8</sup>

### Conclusion

That the barbaric splendour of the ruler of the largely Christian, if monophysite, country of Ethiopia could so impress ambassadors from the Byzantine court in the reign of Justinian may seem surprising to those familiar with the magnificent mosaics of Justinian and Theodora and their courtiers in the apse of San Vitale in Ravenna. But it does draw attention back to the characteristic elements of Graeco-Roman civilization which were so familiar to Malalas and his audience. The world they took for granted centred on the cities of the Empire and the life of these cities centred on the public buildings, whether for daily business and administration or for social and religious gatherings and entertainment. This was a focal point for the Roman citizen and it was seen ultimately as the responsibility of the emperor to maintain and promote this urban life through his patronage and particularly with substantial financial support after major crises like earthquakes and fires. This patronage is systematically recorded by Malalas for the city of Antioch. At the local level in late antiquity civic pride produced a spate of works in praise of individual cities, which traced their history back to their origins. Statues and other monuments were given a place in this history even if this meant constructing somewhat fabulous tales. Malalas' record of the buildings and monuments of cities around the Mediterranean from the legendary days of Zeus and Herakles and Perseus, through Biblical times, to the establishment of the Hellenistic and Roman empires provides a framework for some understanding of how a sixth-century Antiochene saw his environment in the context of history. It was a rapidly changing world in his own generation. Earthquakes, fire and attacks by the Persians severely damaged his own city. When he moved to Constantinople his record makes far more mention of churches as the location of the dramatic incidents of daily urban life and imperial resources were being put into granaries, cisterns and fortifications and restoration work rather than the ornamental fountains and aqueducts of Hadrian's day. His own chronicle combines the traditions of history and archival documentation of his city with an antiquarian's interest in popular anecdote. Together this provides a record of late antique city life which brings us closer to the reality of it.

<sup>8</sup>For some indication of the appearance of this carriage, see the discussion and illustration in Oeconomos, 1959, 177-78.



# CHRONOLOGICAL STRUCTURES IN MALALAS' CHRONICLE

Elizabeth Jeffreys

There are present in Malalas' chronicle several varieties of chronological referencing, derived from different sources, serving different purposes and not always completely synchronized (even when allowance is made for the inevitable corruptions which affect numbers). Chronology and the calculation of the years that had elapsed since the creation of the world were nevertheless of paramount concern to Malalas.

There are a number of largely secular dating elements in the text: ruler-lists within empires, a brief series of events dated from Christ's ascension, consular lists, imperial accessions and reign lengths, dates by the Antiochene system and by indictions; there can also be extracted a fairly full and accurate list of the *comites Orientis* and the patriarchs of Antioch and a sequence of earthquakes, though these are not used as a dating tool by Malalas. But underpinning these disparate elements is a set of years 'From Adam' (or '*anno mundi*' as they are more usually called in connection with other chroniclers) and a number of biblical-secular synchronisms. It will be useful to set out these chronological features in some detail (indicating textual problems where they occur), discuss their possible sources and attempt to use these to understand how Malalas envisaged the structure and sequence of the past.

## 1. Years 'From Adam'

The key structure in Malalas' chronological framework, as should become apparent, is the series of dates 'From Adam' which appear at intervals throughout the chronicle: this series is fundamental to Malalas' conception of the past. The sequence is as follows:

|     |                                                     |       |
|-----|-----------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 1.  | From Adam to the time when the angels desired women | 2122  |
| 2.  | From Adam to Noah's flood                           | *2552 |
| 3.  | From Adam to the Tower of Babel                     | *2922 |
| 4.  | From Adam to Phalek                                 | 3000  |
| 5.  | From Adam to Abraham                                | §3445 |
| 6.  | From Adam to the birth of Moses                     | §4036 |
| 7.  | From Adam to the death of Moses and Aaron           | §4156 |
| 8.  | From Adam to David                                  | ¶4755 |
| 9.  | From Adam to Solomon                                | ¶4795 |
| 10. | From Adam to Hezekiah                               | ∞5266 |
| 11. | From Adam to Manasses                               | ∞5321 |



3. I §5, P 9. 10-11: Thus from Adam to the completion of the Tower of Babel there were 2922 years.

There is an intermediate date: I §4, P 10. 10-11: 'Thus from the flood to the building of the Tower there were 370 years'. This is consistent with the dates given for the flood and the completion of the Tower (370 represents 2922 less 2552; cf. Gelzer, 1885, II, 132-3) but is once again unique to Malalas; Synkellos, for example, gives 2776 From Adam for this point (Synk 43. 13, 48. 9, 58. 30).

4. II §12, Bo 34. 13-14: Thus from Adam to Phalek there were 3000 years, according to the prophecy.

This is the first indication of the chiliastic structure supported by Malalas and which provides the framework for his conceptualization of the past. The date of 3000 years for Phalek is that used by Africanus (fr. 9; cf. Synk 97. 11); it is an unusual one and Synkellos, after quoting it, also notes the more usual [pseudo-]Eusebian date of 2980; on the text of Eusebios, or pseudo-Eusebios used by Malalas, see chapter 2, p. 32. Africanus used a chiliastic structure for his world chronology, as well as structuring it by the week-years of *Daniel* (fr. 50; cf. Synk 391. 1). In the chiliastic structure<sup>2</sup> Phalek holds a pivotal position since, according to *Genesis* 10. 25 'in his days the earth was divided'. The regular interpretation of this was that in Phalek's lifetime, during which the building of the Tower of Babel took place, the peoples of the earth were divided into their languages and regions.<sup>3</sup> According to Prokopios of Gaza, however, in his commentary on *Genesis* written in the early sixth century, not only the earth but time too was divided by Phalek's life (PG 87, col. 316 c).<sup>4</sup> It is reasoning of this sort that must lie behind Malalas' statement here. 'According to the prophecy', and the sentence as a whole, are amplified at X §2, Bo 228, where Phalek is specifically said to appear at the mid-point of time.

5. III §3, Bo 58. 19: Thus from Adam to Abraham there were 3745 years.

3745 years (corr. Chil): '3445 years' Slav, '3423 years' A, '200745 years' Ba.

There are two intermediary dates at II §3, Bo 58.14-15: 'Thus from the flood to Abraham there were 893 years and from the building of the Tower of Babel, 523 years'.

<sup>2</sup>Chiliasm is the process of conceptualizing world history in blocks of one thousand years, to correspond to the seven days of creation; the key text is *Psalms* 90. 4: 'a thousand years are but a day in the sight of the Lord'; cf. 2 *Peter* 3. 8. A symbolic chiliastic chronology was discussed in Hippolytos' *Commentary on Daniel*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and by Irenaeus; see Grumel, 1958, 3 ff. Of importance in the first wave of Christian historiography in the third and fourth centuries and one of Africanus' basic concepts, this quite quickly ceased to attract the attention of more scientific historians such as Eusebios (or Panodoros and Annianos), though it remained a basic assumption in both East and West to which succinct allusion could be made (cf. Daniélou, 1948: the fundamental assessment of the relevant texts; Nicholson, 1985). An alternative term is millennialism, frequently used in connection with the belief that the end of a millennium, and especially of the sixth, would usher in a period of turmoil and the reign of the Anti-Christ. On this see also chapter 2, pp. 34-6.

<sup>3</sup>The classic statement of this is Hippolytos' *Liber Generationis*, written in the third century.

<sup>4</sup>Gelzer, 1885, I, 34, 67 assumes that Prokopios was using Africanus as the basis for this comment and argues that for Africanus the world would endure for 6000 years only before ushering in the final millennium and the second coming of Christ.

The figure '3745' given in Bo and the English translation (1986) is a correction by Chilmead of Ba's blatant error; it is, as Chilmead remarks, a corrupt number. The correct figure, '3445', is given by Slav and is internally consistent. From the figures given elsewhere [From the flood (2552) to Abraham (893), and from the Tower of Babel (2922) to Abraham (523)] there is a total of 3445; the text (and the 1986 translation) should be emended accordingly (cf. Gelzer, 1885, II, 133).

The only date given from Abraham is at III §8, Bo 61.15-16: 'From Abraham to the Exodus of the sons of Israel from Egypt with Moses there were five generations, 443 years'. This links on to none of the 'From Adam' dates.

6. III §8, Bo 61. 17-18: From Adam to the birth of Moses there were 4036 years.

This figure is supported by an intermediary date; III §8, Bo 61. 16-17: 'From the flood to the birth of Moses there were 1484 years'. 2552 (the date of the flood) and 1484 give the total 4036.

7. III §8, Bo 61. 20-21: Thus from Adam to the death of Moses and Aaron there were 4156 years.

This figure is supported by the life-span attributed to Moses at III §8, Bo 61. 18-19: 'Moses lived 120 years'. 4036 and 120 give the total 4156.

8. V §69, Bo 143. 8: Thus from Adam to David there were 4755 years.<sup>5</sup>

There is no intermediary date with which this statement can be correlated, but see Gelzer, 1885, I, 134 for a list of the Judges of Israel taken from Kedrenos but arguably reflecting Malalas' calculations and which is consistent with a date of 4755 for David; cf. Synk 204. 10-205. 23 for a discussion of the different dates at this point supplied by Africanus, Eusebios and himself. Synkellos' own preferred date for David is 4428 (Synk 206. 3).

Malalas' figures here are yet again *sui generis*. It should perhaps be noted that in his careful chronological computations Synkellos regularly discusses the dating systems of Africanus and Eusebios (as revised by Panodoros and Annianos) but makes no attempt to record – let alone discuss – that of Malalas, even though he demonstrably had access to his chronicle.

9. V §69, Bo 143. 15: Thus from Adam to Solomon there were 4795 years.

This is supported by the supplementary information that Solomon reigned for 40 years (V §69, Bo 143. 9); cf. 1 *Kings* 11. 42. 4755 and 40 give the total 4795.

10. V §69, Bo 144. 1-2: Thus from Adam to Hezekiah, emperor of the Jews, there were 5266 years.

There are no intermediary dates to support this calculation (merely a statement that other emperors ruled after Solomon; V §69, Bo 143. 16, 20); cf. Gelzer, 1885, II, 135.

<sup>5</sup>Note that for this and the next date there is a misprint in the 1986 translation (for 47 twice read 4755 and 4795 respectively).

11. V §73, Bo 149. 6: Thus from Adam to Manasses there were in all 5321 years.

There is an intermediary statement which corroborates this figure: V §72, Bo 149. 4-5: 'After the reign of Hezekiah, Manasses reigned over the Jews for 55 years'. This is the standard figure (2 *Kings* 21. 1). So, 5266 and 55 give the total 5321.

12. V §72, Bo 149. 14: Thus from Adam there were in all 5365 years.

A reign of 44 years is attributed after Manasses to his brothers Eliakim and Joakim (correctly Amos 2 years, Josiah 31 years and Joakim 11 years, as discussed by Gelzer, 1885, II, 135; cf. 4 *Kings* 21. 19, 22. 1 and 23. 36), but the result is consistent: 5321 and 44 give the total 5365.

13. VI §17, Bo 162. 1: Thus from Adam till this time there were 5362 years.

5362 years: '5307 years' Slav.

This date is clearly out of phase with earlier calculations; the variant in Slav offers no help. There are no intermediary dates with which to correlate this, nor is it even clear to what 'this time' refers (the reign of Herakles, descendant of Picus Zeus, in Italy – the most likely; or Philip of Macedon; or even Esdra and the return of the Jews from exile in Babylon). Gelzer, 1885, II, 135 despairs over this passage; one cannot but agree.

14. VIII §2, Bo 193. 23-194. 1: Thus from Adam to Alexander of Macedon's victory there were 5557 years.

Chilmead (Bo 547; cf. Gelzer, 1885, II, 135) demonstrated that this date must refer to the year of Alexander's birth.

15. VIII §4, Bo 195. 19-20: Thus from Adam to the death of Alexander of Macedon there were 5593 years.

At VIII §4, Bo 195. 15, it is stated that Alexander lived for 36 years; if 'birth' is read for 'victory' in the previous date (as Chilmead and Gelzer argue), then dates 14 and 15 are consistent (5557 and 36 give the total 5593). These dates remain outside the main Byzantine chronographic calculations; cf. Synk 376. 26 - 378. 18 where, in the course of a survey of the different methods of arriving at a 'From Adam' year for the incarnation, he places Alexander of Macedon at 5100 (Synk 378. 14, cf. 396. 22).

The date for Alexander's death is attributed to Theophilos the chronicler. This creates a number of problems: does this reference mean, for example, that all the 'From Adam' years are to be derived from 'Theophilos', whoever he might be? Theophilos is cited for a number of disparate points, as is discussed in chapter 7, but the most significant for the present are those at X §2, Bo 228 and XVIII §8, Bo 428 where he is listed as one of the three chroniclers 'who agree among themselves' on a crucifixion date of 6000. By 'Theophilos' it is generally assumed that Malalas means the bishop of Antioch (d. 180 approx.) who wrote, amongst other works, the three treatises *Ad Autolyicum* which include one of the most influential early discussions of a Christian cosmic chronology; cf. chapter 2, p. 30. The dates given generally by Theophilos, however, do not correlate with those of Malalas (e.g. David is put, by extrapolation, at 4436) and, in his extant chronological statements, Alexander does not appear to be a significant figure. The reference to Theophilos here is, therefore, suspect; regrettably there are no other witnesses

extant at this point to suggest alternative readings: it could be that there had originally been another 'omnibus' reference to the three 'concordant' chroniclers for this significant secular chronological staging point.

16. X §2, Bo 227. 10-11: Thus from Adam to Phalek, the son of Heber, the total is 2533 years.

2533: '3000' LM, Hes, and Gelzer, 1885, II, 130-2, von S 11.

'2533' is the reading of Ba; it is, however, inconsistent with the firmly established figure of '3000' given for Phalek in date 4 at II §12, Bo 34. 13-14. '3000' is supported at this point by the *Laterculus Malalianus* and Hesychios, both texts closely connected with Malalas (on their status as witnesses, see chapter 9, pp. 255, 287-99). It is thus certain that the reading of the original Malalas at this point was '3000' and the text of Ba (cf. von Stauffenberg, 1931, 11) – and the 1986 translation – should be emended accordingly.

17. X §2, Bo 228. 1-4: ... so that the total from Adam the first-created until the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ and the 42nd year of the reign of Augustus Caesar is 5500 years.

5500: '5967' LM, Slav, cf Hes; Gelzer, 1885, II, 130-2, von S 11.

There is an intermediary date at X §2, Bo 227. 11 - 228. 1: 'and from Phalek until the 42nd year of the reign of Augustus Caesar 2967 years'. None of the witnesses extant here has a variant for this.

'5500' is the reading of Ba; the *Laterculus Malalianus* and the Slavonic texts read '5967', with some support from Hesychios.<sup>6</sup> The intermediary date is consistent with the reading at date 16 above both of the *Laterculus* and Hesychios (3000 and 2967 give the total 5967) and of Ba (2533 and 2967 give the total 5500). However, despite the fact that 5500 is the most usual symbolic Byzantine date for Christ's incarnation (and is in fact mentioned later in Malalas' chronological discussion as being the date given by Eusebios; cf. chapter 2, p. 32), consideration of date 18 below makes it plain that the reading of Malalas at this point must have been '5967'. The text of Ba (cf. von Stauffenberg, 1931, 11) and the 1986 translation should both be emended.

18. X §2, Bo 228. 7-8: ... so that from Adam until the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ and his crucifixion there were 5533 years.

5533: 'fully 6000' LM, Hes, Slav; Gelzer, 1885, II, 130-2, von S 11.

Once again Ba is unsupported in its reading '5533' while the *Laterculus*, Hesychios and the Slavonic texts all agree on reading 'fully 6000'. The figure '6000' is immediately linked in the next sentence with Phalek and the prophetic words of Moses where Phalek is said to be at the mid-point in time before the future coming of Christ. We saw at date 4 (II §12) that this is a reference to *Genesis* 10. 25 and the division of the earth's peoples, while the idea that time (the length of the world's existence) is also divided during Phalek's life can be found in Prokopios of Gaza's commentary on this passage (PG 87, col. 316c). Date 4 and the figures in dates 16 and 17 above (together with the cumulative figures in other dates) are enough to show that Malalas must originally have read '6000'

<sup>6</sup>Barocc. 206, edited by Hody, reads '1067', a nonsense figure; the Paris manuscripts of this fragment cited by Du Cange in his edition of the *Chronicon Paschale* (reprinted 1729, 321) all read '5967'.



at this point. As in dates 16 and 17, the text of Ba (cf. von Stauffenberg, 1931, 11) and the 1986 translation must be emended.

This emendation then restores sense to the entire passage. The logic here is that Malalas is aware of two dates for Christ's life on earth. The conventional one, here attributed to Eusebios, puts Christ's birth at 5500, his crucifixion at 5533 and the commencement of the seventh millenium, in the year 6001, in the future. The other, here attributed to Clement, Theophilos and Timotheos, puts Christ's birth at 5967, and his crucifixion and ascension at 6000; by this calculation the seventh millennium would have begun immediately at that point. Malalas concludes, from his vantage point in the sixth century some 500 years after Christ's life on earth, that both sets of figures, in spite of their variations, indicate that the world had already entered the seventh millennium. Parallels can be found elsewhere in the chronicle for the tone of honest endeavour we find here as Malalas tries to reconcile conflicting statements (see chapters 1, pp. 20-21 and 7, pp. 214-15).

Evidence for contemporary concern with the passing of the millennium in the year 6000 and the arrival of the seventh, with whatever it might bring for good or evil, will be discussed at date 20.

Note that, of the authorities to whom Malalas attributes this unusual date of 6000, Timotheos is otherwise unknown; Theophilos, if he is the Antiochene patriarch with chronological interests, worked with an incarnation date of 5517 and shows no interest whatever in matters millennial (Grant, 1970; Mango, 1980, 191); and though Grumel (1958, 3) cites this passage as evidence for Clement of Alexandria's millennial interests, every other piece of evidence from Clement's work shows that he assumed an incarnation date of 5601 (Grumel, 1958, 24).

19. XV §16, Bo 391. 5-6: Thus from Adam to the death of the emperor Zeno there were 5983 years.

5983 years: 'From Adam according to the Romans 5999 years, 5983 years according to the accurate true calculations of the Alexandrians, from the rule of Diocletian 207, from the holy incarnation 483, indiction 14' Th, '6458 years' MS, '5458 years and seven months' Slav.

As it stands, this date in Ba presents a problem in that it can be reconciled with none of the other 'From Adam' dates; it is, as Gelzer (1885, II, 132) comments, irregular. The solution, however, lies with later witnesses to the text. From Theophanes we can see that Ba's '5983' gives in fact an accurate date for Zeno's death by the Alexandrian era. Theophanes has at this point preserved most of a complex chronological excursus of the sort still found in Ba at XVIII §8, though it should be noted that there too part (including a date by the Diocletianic era) has been omitted from the Greek tradition and is now found only in the Slavonic version. That this passage in Theophanes reflects what originally stood in Malalas is supported by Michael the Syrian, who notes that 'John of Antioch (= Malalas) says that from Adam to the death of Zeno there were 6458 years'. All the other dates for Zeno's death cited by Theophanes are equivalent to A.D. 491. If we take Malalas' preferred incarnation date of 5967 and add 491, the result is 6458, thus confirming the accuracy of Michael the Syrian's report; we should also note that, apart from its initial numeral, the Slavonic texts' reading of '5458' supports Michael the Syrian. Given the millennial preoccupations made explicit in X §2 and XVIII §8, it is

arguable that Malalas included a chronological excursus here since Zeno's death occurred in the year 6000 by 'l'ère mondiale protobyzantine' (Grumel, 1958, 244; or 5999 according to Grumel's 'ère mondiale byzantine'); the passing of the sixth millennium in the first year of Anastasios' reign is noted, for example, in the Syriac chronicle of 846 (Chabot, 1960, 166), by Petrus Alexandrinus writing in 912 (Samodurova, 1961), in *Fasti Vindobonenses Posteriores* (Mommsen, 1892, 330; called *Consularia Ravennatia* B by Frick, 1893). There was plainly an undercurrent of concern at this time. See Harvey (1988) and Jeffreys (1990) for a discussion of the Syrian context for these ideas.

20. XVIII §8, Bo 428. 11-12: So that the total number of years from Adam to this indiction is 6497.

6497 ('4' in rasura and a later hand; see Bury, 1897, 229): '6407' ('6417' Slav).

This statement is attributed to Clement, Theophilus and Timotheos and is preferred by Malalas to that of Eusebios, who – according to Malalas – gives 6432 ('6032' Slav) as the equivalent date. This confirms the statements of X §2 that Malalas supports the chronological system he ascribes to the three chronographers 'who agree among themselves'.

There are, however, textual problems. The other dates in this chronological excursus are aiming at A.D. 528-9. 5967 (Malalas' preferred incarnation date) added to 529 gives 6496; this is one year out from Ba's 6497<sup>7</sup> and we should probably accept Ba's reading as correct. The alternative 'Eusebian' date is in a worse state, for 5500 and 529 give 6029 and not Ba's '6432'; the '6032' of Slav is closer, but still not satisfactory.

Despite this problem, the thrust of the passage is nevertheless plain: Malalas is concerned to argue that the sixth millennium has passed, by whatever system of calculation one operates. While, however, it is clear why a passage of millennial speculation should once have been included at A.D. 491 on Zeno's death, it is not clear why A.D. 528-9 should be significant. It may be that the earthquakes in Antioch of 526 and 528 had reawakened millennial fears, or it may be that, by a reckoning we can no longer trace, some sect (perhaps Syrian) had calculated that the millennium was to end at that time. It is striking that Malalas at X §14, Bo 241, carefully puts Christ's resurrection on 26th March, just as the day was dawning.<sup>8</sup> This is, once again, an unusual date for Christ's passion: the most usual resurrection date found in patristic and Byzantine discussions is 25th March (see the table at Grumel, 1958, 30). Easter Day in

<sup>7</sup>Bury, 1897, 226 comments, accurately, that the sign for '4' in this date is in a later hand and also in rasura (though this is less apparent today); cf. chapter 9, p. 247 for the fact that not a few passages in Ba have been re-inked. Inspection of a wide sample of the re-inked passages suggests that the purpose of the re-inking was to make the existing text in fading ink more legible and not to rewrite the text with a different wording; i.e. the darker v in this difficult date on f. 275v is arguably only a clarification of what was there already. Bury remarks that the '4' is the worst feature of this date but does not explain what he means. Since Bury does not associate this passage with dates nos. 4 or 17, his remarks should not be given too much weight. Note that the Slavonic texts support the 6, 4, and 7 of this number but vary between 1 and 0 for the third element.

<sup>8</sup>Severus reveals in one of his letters (no. 101; PO 14, fasc. 1, p. 246) a concern to divide the days of Christ's passion accurately; this seems an illuminating parallel to Malalas' phrasing here.

528 fell on 26th March. Since one of the major concerns of Byzantine chroniclers was to devise a chronological system which allowed the synchronization of the days of the creation with the days of Christ's passion in a regular cycle of years (19, 84 etc, up to the finally evolved cycle of 532 years, as is discussed in chapter 2, p. 34), this seems to be a striking coincidence and one probably of considerable significance for understanding the construction of Malalas' chronicle. However, since – so far as I am aware – no parallels exist for a Christological cycle in which 26th March was significant, we are left with suspicions only and no proof.

The 'From Adam' years represent Malalas' main conceptual framework for his chronicle. In the two chronological excurses of X §2 and XVIII §8 one can see him trying to solve problems. One is minor: how to deal with lists of emperors which indicate reign lengths but not overlapping periods of office. One is major: the date of Christ's life on earth. Was Christ born in the year 5550 From Adam, or crucified in 6000? This was a fundamental issue which vied with calculations of the date of Easter as motivations for the compilation of chronicles, such as the *Chronicon Paschale* or that of Synkellos. For Malalas the problem also seems to have been to resolve whether the sixth millennium had yet passed. If Christ were born in 5500, then the millennium would end in Malalas own life-time (A.D. 491 by the proto-Byzantine era; A.D. 492 by the Byzantine era [and it is not clear at what point in the development of Byzantine chronological systems the one was replaced by the other]; A.D. 508 by the Alexandrian era and *circa* A.D. 498 by the Eusebian era cited by Malalas; cf. chapter 2, p. 35). There is some evidence that this event was awaited with interest (and/or trepidation): the chronicle mentioned at the beginning of the Tübingen Theosophy (Erbse, 1941, 167), the chronicle of Petrus Alexandrinus, the Baalbek Oracle (Alexander, 1967, 27), the Syriac chronicle of 846 all note the ending of the millennium, under Anastasios. Syriac ecclesiastical historians in particular seem to have associated this period with increased disasters, natural or man-made, and attributed them to millennial punishments for Chalcedonian and monophysite controversies (Harvey, 1988). If Christ were crucified in 6000, however, the millennium had long since passed and no present turmoil could herald a period of prolonged penitence and punishment.

A crucifixion date of 6000, though implicit in Prokopios of Gaza's commentary, seems not to have been used by any other Byzantine author apart from Hesychios of Miletos (the *Laterculus Malalianus* is also exceptional and its author seems to have turned to Malalas because of the strength of his millennial position). This should not blind us to the fact that 6000 is indeed the date which Malalas supports and that it is a crucifixion and not an incarnation date. We also need to remember that almost every statement in the chronicle is equally idiosyncratic and unique to Malalas, and it is perhaps indicative of the uniqueness of Malalas' chronological calculations that they are ignored by later excerptors, apart from the *Laterculus*.

Why did Malalas choose this era? I would suggest that awareness of the imminent passing of the sixth millennium was particularly intense among Syrian Christians (almost all the texts cited for millennial speculation come from a Syrian context; see

Jeffreys, 1990). To give a framework for Malalas' views, I would also suggest that he was in contact with a sect which held atypical views on calculations of the date of Easter.

## 2. Dates concerning Christ

Having discussed the scaffolding for Malalas' chronicle let us consider next the dates given for Christ's life since Christ's incarnation, crucifixion and resurrection are fundamental elements in Malalas' world view, as in that of any Byzantine chronographer. Despite the symbolism consequent on the chiliastic discussions of X §2 and XVIII §8, Malalas is still concerned to provide a secular chronological framework for Christ's earthly life.

### A. Christ's Life

#### 1. Annunciation

IX §25, Bo 226. 7-13: After the 41st year and the sixth month of his [Augustus'] reign had passed, on Sunday 25th Dystros, at the second hour of the day, the archangel Gabriel brought the good news to the Holy Virgin and Mother of God Mary, in the city of Nazareth, in the consulship of Cyrenius and Longinus, when Vitellius, who had recently been appointed by Augustus, was governor of Syria.

41st year LM: cf. '40th year' Slav.

Cyrenius and Longinus (von S 10) cf. 'Cyrinius' LM: 'Kouinios' Ba, cf. Slav.

Vitellius (corr. Chil.) LM: 'Uitellius' Ba.

41st year: Augustus' dates are to be calculated from his first consulate (19th August, 43 B.C.), so this represents March, 2 B.C..

Sunday 25th Dystros: this is the regular Byzantine date for the annunciation; cf. Grumel, 1958, 30.

Cyrenius and Longinus: there is a whole series of knotty problems here. Do these names conceal the suffect consuls for A.D. 2 (T. Quinctius Crispinus Valerianus and P. Cornelius [Lentulus] Scipio)?

Vitellius: does this represent P. Quinctilius Varus, governor of Syria 6-4 B.C.? Downey, 1961, 167 quotes Velleius Paterculus II. 117. 2 on Varus' financial exploitation of Syria during his period of office.

#### 2. Birth

X §1, Bo 227. 1-9: In the 42nd year and the fourth month of the reign of Augustus our Lord God Jesus Christ was born, eight days before the Kalends of January, on 25th December, at the seventh hour of the day, in a city of Judaea named Bethlehem, which is near Jerusalem, in the year 42 according to the calendar of Antioch the Great, while Quirinius the ex-consul was governor of Syria, Octavian and Silvanus were consuls, and emperor Herod was toparch, or emperor, of Judaea.

December: 'Apellaios-December' LM, Slav.

Quirinius (corr.): 'Kyrinios' Ba, cf. LM.

emperor Herod: 'Herod the Great' LM, Slav.

42nd year: this must be December, 2 B.C.

year 42 according to the calendar of Antioch: this produces the date 8 B.C. but Grumel, 1958, 223 suggests emending 42 to 48 which would give 2 B.C. (cf. section 7 below, date no. 1).

*Octavian and Silvanus*: consuls in 2 B.C. (see section 5 below).

*Quirinius*: presumably P. Sulpicius Quirinius, cos. 12 B.C. and governor of Syria A.D. 6/7; for the problems involved in reconciling the career of the historical Quirinius with the narrative of *Luke* 2. 2, see Magie, 1950, 1321-2 and KPW Sulpicius A II, no. 7.

This is a vigorous attempt to give a secular date to Christ's incarnation, and contrasts with the mystical speculation of the next paragraph (X §2, Bo 227-228; see section 1 above, dates nos. 17 and 18).

### 3. Crucifixion

X §14, Bo 240. 3-8, 14-16: In the 18th year and seventh month of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, our God, having reached the age of about 33, was betrayed by Judas Iscariot, his disciple, on 23rd Dystros-March, the moon being in its 13th day. It was Thursday and at the fifth hour of the night. ... Our Lord Jesus Christ was crucified eight days before the Kalends of April, on 24th March, the moon being in its 14th day. It was at the sixth hour of the day, the day being Friday.

*eight days ... on 24th March* Slav, a false date: cf. 'eight ... 25th March' LM, 'nine days ... 24th March' von S 20.

*March* LM: 'Dystros-March' Slav.

*18th year ... of Tiberius*: Tiberius' reign began in August A.D. 14, so this must indicate March, A.D. 33.

*age of about 33*: the 'long' chronology for Christ's ministry on earth (i.e. that it lasted for three years) was accepted by Byzantine chroniclers from Eusebios onwards (cf. Grumel, 1958, 29).

*eight days ... 24th March*: this is a non-date as eight days before the Kalends of April can only ever be 25th March, as is given in the *Laterculus Malalianus*; however the *Laterculus'* date is also impossible as it contradicts both the previous (for the betrayal: Bo 240.7) and the subsequent (for the resurrection: Bo 241.15) March-Dystros dates. The only possible reading is von Stauffenberg's emendation to 'nine days ... 24th March'. The year to which these dates refer is (from Grumel's tables) A.D. 30.

### 4. Burial

X §14, Bo 241. 8-12: Jesus Christ was buried at the tenth hour of that Friday, in the consulship of Sulpicius and Sulla, in the 79th year according to the calendar of Antioch the Great, while Cassius, who had been appointed by Tiberius Caesar, was governor of Syria.

*Sulla* (corr.): 'Sola' Ba, 'Solatus' LM, Slav.

*Sulpicius and Sulla*: L. Livius Ocella Sulpicius Galba and L. Cornelius Sulla Felix, coss. A.D. 33.

*79th year ... of Antioch*: 1st October 30 to 30th September 31.

*Cassius*: perhaps C. Cassius Longinus, cos. 30 (PW 3, col. 1740: Cassius 67).

### 5. Resurrection

X §14, Bo 241. 13-16: Jesus, our Lord God, rose on 25th Dystros-March, at the tenth hour of the night, as Sunday 26th March was dawning, the moon being in its 16th day.

*tenth hour* LM: cf 'sixth hour' Slav.

*Sunday 26th March*: this is consistent with the previous March dates given (if von Stauffenberg's emendation is followed) and again gives the year A.D. 30. As pointed out

above (section 1, date no. 18), this is a resurrection date not apparently supported by other chroniclers (cf. Grumel, 1958, 30; Jeffreys, 1990).

#### 6. Ascension

X §14, Bo 242. 1-7: The Holy Spirit, the Giver of Life, descended on his holy apostles on Sunday 14th Artemisios-May, at the third hour of the day, while Pontius Pilate was governor of Judaea. He had been appointed to govern that people by Tiberius Caesar, who had put an end to the empire of the Jews and had assigned for them the governor whom he had chosen. Annas and Caiaphas were then high priests of the Jewish people.

*third hour* (corr. von S) LM, Slav (var. EL): '13th hour' Ba, 'first hour' Slav (main tradition).

*Sunday 14th Artemisios-May*: this is consistent with the previous dates and gives the year A.D. 30.

*Pontius Pilate*: prefect of Judaea A.D. 26-36; cf. KPW Pontius II, no. 1.

*Annas and Caiaphas*: Annas ben Seth, high priest A.D. 6-15, and Joseph Caiaphas (his son-in-law), high priest A.D. 18-36; cf. Josephos, *Ant.* XVIII, 26. 35.

Several points emerge from this:

1. Malalas, despite his millenarist speculation of X §2, nevertheless attempts to place Christ's life firmly within secular history with many detailed dates;
2. these detailed dates conflict; they were presumably taken from different sources and Malalas has either not seen that they are inconsistent, or is not worried by this; some sequences (e.g. the month dates for Holy Week) are internally consistent (with a few minor emendations); the dates for Christ's passion range from A.D. 30 (Holy Week details) through A.D. 30/1 (79th year of Antioch), and A.D. 33 (18th year of Tiberius and the consulship of that year);
3. the date for Christ's crucifixion, burial, resurrection and ascension (which all took place in the same year) reappears in an attenuated set of dates for which the Antiochene equivalent of A.D. 31 seems to be the key (see B below).

#### B. *Dates from the ascension*

1. X §15, Bo 242. 8-11, 13-14: Four years after the resurrection and ascension of our Saviour Jesus Christ, during the reign of Tiberius Caesar – after St Paul had left Antioch the Great ... Peter came from Jerusalem to Antioch ...

*Four years*: taking A.D. 31 to be the 'Dionysian' equivalent for Malalas' ascension date (see A, above, no. 4: March of the 79th year of Antioch would fall in A.D. 31), this gives A.D. 35.

2. X §24, Bo 246. 20-247. 1: At the beginning of the reign of Claudius Caesar, ten years after the ascension of our Lord God Jesus Christ, Euodios became patriarch in the great city of the Antiochenes in Syria. He was the first after the apostle St Peter to be consecrated bishop there.

*ten years*: this gives the date A.D. 41.

3. X §26, Bo 247. 13-16: Eighteen years after the ascension into heaven of our Lord God Jesus Christ ... the priests heard on that day a human voice ...

*Eighteen years*: this gives the date A.D. 49.

4. X §43, Bo 259. 14-16: In the 35th year after the ascension of our God and Saviour, the emperor Vitellius began a campaign against them ...

*35th year:* this gives the date A.D. 66 for the opening of the campaign against the Jews (or rather, the start of the Jewish revolt), and is accurate.

5. X §45, Bo 260. 4-7: In the 38th year after the ascension of the Saviour Christ, during the reign of his father Vespasian and during the consulship of Commodus and Rufus, Titus captured Judaea and Jerusalem.

*38th year:* this gives the date A.D. 69.

*consulship of Commodus and Rufus:* D. Iunius Novius Priscus (?Rufus) and L. Ceionius Commodus, coss. A.D. 78.

Jerusalem was sacked in A.D. 70; the date by the ascension is in that case more accurate than the consular date and could perhaps be considered completely accurate if the ascension year is considered to run from Easter to Easter as the siege of Jerusalem started in the spring.

This sequence of dates based on the ascension is brief. The *Chronicon Paschale*, however, preserves a more extended set of 15 (Gelzer, 1885, II, 166-7) which demonstrates a marked similarity with those found in Malalas.<sup>9</sup> Gelzer concludes that, given the confused and abbreviated state of Malalas' text as we have it, we cannot know whether the *Chronicon Paschale* took these ascension dates from Malalas, or from a common and independent source. It is worth noting, however, that the dates in Malalas all fall in areas which (admittedly frequently by a circular argument) could be attributed to Nestorians and in the *Chronicon Paschale* stop before the end of the areas of Malalas attributable to this otherwise unidentified author.<sup>10</sup> The fuller list of dates from the ascension preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale* covers many of the major ecclesiastical events of the first five centuries, and so to that extent coincides with the picture that has developed of Nestorians' interests (see chapter 7, p. 187).

<sup>9</sup>2nd year after the ascension: Philip baptised the eunuch and Peter baptised Cornelius (CP 430. 6-13); 4th year: Peter became bishop of Antioch (CP 431. 4-9, cf. Malalas date 1); 39th year: Jerusalem was destroyed (= A.D. 69; CP 461. 11-20, cf. Malalas date 5); 40th year: the Jewish state lost its independence (= A.D. 70; CP 463. 3-6); 72nd year: St John died (CP 470. 14-15); 133rd year: death of Polykarp (CP 480. 20-481. 22); 205th year: death of Cyprian (CP 500. 9-10); 255th year: deaths of SS George and Babylas (CP 510. 2-15); 267th year: death of St Menas (CP 512. 11-13); 269th year: death of St Gelasinos (CP 513. 1-18); 295th year: Synod of Nikaia (= A.D. 325; CP 524. 18-525. 8); 301st year: founding of Constantinople (CP 529. 11-530. 11); 351st year: synod of Constantinople (= A.D. 381; CP 562. 9-16); 401st year: synod of Ephesos (= A.D. 431; CP 581. 11-20); 422nd year: synod of Chalcedon (= A.D. 452; CP 591. 1-4).

<sup>10</sup>For what it is worth, it should be pointed out that the only other use – it seems – of dating by the ascension is found in a few late (15th-16th c.) Syrian Nestorian chroniclers: Vosté, 1941.

### 3. Ruler lists

Malalas presents information on rulers for several states (or empires) in the ancient world; this material appears in narrative rather than list form, unlike the ruler lists in, e.g., the *Excerpta Barbari* (which is a text very like the one which Malalas – or his immediate source – must have been using) or in Synkellos' *Chronographia*. Since these lists transcend all the source boundaries proposed by Bourier in his study of Malalas' sources, it would seem likely that Malalas himself had collected this material together.

#### Argos

Malalas includes two types of information on the Argive rulers. The first appears as incidental detail to narratives dealing with the foundation of Antioch; thus:

II §7, Bo 28: In the time of Picus Zeus, Inachos of the tribe of Iapeth, was the first to reign in the land of the Argives, and built Iopolis

II §29, Bo 46: Lykos, brother of Nykteus of Boiotia, was emperor of Argos

II §41, Bo 53: Adrastus, emperor of Argos, married his daughter to Polyneikes.

These narratives occur in a sequence of Greek history which is placed after 2922 (From Adam; I §5, P 11) and the completion of the Tower of Babel for Inachos, and after 3000 and the time of Phalek (II §12, Bo 34) for Lykos and Adrastus.

The second set (at IV §1, Bo 68) appears thus:

After Inachos, Phoroneus and many others reigned over the Argives until the reign of Lynkeus ... After the reign of Lynkeus, Triopas reigned in the land of the Argives for five years. In the fifth year of his reign the empire of the Argives was destroyed and the Sikyonians took possession of it. The empire, or toparchy, of the Argives lasted for 549 years, as the most learned Diodoros has written.

Africanus (Gelzer, 1885, I, 137 ff.; cf. Synk 69. 10, *Exc. Barb.* 224. 19, 28. 21<sup>11</sup>) synchronizes Inachos and Moses; the From Adam year given for Inachos by Africanus (Gelzer, 1885, I, 143) is 3652, and by Synkellos (145. 5) is 3662. Malalas does not explicitly synchronize Inachos and Moses for he is interweaving several layers at this point but there is an attempt to correlate them; e.g. III §8, Bo 61, gives dates for Moses' birth and death, followed by narratives on Persephone and Iannes and Iambres while at IV §3, Bo 68, after the passage on Inachos and the Argive kings, there is a further reference to Moses and Aaron who were succeeded by Joshua son of Nun. It is probable, then, that for Malalas Inachos is to be dated around 4156 From Adam.

Malalas agrees with the 'standard' ruler-list derived from Kastor (see the list in Schwartz, 1894, 11; cf. Africanus [Gelzer, 1885, I, 143], *Exc. Barb.* 288, Synk 145) that Phoroneus followed Inachos. On the standard list Lynkeus is regularly ninth after Phoroneus ('many others' Malalas) and follows immediately after Danaos. However Malalas here parts company with the regular pattern since Lynkeus is succeeded by Abas and not Triopas, who is fifth after Phoroneus. The destruction of the Argive kingdom by

<sup>11</sup>The *Excerpta Barbari*, or the *Barbarus Scaligeri*, is a collection of extracts from several chronological texts including portions of an Alexandrian world chronicle; it survives as an eighth-century Latin translation but the Greek text from which the translation was made was put together in the reign of Anastasios (Frick, 1893, ccxvi; PW 6, cols. 1566-76).



the Sikyonians in the fifth year of Triopas seems to be Malalas' idiosyncratic version, unsupported by other chronographers. For the *Excerpta Barbari* (292. 2) the Argive empire dissolved after Penthilos, successor to Orestes, having lasted 790 years, while Eusebius/Jerome (1956, 53b) notes that the Argive kingdom lasted 549 years; Huxley (1983, 345-7 and 1987, 160) argues that despite the earlier inaccuracy in Malalas' list, the reference to Diodoros here correctly preserves the original figure from Diodoros' lists (and Kastor). The figures have nonetheless been filtered through many reworkings and the fact that one may be shown by independently surviving evidence to be accurate does not guarantee that any of the others are trustworthy.

### Sikyon

A list of Sikyonian rulers follows after that dealing with the Argive kings as follows:

IV §1, Bo 68: In the fifth year of his [Triopas'] reign, the empire of the Argives was destroyed and the Sikyonians took possession of it. ... Aigialeus was the first to reign over the Sikyonians, who are now known as the Helladikoi. He reigned for 52 years, and then there were 26 other emperors until Zeuxippos who reigned over them for 32 years. Then their priests administered the land, and their [the Sikyonian] empire lasted for 985 years, as the most learned Africanus has written.

32 years: '31 years' Slav, PsS, Ke.

Once again Malalas' version is idiosyncratic. The closest parallels exist in the *Excerpta Barbari* (292. 4 ff.) where there is a reference to the fact that the Sikyonians are now called Helladikoi, as well as to Africanus and his total for the length of the Sikyonian state (which is given as 1007).

The Kastor-derived ruler lists for Sikyon all begin with Aigialeus reigning for 52 years and end with Zeuxippos, for 30, 31 or 35 years (Schwartz, 1894, 10; Gelzer, 1885, I, 150-1). There are 24 rulers between Aigialeus and Zeuxippos, giving an overall total of 26 which may account for Malalas' 26 intermediary rulers. All agree that priests (the Karnian priests) then took over. Africanus' total for the Sikyonian kingdom is 1007 (*Exc. Barb.* 292. 11; Gelzer, 1885, I, 151); Synkellos (178. 3) gives 1000 years; other Kastor-derived texts vary between 959 and 967 (Schwartz, 1894, 10). Gelzer (1885, I, 146, note 1) comments that the 985 given by Malalas does not come from the genuine Africanus but a reworking.

Malalas has given no clear synchronisms for the table, and the connection between Triopas' year 5 and the start of the Sikyonian kingdom is, from all other chronological sources (e.g. Synk, Eusebios/Jerome), a false one. As with the Argive list the Sikyonian list is presented around the period of Moses' death, From Adam 4156 (III §8, Bo 61; cf. IV §3, Bo 69), but what point of the list (the beginning or the end – more probably the beginning) is intended to synchronize with this is not clear. For Synkellos (177. 21 ff.) the Sikyonian rule lasted from A.M. 3239 to 4205; for Africanus (Schwartz, 1894, 42; Gelzer 1885, I, 140) the Sikyonian list starts in A.M. 3390.

## Tyre

II §8, Bo 30: Agenor reigned over these regions [Phoenice and Tyre] for 63 years.

In a narrative passage which provides eponymous founders for the areas surrounding Antioch, Malalas suddenly introduces a reign length for Agenor, son of Poseidon and Libye, daughter of Picus Zeus and Io, daughter of Inachos. This sudden precision is similar to that given for Kadmos' reign over the Boiotians (II §22, Bo 39) or the date of Phaidra's rumoured affair with Hippolytos (52 years after Pasiphae's death 'as the most learned Domninos has noted'; IV §24, Bo 88). That Tyre had its own historiographical tradition is apparent from Josephos (*c. Ap.* I, 107-126; *Ant.* VIII, 144-149; cf. Synk 213.16 ff. etc.), but Malalas is here tapping an entirely different level of local history; the most likely source is probably, as Bourier (1899, II, 58) suggests, Domninos on Antiochene history.

It is hard to calculate a From Adam year from this. II §11 has a comment on Syros, son of Agenor, immediately followed by the From Adam date for Phalek of 3000; the previous From Adam year was 2922, the completion of the Tower of Babel (I §5, P 11).

## Boiotia

From the narrative on Theban history in Book II, the following list can be extracted:

- II §22, Bo 39: In Kadmeia Kadmos, son of Agenor, reigned for 62 years
- II §25, Bo 42: ... [succeeded by] Pentheus, son of Echion, son of Kadmos
- II §29, Bo 45: ... after the death of Kadmos, ... Nykteus began to reign
- II §34, Bo 49: in Thebes Amphion and Zethos succeeded to Nykteus
- II §36, Bo 49: next came the descendants of Amphion and Zethos
- II §39, Bo 52: Oidipous reigned ... for 19 years
- II §40, Bo 52: ... he left the empire to his two sons [Polyneikes and Eteokles]
- II §42, Bo 53: The empire of Thebes, or of the Boiotians, which had lasted for 369 years, came to an end. ...\* The chronicler Africanus has also written about the empire of Thebes.

[\* The references at this point to Palaiphatos and Euripides are clearly relevant to the narratives on Dionysios and Oidipous rather than to the figures for the length of the Theban empire.]

There is no separate ruler list for the Boiotians in Synkellos or the *Excerpta Barbari*, though there are references to Kadmos, Amphion and Zethos (e.g. Synk 178. 22, 184. 2). Despite the idiosyncracies of Malalas' lists and figures elsewhere, Gelzer (1885, I, 141) accepts that the total of 369 is accurately derived from Africanus and refers to the period up to the death of Eteokles. Huxley (1987, 160) argues that this fragmentary list of the mythical Theban kings, is – like other ruler lists in Malalas – derived from the now lost lists of Kastor; if one admits that the material has filtered through several intermediaries, then this seems not unacceptable.

Although they appear after the From Adam year of 3000 for Phalek, the period in which Malalas sets these narratives is not clear since he makes several back references; e.g. II §13 'In earlier times' referring to Picus Zeus before discussing Perseus; II §22 'in earlier times' referring to Kadmos seeking Europe (= II §8); II §43 'in earlier times' referring to Seruch. Nevertheless the impression left is that the Theban narratives (on Dionysios and Oidipous) precede the appearance of Abraham in 3445 From Adam.

**Attica**

At III §9, Bo 62, we find:

In the time of Joshua, son of Nun, ... Ogyges reigned over the land of Attica for 32 years ... a great flood occurred ... the land remained barren and uninhabited for 270 years, as is related in the writings of Africanus.

270: '206' JA, JN, '260' Slav, '200' Ke.

Gelzer (1885, I, 152) comments that '206' is the correct figure, probably relying on *Exc. Barb.* 296. 5 which states that Kekrops (the first ruler of Attica after the devastation caused by the flood; see below) began to reign 208 years after the Exodus (of the Jews from Egypt) which Africanus (usually the ultimate source of the *Excerpta Barbari*) synchronizes with Ogyges (e.g. Synk 71. 4) even though the *Excerpta Barbari* does not refer to Ogyges. Synkellos (78. 19, 173. 27) quotes Africanus' figure for Attica's devastation as 189 years.

The figure of 32 years for Ogyges' reign does not appear to be preserved elsewhere (as is the case with the reign lengths of the Boiotian rulers). It is listed but not discussed by Gelzer (1885, II, 136) who seems inclined to attribute this and the Boiotian figures to Annianos (cf. Huxley's attribution of the Boiotian figures, quoted above, to Kastor which is taking the source one stage further back). Ogyges' flood is specifically synchronized by Malalas with the time of Joshua the son of Nun, while the regular chronographic tradition synchronizes it with the Exodus (as mentioned above).

Malalas does not give a From Adam year for the Exodus, simply for Moses' birth (4036) and for the death of Moses and Aaron (4156, which would also be the date for Joshua becoming leader of the Jews), leaving the Exodus date to be calculated from this. Africanus' Exodus date was 3707 (Gelzer, 1885, I, 55) and Synkellos' date for Joshua 3858. Malalas is thus once again idiosyncratic.

Further information on the Attic rulers (at IV §6, 7, Bo 71-2) is as follows:

Kekrops reigned ... for 50 years [in the time of Pharaoh Naracho], and after him Kranaos reigned for 9 years. ... After Kranaos, Phoroneus and others reigned, up to Kodros who reigned for 21 years. So their empire lasted for 492 years. In the time of the archons, ... Aischylos was the first to reign over them again ... for 21 years, and after Aischylos, Alkmaion reigned over them for 2 years. ... After Alkmaion, 18 others reigned ... up to Eryxias, who reigned for 12 years. Then the empire of the Athenians, which had lasted for 907 years, was destroyed, as Africanus the most learned chronicler has stated.

These figures correspond quite well with the lists given in, e.g., the *Excerpta Barbari* (296. 4) though Phoroneus (an Argive ruler) is an idiosyncrasy of Malalas' and appears in no other list of Athenian rulers. Kodros (and not Kodron as in the 1986 translation) is the final name in the *Excerpta Barbari* before the list of archons. The first part of the *Excerpta Barbari* archon list is represented in Malalas by the names Drakon, Solon and Thales, which do not appear in the *Excerpta*. The names Aischylos, Alkmaion (Akmaion: Ba), Eryxias (Arexion: Ba) do appear, as rulers 12, 13 and 20 on the list in the *Excerpta* but the reign lengths do not correspond. Malalas' total of 907 agrees with that of the *Excerpta*, though as Gelzer (1885, I, 152, cf. I, 154-5) points out, these are not genuine figures from Africanus.

Malalas has synchronized Kekrops with Pharaoh Naracho; Kekrops is put 249 years after Ogyges and the Exodus (Synk 78. 26) or 189 years by Africanus (Synk 173. 26). Synkellos (180. 1) comments that the 45th year of Kekrops is synchronized with the Exodus according to Eusebios (From Adam 3689, but is more correctly put in 3989).

Pharaoh Naracho remains to be elucidated (cf. p. 131); he is placed after Barach and before Gideon.

### Lakonia

At IV §17, Bo 82, we find the following:

Lakon [son of Lapathos] ... reigned for 33 years. ... After him many others reigned up to the reign of Thestios ... He built a city called Thestia ... [and] had three daughters ...

This is an empire and ruler list not, apparently, represented in the major chroniclers. Malalas, at the end of the paragraph, attributes the material to Palaiphatos, contrasting Palaiphatos' version of Menelaos' marriage to Helen and her parentage with that of the poets. As usual there is ambiguity as to how far back the source reference is intended to extend. Malalas' Palaiphatos is something of a puzzle, as is discussed in chapter 7, p. 188.

Lapathos is introduced as a ruler of Egypt, the father of two sons who become the eponymous founders of Achaia and Lakonia. In the absence at present of parallels this is perhaps best viewed as an element from an 'etymological'/aetiological history (cf. the eponymous founders provided for Cilicia, Syria, Tyre, Phoenicia, as well as the Roman provinces, as is discussed in chapter 3, p. 62), combined with a rationalizing of myth in the manner of Palaiphatos. Note that Agamemnon is hardly integrated with his appearance in the fuller, and more historical, list of the rulers of the Hellenes or Peloponnesians. The attribution of a reign length to Lakon is comparable to the reign lengths given to Agenor, Kadmos or Ogyges.

### Hellas (or the Hellenes)

From IV §18-19, 21, Bo 83-5, the following can be extracted:

|                                                       |          |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Abas reigned for                                      | 23 years |
| Proitos                                               | 17       |
| Akrisios II                                           | 31       |
| Pelops                                                | 32       |
| Thereafter the Helladikoi were called Peloponnesians. |          |
| Atreus                                                | 20       |
| Thyestes                                              | 16       |
| Agamemnon                                             | 18       |
| Aigisthos                                             | 7        |

The empire of the Hellenes, or Peloponnesians, lasted for 164 years.

Abas appears to be synchronized with Sampson, and with Dardanos of Phrygia. The list is not attributed to any authority. We have here a garbled mess that seems to indicate that Malalas had very little idea about the geography – let alone the history – of mainland Greece (cf. chapter 4, pp. 67-8, 76-7): he is juxtaposing the terms Hellas, Hellenes, Helladikoi (already used for the Sikyonians) and Peloponnesians. The lists he gives all in

fact derive from the regular list of Argive rulers, of which he had previously (IV §1, Bo 68) given a truncated and inaccurate version.

The names given here correspond to the order found in the *Excerpta Barbari* (290) and Africanus (Gelzer, 1885, I, 143), though the reign lengths do not; the list ultimately derives from Kastor (Schwartz, 1894, 11-12; cf. Synk 182. 12). The comment on Oinomaos and the changed name of the Peloponnese occurs in the *Excerpta* (290. 14; cf. chapter 4, p. 75). In all other lists the ruler following Aigisthos is Orestes. Malalas omits this (and the final name Panthilos) presumably because Orestes is dealt with at length in Book V. The total of 164 years for the Peloponnesian/Hellene empire is the total for the figures given uniquely by Malalas (i.e. the list is consistent within itself).

### Lakedaimonia

At IV §25, Bo 90, we find:

|                    |          |
|--------------------|----------|
| Eurystheus reigned | 42 years |
| 8 others for       | 246      |
| Alkamenes          | 37       |

The empire of the Lakedaimonians lasted for 325 years in all, as the most learned Africanus has written.

*Eurystheus*: 'Erystheus' Ba, Slav.

*Alkamenes*: 'Alkmainos' Ba, 'Alkmaionos' Slav.

(Note that the names in Ba have had to be emended.) Malalas' figures are consistent in themselves; they also coincide in general with the list in the *Excerpta Barbari* (306. 2 ff.), though that list is not attributed to Africanus. The *Excerpta* has an additional ruler (Automedon 25) after Alkmenes, which creates a 'final' total of 350. Gelzer (1885, I, 146, cf. Huxley, 1983) considers this an intrusive corruption from the Corinthian list; it is certainly not part of the regular Lakedaimonian list in Africanus (Gelzer, 1885, I, 143).

The *Excerpta* synchronizes the start of the Lakedaimonian list with the 20th year of Saul, which would account for the reference to Saul at Bo 90, between the Lakedaimonian and Corinthian lists.

No explicit 'From Adam' year is given by Malalas, but these lists must be set shortly before 4755 (V §69, Bo 143: From Adam to David 4755 years; Samuel, successor to Saul, appointed David).

### Corinth

At IV §25, Bo 90, we find:

|                                                     |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| After the Lakedaimonians                            |           |
| Aletes reigned for                                  | 35 years  |
| 11 others reigned for                               | 277 years |
| Automenes                                           | 1         |
| The empire of the Corinthians lasted for 313 years. |           |

*Automenes*: om. Ba, 'Automedon' Slav.

Though no authority is cited, the similarity in format to the passage a few lines before on the Lakedaimonians presumably means that the ultimate source is the same –

Africanus (cf. Gelzer, 1885, I, 98, 150, who assumes that the lists in the *Excerpta Barbari* are based on Africanus).

According to Malalas, the Corinthian empire followed after the Lakedaimonian; according to the regular chronographic system (Africanus, Eusebios, *Excerpta Barbari*, Synkellos), they were concurrent (Aletes 1 = Eurystheus 2; *Exc. Barb.* 306. 3). The regular lists number 11 rulers after Aletes, including Automenes (not 12 in all as in Malalas). Though Malalas' figures are consistent in themselves, the total in, e.g., the *Excerpta Barbari* is 323 (Synk and *Exc. Barb.* give variant figures for the reign lengths).

### Phrygia

The following table can be drawn up:

IV §15, Bo 79: Tros ... built two cities ... Troy ... and Ilion [in the time of Eglom the Zaboulonite]  
 IV §16, Bo 81: Ilios, son of Tros, reigned [at the time of Pelops' victory over Oinomaos]  
 IV §18, Bo 83: Dardanos, son of Ilios [in the time of Sampson]  
 IV §22, Bo 86: Laomedon, son of Dardanos  
 V §1, Bo 91: Priam, son of Laomedon [in the time of David]  
 V §42, Bo 108: The empire of Ephesos, which included all Asia, and of Phrygian Troy lasted for 819 years in all.

On present evidence this sequence of rulers is consistent with the narrative of the Trojan war derived from Diktys. It differs from the set of rulers given in Eusebios/Jerome, and bears no relation to the ruler list included in the 'Εκλογή 'Ιστοριῶν (C 204. 16-24) which, inserted in a Diktys-Malalas narrative, is in fact derived from Eusebian material. It is not clear where, other than his fertile mind, Malalas found the total of 819 (unless it correlates with another figure which he had in mind for Eglom).

### Lydia

The following table can be drawn up:

|                                                             |          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| VI §2, Bo 151: Ardysos reigned for                          | 36 years |
| VI §5, Bo 153: 8 others followed until                      |          |
| Kroisos the Proud                                           | 15 years |
| Thus the empire of the Lydians lasted in all for 232 years. |          |
| <i>Ardysos</i> : 'Ardeus' Ba.                               |          |

The figures in this list (not attributed to any source by Malalas) agree with those of the *Excerpta Barbari* (310-2), Synkellos (287. 11 ff.), and so probably with those of Africanus (cf. Gelzer, 1885, I, 219-22; and VI §12, Bo 158, where comments on the Samian thalassocracy following the destruction of Lydia are attributed to Africanus).

No clear synchronisms are indicated: Lydia is first mentioned after Nebuchadnezzar's capture of Jerusalem (after 5365 From Adam); other Assyrian and Lydian rulers are listed until (VI §7, Bo 153) Kroisos attacks Kyros in the 14th year of his reign, but it is difficult to see how this can be correlated with a From Adam year.

## Egypt

**We can extract the following information from Malalas:**

- |                 |                                           |                                    |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| I §15, P 19:    | Mestram ruled the Egyptians, succeeded by |                                    |
|                 | Hermes from Italy                         | 39 years                           |
|                 | Hephaistos                                | 1680 days, or 4 years and 38 days  |
| II §1, Bo 23:   | Helios                                    | 4477 days, or 12 years and 97 days |
| II §3, Bo 24-5: | Sosis                                     |                                    |
|                 | Osiris                                    |                                    |
|                 | Horus                                     |                                    |
|                 | Thoulis (Typhon <i>Exc. Barb.</i> )       |                                    |

The history of these ancient and historic empires of the Egyptians was written by Manetho.

II §4, Bo 25: Sostris (Sesostris *Chronicon Paschale*)

Gelzer (1885, I, 191ff.) demonstrates that Malalas here reflects closely a text like the *Excerpta Barbari* (284-6) and that both passages preserve Africanus' résumé of Manetho (cf. Synk 59. 28 ff., Manetho, fr. 2 and Lydus, *De Mens.* IV, 86). Gelzer (1885, I, 193) comments that a redactor of Malalas (or his source) had rationalized the distorted figures in Malalas as 'day-years' (the traditional figures for the early 'divine' dynasties of the Egyptians were astronomically high), and he attempts to use them to reconstruct Africanus' system (an attempt which is, of course, irrelevant to our purposes).

No clear synchronisations are given, but the information is set in the period after the building of the Tower of Babel (From Adam 2922) and before Phalek (From Adam 3000).

*Mestraim*: for Synkellos (58. 17) Mestraim and Nektanebo (VII §17, Bo 189; see below) stands for the first and last of the Egyptian rulers. Mestraim (cf. Manetho, fr. 2) stands for Mizraim (*Genesis* 10. 6), the name of Egypt rather than of a ruler.

II §6, Bo 27; III §6, Bo 59: Pharaoh Naracho, of the tribe of Ham

Pharaoh Naracho in Manetho (fr. 5) seems to be known only from Malalas and is a successor to the equally unknown Sostiris, whose role seems to be to explain the presence of Scythians in Persia and to introduce the Hermetic passage in II §6.

Naracho is set in the time of Abraham and information on him is attributed to Theophilos since Manetho wrote only on the ancient Egyptians (which is incorrect on several counts; for Synkellos at least Manetho's writings extended as far as Nektanebo at the end of Dynasty XXX, though it would seem that it was realized that Egyptian history continued beyond Manetho's stopping-place). Just possibly Naracho is a distortion of Nechercheus (*Exc. Barb.* 286. 2-3: Dynasty 4; Manetho, fr. 3 [FGrH IIIc, no. 609, p. 68]).

III §11, Bo 63: Petissonios, the Pharaoh who was mocked (in the time of Moses).

An element in the Iannes and Iambres story (on whom see PW 9, cols. 693-5) and not a historical figure.

IV §17, Bo 81: Lapathos reigned over Egypt ... he divided the land between his sons Achaos and Lakon.

**An unhistorical figure, introduced to be the father of the eponymous founders of Lakonia and Achaia.**

VII §17, Bo 189: During the reign of Ochos of Persia, Nektanebo ruled Egypt ... Thus the first empire of the Egyptians and Thebans lasted 1493 years. The learned chronicler Eirenaïos has related this.

Nektanebo (Manetho, fr. 3; FGrH IIIc, no. 609, p.80) represents Nektanebeus, the last ruler in Dynasty XXX. The summary note that Malalas attributes to Eirenaïos in fact reflects the ruler lists of Panodoros (cf. Gelzer, 1885, II, 136). On Panodoros, Synkellos (33.24 ff.) quotes a very complex portion of his calculations that attempts to make Egyptian chronology square with Christian reckonings and in which he squeezes most of the Egyptian dynasties into the period before 2242 and the Flood. Malalas' figure of 1493 is entirely unsupported (cf. Gelzer, 1885, II, 136).

### Assyria/Persia

From a series of passages we can extract the following information:

I §8, P 12 (After the division of territories) ... Kronos (from the tribe of Shem) ruled, ... (followed by) I §10, P 14, Picus Zeus for 4 years (30 A, B, CP, PsS, Ke, Slav), ... (then) ... Belos for 8 years (2 A, CP, Ke, Slav); ... (then came) Ninos;... (followed by) I §12, P 15, Tharras/Ares, son of Zames ... (followed by) Lames ... (followed by) Sardanapalos, ... (who was destroyed by) II §19, Bo 37, Perseus, who ruled for 53 years. III §6, Bo 59, subsequently Endeuchos, of the tribe of Shem (in the time of Abraham) ruled and later §11, Bo 62, Erechtheus, in the time of Moses and Petissonios Pharaoh.

For the *Excerpta Barbari* (280. 26ff.) the first ruler of the Assyrians was Belos, known as 'Dia' (= Zeus), who reigned for 62 years, followed by Ninus for 52 years, who is recorded as having founded Nineveh and on coming to Asia (*sic*, correctly Italy, cf. 236. 6), was called Picus. He was succeeded by Semiramis Rhea, his wife, and then by Zames for 38 years and Arius for 30. Up to this point there are points of contact with Malalas' list, but thereafter none until the 38th ruler who is 'Thonus Concelerus qui vocatur Graece Sardanapallus ann. xxx'. This list is amplified by a narrative on p. 236 ff. The narrative and list are consistent with one another and both must lie behind Malalas' text, which has however introduced distortions. Though Kronos is not on the ruler list in the *Excerpta* he is referred to as the grandfather of Picus (*Exc. Barb.* 234. 24). Picus Zeus is very likely to represent Malalas' (or his sources') misinterpretation of the discussion of alternative names for Picus (*Exc. Barb.* 236. 4 ff.; see Cook, 1914, II, 694, note 4). Areios in the *Excerpta* is not given an alternative name but he is preceded by Zames; the alternative names, derived from those of the planets, are part of Malalas' euhemerizing technique (cf. chapter 3, p. 62-63). Note that the information given in the *Excerpta* is itself a distortion of the 'conventional' list as reflected in Synkellos (e.g. 109. 16-22, 117. 20-24, 124. 17-22, 142. 20-24 where the information derives from Kastor and Annianos).

The fact that Perseus destroyed Sardanapalos and the Assyrian empire seems not to appear elsewhere (though a connection between Persia and Perseus must always have been etymologically alluring; cf. Synk 196. 11: Perseus, son of Danae, came to Assyria fleeing Dionysios, son of Semele, 640 years after Ninos, in the reign of Belimos). Perseus' assimilation into Assyrian history would appear to be the work of an etymologically minded Antiochene historian, such as the Pausanias cited at, e.g., II §20,



Bo 38. Endeuchos and Erechtheus have at present no apparent connection with any of the names on the Assyrian ruler list.

As for synchronisms, Kronos (assimilated into the Christian world structure by being assigned to the tribe of Shem) appears after the division of territories and the completion of the Tower of Babel (From Adam 2922). Note that Kronos has a father Damnos (or just possibly 'Ouranos'; I §8) who is neither described as a ruler, nor affiliated to one of Noah's sons.

From other passages we can extract the following list:

VI §1, Bo 150: Nebuchadnezzar (in the reign of Joakim) ... (succeeded by) §3, Bo 151, Balshazzar, son of Nebuchadnezzar, who was killed by Dareios the Mede. ... Other emperors followed until Asytages.

|                                               |                                                      |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| VI §7, Bo 153: Kyros                          | ( <i>Kyros II the Great 550/49-529 BC</i> )          |
| §13, Bo 158: Dareios Kambyzes and many others | ( <i>530-522 BC</i> )                                |
| §15, Bo 160: Artaxerxes                       | ( <i>c.465-424 BC</i> )                              |
| §17, Bo 162: Many others until Dareios II     | ( <i>424-405 BC</i> )                                |
| §28, Bo 169: Artaxerxes Mnemon, for 39 years  | ( <i>c.436-358 BC</i> )                              |
| VII §17, Bo 189: Ochos                        | ( <i>Artaxerxes III Ochos 359/8-337BC</i> )          |
| §19, Bo 191: Dareios the Mede, son of Assalam | ( <i>Dareios III, son of Arsames, c.380-330 BC</i> ) |

VIII §1, Bo 192: In the 4th year of Dareios Alexander attacked and overthrew him.

Note that these are listed as ruling over Assyrians, Persians, Medes and Babylonians indiscriminately; it is not clear that there was any distinction in Malalas' mind between these ethnic groups and empires.

As for synchronisms, Nebuchadnezzar is put in the reign of Joakim (From Adam 5365; V §73, Bo 149 and VI §1, Bo 150; Astyages is attached to the Lydians, in the year in which Thales predicted an eclipse (and many other secular episodes are noted). In the 14th year of Kyros, Kroisos of Lydia attacked Persia; Daniel was active under Kyros, who freed the Israelites. The episode of Judith and Holofernes took place under Daniel, while it is regularly put under Nebuchadnezzar who is equated with Cambyses (Gelzer, 1885, I, 109-11); Malalas is idiosyncratic once again and is consequently dismissed by Gelzer. Under Artaxerxes the Temple was reconstructed (VI §17, Bo 162). Mention of Dareios II is followed by reference to Telephos, and Artaxerxes Mnemon comes after a reference to the high priest Eliakim and before a reference to Albas, son of Askanios (VI §28, Bo 169). Ochos captured Egypt when Nektanebo was ruler there. Dareios the Mede is mentioned immediately after Alexander and (VIII §1, Bo 192) in the 4th year of Dareios' reign Alexander began his campaign.

All these are secular synchronisms, but the last can be tied on to VIII §2, Bo 194: 'Thus from Adam to Alexander of Macedon's victory there were 5557 years' (note that, as mentioned above, p. 115, since the time of Chilmead it is clear that this date must refer to Alexander's birth; is this another sign of Malalas' inadequate arithmetic or a misinterpreted source?). These rulers are therefore set between 5365 and 5557 From Adam.

Malalas' sequence of Assyrian-Persian rulers corresponds in general with the list in the *Excerpta Barbari* (which Gelzer takes to be a reflection of that of Africanus; Gelzer, 1885, I, 104), though Malalas gives no reign lengths and telescopes the several references

to Daniel into one, and has some material (e.g. the Judith/Holofernes episode) not in the *Excerpta*. Malalas' most striking idiosyncrasy is his division of the Dareios who followed Baltasar/Belshazzar into two figures, widely separated in time – Dareios the Mede and Astyages. Dareios (cf. Synk 276. 9) had several names (Nebonnedos, Astyages, as well as Dareios). The name Astyages does not appear in the *Excerpta*. The 'many others' of VI §17 are represented in the *Excerpta* by Xerxes, son of Xerxes, and Sogdianus. That there is a connection between the information in the *Excerpta* and that in Malalas, despite the many omissions and distortions, is clear from the comment on Nektanebo and Ochos (VII §17, Bo 189; cf. *Exc. Barb.* 266. 21-268. 2).

## Italy

In Book I we find:

I §9, P 13, Kronos went off to the West ... from Assyria, ... reigning over all the West for many years; I §10, P 14, Picus Zeus ... went off to the West (where Kronos) yielded to him his rule over the West ... Picus Zeus reigned ... for another 62 years. I §14, P 18, after the death of Picus Zeus his son Faunus Hermes reigned over Italy for 35 years. (He then went to Egypt.)

Elsewhere we find:

VI §16, Bo 161: Herakles (of the family of Herakles, son of Alkmene and Picus Zeus) came from Spain to Italy and reigned for 38 years. ... VI §17, Bo 162, Telephos, son of Auge and Herakles, reigned over Italy, ... (followed by) Latinus, son of Telephos, for 18 years.

VI §24, Bo 168: Aineias married Albania, Latinus' daughter, and reigned for 19 years (in Albania)

VI §25, Bo 168: Askanios Julius reigned for 25 years (35 Ke, Slav)

VI §29, Bo 169: Albas reigned for 36 years. ... Then the Aineiades reigned for 331 years

VII §1, Bo 171: Then Romus and Remus began to reign

VII §8, Bo 181: Six others followed until Tarquinius Superbus; the empire was taken from him

VII §14, Bo 188: After the expulsion of Tarquinius, Brutus and Collatinus became consuls and administered the city. Many other consuls followed, for 464 years until Julius Caesar.

The figures Malalas gives for reign lengths from Herakles to Albas agree with those of the *Excerpta Barbari* (apart from that for Askanios, and there the Slavonic texts and Kedrenos give the 'correct' figure); the total for the Aineiades (331 in Malalas) is not expressed as such in the *Excerpta*, but the individual reign lengths listed there total 329. It is a moot point how much of this reflects Africanus' material (Gelzer, 1885, I, 222-46), but clearly Malalas' text is very closely connected to that in the *Excerpta*. Nevertheless the From Adam dates of the *Excerpta* bear no relation to the 5362 that Malalas inserts at VI §17.

As for synchronisms, at I §9 Kronos (cf. under Assyria/Persia above), of the tribe of Shem, is set in the period after the division of territories (From Adam 2922; I §5, P 11) and before Phalek and the year 3000 (II §12, Bo 34). This applies also to Picus Zeus and Faunus Hermes, though the total reign length given ('many years', '62 years', '35 years' must have taken the From Adam total past 3000.

At VI §16 Herakles of the family of Herakles, son of Alkmene and Picus Zeus, seems to be synchronized with Kranos (more correctly Karanos) of Macedonia and with the second reconstruction of the Temple and the From Adam year of 5362 (which Gelzer finds inordinately puzzling). Comparison with the *Excerpta* (238. 20) reveals that

Herakles follows on immediately after Faunus Hermes (and an *Excerpta* From Adam date of 4100), with no long break such as is implied by the way in which Malalas' narrative is divided between Books I and VI.

### Macedonia

In Book VI we find:

VI §16, Bo 161: At that time emperors reigned over the land of Macedonia. First Kranos reigned for 28 years. Then another 23 emperors reigned until Philip.

*Kranos* Ba: 'Karanos' corr. Chil.

*23 emperors* Ba: '26 emperors' Ke.

VII §19, Bo 190: Philip reigned over Macedonia for 20 years. ... The empire, or toparchy, of Macedonia lasted for 602 years, until the reign of Philip, as the most learned Eusebios Pamphilou has chronicled. After Philip, Alexander the son of Philip ruled Macedonia.

In Book VIII we find:

VIII §1, Bo 193: Alexander freed the cities and territories and all the land of the Romans, Hellenes and Egyptians from subjection and slavery to Assyrians, Persians, Parthians and Medes; he restored to the Romans all they had lost.

VIII §2, Bo 194: Thus from Adam to Alexander of Macedon's victory there were 5557 years.

*victory*: As mentioned in section 1, date no. 14 above, p. 115, Chilmead (Bo 547) has demonstrated that this figure must refer to Alexander's birth and not his victory over Dareios (cf. VIII §4, Bo 195, where 5593 is given for Alexander's death after a life of 36 years).

VIII §5, Bo 196: Philip ... Kassandros ... Kassandros' sons ... Demetrios ... Pyrrhos of Epirus ... Meleagros ... six others ... until ... Perseus of Epirus. Their empire lasted for 157 years after the death of Alexander.

On synchronisms we find that Karanos is mentioned just after Artaxerxes (and the rebuilding of the Temple by Nehemiah) and just before the return of Herakles from Spain and the incomprehensible From Adam date of 5362 (which in this case by no means squares with Alexander's death and 'birth' dates of 5593 and 5537 years From Adam, and the 60 years of Macedonian rule from Karanos to Philip.

Once again there is a close connection between the *Excerpta Barbari* and Malalas. The first ruler is given the same mis-spelling ('Cranaus' for Καρᾶνός), though the reign length of 28 years is found in other sources also. Gelzer, 1885, I, 156, comments that the *Excerpta* lists give the same total (157 years) for the rulers after Alexander as that given explicitly by Malalas (VIII §5). There are also significant similarities in VIII §1 (= *Exc. Barb.* 244. 15-16) and VIII §4 (= *Exc. Barb.* 274. 12-18), on Alexander restoring territory to the Romans, though these elements do not come from the ruler lists. However, the list in the *Excerpta* contains 25 rulers (inclusive) from Cranaus to Alexander (not the 23 or 26 of Malalas), and several names on the list of successors are omitted. (Gelzer also comments [1885, II, 136] that Malalas' information on the Macedonians, Ptolemies and Seleucids can in no way be reconciled with that of Theophilus.)

## Ptolemies

In Book VIII §6-8, Bo 196-7, we find a list of the Ptolemies who ruled in Egypt:

|                                                                                                                                                                   |                         |                                            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Ptolemy, son of Lagos                                                                                                                                             | 42 ys (40 corr. Gelzer) | (Ptolemy I Soter 305-282 BC) <sup>12</sup> |
| Ptolemy his son                                                                                                                                                   |                         |                                            |
| Ptolemy III Philadelphos                                                                                                                                          | 37                      | (Ptolemy II Philadelphos 282-246 BC)       |
| Ptolemy IV Euergetes                                                                                                                                              | 25                      | (Ptolemy III Euergetes c.246-222 BC)       |
| Ptolemy V Philopator                                                                                                                                              | 17                      | (Ptolemy IV Philopator c.222-205 BC)       |
| Ptolemy VI Epiphanes                                                                                                                                              | – (25 Slav)             | (Ptolemy V Epiphanes 204-180 BC)           |
| Ptolemy VII Philometor                                                                                                                                            | 11                      | (Ptolemy VI Philometor 180-145 BC)         |
| Five other Ptolemies                                                                                                                                              | 92 (190 Slav)           |                                            |
| Ptolemy XII Dionysios                                                                                                                                             | 29                      | (Ptolemy XII Auletes 80-51 BC)             |
| Cleopatra (Ptolemy XIII)                                                                                                                                          | 22 (29 Slav)            | (Cleopatra VII Philopator 69-30 BC)        |
| 13 (20 Slav) Macedonian Ptolemies ... from Ptolemy, son of Lagos, to Cleopatra, daughter of Dionysios, for 300 years, until the 15th year of ... Augustus Caesar. |                         |                                            |

Gelzer (1885, I, 273) suggests that this list is essentially that of Africanus, pointing to the total of 300 years for the dynasty (I, 268, based on Eusebios *HE* VIII. 2 and Synk) and the 11 years for Philometor (elsewhere, e.g. *Exc. Barb.* 278. 10, Philometor's reign is 35 years); the reign length of Ptolemy, son of Lagos, however, needs to be emended from 42 to 40. It should be noted that there is an intrusive Ptolemy inserted after Ptolemy, son of Lagos (and not discussed by Gelzer).

It should also be noted that in the *Excerpta Barbari*, and in Gelzer's lists, the Ptolemies are not numbered as they are by Malalas, though they are in the *Excerpta*'s second list, at 320. 7 ff., which however differ considerably from Malalas in both number of rulers and totals. It should be remarked too that Malalas' numbers for the Ptolemies are wrong (they are out by one from Ptolemy II Philadelphos to Ptolemy VI Philometor because of the introduction of an intrusive Ptolemy after 'Ptolemy, son of Lagos').

As for synchronisms, Ptolemy, son of Lagos, is presumably put in the year of Alexander's death (5593 From Adam); the defeat of Cleopatra in the 15th year of Augustus is 300 years later, which would thus be 5893. But this is impossible by Malalas' statement of X §2, Bo 228, that Christ's incarnation took place in the 42nd year of Augustus, in the year 5967 (note that it is also impossible by the alternative incarnation date of 5500); the 15th year of Augustus by this reckoning would be 5973 and not the 5893 implied by Malalas' dates for Alexander. So, regrettably, one must conclude that Malalas' figures are either sadly corrupt, or his cosmic arithmetic was as muddled as he feared it might be. In mitigation, however, it is perhaps worth pointing out that he is combining a multiplicity of conflicting and frequently corrupt sources, and that he is not the only chronicler to have had difficulties with his totals.

## Seleucids

From Book VIII we can extract the following list of Seleucid rulers of Syria:

|                   |                     |                              |
|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| VIII §11, Bo 198: | Seleukos Nikator    | 43 years (§20: died aged 72) |
| §21, Bo 204:      | Antiochos Soter     | 20                           |
|                   | Antiochos Theoeides | 15                           |
|                   | Seleukos Kallinikos | 24                           |

<sup>12</sup>Details are taken from Bickerman, 1980, 128-9.

|              |                               |     |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----|
|              | Alexander Nikator             | 36* |
|              | Seleukos Philopator           | 10  |
|              | Antiochos Epiphanes           | 12  |
| §23, Bo 207: | Antiochos Glaukos Hierax      | 2   |
| §24, Bo 207: | Demetrianos                   | 8   |
| §25, Bo 208: | Antiochos, grandson of Grypos | 9   |
| §26, Bo 208: | Antiochos Euergetes           |     |
|              | Nine other rulers until       |     |

Antiochos, son of Dionikes (*Dionysos Slav*)

VIII §34, Bo 213: Thus the Macedonians ruled Antioch the Great, that is, Syria, Cilicia, and other lands, for 263 years from Seleukos Nikator until the empire was given to the Romans.

\*'Alexander Nikator 4 years, and Antiochos Grypes 36 years' Slav.

Note that this list bears absolutely no relationship to the list in the *Excerpta Barbari* (318. 6 ff.). Malalas has clearly moved to an entirely different type of source, or sources; cf. Downey, 1938, 117-8.

This list is grossly confused, as clearly stated by Downey; the most probable identifications, following Downey, are these:

|                                                     |                                                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Seleukos Nikator                                    | <i>Seleukos I Nikator died 280/1 BC</i>                           |
| Antiochos Soter                                     | <i>Antiochos I Soter 281-61 BC</i>                                |
| Antiochos Theoeides                                 | <i>Antiochos II Theos 261-46 BC</i>                               |
| Seleukos Kallinikos                                 | <i>Seleukos II Kallinikos 246-226 BC</i>                          |
| Alexander Nikator                                   | <i>Seleukos III Soter 226-223 BC</i>                              |
| Antiochos Grypos                                    | <i>Antiochos III the Great 223-187 BC</i>                         |
| Seleukos Philopator                                 | <i>Seleukos IV Philopator 187/6-176/5 BC</i>                      |
| Antiochos Epiphanes                                 | <i>Antiochos IV Epiphanes 175-164 BC</i>                          |
| Antiochos Glaukos Hierax (son of Epiphanes)         | <i>[Error for] Antiochos V Eupator, son of Epiphanes 164-2 BC</i> |
| Demetrianos                                         | <i>Demetrios I Soter 162-50 BC</i>                                |
| Antiochos, grandson of Grypos                       |                                                                   |
|                                                     | <i>Alexander Balas 150-45 BC</i>                                  |
|                                                     | <i>Demetrios II Nikator 146-125 BC</i>                            |
|                                                     | <i>Antiochos VI Dionysos 145-42 BC</i>                            |
|                                                     | <i>Tryphon Diodotos 140-37 BC</i>                                 |
| Antiochos Euergetes                                 | <i>Antiochos VII Euergetes Sidetes 138-129 BC</i>                 |
| Nine other rulers until                             | <i>Alexander II Zabinas 128-123 BC</i>                            |
|                                                     | <i>Antiochos VIII Grypos 125-96 BC</i>                            |
|                                                     | <i>Seleukos V 125 BC</i>                                          |
|                                                     | <i>Antiochos IX Kyzikenos 116-95 BC</i>                           |
|                                                     | <i>Antiochos X Eusebes 94-83 BC</i>                               |
|                                                     | <i>Antiochos XI Epiphanes Philadelphos 92 BC</i>                  |
|                                                     | <i>Philip I 92-83 BC</i>                                          |
|                                                     | <i>Demetrios III 95-88 BC</i>                                     |
|                                                     | <i>Antiochos XII Dionysos 89-84 BC</i>                            |
|                                                     | <i>[Tigranes 84-69 BC]</i>                                        |
| Antiochos, son of Dionikes ( <i>Dionysos Slav</i> ) | <i>Antiochos XIII Asiaticos 68 and 65 BC</i>                      |
|                                                     | <i>Philip II Barypous 67/6 BC</i>                                 |

Downey also points out (1938, 113) that three rulers are mentioned in Malalas' account of the imperial period but do not appear in his information on the Seleucids: at IX §21, Bo 225, Philip Barypous = Philip II, 67-6 B.C.; at X §9, Bo 234, Antiochos

Philadelphos = Antiochos XI Epiphanes Philadelphos, 92 B.C.; and at X §10, Bo 235, Antiochos Philopator = Antiochos IX or XII.

Downey (1938, 114) concludes from the peculiarities of this list that Malalas had access to two different sources on Antiochene history, of which the one referring to the earlier material was the more reliable. His reasons were that as far as Antiochos, grandson of Grypos, the totals, though not historically accurate, are internally consistent but thereafter the list of rulers is sketchy and no reign lengths are given and, finally, there are three rulers mentioned only in a later section of the narrative. Downey, however, does not suggest what these two sources might have been. There is also no conspicuous break in style or format after the entry on Antiochos son of Grypos and, in fact, a reference to Domninos (the putative Antiochene chronicler who was one of Malalas' major sources) intervenes with the very earthquake that had set Downey off on his chronological enquiries.

This is an element which needs to be explored more fully through texts like the *Excerpta Barbari*. For the moment what is of importance is that this list is qualitatively different from the other ruler lists which have clear connections (usually) to Africanus via the *Excerpta*. It is interesting, too, to note that Malalas' information on Antioch, from what looks like an Antiochene source, is so garbled.

From this point on the chronicle has moved into imperial and secular chronologies. There is the major synchronism at X §1-2 when Christ's birth in 5967 (Malalas' preferred From Adam date) or 5500 (by the system he rejects) is put in the 42nd year of Augustus but thereafter there are no synchronisms until the death of Zeno (XV §16, Bo 391) and, finally, the second consulship of Justinian (XVIII §8, Bo 428).

#### 4. Roman imperial reigns

From Book X onwards the main chronological referencing system functions by imperial reigns. There are no From Adam dates between Christ's incarnation and the death of Zeno. Since other chroniclers, like the *Chronicon Paschale*, Synkellos or Theophanes, give From Adam (or *anno mundi*) dates for emperors this seems a further indication that Malalas' cosmic structures were out of the ordinary.

The following list attempts to present the information on imperial reigns in both Rome and Constantinople that is noted by Malalas, combined with the names and reign lengths given in the *Laterculus Malalianus* (a significant if somewhat enigmatic witness to the original Malalas; see chapter 9, pp. 287-99). The order followed is essentially that of Malalas. Dates for imperial reigns by the A.D. system have been added, using Bickerman, 1980, 163-5 for emperors from Augustus to Constantine I and Ostrogorsky, 1968, 578, thereafter. There are some doubts over the identification of some rulers in the third century and the *Laterculus*, like modern lists, has ignored most of the tetrarchic rulers in the early fourth century. Malalas' inaccuracies in dating reigns and in reign lengths will be discussed in the forthcoming commentary.

**Key:**

Names: **Bold**: an entry in Malalas and LM; *italics*: an entry in Malalas but not in LM; **Bold Italics**: an entry in LM but not in Malalas; Plain: an emperor not mentioned either in Malalas or LM.

Reign lengths: *Italics*: an entry in LM that agrees with Malalas; **Bold Italics\***: an entry in LM that does not agree with that in Malalas; Plain: an entry in LM that does not appear in Malalas.

Augustus [27 B.C.-A.D. 14] (IX §22, Bo 225) reigned for 56 years; (X §6 Bo 232) died aged 75; 55 yrs

Tiberius [14-37] (X §7, Bo 232) reigned for 22 years; (X §16, Bo 243) died aged 78; 22 1/2 yrs

Caligula [37-41] (X §17 Bo 243) Helios Gaius Caligula reigned for 4 years 7 months; (X §21, Bo 245) died aged 39; 4 yrs 7 mths

Claudius [41-54] (X §22, Bo 246) Claudius Caesar Germanicus ... 14 years and 9 months; (X §28, Bo 250) died aged 65; 14 yrs 9 mths

Nero [54-68] (X §29, Bo 250) reigned for 13 years and 2 months; (X §40, Bo 258) died aged 69; 13 yrs 2 mths

Galba [68-69] (X §41, Bo 258) reigned for 7 months; (X §41, Bo 258) died aged 49; 1 yr 7 mths\*

Otho [69] (X §42, Bo 258) Lucius Otho reigned for 3 months; (X §42, Bo 259) died aged 53; 3 mths

Vitellius [69] (X §43, Bo 259) reigned for 9 years and 8 months (8 1/2: Slav); (X §43, Bo 259) died aged 48; 9 yrs 8 1/2 mths

Vespasian [69-79] (X §44, Bo 259) reigned for 9 years and 10 months; (X §46, Bo 262) died aged 71; 9 yrs 10 mths

Titus [79-81] (X §47, Bo 262) reigned for 2 years; (X §47, Bo 262) died aged 42; 2 yrs

Domitian [81-96] (X §48, Bo 262) reigned for 15 years and 2 months; (X §52, Bo 267) died aged 45; 15 yrs 2 mths

Nerva [96-98] (X §53, Bo 267) reigned for 1 year and 1 month; (X §54, Bo 268) died aged 71; 1 yr 1 mth

Trajan [98-117] (XI §1, Bo 269) reigned for 19 years and 6 months; (XI §12, Bo 277) died aged 60; 19 yrs 6 mths

Hadrian [117-138] (XI §13, Bo 277) Aelius Hadrian reigned for 22 years and 5 months; (XI §20, Bo 280) died aged 65; 22 yrs\*

Antoninus Pius [138-161] (XI §21, Bo 280) Aelius Antoninus Pius reigned for 23 years; (XI §27, Bo 281) died aged 77; 23 yrs

Marcus Aurelius [161-180] (XI §28, Bo 281) Marcus Antoninus reigned for 18 years and 9 months; (XI §31, Bo 282) died (no age given); 18 yrs 9 mths

Lucius Verus [161-169] (XI §32, Bo 282) Antoninus Verus reigned for 8 years; (XI §33, Bo 283) died aged 39; 1 yr\*

Commodus [176-192] (XII §1, Bo 283) reigned for 22 years and 8 months; (XII §13, Bo 290) died (no age given); 22 yrs 8 mths

Pertinax [193] (XII §14, Bo 290) Pertinax Lucius Augustus reigned for 2 months and 18 days; (XII §14, Bo 290) died aged 70; 1 yr 2 mths 18 days\*

Didius Julianus [193] (XII §15, Bo 290) Didius Julianus Silvius reigned for 7 months; (XII §17, Bo 291) died aged 60; 7 mths

Septimius Severus [193-211] (XII §18, Bo 291) Severus Septimius reigned for 17 years and 9 months; (XII §22, Bo 295) died aged 65; 17 yrs 9 1/2 mths\*

Clodius Albinus [193-197]

Pescennius Niger [193-194]

Geta [209-222] (XII §23, Bo 295) Antoninus Getas reigned for 1 year; died aged 51; 1 yr

Caracalla [198-217] (XII §24, Bo 295) Antoninus Caracallus reigned for 6 years and 22 days; (XII §25, Bo 295) died aged 47; 6 yrs 22 days

**Valerian**<sup>13</sup>

|                                                                                                                            |                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Macrinus</b> [217-218]                                                                                                  | 1 yr 7 mths         |
| <b>Diadumenianus</b> [218] ( <i>Alius Antoninus</i> )                                                                      | 4 yrs 2 mths        |
| <b>Alexander Mamaea</b>                                                                                                    | 8 yrs 4 mths        |
| <b>Elagabalus</b> [218-222]                                                                                                |                     |
| <b>Severus Alexander</b> [222-235]                                                                                         |                     |
| <b>Maximinus</b> [235-238] ( <i>Maximus</i> )                                                                              | 3 yrs 10 mths       |
| <b>Balbinus</b> [238]                                                                                                      | 1 yr 3 mths         |
| <b>Pupienus</b> [238]                                                                                                      | 3 1/2 mths          |
| <b>Gordian I</b> [238]                                                                                                     | 22 days             |
| <b>Gordian II</b> [238]                                                                                                    | 22 yrs              |
| <b>Gordian III</b> [238-244]                                                                                               | 6 yrs               |
| <b>Marcus</b>                                                                                                              | 6 yrs               |
| <b>Philip (the Arab)</b> [244-249]                                                                                         | 6 1/2 yrs           |
| <b>Valerianus</b>                                                                                                          | 2 1/2 yrs           |
| <b>Gallus</b> ( <i>parvissimus</i> )                                                                                       | 5 mths              |
| <b>Decius</b> [249-251]                                                                                                    | 1 yr 8 mths         |
| <b>Trebonianus</b> [251-253]                                                                                               |                     |
| <b>Volusianus</b> [251-253]                                                                                                |                     |
| <b>Aemilianus</b> [253]                                                                                                    | 4 mths              |
| <b>Valerian</b> [253-260] (XII §26, Bo 295) reigned for 6 years; died aged 61;                                             | 6 yrs               |
| <b>Gallienus</b> [253-268] (XII §27, Bo 298) Gallienus Licinianus reigned for 14 years; died aged 56;                      | 14 yrs              |
| <b>Claudius II</b> [268-270] (XII §28, Bo 298) Claudius Apollianus reigned for 9 years; died aged 50;                      | 9 yrs               |
| <b>Quintillus</b> [270] (XII §29, Bo 299) Quintilian reigned for 17 days; died aged 41;                                    | 17 days             |
| <b>Aurelian</b> [270-275] (XII §30, Bo 299) reigned for 6 years; died aged 61;                                             | 6 yrs               |
| <b>Tacitus</b> [275-276] (XII §31, Bo 301) reigned for 7 months; died aged 75;                                             | 7 mths              |
| <b>Florianus</b> [276] (XII §33, Bo 301) reigned for 2 months; died aged 65;                                               | 2 mths              |
| <b>Probus</b> [276-282] (XII §33, Bo 302) Aelius Probus reigned for 3 years and 3 months; died aged 50;                    | 3 yrs 3 mths        |
| <b>Carus</b> [282-283] (XII §34, Bo 302) reigned for 2 years; died aged 60 and 1/2;                                        | 2 yrs               |
| <b>Numerianus</b> [283-284] (XII §35, Bo 303) reigned for 2 years; died aged 36;                                           | 2 yrs               |
| <b>Carinus</b> [283-285] (XII §36, Bo 304) reigned for 2 years; died aged 32;                                              | 2 yrs               |
| <b>Diocletian</b> [284-305] (XII §37, Bo 306) reigned for 20 years and 9 months; (XII §44, Bo 310) died aged 72;           | -                   |
| <b>Diocletian et Maximinus</b>                                                                                             | 19 yrs              |
| <b>Maximianus</b> [286-305] (XII §45, Bo 311) Maximian Herculus reigned for 19 years; (XII §46, Bo 312) died aged 46;      | -                   |
| <b>Galerius</b> [293-311] (XII §47, Bo 312) Maxentius Galerius reigned for 3 years; died aged 53; -                        | -                   |
| <b>Constantius I</b> [293-306] (XII §48, Bo 313) Constantius Chlorus reigned for 13 years; died aged 60;                   | -                   |
| <b>Maximus Licinianus</b> (XII §49, Bo 314) reigned for 7 years in Rome; died aged 46;                                     | 7 yrs <sup>14</sup> |
| <b>Constantine I</b> [306-337] (XIII §1, Bo 316) reigned for 32 years; (XIII §14, Bo 324) died aged 60 years and 3 months; | 32 yrs              |
| <b>Constantine I</b> (XIII §15, Bo 324) reigned in Rome for 12 years; died aged 20;                                        | -                   |
| <b>Constant</b> (XIII §16, Bo 325) reigned in Rome for 6 years; died aged 27;                                              | -                   |
| <b>Constantius II</b> [337-361] (XIII §17, Bo 325) reigned in Constantinople for 30 years; died aged 40;                   | 1 yr*               |
| <b>Jullan</b> [361-363] (XIII §18, Bo 326) reigned for 7 years; (XIII §24, Bo 333) died aged 33; 7 yrs                     |                     |

<sup>13</sup>A doublet; see entry after Aemilianus.<sup>14</sup>Out of order in LM: after Numerianus and Carinus.



|                                                                                                                                                         |                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Jovian [363-364] (XIII §26, Bo 334) reigned for 7 months; (XIII §27, Bo 337) died aged 60;                                                              | 7 1/2 mths*         |
| Valentinian I [364-375] (XIII §28, Bo 337) Valentinian the Ruthless reigned for 16 years; (XIII §32, Bo 341) died aged 55;                              | 17 yrs*             |
| Eugenius [392-4] (XIII §33, Bo 341) reigned for 22 days;                                                                                                | –                   |
| Valens [364-378] (XIII §33, Bo 342) reigned for 13 years; (XIII §35, Bo 343) died aged 49;                                                              | 13 yrs              |
| Gratian [367-383] (XIII §36, Bo 343) reigned for 17 years; died aged 28;                                                                                | 17yrs 10mths*       |
| Valerian (XIII §36, Bo 344) reigned in Rome for a very few years;                                                                                       | –                   |
| Valentinian (XIII §36, Bo 344) reigned in Rome;                                                                                                         | –                   |
| Theodosius I [379-395] (XIII §37, Bo 344) reigned for 17 years; (XIII §45, Bo 348) died aged 65;                                                        | 17 yrs              |
| Arcadius [395-408] (XIII §46, Bo 349) reigned for 23 years; (XIII §47, Bo 349) died aged 31;                                                            | 23 yrs              |
| Honorius [393-423] (XIII §48, Bo 349) reigned in Rome for 31 years; (XIII §50, Bo 350) died aged 42;                                                    | 31 yrs              |
| Theodosius II [408-450] (XIV §1, Bo 351) reigned for 50 years and 7 months; (XIV §27, Bo 367) died aged 51;                                             | 48 yrs*             |
| Valentinian (XIV §7, Bo 356) reigned in Rome;                                                                                                           | –                   |
| Marclan [450-457] (XIV §28, Bo 367) reigned for 6 years and 5 months; (XIV §34, Bo 368) died aged 65;                                                   | 6yrs 5mths          |
| Leo I [457-474] (XIV §35, Bo 369) reigned for 16 years and 11 months; (XIV §46, Bo 376) died aged 73;                                                   | 16yrs 11mths        |
| Anthimius [467-74] (XIV §35, Bo 369) reigned in Rome;                                                                                                   | –                   |
| Leo II [474] (XIV §47, Bo 376) reigned for 1 year and 23 days; died aged 7;                                                                             | 1yr 22days*         |
| Zeno [474-5, 476-91] (XV §1, Bo 377) reigned for 15 years; (XV §6, Bo 380) for 15 years and 2 months; (XV §16, Bo 391) died aged 60 years and 9 months; | 15yrs 2 mths        |
| Basiliscus [475-6] (XV §3, Bo 378) and Marcus;                                                                                                          | –                   |
| Anastasius [491-518] (XVI §1, Bo 392) reigned 27 years and 3 months; (XVI §22, Bo 409) died aged 90 years 5 months;                                     | 27yrs 9mths 9 days* |
| Justin I [518-527] (XVII §1, Bo 410) reigned for 9 years and 22 days; (XVII §23, Bo 424) died aged 75                                                   | 9yrs 22days         |
| Justinian I [527-565] (XVIII §1, Bo 425) reigned for 38 years 7 months and 13 days (cf. Slav, CP);                                                      | 39 1/2 yrs*         |
| Justin II [565-578]                                                                                                                                     | 9 yrs               |

Malalas' notices on emperors follow a regular pattern. On noting an imperial accession he gives the name, the length of the reign and a brief portrait (see also chapter 8, pp. 231-44), which usually refers to physical features but can include a comment on religious affiliation and which circus faction was favoured; not infrequently a consular date is given for the accession; two or more names or a distinctive title are sometimes noted. On recording an emperor's death Malalas notes the emperor's age and almost invariably gives the cause of death. This pattern can be observed from Augustus through to Justinian (and beyond the end of the chronicle, for portraits on imperial accessions are to be found in Theophanes too). Between the accession and the death notice a varied range of material is found, sometimes sparse, sometimes copious, since from Augustus (and Book X) onwards Malalas arranges his chronicle by imperial reigns. Imperial activities that concern Malalas include: building (especially in Antioch, and especially after natural disasters), creation of provinces, conduct of wars and peace negotiations, and – less frequently – interventions in religious disputes and making of laws (as is discussed in

chapters 1, pp. 10-11 and 7, pp. 204 ff.). This wide range of imperial activity is clearly drawn from a variety of sources; however, the accession and death notices, together with the portraits, seem to hang together as though derived from a single document, which listed just those items. Von Stauffenburg (1931, 508) suggests that there was a list of brief imperial lives in existence which supplied Malalas with this information.

A propos of Constantine I (XIII §14, Bo 324), Malalas explicitly attributes his information on emperors to Nestorianos, and then notes later that Nestorianos' chronicle ended with the death of Leo II, in 474 (XIV §47, Bo 376). Material, on topics connected with church history that could be attributed to this otherwise unknown writer, can be traced from Book X onwards but it is difficult to decide how much else should be attributed to him. Bourier (1899, I, 26) is inclined to postulate a document which includes lists of accessions, portraits and deaths but does not define it more closely; this point is discussed further in chapter 7, p. 199. The portraits may well have had a separate existence, as is indicated in chapter 8, pp. 242-3.

It certainly looks, however, as though Malalas was using a list of imperial accessions and obits. If this putative text had anything to do with Nestorianos then it must have ended in 474, with the death of Leo II. It is worth noting, as is discussed in chapter 8, p. 243, that there is no portrait for Zeno in the surviving text of Malalas, but there is a hint that other witnesses, e.g. the Slavonic text, attempted to fill this perceived gap: could this indicate a disjunction as Malalas moves away from the support of a full set of sources to compiling a narrative of his own? If, however, this conjectured list had nothing to do with Nestorianos, then we have no idea when and where it ceased.

The information on emperors in Malalas has no connection with the list in the *Excerpta Barbari* (although this is, in fact, a list of the sort that Malalas must have been using). The *Excerpta* numbers the emperors; it gives the reign lengths, but not the emperors' age at death, nor their means of death, nor any portraits; it also includes the number of consulships held. Each emperor is usually referred to by a single name only, and no titles are recorded. The information from *Excerpta Barbari* has not been noted on the list given above since there is clearly no connection between the two.

On the other hand, there is clearly a close connection between the list of emperors at the end of the *Laterculus* and the information embedded in Malalas, as the list given above demonstrates. Though there are a number of differences, they are slight. For example, not all the reign lengths agree exactly (as in the cases of Hadrian, Verus, Pertinax etc.); there is a lacuna in Malalas/Ba in Book XII but material from this area appears in the *Laterculus* and the gap in Ba must be due to physical damage to an exemplar in the Ba tradition since the information in the *Laterculus* is reflected in Constantine Porphyrogennetos' excerpts and in Skoutariotes' history. It looks as though the author of the *Laterculus* has gone through Malalas' chronicle extrapolating the regnal details, ignoring the emperors in Rome and simply listing those based in Constantinople. One should note too that large portions of Book X (discussing the date of Christ's incarnation and in which millennium the world now is) also appear in the *Laterculus*, as is discussed in chapter 9, pp. 292-3.

The status of the last entry in the *Laterculus* ('Justin, 9 years') is difficult, as has been discussed in chapter 1, pp. 24-5, in connection with the editions of the chronicle. It could indicate: 1. that the chronicle's final version continued to the ninth year of Justin (i.e. to 574), as Mommsen, 1898, 424 assumed; 2. that this entry is merely an (inaccurate) doublet of the entry for Justin I; or 3. that there was a note in the copy used by the compiler of the *Laterculus* that that particular manuscript was copied or revised in the ninth year of Justin II, a process which need not have involved the entry of additional material in the chronicle after the end of Justinian's reign.

## 5. Consuls

The entries on this list have been checked against Degraffi, 1952, the edition of Books IX-XII of Malalas' chronicle by von Stauffenberg (references to whose discussions, if any, are given) and Bagnall/Cameron/Schwartz/Worp, 1987, for the consuls after 284.<sup>15</sup> Parallels are cited here from the *Fasti Vindobonenses Priores et Posteriores*,<sup>16</sup> since there are a number of interesting if inconclusive resemblances, and the *Excerpta Barbari* which has elsewhere proved to be relevant.

VII §14, Bo 188: After Tarquinius was expelled, Brutus the Great and Collatinus were consuls ... Many other consuls followed, for 464 years, until Julius Caesar.  
*Collatinus* (corr. Chil.): 'Callatinos' Bo.

Cf. IX §1, Bo 214: The Roman state was administered formerly by consuls, for 464 years, until Julius Caesar the dictator; IX §3, Bo 216: He (Julius Caesar) appointed those whom he wanted each year as consul.

(Cf. *Exc. Barb.* 330. 16-17 'Hic (i.e. Julius Caesar) et consolatium unumquemque annum fieri constituit'.)

IX §7, Bo 217: (Caesar was killed) in the consulship of Isauricus and, for the second time, of Antony.

*Isauricus* (corr. Chil.): 'Chrysaureus' Ba.

41 B.C.: L. Antonius, P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus II.

See von Stauffenberg, 1931, 121; *Fasti Vindob. Post.* (275. 19) 'Antonino II et Chrysaureico. His consulibus Gaius Julius Caesar mortuus est. Et accepit imperium Octavianus annorum XVIII, qui bisextum et lunae cursum adinvenit'.

IX §19, Bo 224: (Augustus killed Brutus) in the consulship of Calvinus and Pollio.

*Calvinus* (corr.): 'Calvisianus' Bo.

40 B.C.: Cn. Domitius Calvinus, C. Asinius Pollio.

*Fasti Vindob. Post.* (275. 23) 'Calbisione et Pullione'.

IX §24, Bo 226: (Augustus' census took place) in the consulship of Agrippa, for the second time, and of Donatus.

From the regnal year given for Augustus ('in the 39th year and 10th month') this should be 3 B.C.; Agrippa was consul in 28 B.C. and 27 B.C. and the three Donati listed by Degraffi are from the mid-3rd c. A.D.; the intended consulship year cannot be identified.

<sup>15</sup>Note that Bagnall/Cameron/Schwartz/Worp, 1987, do not discuss Malalas' consular dates, presumably since they are derivative and without independent value.

<sup>16</sup>Ed. Mommsen, 1892, 274-336; also known as the *Consularia Ravennatiae* A and B [ed. Frick, 1893], see Bagnall *et al.*, 1987, 48-50.

IX §25, Bo 226: (The annunciation took place) in the consulship of Cyrenius and Longinus. *Cyrenius* (corr. von S): 'Kouinios' Ba.

2 A.D.: T. Quinctius Crispinus Valerianus, P. Cornelius Lentulus Scipio (suffect).

From the regnal year of Augustus ('41st year and 6th month') this should be March 2 B.C.; cf. X §1, where the consular year (see next entry) and the Antiochene date (on emendation) give 2 B.C.; see section 2A above, dates nos. 1 and 2.

X §1, Bo 227: (Christ was born) while Octavian and Silvanus were consuls.

2 B.C.: Imp. Caesar Divi f. Augustus XIII, M. Plautius Silvanus.

*Fasti Vindob. Pr.* (278. 74) 'Augusto XII et Silano. His cons. Christus natus est VIII kl. Ian. luna XIII'.

*Fasti Vindob. Post.* (278. 74) 'Augusto XII et Silvano. Augusto XIII et Sylva. His cons. natus est Christus etc. ... Ab Adamo autem anni VD'.

*Exc. Barb.* (338. 9) 'Augusto et Silvano. His consulibus dominus Iesus Christus natus est. ... Fiunt vero ab Adamo ... anni V milia quingenti'.

X §4, Bo 230: (The *Magoi* arrive) in the consulship of Vinicius and Varus.

*Vinicius* (corr.): 'Vindicius' Ba, LM.

*Varus* (corr.): 'Valerius' Ba, 'Varius' LM, cf. Slav.

A.D. 2: P. Vinicius, P. Alfenus Varus.

*Fasti Vindob. Post.* (278. 77) 'Vinitio et Varro'.

*Fasti Vindob. Pr.* (278. 77) 'Vincio et Varo'.

X §4, Bo 231: (Herod died) in the consulship of Lamia and Servilius.

*Servilius* (corr.): 'Serellianus' Ba, 'Servilianus' LM, Slav.

A.D. 3: L. Aelius Lamia, M. Servilius.

X §7, Bo 232: (Tiberius succeeded) in the consulship of Sextus and Sextus.

*and Sextus* (corr.): 'and Seticianus' Ba.

A.D. 14: Sex. Pompeius, Sex. Appuleius.

X §11, Bo 236: (John the Baptist began to preach) in the consulship of Silanus and Nerva.

*Silanus* (corr.): 'Alvanus' Ba, 'Silvanus' LM, Slav.

A.D. 28: C. Appius Iunius Silanus, P. Silius Nerva.

*Fasti Vindob. Pr. et Post.* (278. 77) 'Silvano et Nerva'.

X §11, Bo 236: (Christ was baptised) in the consulship of Fufius and Rubellius.

*Fufius* (corr.): 'Rufus' Ba, LM.

*Rubellius* (corr.): 'Rubellio' Ba, LM.

A.D. 29: C. Fulvius Geminus, L. Rubellius Geminus.

*Fasti Vindob. Post.* (281. 112) 'Ruffio Gemino et Rebellio Gemino' (preceded by 'His cons. passus est Ioannes Baptista IIII kal. Sept. sub Herode rege. Natus autem VIII kl. Iulias', presumably attached to the previous consular pair, 'Tiberio et Silvio' [A.D. 31]).

X §11, Bo 236: (John the Baptist was beheaded) in the consulship of Flaccus and Rufus.

*Flaccus and Rufus* (corr.): 'Flacco and Rufinus' Ba.

A.D. 17: L. Pomponius Flaccus, L. Caelius Rufus.

*Fasti Vindob. Pr. et Post.* (279. 94) 'Falcone et Rufino ('Ruffino' *Post.*)'.

X §14, Bo 241: (Christ's burial took place) in the consulship of Sulpicius and Sulla.

*Sulla* (corr.): 'Sola' Ba, 'Solatus' LM, Slav.

A.D. 33: L. Livius Ocella Sulpicius Galba, L. Cornelius Sulla Felix.

X §17, Bo 243: (Gaius Caligula succeeded) during the consulship of Gallus and Nonianus.  
*Nonianus*: written as 'Nonnianus' Ba.

A.D. 35: C. Cestius Gallus, M. Servilius Nonianus.

X §22, Bo 246: (Claudius succeeded) during the consulship of Caesianus and Solon.  
*Caesianus* (corr.): 'Casius' Ba.

A.D. 39: C. Caesar Augustus Germanicus II, L. Apronius Caesianus.

X §29, Ba 250: (Nero succeeded) during the consulship of Silanus and Antoninus.  
*Silanus* (corr.): 'Silvanus' Ba.

A.D. 53: D. Iunius Silanus Torquatus, Q. Haterus Antoninus.

Von Stauffenberg, 1931, 211, notes that these are indeed the consuls for 53 A.D. whilst discussing the problems of Malalas' chronology for Nero.

X §35, Bo 256: (St Peter was put to death) during the consulship of Apronianus and Capito.

A.D. 59: C. Vipstanus Apronianus, C. Fonteius Capito.

X §37, Bo 257: (St Paul was martyred) during the consulship of Nero and Lentulus.

A.D. 60: Nero IV, Cossus Cornelius Lentulus.

X §40, Bo 258: (Nero disappeared) during the consulship of Italicus and Tolpillianus, also known as Trachelus.

*Italicus* CP: 'Itoricus' Ba.

*Tolpillianus ... Trachelus*: 'Trachelus' CP, 'Tourpillianus' *De insid.*

A.D. 68: Ti. Catus Asconius Silius Italicus, P. Galerius Trachalus.

*Fasti Vindob. Pr.* (283. 158) 'Italico et Turpilionem' (immediately preceding this: 'His cons. Nero de imperio non comparuit').

Von Stauffenberg, 1931, 217, discusses the similarities between the *Fasti Vindob.* and Malalas.

X §44, Bo 259: (Vespasian was crowned) during the consulship of Rufus and Capito.

*Capito* (corr.): 'Capitianus' Ba.

A.D. 67: L. Iulius Rufus, Fonteius Capito.

X §44, Bo 260: (A persecution of Christians took place) during the consulship of Decius and Rusticius.

A.D. 251: Imp. Decius III, Q. Herennius Etruscus Messius Decius Caesar.

*Fasti Vindob. Pr.* (289. 357) 'Decio II et Rustico'; *Fasti Vindob. Post.* (289. 357) 'Rustico et Decio' (both these notices, with a comment on the persecution, occur in their correct temporal position).

Von Stauffenberg, 1931, 226, notes this distortion and assumes that Malalas has confused entries in the consular fasti.

X §45, Bo 260: (Titus' capture of Jerusalem) during the consulship of Commodus and Rufus.

A.D. 78: D. Iunius Novius Priscus (Rufus?), L. Ceionius Commodus.

XI §13, Bo 277: (Hadrian's accession took place) during the consulship of Apronianus and Niger.

A.D. 117: Q. Aquilius Niger, M. Rebilus Apronianus.

*Fasti Vindob. Post.* (285.212) adds 'Fiunt a passione domini usque ad consolatum Nigri et Aproniani anni xxxliiii'; cf. von Stauffenberg, 1931, 295.

XII §18, Bo 291: (Septimius Severus succeeded) during the consulship of Falco and Clarus.

*Falco* (corr.): 'Flacco' Ba, 'Flaccus' CP.

A.D. 193: Q. Pompeius Sossius Falco, C. Iulius Erius Clarus Vibianus.

Von Stauffenberg, 1931, 333, notes that the *Fasti Vindob. Pr. et Post.* (287. 295) have the correct forms and that Malalas' variation is quite likely due to Ba's error (or that of a predecessor in the tradition).

XII §34, Bo 303: (Carus was killed) during the consulship of Maximian and Ianuarianus.

*Maximian* (corr.): 'Maximus' Ba.

*Ianuarianus* (corr.): 'Jannuarius' Ba.

A.D. 288: Maximianus Aug. II, Pomponius Ianuarianus.

*Fasti Vindob. Pr.* (290. 397) 'Maximo II et Ianuarino'; cf. *Fasti Vindob. Post.* (290. 397) 'Ianuario et Maximiano II'.

Von Stauffenberg, 1931, 394-5, points out the connection with the lists in the *Fasti Vindob.*

XII §37, Bo 306: (Diocletian succeeded) during the consulship of Bassus and Quintianus.

A.D. 289: L. Ragonius Quintianus, M. Magrius Bassus.

XIII §1, Bo 316: (Constantine the Great succeeded) during the consulship of Severus and Maximianus.

A.D. 307: (East) Severus Augustus, Maximinus Caesar.

XIII §4, Bo 319: (First *comes Orientis* appointed) during the consulship of Julius and Albinus.

*Julius*: written as 'Illus' Ba.

A.D. 335: Iulius Constantius, Caeionius Rufius Albinus.

XIII §7, Bo 319: (Constantinople was dedicated) during the consulship of Gallicanus and Symmachus.

*Gallicanus* (corr. Chil.): 'Gallianus' Ba.

A.D. 330: Fl. Gallicanus, Aurelius Valerius Tullius Symmachus.

XIII §15, Bo 324: (Constantine became emperor in Rome) during the consulship of Ursus and Polemius.

*Polemius*: written as 'Polybios' Ba.

A.D. 338: Fl. Ursus, Fl. Polemius.

*Fasti Vindob. Pr.* (293. 459) 'Urso et Polymio'.

XIII §18, Bo 326: (Julian succeeded) during the consulship of Mamertinus and Nevitta.

*Mamertinus* (corr. Chil.) CP: 'Marmentius' Ba, 'Mamertius' Slav.

A.D. 362: Cl. Mamertinus, Fl. Nevitta.

XIII §26, Bo 334: (Jovian crowned) during the consulship of Salustius.

A.D. 363: Iulianus Aug. IV, Fl. Sallustius.

XIII §36, Bo 343: (Gratian succeeded) during the consulship of Ausonius and Hermogenianus.

*Ausonius* (corr. Chil.): 'Ausonianus' Ba.

*Hermogenianus* (corr. Chil.): 'Hermogenes' Ba.

A.D. 379: D. Magnus Ausonius, Q. Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius.

XIII §39, Bo 346: (Resaina was renamed Theodosiupolis) during the consulship of Merobaudes and Saturninus.

A.D. 383: Fl. Merobaudes II, Fl. Saturninus.

XIV §1, Bo 351: (Theodosius was crowned) during the consulship of Stilicho and Aurelianus.  
A.D. 400: Fl. Stilicho, Fl. Aurelianus.

XIV §21, Bo 363: (Seleukeia was captured by Isaurians) during the consulship of Theodosius and Rumoridus.

*Rumoridus*: written as 'Romoridus' Ba.

A.D. 403: Theodosius Aug. I, Fl. Rumoridus.

XIV §36, Bo 369: (The fourth earthquake in Antioch took place) during the consulship of Patricius.

A.D. 459: Fl. Ricimer, Fl. Patricius.

XIV §45, Bo 373: (Anthemius was murdered) after his (Olybrius') consulship, which he had held together with Rusticius.

A.D. 464: Fl. Rusticius (Nestorius), Fl. Olybrius.

XIV §46, Bo 376: (The Caesar Leo the Younger) became consul in the month of January of the 12th indiction, in the year 522 according to the era of Antioch.

A.D. 474: Leo Iunior Aug.

XV §3, Bo 378: (Verina made Basiliscus emperor;) she also named him consul, together with Armatus.

A.D. 476: Basiliscus Aug. II, Fl. Armatus.

XV §12, Bo 386: (During Illus' rebellion) Illus became consul ... likewise the emperor's brother Longinus.

A.D. 486: Caecina Mavortius Basilius Decius, Fl. Longinus (I).

XV §12, Bo 386: (Longinus provided dancers) then stepped down from his second consulship.

A.D. 490: Anicius Probus Faustus, Fl. Longinus II.

XVI §1, Bo 392: (Anastasios succeeded) during the consulship of Olybrius, the son of Areobindus.

A.D. 491: Fl. Olybrius.

XVI §6, Bo 395: (The charioteer Kalliopas came to Antioch) during the third consulship of the emperor Anastasios.

A.D. 507: Anastasius Aug. III, Venantius.

XVII §1, Bo 410: (Justin succeeded) on 9th July in the 11th indiction during the consulship of Magnus.

A.D. 518: Fl. Anastasius Paulus Probus Moschianus Probus Magnus (East).

XVII §3, Bo 411: (Some time later) he [Justin] made Philoxenos consul.

A.D. 525: Fl. Probus iunior, Fl. Theodorus Philoxenus Soterichus Philoxenus.

XVII §8, Bo 412: (Vitalian) was designated consul (and murdered).

A.D. 520: Fl. Rusticius, Fl. Vitalianus.

XVII §16, Bo 419: (The fifth earthquake in Antioch took place) in the seventh year of his (Justin's) reign, in the month of May ... during the consulship of Olybrius.

A.D. 526: Fl. Olybrius.

XVII §18, Bo 422: (Justinian was crowned) after eight years and nine months of Justin's reign ... during the consulship of Mavortius.

A.D. 527: Vettius Agorius Basilius Mavortius.

XVIII §1, Bo 425: (Justinian began to rule) in the year 575 according to the calendar of Antioch, during the consulship of Mavortius.

A.D. 527: Vettius Agorius Basilius Mavortius.

XVIII §8, Bo 428: (The chronological excursus is set in) the second consulship of Justinian ... (twice).

A.D. 528: Iustinianus Aug. II.

XVIII §46, Bo 450: (Mundo came over to the Romans) during the consulship of Decius.

A.D. 529: Decius.

XVIII §50, Bo 452: (Hermogenes and Rufinus sent into Persian territory) during the consulship of Lampadius and Orestes.

A.D. 530: Lampadius, Rufius Gennadius Probus Orestes.

XVIII §80, Bo 478: Justinian distributed largesse for his third consulship.

A.D. 533: Iustinianus Aug. III (East).

XVIII §83, Bo 479: (A council was held in Constantinople) after Belisarios' consulship.

A.D. 535: Belisarius (East).

XVIII §84, Bo 479: (Arian churches were confiscated) in the consulship of John the Cappadocian.

A.D. 538: Iohannis (East).

Several categories of dating by consul can be discerned:

1. A cluster in Book X concerning episodes in Christ's life and the early development of the church; perhaps these can be associated with the set of dates from Christ's ascension (which however extend much further) and attributed to a historian with ecclesiastical interests (e.g. the shadowy Nestorians, as perceived by Bourier); however, this ecclesiastical link ceases at X §37 with the martyrdom of St Paul, apart from the chronologically misplaced reference to the persecution under Decius (and note that the *Fasti Vindobonenses* have a notice of that persecution at its correct date).

2. A majority of consular dates occur in notices of imperial accessions; it looks as though Malalas, or some part of the tradition and/or sources he was drawing on, had access to a list of imperial accessions (and obits, with or without portraits) dated by consul.

3. There is a change in the pattern of expression of the consular dates after XIV (though they are still present in notices of imperial accessions). Instead of being almost detachable the references are now embedded allusively in the narrative (e.g. at XIV §§45, 46, XV §3 etc); this pattern starts in fact part of the way through XIV. It is worth considering whether this change is to be associated with a source that went as far as



Theodosius I, in which case it would not be Nestorianos, since Malalas explicitly states at the end of XIV that Nestorianos' work ended with the death of Leo II. Note that the 'to the present' comments (discussed in chapter 7, p. 206) also cease before the end of XIV, with the last reference applied to Leo I (XIV §43, Bo 372), as do the remarks on provincial organization (with only one more, coming in connection with Justinian's reforms of 535). Do these make a nexus attributable to one element on which Malalas was drawing? These points are considered further in chapter 7, pp. 207-8.

4. Note that there is only one consular date in XI (to Hadrian's accession). Book XI is a notoriously difficult book to assess as a historical document (it covers Trajan's Parthian wars in a largely mythical version found only in Malalas, and includes much Antiochene folk-lore); perhaps this lack of consular dates is a pointer to the fact that Malalas is here using a different set of source materials.

5. Every consul from 526 to 538 is recorded (there were no consuls for 531, 532, 536 or 537). There were consuls for 539 (Appion), 540 (Justin), and 541 (Basilius) who are not noted, but then none till 566 (Justin). This may, or may not, be significant.

6. For the earlier consular dates there are some resemblances to the lists in the *Fasti Vindobonenses*, but none to the list in the *Excerpta Barbari*. Von Stauffenberg notes the resemblances and seems to think that there are connections with *Excerpta Barbari* too (von Stauffenberg, 1931, 19); he may be referring to the notes in the consular fasti of the *Excerpta* that refer to Christ's birth, etc., but there are no striking similarities in the forms of names.

## 6. Indictions

From the fourth century the indiction cycle of fifteen years (originally introduced as an administrative and taxation device, with the year running from 1st September to 31st August) came increasingly to be used as a standard means of dating. Malalas uses two words for indiction: ἰνδικτιῶν, which is by far the more frequent, and ἐπινέμησις, which is found at IX §5, Bo 216, XIV §§46, 47, Bo 376 and XVIII §3, Bo 426; there appears to be no distinction between the two. In the following passages the entry is dated by indiction:

IX §5, Bo 216: 49 B.C. Antioch's autonomy proclaimed on 12th Artemisios-May of the 'following indiction'.

XIII §29, Bo 338: A.D. 370 Valens made peace with the Persians on 10th November, 14th indiction.

XIII §35, Bo 343: 367 Earthquake in Nikaia in the month of September of the 11th indiction.

XIV §28, Bo 367: 450/1 Marcian crowned in the year 499 according to the era of Antioch in the 4th indiction.

XIV §46, Bo 376: 474 Leo the Younger became consul in the month of January of the 12th indiction, in the year 522 according to the era of Antioch, and was crowned on 9th Peritios of the 12th indiction.

XIV §47, Bo 376: 474 Leo died in the 11th month of his consulship, in November of the 13th indiction in the year 523 according to the era of Antioch.

XV §5, Bo 379: 476/7 Zeno entered the palace ... in the 14th indiction.

XV §16, Bo 391: 491 Zeno died ... on 9th Xanthikos of the 14th indiction in the year 539 according to the era of Antioch.

XVI §6, Bo 396: 507 Riots in Antioch ... on 9th July of the 15th indiction.

- XVI §15, Bo 401: 515/6 Theodosius murdered in Alexandria ... in the year 564 according to the era of the Antiochenes, of the 9th indiction.
- XVII §1, Bo 410: 518 Justin succeeded on 9th July of the 11th indiction.
- XVII §13, Bo 417: 520/1 Olympic festival not to be held after 14th indiction (in the year 568 of Antioch).
- XVII §23, Bo 424: 527 Justin died ... on 1st August of the 5th indiction.
- XVIII §1, Bo 425: 527 Justinian reigned ... from 1st April in the 5th indiction.
- XVIII §2, Bo 425: 527 Patrikios was named *comes Orientis* in October of the 6th indiction.
- XVIII §3, Bo 426: 528 Justinian distributed consular largesse in January of the 6th indiction.
- XVIII §8, Bo 428: 528 The combination of Justinian's consulship (running from January to December 528) and the 7th indiction (September 528 to August 529) gives the common months of September-December 528.
- XVIII §16, Bo 435: 528 Victory over the Persians in April of the 6th indiction.
- XVIII §25, Bo 441: 528 Theodora went to Pythion at the end of this (= 6th) indiction.
- XVIII §35, Bo 445: 529 June of 7th indiction, there was a riot among the Samaritans.
- XVIII §71, Bo 473: 532 Nika riot took place in the 10th indiction.
- XVIII §81, Bo 479: 533/4 Belisarios' triumph took place in the 12th indiction.
- XVIII §87, Bo 479: 540 Antioch was captured in June of the 3rd indiction.
- XVIII §90, Bo 481: 541 Woman in ecstasy in the 5th indiction.
- XVIII §93, Bo 482: 543 Earthquake in Kyzikos in September of the 7th indiction.
- XVIII §97, Bo 483: 547 Vigilius, bishop of Rome, came to Constantinople in February of the 10th indiction.
- XVIII §103, Bo 484: 547 Fierce storm took place in June of that (= 10th) indiction.
- XVIII §104, Bo 484: 547 Theodora died on 28th June of that (= 10th) indiction.
- XVIII §106, Bo 484: 549/50 Indian ambassador came to Constantinople with an elephant in the 13th indiction.
- XVIII §109, Bo 484: 550 The church of the Holy Apostles was dedicated on 28th June of that (= 13th) indiction.
- XVIII §111, Bo 485: 550 Vigilius was received by the emperor on 26th June of that (=13th) indiction.
- XVIII §112, Bo 485: 550/1 A severe earthquake in Palestine in the 14th indiction.
- XVIII §113, Bo 486: 551 St Eirene over the Golden Horn was dedicated in September of the 15th indiction.
- XVIII §115, Bo 486: 552 Menas died in August of the 15th indiction.
- XVIII §117, Bo 486: 553 Coinage was debased in March of the 1st indiction.
- XVIII §118, Bo 487: 554 Earthquake at Byzantium in August of the 2nd indiction.
- XVIII §119, Bo 487: 556 Samaritans rioted in July of the 4th indiction.
- XVIII §120, Bo 488: 556 Plague in December of that (= 4th) indiction.
- XVIII §121, Bo 488: 556 Shortage of bread in May of that (= 4th) indiction.
- XVIII §122, Bo 488: 556 Fire like a spear (= comet) in the sky in November of the 5th indiction.
- XVIII §123, Bo 488: 557 Earthquake in April of that (= 5th) indiction.
- XVIII §124, Bo 488: 557 Earthquake in December of the 6th indiction.
- XVIII §127, Bo 489: 558 Plague in February of the 6th indiction.
- XVIII §129, Bo 489: 559 Huns and Slavs attacked Thrace in March of the 7th indiction.
- XVIII §136, Bo 491: 561 Hellenes arrested, June of that (= 9th) indiction.
- XVIII §137, Bo 492: 562 Church of the Holy Martyr Theodora dedicated in August of the 10th indiction.
- XVIII §138, Bo 492: 562 Faction fighting in Constantinople in October of the 11th indiction.
- XVIII §141, Bo 493: 562 Plot against Justinian in November of the 11th indiction.
- XVIII §143, Bo 495: 562 The Great Church dedicated for the second time in that (= 11th) indiction.
- XVIII §144, Bo 495: 563 Charioteer Julianikos killed in January of the 11th indiction,

Dating by indiction is rare before the middle of Book XVI; it becomes frequent from the beginning of XVIII and is thereafter the dominant dating mode. By this stage Malalas is recording annalistically, that is, noting events on a yearly basis, rather than giving continuous narrative for a block of material on, e.g., campaigns in Persia or court intrigue. This must be partly because he is now dealing with matters close to his own lifetime (or happening as he writes, as it were). It must also be because he now has access to a different set of sources. While it is possible in XV-XVII, and in parts of XVIII, to isolate blocks of material and suggest Malalas' possible informants like Marinus the Syrian or Hermogenes, the annalistic entries are most likely to come from something like a Constantinopolitan city chronicle. Portions of this chronicle can also be isolated in Theophanes, Theodore Lector and the Great Chronographer as is discussed elsewhere, in chapters 7 and 9, at pp. 213-14 and 256-58.

## 7. Dates by the Antiochene era

From Book X onwards a number of events are dated by the Antiochene era, which is calculated from 1st October, 49 B.C. (Grumel, 1958, 215) to mark the granting of autonomy to Antioch by Julius Caesar (cf. IX §5, Bo 216). Malalas notes the introduction of this method of calculating at IX §7, Bo 217, but on Caesar's death, which is put by Malalas in 41 B.C. (by the consular year) and not 44 B.C.; see Downey, 1961, 157-8 for a discussion of the numismatic evidence that the calculation probably began in fact in 47 B.C. (though dated retrospectively *honoris causa*). The Antiochene year, therefore, ran from 1st October to 30rd September, but in the mid-fifth century was altered to run from 1st September to 31st August presumably to correspond with the indiction year (Downey, 1940/1, 39-48; Grumel, 1958, 215).

1. X §2, Bo 227: In the year 42 according to the calendar of Antioch the Great.  
42 = 8 B.C., but Grumel, 1958, 223 suggests emending to 48 = 2 B.C.; cf. section 2 A above, date no. 2.
2. X §10, Bo 235: (A fire) in the city of Antioch in Syria, in the 72nd year of its autonomy.  
72 = 1st October A.D. 23 – 30th September A.D. 24.
3. X §14, Bo 241: (Christ was buried) in the 79th year according to the calendar of Antioch the Great.  
79 = 24th March, A.D. 31; cf. section 2 A above, p. 121, date no. 4.
4. X §18, Bo 243: (The 2nd earthquake since the Macedonians) on 23rd Dystros-March in the year 85 according to the calendar of the Antiochenes.  
85 = 23rd March, A.D. 37.
5. X §27, Bo 248: (Antiochenes allowed to purchase the Olympic Games) in the year 92 according to the calendar of the Syrian Antiochenes.  
92 = 1st October A.D. 43 – 30th September A.D. 44.
6. XI §8, Bo 275: (Antioch's 3rd earthquake) on Sunday 13th Apellaios-December in the year 164 according to the calendar of the Antiochenes.  
164 = 13th December, A.D. 115; cf. section 9 below, p. 155, no.8.

7. XII §6, Bo 286: (The Olympic festival was celebrated for the first time) ... in the year 260 according to the era of the Syrian Antiochenes.  
260 = 1st October A.D. 211 – 30th September A.D. 212; the games were usually held in the summer, so this should refer to 212.

8. XII §26, Bo 296: (Sapor destroyed Antioch) in the year 314 according to the era of Antioch the Great.

314 = 1st October A.D. 265 – 30th September A.D. 266. There are problems with Malalas' account of Sapor's destruction of Antioch since his dates are at variance with other versions; Müller (FHG IV, 192), followed by von Stauffenberg, 1931, 193, emends to 304 (= A.D. 255/6); Ensslin, 1949, 33-5, suggests 310 (= A.D. 261/2); see Downey, 1961, 590-1.

9. XIII §8, Bo 322: (The Genethlion of Constantinople) on 11th May-Artemisios in the year 378 according to the era of Antioch the Great.

378 = 11th May, A.D. 330; correct.

10. XIII §23, Bo 333: (Julian was killed) in the year 411 according to the calendar of Antioch the Great.

411 = 1st October A.D. 362 – 30th September A.D. 363.

11. XIII §34, Bo 342: (Valens began to rule) in the year 326 according to the era of Antioch.

326 = 1st October A.D. 278 – 30th September A.D. 279; inaccurate. Chilmead emends to 426 = A.D. 378, which is still not right for Valens' accession though correct for the year of his death; the accurate Antiochene year would be 412 (Valens 364-78).

12. XIV §28, Bo 367: (Marcian acceded) in the year 499 according to the era of Antioch, of the fourth indiction.

499 = 1st October A.D. 450 – 30th September A.D. 451 (Marcian 450-7).

13. XIV §36, Bo 369: (Antioch's 4th earthquake took place) on Sunday 13th September in the year 506 according to the era of Antioch.

506 = 13th September, A.D. 458; cf. Downey, 1961, 597-604 and Grumel, 1958, 215 and 194 for the evidence that this provides for the Antiochene calendar shift (from 1st October to 1st September); see also section 9 below, p. 157, no. 20.

14. XIV §47, Bo 376: (Leo the Younger was consul) in the year 522 according to the era of Antioch of the 12th indiction.

522 = 1st September A.D. 473 – 31st August A.D. 474 (the consular year ran from January to December and the Antiochene year is now running from September to August, like the indiction year).

15. XIV §47, Bo 376: (Leo the Younger died in the month of November) of the 13th indiction, in the year 523 according to the era of Antioch.

523 = November, A.D. 474.

16. XV §16, Bo 391: (Zeno died) ... on 9th Xanthikos of the 14th indiction, in the year 539 according to the era of Antioch.

539 = 9th April, A.D. 491 (correct for Zeno's death).

17. XVI §2, Bo 393: (Riots in Antioch) in the year 543 according to the era of Antioch.

543 = 1st September A.D. 494 – 31st August A.D. 495.

18. XVI §11, Bo 400: (Severus became patriarch of Antioch in place of Nestorian) on 6th November in the year 561 according to the era of the Antiochenes.

561 = 6th November, A.D. 512.

19. XVI §15, Bo 401: (Riot over a shortage of oil.) This was in the year 564 according to the era of the Antiochenes, of the 9th indiction.

564 = 1st September A.D. 515 – 31st August A.D. 516.

20. XVII §1, Bo 410: (Justin began to reign on 9th July in the eleventh indiction during the consulship of Magnus.)

*eleventh indiction*: CP, Ev, Slav add 'in the year 566 according to the era of the Syrian Antiochenes'.

566 = 9th July, A.D. 518, which is corroborated by the consulship date.

21. XVII §13, Bo 417: (The Olympic Festival was stopped) in the year 568 of the Antiochenes.

568 = 1st September A.D. 520 – 31st August A.D. 521.

22. XVIII §1, Bo 425: (Justinian acceded) on 1st April in the 5th indiction in the year 475 according to the calendar of Antioch.

475 = 1st April, A.D. 527, which is correct and confirmed by the consular date given in this passage.

23. XVIII §8, Bo 428: There is nothing in the surviving Greek text (cf. date 20 above) but Slav adds:

'According to the Antiochenes who live in the city by the Orontes this was the 577th year starting from Julius Caesar'.

577 = 1st September A.D. 528 – 31st August A.D. 529.

This list of 'years of Antioch' transcend all source divisions (e.g. the sections which, as discussed in chapter 7, pp. 198-99, 209-11, could be attributed to Domninos, Nestorinos, or the oral sources from Book XV onwards, etc.). The last Antiochene date occurs at XVIII §8, Bo 428. 12, admittedly in the Slavonic texts only but it is accurate and consistent with the other dates given at that point and should be accepted as having been originally in the Greek. No dates by the Antiochene era are found after this point. This suggests that the dates by 'years of Antioch' as well as the dates 'from Adam' are provided (compiled or inserted) by Malalas and belong to the edition that was completed in the early 530s. It should also be noted that, apart from a textual problem with dates nos. 8 and 11 and the question of the calendar shift in the 450s, these dates are accurate when they can be confirmed from other dating details, whether from within the chronicle itself or from external information.

## 8. Other eras and calendars

### Era of Diocletian

There are only scattered signs that Malalas was aware of this era.

At XII §41, Bo 309, Malalas notes its institution (in A.D. 285; Grumel, 1958, 36-7, 240). At XV §16, Bo 391, at the death of Zeno, Theophanes (Th 136.16-20) preserves a multiple date where Malalas has a somewhat anomalous single date that only makes sense if taken to refer to the Alexandrian era; Theophanes' date includes this but also reads in part 'from the rule of Diocletian 207' (= A.D. 491; Grumel, 1958, 244). This arguably represents a fuller date than originally stood in Malalas' text to discuss the passing of the sixth millennium; see section 1 above, pp. 117-18, date no. 19 and Jeffreys, 1990. At XVIII §8, Bo 428, the Slavonic texts preserve an addition to the chronological excursus

which must have been part of the original text: 'According to the Alexandrians, who are Egyptians and live by the Nile, this was the 245th year from Diocletian'. This represents A.D. 529 and is consistent with all the other dating information given at this point.

The Diocletianic era (the 'era of the martyrs') was the basis for universally used Easter tables which expired in 532 and which were extended in 525 at the request of the Pope, in Rome, by Dionysius Exiguus who then substituted a reckoning by the 'year of our Lord' (*anno Domini*), arbitrarily making the first year of his new table 532 A.D. (PL 67, col. 487; cf. Jones, 1943, 68 ff.).

### Seleucid era

Though used regularly by later chroniclers in Syria (e.g. John of Ephesos, Pseudo-Dionysios), the Seleucid era is barely noticed by Malalas.<sup>17</sup>

At VIII §16, Bo 202, Malalas notes that Seleukos ordered the months in Syria to 'be named in the Macedonian fashion, since he found that giants had lived in the land' (the logic here is elusive). Month names are, in fact, frequently given by Malalas with both Macedonian and Roman names.

At VIII §34, Bo 213, it is noted that the Macedonians ruled Antioch 'for 263 years from Seleukos Nikator until empire was given to the Romans'. It is not clear what is intended here: 263 from 312 B.C. gives 49 B.C., the start of Caesar's era of Antioch (see section 7 above), and this is presumably intended to be significant. Downey (1938, 118, note 1 and table on 113) comments that Malalas did not understand how the Seleucid era functioned.

At XVIII §8, Bo 428, Slav includes a further addition to the chronological excursus which, again, must have stood in the original Malalas: 'According to the so-called Syrian Macedonians of Apamea, this was the 40th year from Seleukos Nikator'. This is nonsense as it stands but if emended to '840th year' gives A.D. 529, which is consistent with the other dates in this passage.

### Olympiads

It is striking that Malalas makes no attempt to date entries in his chronicle by Olympiads, the major universal secular dating system of the ancient world, and used by Africanus, Eusebios, Panodoros, Annianos and later the *Chronicon Paschale* and Synkellos – to name but a few. This is perhaps a further indication that the main chronological framework that he was using (the dates From Adam) was idiosyncratic and difficult to reconcile with existing chronologies.

### Roman calendar

The Roman month system is used only to a very limited extent and then largely in connection with Christ's life: X §1, Bo 227, Christ born; X §11, Bo 236, John the Baptist beheaded; X §14, Bo 240, Christ crucified; X §37, Bo 257, St Paul beheaded; XIII §1, Bo 316, Constantine the Great began to reign.

<sup>17</sup>The Seleucid era ran from 1 Dios-October 312 B.C.; Grumel, 1958, 209 and tables at 240 ff.

## 9. Other chronological elements

### Earthquakes

The following sequence of notices of earthquakes in Antioch and the eastern Mediterranean is not used specifically as a dating device by Malalas but it clearly has some connection with an official list and there are not infrequently other indications of date attached to the notices.<sup>18</sup>

#### 1. VII §18, Bo 190:

#### Rhodes

At that time the entire island of Rhodes was shaken at night by the wrath of God, an earthquake, in the month of October. The statue of the Kolossos fell and lay on the ground.

#### 2. VIII §25, Bo 208:

#### Antioch 1 (?)

At that time Antioch the Great suffered from the wrath of God, in the eighth year of his reign, in the time of the Macedonians, 152 years after the original laying of the foundation of the wall by Seleukos Nikator, at the tenth hour of the day, on 21st Peritios-February. It was completely rebuilt, as Dominos the chronicler has written. It was 122 years after the completion of the walls and the whole city that it suffered; it was rebuilt better.

Not specifically listed as the first earthquake, but cf. X §18 for the second. See Downey, 1961, 126, and note 32: possibly took place in 130 B.C.

#### 3. X §3, Bo 229:

#### Diospolis

During the reign of the revered Augustus Caesar, a city in Palestine named Salamis suffered from the wrath of God. Augustus restored the city and called it Diospolis.

#### 4. X §18, Bo 243:

#### Antioch 2

In the first year of his [Caligula's] reign Antioch the Great suffered from the wrath of God, at dawn on 23rd Dystros-March, its second calamity since the time of the Macedonians, in the year 85 according to the calendar of the Antiochenes.

23rd March, A.D. 37 (cf. section 7 above, p. 151, date no. 4).

#### 5. X §23, Bo 246:

#### Asia

During his [Claudius'] reign Ephesos, Smyrna and many other cities of Asia suffered from the wrath of God.

#### 6. X §28, Bo 250:

#### Crete

In the 13th year of the reign of Claudius Caesar, the entire island of Crete suffered from the wrath of God.

A.D. 42; Diktys' text was found.

#### 7. X §53, Bo 267:

#### Diokaisareia

During his [Nerva's] reign Diokaisareia, a city in Cilicia, suffered its third calamity from the wrath of God, as did Nikoupolis and its territory.

#### 8. XI §8, Bo 275:

#### Antioch 3

During the reign of the most sacred Trajan, Antioch the Great near Daphne suffered its third calamity, on Sunday 13th Apellaios-December, just after cock-crow in the year 164 according

<sup>18</sup>Cf. Downey, 1938 and 1955. Grumel's list of earthquakes (1958, 476-481) is somewhat incomplete; he has gone through Theophanes and parts of the *Chronicon Paschale* and has occasional references to Malalas, but fails to list some of the most obvious earthquakes recorded by Malalas, even when they also appear in either Theophanes or the *Chronicon Paschale*.

to the calendar of the Antiochenes, two years after the arrival of the most sacred emperor Trajan in the East.

A.D. 115 (note that the Third Calamity appears in the title to Book XI); cf. section 7 above, p. 151, date no. 6.

9. XI §8, Bo 275:

**Rhodes 2**

On the same night that Antioch the Great suffered, the island city of Rhodes, which was part of the Hexapolis, suffered its second calamity from the wrath of God.

So presumably A.D. 115.

10. XI §16, Bo 279:

**Kyzikos**

During the reign of the most sacred Hadrian, Kyzikos, which is the great metropolis of the province of Hellespont, suffered an earthquake from the wrath of God on the night of 10th November.

After A.D. 117.

11. XII §11, Bo 289:

**Nikomedeia 3**

During the reign of Commodus, Nikomedeia, the metropolis of Bithynia, suffered from the wrath of God. This was her third calamity and it extended to Moudoupolis and the river Sangaris and surrounding districts, on 3rd May-Artemisios at daybreak.

12. XII §28, Bo 298:

**Nikomedeia 4**

During his [Claudius Apollianus'] reign Nikomedeia, the metropolis of Bithynia, suffered its fourth calamity from the wrath of God as far as the rivers and Dacibyza.

13. XII §48, Bo 313:

**Salamias**

In his [Constantius Chlorus'] reign the city of Salamias in Cyprus suffered from the wrath of God, and the greater part of the city was plunged into the sea by an earthquake. The remainder was levelled to the ground.

14. XIII §12, Bo 323:

**Maximianoupolis 2**

During the reign of Constantine Maximianoupolis in Osrhoene suffered from the wrath of God, its second calamity after its capture by the Persians.

After A.D. 330.

15. XIII §35, Bo 342:

**Nikaia**

During his [Valens'] reign the city of Nikaia in Bithynia suffered from the wrath of God in the month of September of the 11th indiction.

A.D. 367 (from the indiction); cf. Grumel, 1958, 477 (Socrates, PG 67, col. 481 gives 11th October).

16. XIV §12, Bo 359:

**Crete**

In his [Theodosius'] reign the island of Crete suffered from the wrath of God.

Under Theodosius II, and so some time between 408 and 450.

17. XIV §20, Bo 363:

**Nikomedeia 5**

During his [Theodosius'] reign Nikomedeia, the metropolis of Bithynia, suffered its fifth calamity from the wrath of God.

Under Theodosius II, and so some time between 408 and 450.

18. XIV §22, Bo 363.20:

**Constantinople 1**

During his [Theodosius'] reign Constantinople suffered from the wrath of God for the first time. The earthquake occurred on the night of 26th January ...

A.D. 447, 26th January (Croke, 1981); a liturgical procession took place.



## 19. XIV §29, Bo 367:

**Tripolis**

During his [Marcian's] reign the city known as Tripolis in Phoenice Maritima suffered from the wrath of God, at night, in the month of Gorpaios.

Under Marcian, and so some time between 450 and 457.

## 20. XIV §36, Bo 369:

**Antioch** 4

In the reign of Leo, Antioch the Great suffered its fourth calamity from the wrath of God, at dawn, on Sunday 13th September, in the year 506 according to the era of Antioch, during the consulship of Patricius.

The dates given here vary between 457/8 (the Antiochene era) and 459 (consulship of Patricius); PsD puts this entry under 456/9. See Grumel, 1958, 477 and Downey, 1961, 597-604: cf. section 7 above, p. 152, date no. 13.

## 21. XV §4 Bo, 378:

**Gabala**

During the reign of Basiliskos and his son Marcus, a city in First Syria named Gabala suffered from the wrath of God in the month of Gorpaios at dawn.

Grumel, 1958, 478 – simply dated 'under Basiliscus'.

## 22. XV §11, Bo 385:

**Constantinople** 2

During the reign of Zeno, Constantinople suffered its second calamity from the wrath of God ...

From Theophanes, 25th September, 1st indiction = 477/8; CP puts this under A.D. 487.

## 23. XV §11, Bo 385:

**Nikomedeia** 6

Nikomedeia, the metropolis of Bithynia, also suffered then, its sixth calamity, ...

At the same time as Constantinople 2, i.e. 477/8 (Theophanes), 487 (CP).

## 24. XV §11, Bo 385:

**Helenoupolis**

and likewise Helenoupolis in the same province.

At the same time as Constantinople 2, i.e. 477/8 (Theophanes), 487 (CP).

## 25. XVI §18, Bo 406:

**Rhodes** 3

During his [Anastasios'] reign the island of Rhodes suffered its third calamity from the wrath of God, at night.

Under Anastasios; PsD A.D. 503/4; Grumel, 1958, 478: Evagrius III, 43 (and Malalas) – *circa* 515.

## 26. XVII §15, Bo 417:

**Dyrrachium**

In that year it happened that the place known as Dyrrachium, a city in the province of Nova Epirus, the birthplace of the emperor Anastasios, suffered from the wrath of God.

Theophanes: A.D. 521/2; PsD: A.D. 530/1.

## 27. XVII §15, Bo 417:

**Corinth**

In that year Corinth in Hellas also suffered.

See no. 26 for dates.

## 28. XVII §15, Bo 417:

**Anazarbos** 4

In the next year Anazarbos, a city in Cilicia, suffered its fourth earthquake from the wrath of God.

From Theophanes: A.D. 524/5.

29. XVII §15, Bo 419: **Edessa 1**  
 (At this time under Anastasios Edessa was flooded.) The city of Edessa was built by Seleukos Nikator, who fortified it. Seleukos, who was a Macedonian, had named it Antioch the Half-barbarian and, after its first calamity, it was renamed Edessa.
30. XVII §16, Bo 419: **Antioch 5**  
 In the seventh year of his [Justin's] reign, in the month of May, Antioch the Great suffered its fifth calamity from the wrath of God, during the consulship of Olybrius.  
 A.D. 526: 26th May (Theophanes), 29th May (Slav, Evagrius); 4th indiction (Theophanes).
31. XVIII §19, Bo 436: **Pompeioupolis**  
 In that year Pompeioupolis in Mysia suffered from the wrath of God.  
 Theophanes: A.D. 535/6; JE/PsD: A.D. 538/9.
32. XVIII §27, Bo 442: **Antioch 6**  
 It was at that time that Antioch suffered its sixth calamity from the wrath of God.  
 Th: A.D. 528/9; JE/PsD: A.D. 539/40; note that though Slav no longer has a reference to this earthquake (since its material ceases at XVIII §13) it includes a reference to it in the title to the present Book XVIII, XVII in the Slav numbering; cf. chapter 9, p. 285).
33. XVIII §28, Bo 443: **Laodikeia 1**  
 In that year Laodikeia suffered its first calamity through earthquake.  
 PsD: A.D. 540/1.
34. XVIII § 37, Bo 448: **Amaseia**  
 At that time it happened Amaseia in Pontus suffered from the wrath of God.  
 Grumel, 1958, 478: A.D. 529 (but cites no other text).
35. XVIII §40, Bo 448: **Myra**  
 In that year Myra, the metropolis of Lykia, suffered through the wrath of God ...  
 Grumel, 1958, 478: A.D. 530.
36. XVIII §55, Bo 456: **General**  
 In that year there were widespread earthquakes ...  
 Theophanes has this after an entry for A.D. 528/9.
37. XVIII §77, Bo 478: **Byzantion**  
 In that year an earthquake occurred in Byzantion late in the evening.  
 Theophanes: A.D. 531/2.
38. XVIII §79, Bo 478: **Antioch**  
 Not long afterwards a tremendous earthquake occurred in Antioch the Great but it caused no damage.  
 No date, but from the context in Theophanes, c. 536/??; Downey, 1961, 533 and note 126 suggests 531/4 since the reference is sandwiched between entries dealing with the 10th and 14th indictions.
39. XVIII §93, Bo 482: **Kyzikos**  
 In the month of September of the 7th indiction an earthquake occurred in Kyzikos and half the city collapsed.  
 Both Theophanes and JE/PsD give 6th September; Th: A.D. 543/4; PsD: A.D. 544/5.

## 40. XVIII §112, Bo 485:

Palestine

In the 14th indiction a severe and tremendous earthquake occurred throughout the land of Palestine, in Arabia and in the land of Mesopotamia, Antiochia, Phoenice Maritima and Phoenice Libanensis.

Th: A.D. 550/1; PsD: A.D. 546/7; TF gives 6th July.

## 41. XVIII §118, Bo 486:

Byzantion

In the month of August of the 2nd indiction there occurred a tremendous earthquake ... at Byzantion.

A.D. 554 (from the indiction).

## 42. XVIII §123, Bo 488:

Byzantion

In the month of April of that indiction occurred a tremendous earthquake that caused no damage.

A.D. 557 (from the indiction); Th: 16th August.

## 43. XVIII §124, Bo 488:

Byzantion

In the month of December of the 6th indiction another most tremendous earthquake occurred at midnight.

A.D. 557 (from the indiction); Th and Ps D both give A.D. 567/8.

*Implications from this list*

The early examples of references to earthquakes seem all to come from areas that can be assigned to Domninos; but the reasoning may often be circular (along the lines of 'this is an earthquake reference, it must have come from Domninos...').

There are signs that a numerical list of earthquakes existed, of a sort that might have been kept in some archive or in a bureaucrat's office. This list is clearest for Antioch, where it starts at 1 (no. 2) and continues in the text as we have it now as far as 6 (no. 32); note that there is a further Antiochene earthquake recorded (no. 38) without a number – this comes from the section of the chronicle where Malalas was using Constantinopolitan sources (see chapters 1, p. 21 and 7, p. 213). There are also briefer, and clearly incomplete, lists for other cities – Rhodes, Anazarbos or Nikomedeia, for example.

What is more certain is that up until no. 35 the vocabulary is unified, referring to 'calamity' (πάθος) and 'wrath of God' (θεομηνία), both of which are occasionally amplified by 'earthquake' since the 'wrath of God' can take other forms (fire, flood or plague, for example). No. 33 and nos. 36 onwards refer simply to 'earthquake' (σεισμός).

It looks as though we have here a further instance of a set of chronicle entries that transcend the proposed (and sometimes quite certain) source divisions; up to no. 35 these references, like the 'From Adam' and Antiochene dates, are material that could arguably have been inserted by Malalas himself into his basic compilation.

This list also confirms the chronicle's shift in focus, and provides some evidence for the sequence of editions. One would like to argue that the break between the first major edition and revision would come (once more nothing is neat and smooth) after the last reference to earthquakes as the 'wrath of God' at no. 35 in 530 (XVIII §40, Bo 448); no. 33, Laodikeia 1, is an intrusive element. After this point we have, as well as 'earthquake' rather than the 'wrath of God', references to 'Byzantion' rather than 'Constantinople' (personal experience or a change of official list, from the Antiochene to the one held in

Constantinople?). However, this is not absolutely water-tight, and probably the strongest statement one could make from this is that the word 'earthquake' in nos. 33, and 36 onwards derives from the Constantinopolitan source which was woven into the chronicle which Malalas had ended in 532.

### Comites Orientis

Although Malalas does not use the sequence of *comites Orientis* as a dating tool, it is nevertheless possible to reconstruct a remarkably full list of the holders of this office from the beginning of Zeno's reign until the early 530s, that is, the time when it is suggested that the first edition of the chronicle took final shape and also not long before the office itself was reconstructed. It is instructive to compare the list from Malalas with that, compiled from all sources, in PLRE 2 (and cf. Downey, 1939).

#### *Comites Orientis referred to by Malalas:*

Felicianus (XIII §4; Bo 319) [first *comes Orientis*, appointed by Constantine, 335]

|                                         |                                                       |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Theodoros (XV §15; Bo 389)              | [c.489/490]                                           |
| Kalliopios (XVI §2; Bo 393)             | [494]                                                 |
| Constantius (XVI §2; Bo 393)            | [494]                                                 |
| Basileios (XVI §6; Bo 396)              | [507]                                                 |
| Prokopios (XVI §6; Bo 396)              | [507]                                                 |
| Eirenaios Pentadiastes (XVI §6; Bo 398) | [507]                                                 |
| Theodotos (XVII §12; Bo 416)            | [?before 522]                                         |
| Anatolios (XVII §14; Bo 417)            | [526]                                                 |
| Ephraimios (XVII §22; Bo 424)           | [526 and earlier ?]                                   |
| Zacharias (XVII §22; Bo 424)            | [527]                                                 |
| Patrikios (XVIII §2; Bo 425)            | [527]                                                 |
| – (XVIII §64)                           | [530, riots involving unnamed <i>comes Orientis</i> ] |
| [Zemarchos (XVIII §131)]                | 559 = Theophanes, as Ba is in lacuna]                 |

#### *Comites Orientis listed in PLRE 2, 1281:*

|                           |               |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Theodoros 33†*            | ?c.489/490    |
| Calliopius 3†*            | c.494         |
| Constantius 13†*          | 494           |
| Basilus 7                 | 507           |
| Procopius 6†*             | 507           |
| Irenaeus 5 Pentadiastes†* | 507           |
| Anonymous 52              | 513/518       |
| Irenaeus 6                | 518           |
| Theodotus 11              | before 522    |
| Ephraemius                | 522/523-524/5 |
| Anatolius 9†*             | 525           |
| Ephraemius                | 526           |
| Zacharias 3†*             | 527           |

Based on the information in PLRE 2:

†: known only from Malalas, or sources derived from his chronicle.

\*: possibly to be identified with another contemporary of the same name and a similar range of activities, but Malalas' information is insufficient to allow certainty.

No symbol: attested elsewhere than in Malalas' chronicle.

Malalas notes the appointment and departure from office of almost all the *comites Orientis* known for the period 494-527; the two exceptions recorded in PLRE 2 (Anonymous 52 and Irenaeus 6) are noted in the context of Severus' religious controversies, a topic ignored by Malalas.

The great majority of Malalas' statements on the *comites Orientis* for this period lack independent witnesses, that is to say, many of the subsidiary witnesses, where they exist, are texts based on Malalas; the inscription noting building work by Ephraemius (IGLS 1142; see PLRE 2, 394) is an exception. It is not until the information from Malalas is available that anything like a regular sequence of the holders of this office can be reconstructed; lists for earlier periods are derived from epigraphic evidence, the addressees of legislation and especially the letters of Libanios. It is striking that there are no entries in Downey's list (1939, 14) after Eleutherios (c. 400) and Abthartios (435) before Theodoros (489/90), the first of the Malalas-derived entries.

As we shall see in connection with the information on patriarchs, the sequence of holders of the office of *comes Orientis* can be reconstructed from about half-way through Zeno's reign. Prior to that the only reference to the *comes Orientis* in the chronicle, and indeed in the literature generally, is the unsupported and somewhat garbled statement on the establishment of the office in 335, though Felicianus, the first *comes Orientis* according to Malalas, is a known figure (cos. 337). Jones, 1964, 104, note 61 is sceptical of Downey's reliance on Malalas at this point, and certainly – given Malalas' creative information on the establishment of provinces and civic customs elsewhere – caution would seem sensible. While Malalas may have reasonable information on the *comites Orientis* contemporary with him, he will be as reliable, or unreliable, on the office under Constantine as he is on any other topic from that period, that is to say, somewhat unreliable. Perhaps the most that can be retained from Malalas' statement is that Constantine established this office when he set up similar *comites* (Jones, 1964, 104-6). The last reference to the appointment of a *comes Orientis* by Malalas is to that of Patrikios (in 527, just before the chronological excursus of XVIII §8); subsequent references are to an unnamed *comes Orientis* involved in a riot in 530 and to Zemarchos in 559 (in a passage of doubtful authenticity, coming as it does from Theophanes when Ba is in lacuna).

Drawing on this one might like to argue that Malalas had access to special knowledge of the sequence of holders of the office of *comes Orientis* from Zeno through to the first years of Justinian and was perhaps a member of a bureau attached to this official. Against this, however, it should be remembered that the information on patriarchs follows a similar pattern. The lack of information on the *comes Orientis* in earlier parts of the chronicle (despite the importance of this official and his entourage in Antiochene life) is consistent with Malalas' prooemium where he indicates that there will be a change in his historiographical techniques from Zeno onwards.

The break in information on the sequence of *comites Orientis*, which comes before the moment when the office was reorganized in Antioch in 535/6 (Jones, 1964, 185), is consistent with the moment at which there are other signs of Malalas' break with his Antiochene circumstances; there are, for example, no further details on the sequence of

patriarchs, earthquakes are barely noticed, the focus of interest becomes Constantinople. All this can be tied in with the final polishing of the chronicle's first edition in the early 530s (as is discussed in chapter 1, p. 22).

Note that the *comes Orientis* is a civil and not a military official and dealt with legal and financial matters; this may be relevant to the interest which Malalas shows in the establishment of provinces and cities, as is discussed in chapter 8, p. 227.

### Patriarchs

Malalas in no way uses the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople or the popes of Rome as a dating device<sup>19</sup> but he does refer in passing, and anachronistically, to the patriarchs of Rome (X §35, Bo 256: Peter was succeeded by Linos), Jerusalem (X §42, Bo 258-9: St James the apostle was succeeded by Simon-Symeon), Alexandria (X §32, Bo 252: the apostle Mark was succeeded by his disciple Anianos), and Ephesos (XI §2, Bo 269: St John the Theologian disappeared) while more completely historical figures, like the popes Vigilius and Agapetus of Rome and Apollinarios of Alexandria appear incidentally in XVIII (§§ 83, 97, 107, 111, 113; Bo 479, 483-6). Patriarchs of Constantinople are more prominent: Euphemios was deposed and succeeded by Makedonios (XVI §11, Bo 400); Anthemios was deposed and replaced by Menas (XVIII §83, Bo 479), Menas was deposed (XVIII §98, Bo 483), Eutychios ordered prayers during a drought (XVIII §139, Bo 492) and officiated at the dedication of Hagia Sophia (XVIII §143, Bo 495). For none of these patriarchates, however, can we construct anything like a full list of patriarchs.

The situation is different for Antioch. Here we find the following names mentioned:<sup>20</sup>

- |              |                                 |                              |
|--------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. St. Peter | (X §15, Bo 242) <sup>21</sup>   |                              |
| 2. Euodios   | (X §24, Bo 246)                 | [41/44 - c.70] <sup>22</sup> |
| 3. Ignatios  | (X §32, Bo 252; XI §10, Bo 276) | [c.70 - d.116] <sup>23</sup> |

<sup>19</sup>Theophanes, by contrast, includes patriarchs in the regnal lists at each entry in his chronicle.

<sup>20</sup>Reference material: Devreesse, 1945, 114 ff.; Grumel, 1958, 446 ff.; Downey, 1961, *passim*. The numbers attached to the patriarchs are taken from Devreesse, 1945, 114 ff.

<sup>21</sup>On the traditions of Peter as the first bishop of Antioch, see Downey, 1961, 281-4 and 583-6; note that at X §75, Bo 243 Peter is also recorded as bishop of Rome (where traditionally he held that office for 25 years before his martyrdom in A.D. 65). Malalas dates Peter's presence in Antioch to A.D. 35, while a chronology based on *Acts* would put Peter's missionary activities in Antioch to A.D. 47-54.

<sup>22</sup>See Downey, 1961, 285-6 for a discussion of the problems concerning Euodios' dates; for Malalas his 'patriarchate' began in A.D. 41, in the tenth year after Christ's ascension (see section 2 B above, date no. 2). According to Synkellos (404. 3, based on Eusebios) Euodios was bishop for 29 years.

<sup>23</sup>See Downey, 1961, 292, note 81 for the difficulties over Ignatios' dates. For Malalas he was martyred probably in A.D. 116 (XI §10, Bo 276); by other sources (Eusebios/Jerome, [1956, 194] he was martyred in A.D. 107/108. As Downey remarks, the chroniclers clearly had no satisfactory information for the chronology of the early bishops of Antioch.

|                 |                                               |                                 |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| (7. Theophilos  | ( <i>passim</i> ) <sup>24</sup>               | [d. after 181/2)] <sup>25</sup> |
| 13. Babylas     | (XII §35, Bo 303)                             | [238/44 - 250] <sup>26</sup>    |
| (40. Domnus     | ( <i>passim</i> ) <sup>27</sup>               | [441/2 - 450] <sup>28</sup>     |
| 47. Stephanos   | (XV §6, Bo 380)                               | [476-9] <sup>29</sup>           |
| 48. Kalandio    | (XV §6, Bo 381)                               | [479-84] <sup>30</sup>          |
| 49. Peter       | (XV §1, Bo 377 = A.D. 474;                    | [470, 485-8] <sup>31</sup>      |
| (the Fuller)    | XV §5,6, Bo 379-80 = A.D. 476)                |                                 |
| 51. Flavian     | (XVI §11, Bo 400)                             | [498-512] <sup>32</sup>         |
| 52. Severus     | (XVI §11, Bo 400; XVII §6, Bo 411)            | [512-8] <sup>33</sup>           |
| 53. Paul        | (XVII §6, Bo 411; XVII §11, Bo 415)           | [519-21] <sup>34</sup>          |
| 54. Euphraisios | (XVII §11, Bo 416; XVII §22, Bo 423)          | [521-6] <sup>35</sup>           |
| 55. Ephraimios  | (XVII §22, Bo 423; XVIII §§27,59, Bo 443,460) | [527-45] <sup>36</sup>          |

From this we can see that Malalas has recorded Antioch's founding bishops (from Euodios onwards anachronistically called patriarchs), while he mentions one notable martyr who was also a patriarch. Two of the sources to which he refers may possibly have been patriarchs (Domninos and Theophilos), though since their relevant works do not survive this is unprovable. From the reign of Zeno onwards the list of patriarchs is complete, with only Palladius (Devreese, 1945, 118: no. 50 Palladius, 490-498) omitted. It is striking that Malalas is not interested in doctrinal matters and patriarchs appear in the chronicle at the moment of entry and departure from office only. Though several of these patriarchs (most conspicuously Severus) were at the forefront of doctrinal controversy, this is barely noted and only patriarchal actions that impinge on civic life are recorded: e.g. the fact that Peter (the Fuller) supported the usurper Basiliskos against Zeno who had

<sup>24</sup>Possibly the Theophilos cited as a source by Malalas: P 5; I §14, Bo 18; II §7, Bo 29; III §6, Bo 59; IV §20, Bo 85; V §68, Bo 143 app.; VI §10, Bo 157; VIII §4, Bo 195; IX §10, Bo 220; X §2, Bo 228; X §32, Bo 252; XVIII §8, Bo 428; see chapter 7, p. 194.

<sup>25</sup>Downey, 1961, 300-1: the date for Theophilos' succession is given as A.D. 169 by Eusebios/Jerome (1956, 205); his death must have occurred between A.D. 180 (death of Marcus Aurelius while Theophilos was writing *Ad Autolyicum III*) and 188 (when Maximinus was already bishop).

<sup>26</sup>On Babylas' dates and the dubious authenticity of his rebuke to an emperor (Numerian according to Malalas, Philip the Arab elsewhere), see Downey, 1961, 306-7, especially note 142. Malalas' placing of Babylas under Numerian and the year 284 (followed by CP) is utterly at variance with all other witnesses.

<sup>27</sup>Just possibly the Domninos cited as a source by Malalas: P 5; IV §24, Bo 88; V §67, Bo 142; VIII §25, Bo 208; X §10, Bo 235; X §51, Bo 266; XI §4, Bo 273; XII §9, Bo 287; XII §26, Bo 297; XII §44, Bo 310.

<sup>28</sup>Honigmann, 1947, 138 for a discussion of these dates.

<sup>29</sup>Downey, 1961, 489, especially note 489.

<sup>30</sup>Downey, 1961, 490.

<sup>31</sup>These dates are taken from Grumel, 1958, 446-7 and are at variance with those given by Malalas, as will be discussed in the forthcoming commentary. The sequence of patriarchs at this time is not clear; see Downey, 1961, 507-8, note 19.

<sup>32</sup>Downey, 1961, 508.

<sup>33</sup>On Severus' stormy life and times, see briefly Downey, 1961, 511-2, Frend, 1972, 201 ff., Stein, 1949, 168-74. That Malalas should have so little to record about Severus should say much about Malalas' own interests and religious stance (see chapter 1, pp. 14-15).

<sup>34</sup>Downey, 1961, 517; Frend, 1972, 249; Stein, 1949, 270-1.

<sup>35</sup>Downey, 1961, 519.

<sup>36</sup>Downey, 1961, 519, note 70 and 557, note 229; PLRE 2, 394-6; Stein, 1949, 638, note 1. Ephraimios was patriarch for 18 years.

appointed him (and therefore, it is implied, had deserved Peter's loyalty [XV §5, Bo 379], or the action taken by Ephraimios on behalf of hostages [XVIII §59, Bo 460]).

A similar lack of interest in the doctrinal issues discussed in his lifetime is demonstrated by Malalas' skimpy notices of the major Church councils. He records the councils of Nikaia (XIII §11, Bo 323), Constantinople (XIII §40, Bo 346), Ephesos (XIV §25, Bo 365), Chalkedon (XIV §30, Bo 367), but – unlike, e.g., the *Chronicon Paschale* – does not mention the matters debated there. The closest that Malalas comes to recording religious controversy is in his account of the *Trisagion* riot in Constantinople, about which he was probably informed by Marinus the Syrian.

## Conclusions

Malalas, like all historians, compiled his chronicle from many sources. He has to some extent made this plain by citing numerous authorities; however, it is also clear that he knows many of these only at second-hand, that some of the citations are fictitious, and that other authorities – like the *Excerpta Barbari* – to which he is significantly indebted are not mentioned at all. As discussed in chapter 7, Bourier has suggested that in Books I-XIV Malalas has made use of four main sources which have been interwoven in a fairly complex way but he made no suggestions about what has happened in Books XV-XVIII. Though it seems very likely that the broad outlines of this case will stand, that is, that Malalas did indeed draw on an Antiochene historian – Dominos – and an ecclesiastical historian – Nestorianos – and one or two other major sources, the detail needs to be refined. One need is to establish which elements are due to Malalas himself; one way of doing this is to pinpoint what parts of the chronological systems found in the chronicle transcend the source boundaries proposed by Bourier.<sup>37</sup>

Let us consider briefly each of the chronological elements that we have isolated:

### 1. Dates 'From Adam'

These dates over-ride the source divisions proposed by Bourier and appear also in the books not considered by him. They seem to be attributed to Theophilos or to the triumvirate Clement, Theophilos and Timotheos. On Malalas' citation pattern as observed elsewhere, the last named authority in a cluster is most likely to be the real source; however it is also very likely that one element in a cluster has fallen out somewhere in the tradition (so that the reference to Theophilos alone is misleading), or that Malalas has interpreted somewhat generously the extent of the authority he is quoting. Nowhere, for example, in the extant writings of Clement or Theophilos do we find evidence that they supported the incarnation and crucifixion date attributed to them by Malalas, while nothing is known of Timotheos other than the statements found in Malalas.

The From Adam dates must represent Malalas' own interpretation of cosmic time (see also Jeffreys, 1990). The centre-piece, the dating of Christ's crucifixion to the year 6000, is unique to Malalas (and Hesychios) and compels him to rearrange all other From

<sup>37</sup> This method is also instructive when used with other features in Malalas: author citations, reference to establishment of provinces, the 'to the present' phrases, foundation of cities, setting up of a *tyche* etc.



Adam dates to fit in with it. It is conspicuous that no chronological expert, Byzantine or modern, uses Malalas for universal dates of any kind. Malalas' From Adam dates are, from Phalek onwards, out of kilter with those of any other system. Nevertheless these provide the main chronological framework for the chronicle as well as – very probably – its *raison d'être* in the millennial preoccupations that they reveal. Onto this framework are loosely hung the other chronological elements.

## 2. Dates from the ascension

This is a brief list of dates concerning Christ's life; a more extensive set survives in the *Chronicon Paschale*. It is impossible to decide whether the *Chronicon Paschale* took the dates from a fuller Malalas (the *Chronicon Paschale* clearly elsewhere did use Malalas, and knew a text which is on the whole very similar to that in Ba) or whether they were using a common independent source. The latter seems not at all improbable (cf. the situation with *Excerpta Barbari* and the material in the ruler lists). Note that the fuller list as attested by the *Chronicon Paschale* ends before the section of Malalas that could be attributed to Nestorianos, and covers the sort of material that could come from Nestorianos as defined by Bourier; i.e. is it possible that Nestorianos could be the common independent source? This, of course, can only be speculation since Nestorianos is otherwise unknown.

## 3. Ruler lists

Apart from the lists of the Ptolemies and the Seleucid rulers, the ruler lists seem to be taken from a chronographic source very like the *Excerpta Barbari*, whose sources in turn are Africanus (or Pseudo-Africanus) and ultimately Kastor. Some narrative material, e.g. on Kronos, Picus Zeus, and – surprisingly, in view of the lack of contact in the list of Ptolemies – Alexander, together with some of the 'floruit' notices, was also taken from this same source. The *Excerpta Barbari* also includes references to authorities and to objects surviving 'to the present'; there are moments when one is tempted to speculate that this text is to be equated with the otherwise unknown Timotheos – but this is unprovable. Malalas' contribution has been to select material from his source (perhaps working from memory), garble it, and slot it loosely with some synchronisms into his From Adam framework.

## 4. Roman imperial reigns

Bourier developed a complicated set of source divisions for the material in the imperial period, but he clearly envisaged Malalas as having actively manipulated (selected and structured) the texts and information he had available; Bourier's suggestions for the sources from Book X onwards are the least convincing parts of his argument (1899, I, 23-46). However, it seems fairly clear, as von Stauffenberg suggests (1931, 508), that Malalas had access to a list of brief imperial lives, which included verbal portraits, modes of death and age at death, as well as the length of reign. From Book X onwards the chronicle is structured by imperial reigns and not by From Adam dates, of which there are none between Christ's incarnation and the death of Zeno; this is very likely a consequence of Malalas' abnormal crucifixion date. The sequence of emperors becomes the framework into which other elements are slotted, and the calculation of totals plainly caused Malalas some problems (cf. XVIII §8).

### 5. Consuls

These appear attached to imperial accessions, episodes in early ecclesiastical history, etc; they have some interesting (but not persistent) similarities to the *Fasti Vindobonenses* and there is a change in presentation around the time of Theodosius I. Somewhere in the tradition the consular dates up to Theodosius I (and early in Book XIV) derive from a consular list with annalistic details added. Many consular dates (in Books XV-XVII) are embedded in the narrative and Malalas probably took them over from his source. Malalas in fact probably found all the consular dates in the different sources he was using and did not insert them into the narrative himself.

### 6. Indictions

Dating by indiction occurs sparsely before Book XVIII. The early instances were probably already included in the sources Malalas was using. Those in Book XVIII must derive from the material from the Constantinopolitan city chronicle that was incorporated into the second edition of Malalas' chronicle.

### 7. Dates by the Antiochene era

These transcend all suggested source divisions (both within Books I-XIV and beyond) and are therefore imposed by Malalas on the blocks of material he selected. The dates refer to a variety of events. The last one, admittedly extant only in the Slavonic texts but to be accepted nonetheless, is part of the chronological excursus and consistent with the other dates given there. The absence of such dates thereafter is a further indication of the shift in focus and almost certainly of the change in place of composition.

### 8. Other eras

The eras of Diocletian and Seleukos are used extremely rarely and chiefly in connection with the chronological excursuses whose purpose was to present Malalas' millennial views; they are arguably due to Malalas himself, in spite of his lack of understanding of the Seleucid system. It was Malalas' chronological idiosyncrasy – and/or ineptitude – which probably accounts for his failure to date by Olympiads, or use the Roman calendar (except on a very few occasions).

### 9. Other chronological elements

#### *Earthquakes*

A fairly extensive list of earthquakes, in which many of the incidents are from a numbered sequence, can be extracted from the chronicle though the earthquakes themselves are not used as a dating tool. Although references to earthquakes often appear in areas attributed to Domninos, they also occur in the later books, with the last numbered Antiochene earthquake dating to 528/9. Earthquake notices appear in the Constantinopolitan section of the chronicle but are no longer part of a numbered sequence. The earlier earthquake lists have been inserted into the chronicle framework by Malalas himself.

#### *Patriarchs and Comites Orientis*

Although a nearly complete list of both patriarchs and *comites Orientis* from Zeno to circa 530 (but interestingly not thereafter) can be reconstructed from the chronicle, these are not part of the chronological structure and reference to these prominent officials is frequently an inevitable part of Malalas' Antiochene narrative.

# MALALAS' SOURCES

Elizabeth Jeffreys<sup>1</sup>

While 'Quellenkritik', the preoccupation of the German historiographical and philological tradition of the late nineteenth century, has long since become unfashionable, some understanding of a historian's – or chronicler's – sources is nevertheless necessary for a proper evaluation of the material presented in his text. This is especially true in the case of Malalas, for two reasons. Firstly, a number of statements in the chronicle are attributed to an authority. If Malalas had direct access to all the writers implied by the citations, then we have interesting and important evidence for the literary culture of Antioch in the first quarter of the sixth century. Even if he did not, such a conclusion is nonetheless informative. Secondly, for some periods, especially for events at Antioch in the first and second centuries, Malalas is almost the only witness for a number of episodes. One needs to have some idea of his likely prejudices and credibility in order to give proper weight to his evidence. When it can be checked the version Malalas gives is frequently unique, or to put it differently, utterly at variance with the received tradition, or demonstrably wrong.<sup>2</sup>

The only major study of Malalas' sources is that made by Bourier in 1899. His examination of Books I-XIV concluded that Malalas had used four main authorities – Domninos, Nestorianos, Timotheos, and another source, anonymous (= Fourth Source) which might possibly be identified with Timotheos (Bourier, 1899, II, 58-9). Bourier's arguments were criticized in some detail by Patzig (1901a, 598-611), who wished to amalgamate Domninos and Nestorianos and also saw no reason why the claims of the preface, with its list of sources used, should not be believed.<sup>3</sup> Bourier was also criticized more generally by von Stauffenberg (1931, *passim* and summarized at 509-10). Von Stauffenberg concluded, from his work on IX-XII, that Malalas was using three types of material: a Kaisergeschichte, which had common elements with the sources of Victor, Eutropius and the *Historia Augusta*; a Christian world-chronicle with a strong Eastern

<sup>1</sup>The accounts of the Antiochene and Constantinopolitan archives and city chronicles (pp. 203-5, 208-10, 213-4), Malalas' interest in legislation (pp. 201-2) and Hermogenes as an oral informant (pp. 209-101) have been contributed by Brian Croke.

<sup>2</sup>To pick some random examples: on the Old Testament heroine Judith, see Dubarle, 1959; on Trajan's Parthian Wars, see Lepper, 1948, 55 ff.; on regnal years for Constantine and his dynasty, see Barnes, 1982, 46.

<sup>3</sup>Note that the authors referred to in the preface are listed in more or less chronological order, from Moses to Eustathios of Epiphaneia (died some time after 502), though there are some notable omissions in the list as preserved (conspicuously absent are Nestorianos and Timotheos, both very significant for the contents of Malalas' work).

imprint (it is not clear to me whether von Stauffenberg meant Alexandrian or Syrian); and an Antiochene *Patria* (a local history, especially concerned with the founding of the city) which also included material from a Constantinopolitan *Patria*. Bourrier's work nevertheless remains the starting point for discussions on Malalas' sources (Downey, 1961; Hörling, 1980; Reinert, 1981).

Neither Bourrier nor von Stauffenberg (nor any more recent student of Malalas) has, however, looked at the chronicle as a whole. While examinations of portions of the text bring valuable insights, they also leave many questions unanswered. What follows – while equally unlikely to produce conclusive and universally acceptable answers – will attempt to discuss the question of Malalas' sources in terms of the whole text, and to collect up material which might provide the basis for better informed judgements in the future.

The chronicle, in eighteen books and a preface (ἐγκύκλιον, 'report', 'general letter'), is not a seamless whole. The preface indicates that divisions in the text are to be anticipated. The preface itself, however, is not an easy section of the text to interpret since it has obviously suffered, at an earlier stage in its transmission, the all too frequent fate of an opening page; several lacunas must now be postulated in what survives. The sense that can be extracted remains ambiguous. Malalas<sup>4</sup> seems to be making a distinction between material he has 'abbreviated' (μετὰ τὸ ἀκροτηριάσαι, P 5) from earlier poets, historians and chroniclers, and oral information ('which came to my hearing') on events that took place in his own lifetime. He appears to be stating that his lifetime is to be put in the reign of Zeno.<sup>5</sup> As has been discussed earlier (chapter 1, pp. 3-4), it is not, however, clear whether Malalas means by this that he was born in Zeno's reign, or reached maturity then, or had access to older contemporaries whose recollections stretched back that far. In view of Malalas' concern with millennia and the calculation that, by the conventional Byzantine reckoning, the sixth millennium would end in 492, the first year of Anastasios, Zeno's successor, it is also possible – though less likely – to argue that Zeno's reign was pivotal in Malalas' views on cosmic chronology, rather than only in connection with his own lifetime (see chapter 6, pp. 117-18).

Nevertheless the reference to Zeno highlights several changes that can be observed in the text around this point (that is, from the beginning of XV onwards) though it should be noted that, as so often in Malalas, the situation is not entirely clearcut. Book XIV ends with the death of Leo II, and a reference is made to the chronicle of Nestorians

<sup>4</sup>Given the questions that have arisen in previous discussions on sources (Bourrier, von Stauffenberg, etc.) and will arise later here about the status of the first-person comments elsewhere in the chronicle, it needs to be said that this preface must surely be attributed to Malalas himself and accepted as a statement of his purposes and method.

<sup>5</sup>P, the only complete witness at this point (B reflects this preface, but it has been shortened and adapted to introduce the chronicle of John of Antioch), reads: 'up till the events of my own lifetime which came to my hearing, I mean indeed from Adam to the reign of Zeno and those who lived afterwards' (ἕως τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἐν τοῖς ἑμοῖς χρόνοις ἐλθόντων εἰς τὰς ἡμᾶς ἀκοάς, λέγω δὴ ἀπὸ 'Αδάμ ἕως τῆς βασιλείας Ζήνωνος); Slav, the only other witness, reads more straightforwardly: 'up till the events of my own lifetime, I mean, from the reign of Zeno'.

which, it is stated, ended at that point.<sup>6</sup> Source citations of this kind had been frequent up to this point (though less so for the imperial period than for earlier, mythical times); this is now the last, apart from references to Eustathios (of Epiphaneia: XVI §9, Bo 399) and Timotheos (the Persian carrier: XVIII §30, Bo 444), of which more will be said later. This change in technique does seem to correspond to a move from reliance on earlier, written historians (or poets and chroniclers) to the use of a different type of source. Equally, from now on, each book deals with a single reign (XV: Zeno; XVI: Anastasios; XVII: Justin; XVIII: Justinian), and the contents alternate between brief annalistic entries (of a sort to be associated with a putative city chronicle) and fuller narratives which can often be linked with a possible 'oral informant' (such as, for example, Marinus the Syrian, in XVI §16, Bo 402-6).

Books I-XIV can, therefore, with considerable justification, be viewed as a distinct unit within the chronicle, vindicating Bourier's examination of them apart from XV-XVIII; so they will also initially be discussed here as a separate block.

There is another separable block of material in the chronicle, in XVIII. By XVIII §72, Bo 477, the nature of the chronicle has changed almost completely. The entries are now, for the most part, very brief<sup>7</sup> (the most discursive exception being that on the bankers' abortive coup, XVIII §141, Bo 493 ff.); they are almost entirely focussed on Constantinople and almost all are recorded by year, month and indiction. The chronicle has ceased to be Antiochene and has become Constantinopolitan. It is difficult, however, to isolate the exact point at which the break occurs. One possible point occurs at XVIII §71, Bo 473, with the entry, dated to 531/2, on the Nika riot but it is also arguable that the chronicle originally ended at XVIII §76, Bo 478, in 532, with the establishment of the Endless Peace (cf. chapter 1, pp. 19-20). But though there are few 'discursive' entries after these points (like the bankers' coup just referred to), there are several brief 'annalistic' entries earlier (e.g. XVIII §3, Bo 427; §12, Bo 430; §31, Bo 444; §33, Bo 445; §48, Bo 452). The most likely solution is that several strands of source material have been interwoven. The issue, however, is complex; it has been discussed previously in chapter 1 (pp. 23-24) and will be referred to again below. It is relevant to recall here that Malalas' preface concludes with a request for others to continue his work.<sup>8</sup>

One of the most striking characteristics of Books I-XIV is the way in which Malalas frequently cites an authority for his statements. These citations refer to poets and historians indifferently (Malalas does not cite theologians or philosophers, who appear only in his 'floruit' lists). Some passages appear to be close and accurate quotations of a text, others are paraphrased and garbled almost beyond recognition; many of the authors survive only in fragments, with Malalas providing a significant part of the evidence; other authors are otherwise completely unknown. Most of the authorities referred to wrote in

<sup>6</sup>Nothing is known of Nestorians, other than what can be gleaned from Malalas: see pp. 187 below.

<sup>7</sup>Though one must beware of sweeping generalisations as it is clear from other witnesses (the Tusculan Fragments, *Chronicon Paschale* or Theophanes) that some of these entries have been abbreviated by the time they have reached Ba; e.g. XVIII §§107, 108, 111, 125.

<sup>8</sup>'My successors must complete the story relying on their own ability' (δεῖ δὲ καὶ τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα συγγράψασθαι τὰ λοιπὰ ἀρετῆς χάριν).

Greek, but a not insignificant number used Latin. Did Malalas in fact have access to all of these in their full and original form? In what follows various approaches to this question will be tried, simultaneously presenting the basis for discussion while addressing the problem.

Firstly, it might be helpful to indicate the wide time-span of the authorities covered by Malalas. The following table lists the names by centuries:<sup>9</sup>

|              |                                                                                                                      |
|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 77th c. B.C. | Hebrew scriptures, Moses                                                                                             |
| 76th c. B.C. | Homer                                                                                                                |
| 5th c. B.C.  | Archilochos, Euripides, Herodotos, Peisander, Sophokles                                                              |
| 4th c. B.C.  | Deinarchos, ?Palaiphatos, Plato, Pythagoras                                                                          |
| 3rd c. B.C.  | Apollonios Rhodios, Kallimachos, Manetho, Philochoros                                                                |
| 2nd c. B.C.  | ?Pheidaios                                                                                                           |
| 1st c. B.C.  | Kastor, Didymos, Diodoros, Dionysios, Licinius Macer, Livy, Sallust, Vergil                                          |
| 1st c. A.D.  | Kephalion, Josephos, Lucan, Ovid, Pliny, Polybios                                                                    |
| 2nd c. A.D.  | Aquila, Arrian, Charax, Clement, Eirenaios, Florus, Lucian, Phlegon, Plutarch, ?Rheginos, Suetonius, Tatian, Thallos |
| 3rd c. A.D.  | Africanus, Diktys, ?Pausanias, Philostratos, Porphyrios, Theophilos                                                  |
| 4th c. A.D.  | Eusebios, Eutropius, Eutychianus, Magnus, Servius, ?Sisyphos                                                         |
| 5th c. A.D.  | ?Bassus, Cyril, Domninos, Nestorianos, Priscus, ?Timotheos                                                           |
| 6th c. A.D.  | Eustathios, Timotheos (the Persian)                                                                                  |

Date unknown: Auleas, Bottios, Brunichius, Fortunus, Hermes Trismegistos, John, Membronios, Ninos, Orpheus, Pergamos, Sotates.<sup>10</sup>

By this reckoning Malalas was acquainted with a wide range of writers, spanning Graeco-Roman culture with an element of Egyptian and Assyrian, from the earliest period to his contemporaries at the beginning of the sixth century. It is, however, plain that he cannot have known all these texts at first hand.

In the first place, several clusters of references reappear in other texts. One of the most obvious occurs at II §28, Bo 45, in the passage on Dionysos' arms at Delphi, where Deinarchos, Philochoros and Kephalion are cited together as authorities for this statement. This passage, in almost identical terms, appears in Eusebios (Eusebios/Jerome, 1956, 54c) and Synkellos (Synk 190) while it is probably derived ultimately from Africanus (Gelzer, 1885, I, 131). Then there are the references noted by Bidez (1902) and Costanza (1959) to quotations from Orpheus, Sophokles, etc, which occur in hagiographical texts (Lives of St Katharine and St Lucy) as well as in Malalas; these must come from a recension of the Tübingen Theosophy though not necessarily the same one as that used by Malalas.<sup>11</sup>

Secondly, many of the references come in a string. A good example of this occurs at VI §10, Bo 157 where Thallos, Kastor, Polybios and Herodotos are all cited in connection with Kyros' victory over Kroisos, with Theophilos given as the final authority. There is

<sup>9</sup>Reinert, 1981, has constructed a similar table for Books I-IV only.

<sup>10</sup>Note that, as will be discussed later, a number of sources, clearly identifiable because extant and available for comparison with Malalas' text, are not mentioned by Malalas.

<sup>11</sup>See now Robert, 1968 and 1971 for the epigraphic evidence that the texts in the Theosophy are genuinely end-products of oracular utterances.

no precision in the material attributed to any of these historians; this, together with the apparent assumption that Herodotos postdates Thallos, Kastor and Polybios, casts doubt on Malalas' knowledge of their texts. These references may well have been embedded in Theophilos' account (his *Ad Autolyicum*, his only surviving work which touches on chronological matters, includes many citations from secular and other authorities – if indeed Malalas' Theophilos is to be identified with the bishop of Antioch), though it is very likely that Malalas did not know this at first hand either (see below).

Thirdly, the references may have been already in Malalas' source. On comparatively rare occasions it is possible to compare Malalas' source with the chronicle as we now have it. One such instance involves the *Excerpta Barbari*.<sup>12</sup> Here we can see references to Africanus reappearing in Malalas in passages undoubtedly taken over, though distorted in the process, from the *Excerpta* (or a text very like it; see below): e.g. on the Sikyonian ruler list (*Exc. Barb.* 292. 6-294. 19, cf. IV §1, Bo 68). On other occasions there are citations of authorities in the *Excerpta* in passages which reappear in Malalas, but where the citation has not been picked up; e.g. Euripides on the Pillars of Herakles: *Exc. Barb.* 238. 25-240. 2, cf. VI §16, Bo 161). It should be remembered that citation of authorities in Malalas' manner was not an unusual phenomenon and parallels can be seen, for example, in Theophilos of Antioch's *Ad Autolyicum* (2nd c.), Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Julianum* (5th c.), as well as in the *Excerpta Barbari* (early 6th c.), John Lydus (6th c.) and perhaps *par excellence* by Eusebios of Caesarea (4th c.) in the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and *Demonstratio Evangelica*.

Fourthly, some references are so garbled that the text must have been paraphrased several times before it reached Malalas. For an instance of this, see II §44, Bo 54 where a euhemeristic statement on the fabrication of gods is attributed to Diodoros; this draws ultimately on Diodorus Siculus I, 2.1-2, 6.1. An intermediate and more intelligible stage of the text can be seen in the Life of St Katharine (ed. Viteau, 1897, 45, line 30; Bidez, 1902, 388-9), a more accurate version of the source common to Malalas and the Life. Again, the ruler lists in Books I-VI are attributed to Africanus but are very inaccurate reproductions of what we know of Africanus' lists from reconstructions based on other witnesses: Malalas would appear to have derived his information from a text very like the *Excerpta Barbari*. At times the garbling process can be observed in progress (in areas other than the ruler lists); a good example of this occurs at *Exc. Barb.* 234. 21-240. 11 which is reflected in I §§8-10, P 12-15, I §§13-14, P 16-18 and VI §§16-18, Bo 161-2; see chapter 6, pp. 134-5.

Fifthly, most of the references to the Latin writers are so vague that, so far from assuming a close knowledge of the texts, one is almost compelled to conclude that Malalas' acquaintance with them was second-hand. This applies to the references to Florus, Livy, Lucan, Ovid, Pliny, Sallust, Servius, and Suetonius Tranquillus.<sup>13</sup> The one possible exception is the quotation from *Aeneid* IV in XII §3, Bo 285, but it is very

<sup>12</sup>The importance of the *Excerpta Barbari* for Malalas can be seen in chapter 6, when it appears constantly in connection with the ruler lists. It will be discussed further below.

<sup>13</sup>Note that it is stated that Eutropius has been consulted in a Greek translation of his work (VIII §28, Bo 209).

likely that this was already embedded in Malalas' local Antiochene source at this point (probably Domninos; see below) and is not necessarily evidence that Malalas himself had ever read Vergil.<sup>14</sup>

There are, however, a number of quotations that are very precise and correspond closely to a text that is independently extant. Examples of this include the quotations from Euripides' *Iphigeneia in Tauris* (V §63, Bo 139) and the Orphic poems (acknowledged as derived from Timotheos [see below]; this is not the place to draw out detailed implications from this situation, but it looks as though there can have been very few intermediaries between Malalas and Timotheos' version of the Orphic texts). In the case of Diktys, where the Greek original is extant only in a scanty fragment, the situation is complicated since the Latin version (Septimius) is self-confessedly a paraphrase, while allowance has also to be made for the shadowy figure of Sisypheos of Kos who appears to have rewritten Diktys' novel from the standpoint of Teukros; nevertheless, from the evidence of the papyrus fragments of the original Greek Diktys, it would seem that Malalas has reproduced substantially what was before him.<sup>15</sup> In a number of cases, for example, the 'pagan oracles' contained in the Tübingen Theosophy (at II §3, Bo 24-5; II §5, Bo 26-7; II §23, Bo 40-1; III §13, Bo 65-6; IV §§8-10, Bo 73-7; IV §12, Bo 77-8; X §5, Bo 231-2) or the passage from the Septuagint (at V §70-72, Bo 144-9), it can be shown that Malalas is quoting an earlier text, often very precisely, although the passage has not been attributed to an authority.

It is, however, useful to list (alphabetically) the authorities cited by Malalas, identifying them (where possible), indicating the topics for which they are used, suggesting some conclusions or points to be kept in mind, and giving appropriate references to editions and secondary literature where these are available or helpful (fuller discussions will be given in the commentary).

**Africanus:** Sextus Julius Africanus, fl. 220, chronographer. [See: Gelzer, 1885, 2 vols; PW 10, cols. 116-25, Iulius 47; Thee, 1984; Mosshammer, 1984. Ed.: Routh, 1846, 238-309; PG 10, cols. 63-94].

Preface (in list of authorities); II §42, Bo 53: on empire of Thebes (Palaiphatos and Euripides are also mentioned); III §9, Bo 62: Ogyges' flood; IV §7, Bo 72: Athenian ruler-list; IV §25, Bo 90: Lakedaimonian ruler-list; IV §25, Bo 90: first Olympic festival, founded by Olympians in time of Saul (part of Corinthian ruler-list); VI §12, Bo 158: destruction of the Lydians (with a reference to Pythagoras); XI §1, Bo 269: St John the Theologian vanished from Ephesos (Eirenaïos is cited with Africanus).

The inclusion of Africanus in the list in the preface must surely be attributed to Malalas himself. The reference at XI §1, Bo 269 is different in kind to the others and has not been included by Routh in his collection of the fragments; it probably derives ultimately from Eirenaïos (Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3. 1.1). Almost all the references to Africanus are in

<sup>14</sup>See Baldwin, 1987, for a brief comment on the status of this passage as evidence for Latin pronunciation in the 5th-6th centuries.

<sup>15</sup>The status of Diktys and the Trojan material in Malalas is a complex one; see Griffin, 1907; Patzig, 1903 and 1908; Peristerakis, 1984. Note that even so it seems unlikely that the portrait list in Malalas' Diktys material ever formed part of the original Diktys; see also chapter 8, p. 242.



connection with ruler-lists. But since the ruler-lists are full of inaccuracies (as can be seen in the discussions in chapter 6) and there are no signs of Africanus' other preoccupations and interests, like the seventy-week year (and even the chiliastic cosmic framework which does ultimately derive from Africanus is significantly different), it seems unlikely that Malalas knew Africanus' work directly; the Africanus citations, and the ruler-lists, come from a text rather like the *Excerpta Barbari*.

**Anthios:** unknown chronicler.

II §19, Bo 37 sub-text: on the etymology of the names of the Medes and the Persians.

This authority is preserved in the Slavonic translation only and is a passing citation in the narrative on Perseus; it is unlikely that Malalas consulted this writer directly.

**Apollonios:** referred to by Malalas as 'the historian' but can only mean Apollonios Rhodios, 3rd c. B.C. [Ed.: Fränkel, 1961.]

IV §13, Bo 79: on the Argonauts' visit to Kolchis ('There are other parts of the story').

The passage on the Argonauts (IV §12-13, Bo 77-9) includes a pagan oracle foretelling Christ's birth, found also in the Tübingen Theosophy (early 6th c.) and a reference to Constantine establishing the chapel of the archangel Michael at Sosthenion in the fourth century. It looks as though Malalas, whatever the state of the narrative that he found in his source, has been interweaving various layers but is most unlikely to have looked at the *Argonautica* for himself.

**Aquila the Jew:** Jewish proselyte from Pontus, c. 125; translator of the Old Testament. [See: PW 2, col. 314, Aquila 7. Ed.: Field, 1875.]

I §2, P7: Enoch was the seventh from Adam.

The reference is very vague and is almost certainly indirect; cf. *Chronographeion Syntomon* (Schoene, 1875, Appendix 4, col. 2) where Aquila is referred to as an authority on biblical chronology.

**Archilochos:** lyric poet, 7th c. B.C. [See: PW 9, col. 29, Hypermnestra. Ed: Lasserre/Bonnard, 1958; Tarditi, 1968.]

IV §1, Bo 68: Lynkeus made war on Danaos and took his daughter.

This statement is embedded in a garbled Argive and Sikyonian ruler-list which is otherwise attributed to Africanus and which has much in common with the *Excerpta Barbari* (though this passage does not appear in that text). The killing of Danaos by Lynkeus is well attested in the ancient sources (e.g. Schol. Eurip. *Hel.* 586; Serv. *Aen.* X 497; Schol. Stat. *Theb.* VI 269; *Myth. Vat.* II 103), but the authenticity of this fragment (Bergk 150, LB 267, T 283, not in Diehl) is highly suspect: 'Archilochi nomen valde suspectum censet Bergk' (Tarditi, 1968, at fr. 283).

**Arrian:** Flavius Arrian, 2nd c.; historian. [See: PW 2, cols. 1230-47 at 1236. Ed.: FHG III, 586-601, fr. 18; FGRIIb 156, fr. 49.]

XI §6, Bo 274: Arrian wrote an account of Trajan's war with the Persians.

Malalas' account of Trajan's wars is extremely garbled, as Lepper, 1948, demonstrates. The comment preserved here need only mean that Malalas was aware that Arrian was reputed to be an authority on this subject; Bosworth, 1983, citing John Lydus' use of Arrian, provides a salutary discussion on the caution needed when dealing with fragments of this sort.

**Auleas:** author of tragedies. [See: PW 2, col. 2402; TrGF I, 62-3, 327, note 231.]

III §7, Bo 61: Auleas had written about Endymion; V §68, Bo 143: Auleas wrote tragic choruses for plays.

Auleas is an otherwise unattested author and both PW (Dieterich) and TrGF (Snell) assume this reference to be spurious, though Cantarella, 1970, attempts to save it. Note however that the second passage is partially confirmed by P.Ox. 1802, col. 2, 43 (2nd-3rd cc.); cf. TrGF, I, 62-3.

### **Bassus**

X §12, Bo 239: I (= Malalas) found a document on the statue set up by Veronica in Paneas, in the house of Bassus, a Jew who became Christian.

Though this is not strictly speaking an author-citation, Bassus' house provides the locale for the discovery of the petition that Malalas quotes. The statue in Paneas was significant in later Iconoclast debates (hence the references to it by John of Damascus; see chapter 9, p. 254) but was also important earlier: see Eusebios, *HE* VII, 18. 1-4. From Eusebios' comments 'Veronica's House' was on the tourist list of sites to see (cf. Tsafir, 1986, 130 where the statue at Paneas is listed in Theodosius' itinerary; Wilkinson, 1977, 167). Although this passage occurs in an area assigned by Bourier to Nestorianos, one could argue that this is a paragraph and document (X §12, Bo 237-9) acquired locally by Malalas and inserted into whatever main source he was using, that is, there are reasonable grounds for accepting the 'I' reference as genuine (cf. chapter 1, pp. 4-5 and later in this chapter, p. 214-15); cf. the comment on 'Brunichius' below.

### **Bottios**

II §13, Bo 34: Picus Zeus seduced Danae with gold (contrasted with Euripides' version); VIII §1, Bo 193: Alexander defeated Dareios; X §48, Bo 262: Domitian banished St John the Theologian to Patmos and caused other Christians to flee to Pontus.

Bottios (or Bouttios) is an otherwise unknown and completely unidentifiable chronicler. Malalas cites him for an odd mixture of euhemerized myth, secular and ecclesiastical history. The reference to Alexander has some resemblance to *Exc. Barb.* 268. 16-24, but the verbal connections are not close. It is most unlikely that Malalas knew this author at first hand. The name is suspiciously close to the cult name Zeus Bottios or Bottiaios (VIII §13, Bo 200) derived from the village of Bottia on Mount Silpios; cf. Libanios, *Or.* 11. 76.

**Brunichius** [See: PW 3, col. 906; Gelzer, 1885, I, 229.]

VII §12, Bo 187: I (= Malalas) found this account in the city of Thessalonike; the account was by Brunichius, the Roman chronicler, and concerned Februarius (and probably also the material on Manlius).

Brunichius is otherwise unknown; Wissowa (PW) considers him to be an example of 'Schwindelliteratur' like Sisypchos of Kos or Diktys (though we should note that Diktys is now vindicated as a real text). The evidence elsewhere in the text (as mentioned above under 'Bassus') of Malalas' critical judgement and personal intervention in the material he selects makes it tempting to think that this might be a genuine comment. This would mean that Malalas had travelled to Thessalonike (cf. chapter 1, p. 4).

**Charax of Pergamum**: historian, 2nd c. [See: PW 3, col. 2122-3; Cameron (A.D.E.), 1976, 65. Ed.: FHG III, 636-45, fr. 19; FGrH IIa 103, fr. 33-4.]

IV §16, Bo 81: on the chariot race between Pelops and Oinomaos (= fr. 33); VII §4, Bo 175: on hippodrome symbolism (= fr. 34).

Charax is now known, from epigraphic evidence, to have flourished in the second century, rather than the sixth as previously suggested (given the way in which his hippodrome material is bandied around between sixth-century writers); he wrote a universal history in forty books. The material on hippodrome symbolism appears in Lydus (*De mens.* I, 12), Corippus (Cameron (A.M.), 1976, 146-7, discussing I 324 ff.; cf. Lyle, 1984) and also Cassiodorus (*Variae* III, 51); Malalas would seem to be tapping a matter that was of common interest in the early sixth century.

**Clement of Alexandria**, c.150-211/6. [See: PW 4, col. 11, Clemens 8. Ed.: FHG IV, 364; FGrH II a, 482, no. 102; FGrH IIa 102; PG 8-9 (PG 9, col. 1485 ff: chronological framework, compiled from the *Stromateis*).]

Preface: one of the authorities referred to in the list of authorities consulted; II §11, Bo 34: on Syros' arithmetical philosophy; X §2, Bo 228: cited with Theophilos and Timotheos as the chroniclers 'who agree among themselves', and whose calculations Malalas prefers; X §4, Bo 231: on the date of Herod's death and the accession of Archelaos; X §13, Bo 240: on the death of Herod [but wrong date and wrong Herod]; X §15, Bo 242: cited with Tatian on Paul in Antioch; XI §19, Bo 280: on Markion and Manichaean beliefs; XVIII §8, Bo 428: cited again with Timotheos and Theophilos on cosmic chronology.

FGrH IIa 102 assumes that the Clement referred to by Malalas in conjunction with Theophilos and Timotheos is Clement of Alexandria, who is also cited as a chronicler by Eusebios/Jerome, 1956, 7. Grumel, 1958, 6, uses X §2 and XVIII §8 as evidence that Clement supported an Incarnation date of 6000 despite there being no evidence for this elsewhere in Clement's works, though a certain amount for his favouring the usual 5500 (*ibid.*, 24; though according to PG 9, col. 1490 Clement placed Christ's birth in 5538). On the basis of the suggestions for the idiosyncrasy of Malalas' incarnation date discussed in chapter 6 (pp. 116-17), I would regard the references to Clement in X §2 and XVIII §8 to be 'inventions' by Malalas which tell us nothing about Clement's views on the date of Christ's incarnation and crucifixion; they might have been included in Timotheos (whose writings are not extant and whose nature can only be surmised from Malalas' references), or might simply be adduced by Malalas to add weight to his extrapolations from whatever

arguments Timotheos had put forward. The episodes for which Clement is cited elsewhere in the chronicle have yet to be matched up with any of his extant works. The reference to Syros and arithmetical philosophy stands apart from the others, which are all on early church or doctrinal matters.

**Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, died 444.** [Ed.: *Contra Julianum*, PG 76, cols. 503-1063.]

II §5, Bo 27: Hermes Trismegistos' oracle (= *Contra Julianum* I: PG 76, cols. 556, 552; Erbse, 1941, 104-11, 202-3); III §2, Bo 58: John and Cyril, the most holy bishops, have given facts on Melchisedek (Josephos is also cited); VII §15, Bo 188: on Plato's foretelling of the Trinity (= *Contra Julianum* I: PG 76, col. 553; cf. Erbse, 1941, 204, no. 3).

The reference concerning Melchisedek is extremely imprecise and surely comes at second- or third-hand (though cf. PG 79, cols. 953-1006 for Cyril's brief homilies on *Hebrews* 7, where Melchisedek is viewed as prefiguring Christ). The other two citations concern 'pagan oracles' of the sort that also occur in the Tübingen Theosophy, as well as in the set of Syriac prophecies edited in Brock, 1983. Cyril and Malalas are here tapping, at different periods, different strata of the same common source whose oracular and epigraphic basis has now been clearly established (Robert, 1968 and 1971).

**Deinarchos: of Delos, 4th c. B.C.** [See: PW 4, col. 2388-9. Ed.: FHG IV, 391.]

II §28, Bo 45: on Dionysios' tomb.

This, with a reference to Philochoros, is embedded in a citation from Kephalion. The same cluster of references, however, is also found in Synkellos (190. 16-24); this set of statements plainly had wide currency: cf. Cyril, *Contra Julianum* X (PG 76, col. 1025), Eusebius/Jerome, 1956, 54. Malalas therefore cites Deinarchos simply as part of a package derived very probably, as Müller (FHG IV, 625) suggests, from Domninos.

**Didymos: Didymos Chalkenteros, Alexandrian polymath, c.80-10 B.C.** [See: PW 5, cols. 445-472, esp. 466-7. Ed.: Schmidt, 1854, esp. 356-63.]

Preface: listed amongst the authorities used by Malalas (after a correction on the basis of Slav); IV §15, Bo 81: Ganymede died on an embassy (contrasted with the eagle version); IV §22, Bo 86: on Herakles and Antaios; VI §22, Bo 166: on the opposition Diomedes met on return (included in the Meleager story).

A mixed collection of topics. PW 5, col. 466 suggests that the probable source for Malalas would be the *Xene Historia*, a collection of mythological stories; cf. Synk 190. 1 on Perseus and Gorgo and 189. 20 on Ganymede where Didymos and the *Xene Historia* are cited on these topics. But Malalas' references are very imprecise and it is much more likely that these were already in his immediate source.

**Diktys of Crete: 2nd-3rd cc.** [See: Griffin, 1907; Peristerakis, 1984. Ed.: FGh I 49; Eisenhut, 1973 (= Septimius).]

V §40, Bo 107: Diktys recorded events at Troy; V §50, Bo 119: Diktys (and Sisypheos) wrote on Kirke; V §51, Bo 122: Diktys wrote on Odysseus; V §59, Bo 132 (cf. X §28, Bo 250) Diktys' text found in the time of Claudius Nero and contrasted with Sisypheos, Homer and Vergil; V §61, Bo 135: Orestes discussed in Diktys' sixth Rhapsody.

Diktys survives in Greek only as small papyrus fragments (Eisenhut 1969 and 1973) and as this 'paraphrase' in Malalas and related chronicles. It is not clear whether Diktys continued to be available in its independent form (to, e.g., Pseudo-Symeon or Tzetzes); see Patzig, 1892; Griffin, 1907; Noack, 1892 and chapter 9, pp. 260-1. The version of Diktys in Malalas is considerably changed from that preserved in Latin as 'Septimius'. The problem is further compounded by the role of Sisypheos (see below), cited by Malalas but not otherwise known. It looks as though the fictitious diaries of Diktys were recast from Teukros' stand-point by the equally fictitious Sisypheos and this version then used by Malalas, who also inserted the cross-references for the finding of the text (following the information given in Septimius/Diktys' prologue). Note that the rationale behind the lengthy Troy material is the bringing of the palladion from Troy to Italy (and hence ultimately to Constantinople). The Troy material does, of course, also have Antiochene connections through Orestes and Iphigeneia, and it would seem not unreasonable to think that this might have been in Domninos, or some other historian of Antioch (see the forthcoming commentary for a fuller discussion and analysis of the Trojan and Diktys material in Book V). However, as this section is very full and disproportionately long, it is arguable that Malalas himself copied it into his chronicle framework.

**Diodoros:** Diodorus Siculus, died c.21 B.C. [See: PW 5, cols. 663-704. Ed.: Oldfather, 1933.]

Preface: one of the authorities acknowledged by Malalas; I §13, P 17: Picus Zeus' tomb in Crete; [I §14, P 18 on Herakles; P reads 'Herodotos', Slav reads 'Diodoros';] II §44, Bo 54: on deification of men; IV §1, Bo 68: Diodoros states that the Argive empire lasted for 549 years.

These are rather vague references, apart from that on Picus Zeus' tomb (Diod. Sic. III, 61. 1-2). That however would seem to have been anthologized since it reappears frequently elsewhere presumably as a useful argument in Christian polemic for the mortality of pagan deities (e.g. Theophilus, *Ad Autol.* 10; Athenagoras, *Pr. Christ.* 30; Tatian, *Adv. Gr.* 27; Clem. Alex., *Protr.* II 37.4; Cyril, *Contra Julianum* X, 342c; Pophyr., *Vita Pythag.* 17; see Gelzer, 1885, I, 77; Reinert, 1981, 173, note 139). In the case of Malalas this passage has been inserted into a narrative that has been taken from a text like the *Excerpta Barbari* (or rather, at this point, from 'Anon.', the unattributable narrative on Zeus; *Exc. Barb.* 234. 22-238. 24). The passage on the deification of men is a distorted paraphrase which also appears elsewhere as well as in Diodoros and may ultimately go back to Euhemeros' *Hiera anagraphe*; cf. Cicero, *De deorum nat.* III 53, Diod. Sic. III, 63 ff., 4. 2 and PW 5, col. 675. Huxley (1983 and 1987; cf. chapter 6, p. 125) argues that the reference to Diodoros preserves a reflection, via Kastor, of Diodoros' chronological lists; given the fluidity of Malalas' other citations of Diodoros this seems an optimistic assumption. Despite the comment in the preface, Malalas is unlikely to have consulted Diodoros directly.

**Dionysios:** Dionysios of Halikarnassos, fl. 30-8 B.C. [Ed. Cary, 1937.]

VII §19, Bo 190: Thessalonike was so named after a member of Philip of Macedon's family.

This comment seems most unlikely to be the result of direct access by Malalas to Dionysios of Halikarnassos; who notes simply (I, 49. 4) that Pallene was destroyed in the reign of Kassandros when Thessalonike was being founded. Thessalonike was indeed founded by Kassandros (c. 359-297 B.C.), elder son of Antipater, in honour of his wife (Thessalonike), a daughter of Philip II; see Strabo VII, fr. 21.

**Domninos:** unidentified historian. [See: Bourier, 1899, *passim*.]

Preface: included in the list of authorities consulted; IV §24, Bo 88: Phaidra's affair took place 52 years after Pasiphae's death; V §67, Bo 142: on the statue of Orestes, 'The Runaway'; VIII §25, Bo 208: Antioch's walls rebuilt 122 years after the city's foundation; X §10, Bo 235: Domninos recorded Tiberius' building activity in Antioch; X §51, Bo 266: on the length of Apollonios of Tyana's life (and all his other activities?); XI §4, Bo 273: on the rituals on Trajan's arrival at Antioch; XII §9, Bo 287: on the *amphithales* at Antioch; XII §26, Bo 297: on Valerian's Persian Wars (contrasted with Philostratos' account); XII §44, Bo 310: Domninos on Diocletian and the Olympic festival.

Domninos is an otherwise unknown historian, considered by Bourier to be one of Malalas' main sources. His work clearly dealt with Antiochene history, with especial emphasis on its legendary past (as exemplified by the narratives on Orestes). He is interested in the buildings and statues of Antioch (e.g. his account of 'The Runaway' and Apollonios' talismans). It is tempting to attribute the narrative earlier in the chronicle on Amphion and Zethos to Domninos on the grounds that the statues of these two are mentioned under Trajan. He is also concerned with civic rituals, e.g. the Olympic games, the welcome to Trajan, the role of the *amphithales*. His work would seem to have given some information on military history (e.g. on Valerian's campaigns), perhaps on that which particularly affected Antioch. Some of his sources, e.g. Pausanias, can be shown to be embedded in material which must be derived from Domninos (Bourier, 1899). Bourier assumes that Domninos' history was available to the end of XIV (cf. the table on p. 198 below), but we must remember that Malalas' last citation of Domninos occurs in XII. Though perhaps if Domninos is to be associated with references to Antiochene buildings then as the last significant notice is to the Basilica of Anatolius, at XIV §13, Bo 360, this may be an indication that the work extended at least to the reign of Theodosius II. Since nothing else is known of Domninos, assimilation to the bishop named Domnos in the mid-fifth century is pure guesswork. Domnos would represent the conflict between pagan/Hellenic views and Christianity that is a leit-motif of Malalas' chronicle, but this does not in fact advance our understanding of the situation very much. It might also be suggested, following an inspection of PLRE 2 (cf. PW 5, cols. 1521-5), that the Domninos who came from Larissa not far from Antioch and was a philosopher in Athens in the mid-fifth century might be an attractive candidate; this writer's extant works, however, and the references to him elsewhere show that his interests lay entirely with mathematics and he would seem to have nothing in common with the homonymous Antiochene historian. Note that Patzig (1901) wanted to coalesce Domninos and Nestorinos into one; this, however, simply means removing the question of the structure of the chronicle away from Malalas and back one generation, still leaving the same

questions of rationale to be answered. On the question of the substantial amount of material on the Trojan war, which Bourrier attributes to Domninos – might it not be more logical to attribute to Domninos only the Orestian narrative, based largely on Euripides (from V §65 onwards) and with a strong Syrian connection, leaving the Diktys/Sisyphos sections to have been added by Malalas? However shadowy Domninos remains, it must nevertheless be accepted that an Antiochene history attributed to him lies behind much of the early books of Malalas.

Eirenaïos (Irenaeus): bishop of Lyons, died 200. [See: PW 5, cols. 2124-6, Eirenaeus 8.]

VI §14, Bo 160: on Judith in the Hebrew scriptures; VII §17, Bo 191: on the length of the first empire of the Egyptians and Thebans; XI §2, Bo 269: on the disappearance of St John the Theologian (Africanus is also cited).

All these references are very vague (see Gelzer, 1885, II, 136). While the reference to the Egyptians may ultimately derive from Panodoros (cf. chapter 6, p. 132), the other comments may reflect Africanus at several removes. Malalas, however, is most unlikely to have consulted directly any text of Irenaeus (author of a work on the schismatic sects of the early church now surviving only in extensive quotations by later writers).

Euripides: c. 475-c. 406 B.C. [Ed.: Murray, 1902-10.]

II §8, Bo 31: Euripides wrote poetically on Europe, Zeus and Minos (in the play called *Phrixos*; Bentley, at Bo 712, cf. Eratosthenes, *Katemerismoi*); II §13, Bo 34: Euripides wrote a myth about Danae, contrasted with Bottios the chronicler (= *Danae*); II §26, Bo 43: on Bacchus and Dionysios, quoting *Bacchai* 28-9 though attributing the lines to Pentheus rather than Dionysios and needing emendation to remove an oral simplification (= *Bacchai*); II §35, Bo 49: on Zeus as a satyr seducing Antiope, contrasted with Kephalion's truthful version (= *Antiope*); II §42, Bo 53: Euripides' poetic play on Oidipous, Iokaste and Sphinx is contrasted with Palaiphatos' and Africanus' versions (= *Oidipous*); IV §7, Bo 72: Euripides wrote a play on Alkmaion, inserted in a ruler-list attributed to Africanus (= *Alkmaion*); IV §18, Bo 84: Euripides wrote on Bellerophon (= *Stheneboia*); IV §21, Bo 86: Euripides wrote on Pasiphae (= *Pasiphae*); IV §24, Bo 88: Euripides wrote on Phaidra and Hippolytos, with a date from Domninos and contrasted with Kephalion's version (= *Hippolytos*); V §49, Bo 117: Euripides wrote on the three-eyed Cyclops, contrasted with Pheidaios and Homer; note that the statement on Euripides' plot, as interpreted by Pheidaios, could either have been in Sisyphos' reworking of Diktys or could be an addition by Malalas (= *Cyclops*); V §63, Bo 137: Orestes and Iphigeneia, with quotations from the *Iphigeneia in Tauris* – IT 69-70, 72-3, 103-5, 238, 241, 246, 248-51, 254-5, 495, 510, 771, 774, 790-1 – some of which are garbled (= *Iphigeneia in Tauris*); VI §21, Bo 166: on Meleager (= *Meleager*); XIV §12, Bo 359: Crete is an island of a hundred cities (TGF, Euripides, fr. 472).

Though some of the fullest quotations come in connection with Antiochene material (i.e. from the *Iphigeneia in Tauris* in Book V, on Orestes), it is hard to argue that all the Euripidean material has an Antiochene connection. (Note that *Exc. Barb.* 240. 1-2 has a reference to Euripides in the passage on the Pillars of Herakles that does not appear in Malalas though the 'to the present' phrase does.) Euripides was, of course, a widely read author. Given the distortion present in some of the quotations it is hard to argue that Malalas had direct access to Euripides, even though Domninos might have; Patzig (1901a, 610) considers that Malalas did use Euripides directly. However, these scraps are of little textual significance in the history of the transmission of the Euripidean plays.

**Eusebios Pamphilou:** bishop of Caesarea, c. 260-340.

Preface: Eusebios is listed amongst the authorities consulted by Malalas; I §4, P 9: the ark is on Ararat in Armenia (Pergamos the Pamphylian and Josephos are also cited); I §6, P 11: the three tribes were divided into 72 nations; II §43, Bo 53: on Seruch and idols (leading on to references to Diodoros and Rheginos); III §1, Bo 57: on Abraham and Tharras; IV §4, Bo 70: on Deukalion and the flood and a list of prominent Hellenes (Prometheus etc); VI §1, Bo 150: capture of Jerusalem in the fifth year of Nebuchadnezzar; VII §19, Bo 190: length of the kingdom of Macedon; VIII §9, Bo 197: Eusebios and Pausanias recounted the victory of Augustus over Antony; VIII §24, Bo 207: second capture of Jerusalem and the Maccabees' revolt; IX §2, Bo 215, sub-text: Lucan and Eusebios wrote on Pompey; X §2, Bo 228: Eusebios' incarnation date is contrasted unfavourably with that of Clement, Theophilos and Timotheos; X §35, Bo 256: Linos succeeded Peter as bishop of Rome; X §45, Bo 260: on the third capture of Jerusalem; XVIII §8, Bo 428: Eusebios' incarnation date is again contrasted unfavourably with that of Clement, Theophilos and Timotheos.

These references, however, are not to the 'real' Eusebios (see Gelzer, *passim*, Bickerman, 1951, 72 and chapter 2, p. 32) but must refer to a version of the chronicle which calculated years from the creation and not simply from Abraham; cf. the *anno mundi* dates attributed to Eusebios by Synkellos (though these do not correspond with those cited by Malalas).<sup>16</sup> Note that many of the references to Eusebios are to chronological points. It would seem that this Pseudo-Eusebios, like Annianos, put the incarnation at 5500 and the crucifixion at 5533. Although Malalas would seem to know Pseudo-Eusebios well enough to cite his incarnation date, it seems likely – from the vagueness of the references – that he knew the text only indirectly.

**Eustathios of Epiphaneia:** died after 502/3. [See: PLRE 2, 435-6. Ed.: FHG IV, 138-42.]

Preface: one of the authorities consulted by Malalas; XVI §9, Bo 399 (= fr. 6): Eustathios wrote on Anastasios' Persian wars.

Eustathios was the author of a Χρονική Ἱστορικὴ in two parts (to the Fall of Troy, and to 502/3) which used Priskos (see Blockley, 1981, 117, 167 and 1983, 391) and was subsequently used by Evagrius, Malalas, Prokopios, etc. This reference to Eustathios is significant in that it comes in a section for which there is no suggestion that Malalas was drawing on a pre-existing chronicle, unlike the period up to Zeno for which the Tübingen Theosophy indicates there did exist a chronicle (Erbse, 1941, 167). The implication would be that Malalas has made the selection of material for the period after Zeno himself, as the wording of the preface suggests. It is possible that much of Malalas' material on the early fifth century (the betrothal of Theodosius II, the career of Kyros of Panopolis and Chrysaphios; the Huns and Attila; the career of Zeno) was indeed derived from Eustathios, without acknowledgement. Allen, 1988, argues that Eustathios was more concerned with chronological speculation than has been hitherto suspected, which is a further sign that he may have been a significant influence upon Malalas.

<sup>16</sup>According to Bickerman, II §43 and III §1 show that this Ps-Eusebios used the apocryphal *Book of Jubilees*, a text which Malalas was certainly using in Book I (see the forthcoming commentary).



**Eutropius:** historian, cos. 387. [See: PLRE 1, 317; PW 6, cols. 1521-7. Ed.: Droysen, 1879; Santini, 1979.]

VIII §28, Bo 209: Eutropius, the Roman writer, in his translation, wrote on Perseus of Epirus (cf. 4.6-7), with a further reference to Palaiphatos; XIII §25, Bo 334: after an account of St Basil's and St Mercurius' involvement in Julian's death, Malalas states that Eutropius' version (cf. 16.2) did not agree in some details.

Eutropius wrote a *Breviarium* of Roman history which went to the death of Jovian; a Greek translation was made by Paianios, c. 380 and a further Greek adaptation was made by Capiton of Lycia in the early sixth century (FHG IV, 133, and known from John of Antioch and Planudean and Constantinian excerpts; see also the Souda, s.v. Eutropius, Kapiton). It could be that this is another recently available text known to Malalas, showing once again that he was using the latest material to hand.

**Eutychianos:** soldier/historian, fl. 363. [See: PLRE 1, 319; PW 6, cols. 1531-2. Ed.: FHG IV, 4-6; FGrH IIB 226.]

XIII §22, Bo 332: Eutychianos took part in Julian's Persian campaigns and wrote about them, though his version is different from that of Magnus.

According to FHG IV, 4 Eutychianos is a major source for Ammianus though PLRE doubts this (cf. FGrH IIB 226, Komm. pp. 638-9). There is also discussion whether he is Christian (Seeck, 1906, 537ff.); he is presumably not the Eutychianus of the *Patria* (ed. Preger, 1901, I, 144.3). Büttner-Wobst (1892, 564) comments: 'Der fabelhafte Bericht über Julians Tod, den Malal. 332.18 ff. aus E. mitteilt, ist nur durch Verwirrung des Textes unter E.'s Namen getreten'. In other words, this is a reference of exceedingly dubious quality. One is left with a strong suspicion that Malalas himself inserted it, particularly in view of the 'source-criticism' of the contrast with Magnus (see below).

**Florus:** L. Annaeus Florus, 2nd. c. A.D. [See: PW 6, cols. 2761-70 at 2765. Ed.: Jal, 1967.]

VIII §29, Bo 211: On Scipio, 'as the most learned Florus noted from Livy's writings'.

L. Annaeus Florus, probably the poet-friend of Hadrian and author of the dialogue 'Vergilius orator an poeta'. The *Epitome*, his chief work, though based largely on Livy, did also draw on other authors (e.g. Seneca) but the presence of Florus' *Epitome* in most of the *Periochae* of Livy reinforced this misapprehension. VIII §29, Bo 209.10-211.3 on Scipio, Hannibal and Antiochos Nikomedes very roughly represents Florus I, 22 on the second Punic War, though no mention is made there of Antiochos, who is however mentioned in I, 24.6. The passage in Malalas therefore is a recasting of Florus from an Antiochene standpoint, either by Malalas or his source. It is not a direct quotation and tells us nothing positive about Malalas' knowledge of Latin (but, rather, is negative by implication).

### Fortunus

I §1, P 6: on Seth, the naming of the planets and the invention of writing.

This author is completely unknown and the reference very vague and impressionistic, despite the comment about the lecture (or account) in Constantinople in which the material on the planets was presented. Lydus (*De mens.* II, 4-12) demonstrates a parallel interest in this type of cosmology, which could be seen as an echo of Philoponus' debates on the Aristotelian nature of time (Sorabji, 1987; cf. chapter 1, p. 6), but this shows no more than that Malalas was aware of a matter of current scientific and philosophical interest.

### Hebrew Scriptures (cf. Moses)

Preface: the Hebrew books written by Moses are amongst the sources acknowledged by Malalas; I §2, P7: information on Enoch, according to Aquila the Jew and the Hebrew scriptures written by Moses (followed by a quotation from *Genesis* 6. 2, 4); I §4, P 9: on the Flood, with a general recollection of the wording of the *Genesis* account; III §6, Bo 61: on Joseph (referring to *Exodus*); III §12, Bo 65: on Moses, Pharaoh and the release of the Jews (referring to *Exodus*); IV §17, Bo 81: on Sampson, who had mystic knowledge and worked miracles (synchronized with Ilios); VI §14, Bo 160: on Judith (Eirenaïos is also cited, but *Judith* underlies the text).

### Sacred Scriptures

X §2, Bo 228: on the millennial question; X §4, Bo 231: on the slaughter of the Innocents; X §11, Bo 236: John the Baptist's comment on Herod's marriage is attributed to the scriptures; X §14, Bo 241: graves opened at the crucifixion.

Apart from the quotations from *Genesis* and some phrases in connection with the crucifixion account, the references do not show particularly close contact with the text of the Bible but are loose paraphrases. The one exception is the unattributed, and fairly extensive, passage taken from *Isaiah* 36-37.38 (or 4 [= 2] *Kings* 18-19.37) at V §70-2, Bo 144-9 on the Assyrian descent on Jerusalem which follows the wording of the Septuagint closely. The question remains to be examined to what extent Malalas has been affected by apocryphal versions of the scriptures (both Jewish and gnostic). Portions of *Jubilees* underlie Book I (§§1-3, 5), and there are hints elsewhere in the early books that idiosyncratic interpretations of well known episodes may preserve gnostic elements; see the forthcoming commentary.

### Hermes Trismegistos [See: Fowden, 1986. Ed.: Erbse, 1941.]

II §5, Bo 26: a pagan oracle, attributed to Hermes Trismegistos through Cyril of Alexandria's *Contra Julianum* (= Cyril, PG 76, 556, 552; Erbse, 1941, 202-3).

This passage was part of a corpus of independently circulating oracles and prophecies drawn from pagan authors and foretelling the coming of Christ several other examples of which are cited by Malalas (cf. p. 172 above). It existed in several versions – hence the variations between this, and other similar passages, in Cyril and Malalas; epigraphic evidence (as mentioned above; Robert, 1968 and 1971, cf. Lane Fox, 1986, 168 ff.) has now clearly demonstrated the close relationship of these texts to oracular utterances of the first and second centuries A.D. One of these collections (known in its surviving form as the Tübingen Theosophy) was compiled early in the sixth century, and another set of

closely related texts also existed in Syriac (Erbse, 1941; Brock, 1983). Malalas' reference to Hermes, and the quotation of the oracle, occurs after a 'mentioned above' phrase, which Bourier (1899, I, 9-19) has shown convincingly is elsewhere used by Malalas to mark a break between one source and another; in this section of Books I and II Malalas is interweaving a text like the *Excerpta Barbari* with other material – at this point, the pagan oracle. Note that Hermes Thrice-Blessed (rather than Thrice Greatest) is mentioned in the *Excerpta Barbari* (238. 13) as an alternative name for Hephaistos, the Egyptian ruler who is the subject of Malalas' previous paragraph. This could well have prompted the inclusion of this passage. Note too that at XIII §36, Bo 343, Malalas comments under the reign of Gratian that Theon, the Neo-Platonist and father of Hypatia, interpreted Hermes Trismegistos and Orpheus (cf. chapter 1, p. 14). It remains debatable whether Malalas had direct access to the collection of oracles of which this is a part or whether he knew them through Timotheos (see below), to whom the Orphic fragments are attributed.

#### Herodotos [Ed.: Hude, 1908.]

I §14, P 18: on the allegorized Herakles, though the Slavonic reads 'Diodoros' (defended by Reinert, 1981, 167, note 77; cf. Hdt. II, 40); II §4, Bo 26: on the fierceness of Scythians in battle; VI §10, Bo 157: on Kroisos' defeat by Kyros, cited with Thallos, Kastor and Polybios and all referred to Theophilos (cf. Hdt. I, 86).

These references are vague, bordering on the proverbial and are most unlikely to be derived from direct knowledge of the text of Herodotos.

#### Homer [Ed.: Allen, 1908.]

I §10, P 15: Pegasus Zeus married his sister Hera, quoting *Iliad* XVI, 431-2, XVIII, 556 (the quotation is not in the passage in the *Excerpta Barbari* (236. 4 ff.) which closely resembles this); II §2, Bo 24: on Aphrodite and Ares, contrasted with Palaiphatos' version; V §49, Bo 117: on Cyclops, contrasted with Pheidaios; V §50, Bo 120: on Kirke, contrasted with Pheidaios; V §59, Bo 133: Homer found Sisyphos' account and based his version of the Trojan War on it.

Apart from the tag in I §10, Malalas does not seem particularly closely acquainted with Homer's text; he knows of him as the 'lying poet' and considers him unhistorical (see Griffin, 1907); he prefers the rationalising and euhemerising prose accounts of Pheidaios, Sisyphos and Palaiphatos. It is interesting to consider whether this was an attitude widespread in the sixth century, or whether Malalas is reflecting the opinions of an earlier generation as shown through the sources available to him (though we should remember that he was responsible for the selection he made). It is also worth noting the disproportionate amount of space allotted to the Trojan war. Was this also a feature of Malalas' source, since the passages on Orestes (V §§60-67, Bo 133-142) have clear Antiochene and Syrian connections which Domninos may well have emphasised? Domninos is cited at V §67, Bo 142, on a statue of Orestes. Or does this emphasis reflect Malalas' own purposes? The only, not entirely satisfactory, explanations (to be discussed more fully in the commentary) that suggest themselves at present are that this imbalance reflects the perceived importance of Homer in Greek cultural life, and provides a link between that and Malalas' own Romano-Greek and Syrian world through the

transference of the palladion from Troy to Rome to Constantinople (as is discussed in chapters 3, p. 58 and 5, p. 98).

**John**, the most holy bishop.

III §2, Bo 58: on Melchisedek, cited together with Cyril and Josephos.

A vague and indirect reference; of the possible bishops John, Chrysostom is perhaps the most likely (cf. *In Epist. ad Hebr. cap. vii*, hom. 12-13; PG 63, col. 95 ff.). Melchisedek, king of Salem and priest of the most high God (*Genesis* 14. 18-20, *Hebrews* 5. 6-7. 28) was taken as a prefiguration of Christ in orthodox as well as gnostic circles (Robinson, 1981, 399); by the mid-sixth century he was visualized as a Byzantine emperor (von Simson, 1948, 31; cf. the mosaic of Melchisedek in San Vitale, Ravenna).

**Josephos**: Flavius Josephus, 37/8-100. [Ed.: Thackeray *et al.*, 1926-81.]

I §4, P 9: the ark is to be found on Mt Ararat, for which Pergamos and Eusebios are cited as well as Josephos (= *Ant.* I, 93); I §5, P 10: on Seth's tablets, discussed in the second book of Josephos' *Archaeology* (= *Ant.* I, 93-5); I §5, P 10: the tables are to be found on Mt Siris; III §2, Bo 8: on Melchisedek, in his *Archaeology*, together with John and Cyril (= *Ant.* I, 176); X §26, Bo 247: the voice from the Temple that Christ was a just man (cf. *BJ* VI, 300, *AJ* XVIII, 3.3); X §45, Bo 260: on the capture of Jerusalem by Titus (the comment that Josephos was a Hebrew and present at the war sounds like an explanatory aside from Malalas, but cf. *BJ* VI, 96).

Although several parallels in Josephos' works can be found for these comments none sound as though Malalas had gone directly to the text but rather was using a predigested paraphrase or source; he could equally well be quoting from memory or from his 'general knowledge'.

**Kallimachos**: poet, c.306 - c. 240 B.C. [Ed.: Pfeiffer, 1949-53.]

VII §4, Bo 175: Enyalios invented the two-horse chariot race, as Kallimachos has written in his *Aitesia* (Ba, P: = Anniversaries, *Etesia*; Chilmead suggests correctly Αἰτίαι, Causes; = fr. 810).

Almost certainly already cited in Charax's (*q.v.*) account of hippodrome symbolism and so not known directly by Malalas; Charax's ideas appear to have attracted especial attention in the first part of the sixth century. The reference is, however, of extremely doubtful authenticity and Malalas would not have consulted Kallimachos for himself.

**Kastor**, of Rhodes: historian, early 1st c. B.C. [See: Schwartz, 1894; PW 10, cols. 2347-57. Ed.: FGh IIB 250.]

VI §10, Bo 157: on Kroisos; a multiple citation including Thallos, Polybios and Herodotos, all referred to Theophilos.

This is not a precise reference (though see FGh II b 250, fr. 11 and note that Eusebios, *Praep. Evang.* X, 10.4 cites Thallos and Kastor together; PW 10, col. 2350). Kastor's tables were used by Varro, Julius Africanus and Eusebios. Though not consulted by Malalas directly (as this vague citation would indicate) Malalas did reproduce in the ruler-lists material that ultimately derived from Kastor (though unacknowledged): it descended

through Africanus, via a text like the *Excerpta Barbari*, as is discussed in chapter 6, section 3, pp. 124-38).

**Kephalion:** rhetorician and historian, 1st c. [See: PW 11, cols. 191-2. Ed.: FHG III, 625-31; FGh II a 93.]

II §23, Bo 40: on Teiresias' physiological enquiries (Teiresias was exiled to the temple of Apollo Daphnaïos, i.e. in Daphne? is this an Antiochene justification for including this passage? = fr. 3); II §28, Bo 44: Dionysios' arms are hung up in Delphi (passage probably already included the Deinarchos and Philochoros references; = fr. 4); II §35, Bo 49: Kephalion's truthful version of the Dirke story is contrasted with that of Euripides (= fr. 5); IV §24, Bo 90: Kephalion's true version of the Hippolytos story is contrasted with that of the poets (= fr. 6); VI §20, Bo 165: on the naming of the river Acheloos (= fr. 7).

Kephalion appears to have compiled an extensive rationalising history of the world from Ninos to Alexander (cf. Bowersock, 1989). The Teiresias and Dirke passages have Antiochene connections, the others apparently not. Müller (FHG III, 630) considers that Malalas knew Kephalion only through Domninos: this seems a perfectly reasonable suggestion.

**Licinius Macer**, c. 118 B.C., trib. 73 B.C. [See: PW 13, cols. 419-28, Licinius 112; Schanz/Hosius, 1927, 319-21; Ogilvie, 1965, 7-12.]

VII §7, Bo 180: Licinius wrote on the Brumalia (= fr. 2).

This author, surviving in scrappy fragments and known to be a source of Livy, is most unlikely to have been known directly to Malalas (cf. Gelzer, 1885, I, 229; Crawford, 1914/19, 371; PW 13, col. 422) and the brief paraphrase (which agrees with what else is known of Licinius' work) would have been embedded in Malalas' source which dealt with Roman customs and history (the Brumalia, Februarius, consuls' dress etc.). Some of this material is common to, or very similar, to that found in Lydus (as is discussed in chapter 4, pp. 72-75).

**Livy:** T. Livius, 59 B.C -17 A.D. [Ed.: Ogilvie, 1974.]

VII §6, Bo 178: on the rape of the Sabine women (cf. Livy I, 9), for which Vergil and Pliny are also cited, together with 'other historians' for the first chariot-race with mules; VII §9, Bo 183: on the Consilia (= Consualia) and the rape of Lucretia (cf. Livy I, 9, but referring to the Sabine women); VIII §29, Bo 211: on Scipio, through Florus' *Epitome* (cf. Florus I, 22).

From the vagueness of these references and the distortion of the Latin name of the festival in VII §9 (PW 4, cols. 1111-2), it would seem that Malalas was aware that Livy (as well as Lucan, Pliny, and Vergil) was an authoritative name to cite in connection with Roman history. However, he would seem not to know Livy's work directly, even through Florus' *Epitome*.

**Lucan:** M. Annaeus Lucanus, 39-265 [Ed. Housman, 1926.]

IX §2, Bo 215: on Caesar's defeat of Pompey (cf. Lucan, VIII, 456); IX §19, Bo 224: Brutus beheaded.

Again, as with Livy, Malalas is aware that Lucan is a name to cite in connection with Roman history, but the material produced is so imprecise that he cannot have used Lucan's work directly.

**Lucian**, of Samosata, 120-c.180. [Ed.: Iacobitz, 1836.]

IV §11, Bo 77: according to Lucian, Marsyas came from Kalchis (Ninos and poets are also cited).

Marsyas, it would seem, is an alternative name for the plain between Laodikeia and Chalkis in Syria (Massyas: Strabo XVI, 2. 18; Marsyas: Polybios V, 45, 8 ff. 61, 7; cf. PW 14, col. 1989 for Marsyas as a tributary of the Orontes); Lucian, however, seems only to refer to Marsyas in his regular context of the river Maiander (*Dialogi Deorum* 26.2; *Adversus Indoctum* 5; *Tragodopodagra* 313). On the perhaps rash assumption that Malalas is confusing Kalchis and Chalkis, this looks like an aside made out of local knowledge and lore; it tells us nothing, however, about Malalas' reading of Lucian.

**Magnus**, of Carrhae: historian, 363. [See: PLRE 1, 534; PW 14, cols. 491-3, Magnus 27. Ed.: FHG IV, 4-6; FGrH IIB 225.]

XIII §21, Bo 329: Julian had boats made at Samosata; XIII §23, Bo 332: on Julian's being mysteriously wounded.

It has been debated whether Magnus is to be regarded as the source for Ammianus (XXIV, 4, 23-25) and Zosimos (III, 12 f.) or whether all three used the same source (see Thompson, 1947, 28-33; Chalmers, 1960, 152 ff.). FGrH IIB 225 (and FHG IV, 4-6) quote XIII §§21-23, Bo 328-332, as representing a paraphrase of Magnus' narrative. It remains true, however, that Malalas appears to be the only witness for any material that can be attributed to Magnus; given the status of the episodes elsewhere (e.g. in XI on Trajan) for which his evidence is unsupported, this seems a somewhat dubious recommendation. This apart, one could argue that Malalas was so interested in Julian that he searched for extra material and compared sources; certainly on Julian's death he cites Eutropius and Eutychianos as well as Magnus.

**Manetho**: fl. 280 B.C. [Ed.: FHG II, 510-616; FGrH IIIC 609.]

II §3, Bo 25: Manetho had written on the ancient empire of the Egyptians; III §6, Bo 59: Manetho had written on the ancient empire of the Egyptians (and on the later empire).

These are basically the same comment, which is derived from a text like the *Excerpta Barbari* (284-8; see chapter 6, p. 131), which in turn is derived from Africanus who used Manetho extensively on the Egyptian dynasties. This is a good indication of the way in which Malalas has chopped and interwoven his material: he would not have known Manetho directly. (See FGrH IIIC 609, pp. 82-3 on II §3, Bo 25, [= fr. 5a] and III §6, Bo 59 [= fr. 5b] as fragments of Manetho.) See Fowden (1986, 30) and Adler (1989, 55 ff.) for comments on the sage pseudo-Manetho.

### **Membronios of Babylon**

I §12, P16: Perseus named the Persians after himself, according to Membronios the Babylonian (Semeronios the Babylonian Persian: CP).

This is a puzzling name; Gelzer (1885, I, 77) suggests, slightly desperately, that it could conceal a Persian historian named Seiramnis (cf. FHG IV, 492). Cumont-Bidez, 1938, II, 59 suggest it may be a reference to Sumerians. In other words this is a garbled and fictitious name concealing, presumably, a recollection of an authority in the tradition from which Malalas acquired the connection between Perseus and the Persians.

### Moses (cf. Hebrew scriptures and Sacred Scriptures)

Preface: one of the authorities acknowledged by Malalas; I §2, P 7: on Enoch in Aquila's interpretation of Moses' Hebrew account, with a quotation from *Genesis* 6. 2, 4; I §3, P 8: on stubborn giants (*Genesis* 6. 3); II §12, Bo 34: on Phalek, under whom the earth was divided (= *Genesis* 10. 25); III §14, Bo 67: Israelites walked through the Red Sea (= *Exodus* 14); IV §10, Bo 75: according to Orpheus men were moulded from earth by God, as Moses said (= *Genesis* 1); X §2, Bo 228: Phalek is at the mid point of time according to the prophetic words of Moses, and a thousand years are but a day in the sight of the Lord (*Psalms* 90. 4).

While some of the quotations from the Old Testament are reasonably accurate, others are considerably distorted and some curious elements have been introduced into the paraphrasing. The angels and the giants, for example, play a very odd role, in conventional scriptural terms, in the rationale for the flood but one which is explicable from the *Book of Jubilees* (see the forthcoming commentary). The virtual equation of Orpheus and Moses seems a little bold while the use made of Phalek finds parallels in Prokopios of Gaza (see chapter 6, p. 113). Malalas would seem to know the Old Testament but embroidered with what seem to be gnostic or Hermetic elements.

### Nestorianos [See: Bourier, 1899 *passim*.]

XIII §14, Bo 324: on Constantine's age at death, as Nestorianos wrote; he also wrote about other events and the times of the emperors 'mentioned above'; XIV §47, Bo 376: Nestorianos' chronicle ended with the death of Leo II.

Nestorianos remains unidentified. Bourier considered that his chronicle was one of Malalas' main sources, and attributed to him a special interest in ecclesiastical history. Patzig (1901) saw no reason why he should be distinguished from Domninos. It has also been suggested (Patzig, 1891/2, 29; Gleye, 1893, 161) that Nestorianos need not be his name but simply an indication of his religious adherence (i.e. 'the Nestorian'); there is no proof for this, though it is perhaps interesting that the A.D. 31 ascension date that can be observed in Malalas and occurs in areas attributed to Nestorianos by Bourier is taken up in the sixteenth century by Nestorians of that period (see chapter 6, p. 123, note 10). If Malalas' citation of Nestorianos in XIII §14 is to be taken at face value, then Nestorianos is the source that provides reign lengths, ages and modes of death of emperors and need have been nothing more than an extensive list of imperial reigns. It is also interesting to note that there appears to be a hiatus in the use of verbal portraits at the point where Nestorianos' work would have ceased to be available to Malalas (cf. chapter 8, p. 243).

### Ninos

IV §11, Bo 76: Ninos, like Lucian, rationalized the poet's version of Marsyas' quarrel with Apollo by saying Marsyas blasphemed and went out of his mind.

Ninos is not otherwise known but the reported comment would appear to be appropriate to a Christianizing allegorist.

**Orpheus** [Ed.: Kern, 1922.]

IV §8-10, Bo 72-6: a general reference to Orphic 'theology' with detailed verse quotations and prose paraphrases, all finally attributed to Timotheos.

The Orphic passages cited by Malalas (IV §8, Bo 73 = fr. 62; IV §9, Bo 74 = fr. 65; IV §10, Bo 75 = fr. 233) are now considered portions of the Rhapsodic Theogony, originally composed c. 100 B.C. and much studied by the Neoplatonists in the fifth century (West, 1983, 227 ff.). These detailed quotations, accepted into the Orphic canon by modern editors, are attributed by Malalas to Timotheos. There seems no reason to doubt this; Malalas would then not necessarily have had direct access to a full copy of the Orphic Theogony.

**Ovid:** P. Ovidius Naso, 43 B.C.-A.D.18. [Ed.: Anderson, 1977.]

I §3, P7: Ovid has a poetic version of the Phthaethon (= Phaethon) story, contrasted with Plutarch's.

An extremely vague reference to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (I, 750 - II, 400), which can only be indirect.

**Palaiphatos:** 4th c. B.C. [See: PW 18, cols. 2451-5, Palaephatus 2-4: FGrH I 44. Ed.: Festa, 1902.]

II §2, Bo 24: Palaiphatos' version of Ares and Aphrodite is truer than that of Homer; II §9, Bo 33: on Phoinix and the purple dye; II §24, Bo 41: on Dionysios sheltered in Zeus' bosom because of his premature birth; II §42, Bo 53: Palaiphatos wrote truthfully on Oidipous and Thebes (cf. *Περὶ ἀπίστων* 4), with an implied contrast with Euripides; III §10, Bo 63: the rationalised version of the Persephone story seems to be attributed to Palaiphatos; IV §17, Bo 83: Palaiphatos' version of what happened to Helen is contrasted with the poets'; VIII §28, Bo 209: Palaiphatos mentioned Perseus of Epiros, as did Eutropius and Sallust.

The Palaiphatos recorded by the Souda – assuming that later writers masquerading under this name have not been jumbled together – wrote a variety of works on historical and mythological themes. These included five books *Περὶ ἀπίστων* (*On the Unbelievable*) that survive now only in a one volume abridgement. Of the euhemerising interpretations of details of Hellenic myth that this contains, only one (on Oidipous) has any connection with the points attributed to Palaiphatos by Malalas. Malalas would seem to have been aware, almost certainly indirectly, of a Palaiphatos whose work covered what would now be viewed as both mythology and history.

**Pausanias,** 2nd/4th c. [See: Diller, 1955. Ed.: FGrH IIIc 854.]

Preface: amongst the authorities acknowledged by Malalas; II §20, Bo 38: Pausanias wrote on Perseus, Persian fire temples and *magoi*; VIII §9, Bo 197: Eusebios and Pausanias both cited for Augustus' victory at Actium (and the list of Ptolemies?); VIII §19, Bo 203: Seleukos built 75 cities in Persian territory; VIII §19, Bo 204: Pausanias was wrong in saying that Antioch was named for Seleukos' father; VIII §25, Bo 208: Domninos, and Pausanias (Slav) wrote on Antioch's rebuilt walls; X §27, Bo 248: on Sosibios' bequest to Antioch.



Diller (1955, 275-6) argues that the Pausanias cited by Stephanus Byzantius as the author of a book on the history of Antioch, his native city, must be the Pausanias cited by Malalas and is to be dated to the second century. Malalas, however, knew this work only indirectly as Bourier (1899, 9-14, 21) has shown that the citations from Pausanias at VIII §19 and §25 are embedded in a passage that must be attributed to Domninos. Does this then mean that the criticism of Pausanias at VIII §19 is to be attributed to Domninos rather than Malalas?

**Peisander (ex Pindar).** [See: PW 19, cols. 145-6. Ed.: Dübner, 1840.]

I §3, P 8: on serpent-footed men (Pindar: P; Peisander: B, Slav).

The reading of P should be emended (as was not done in the 1986 translation) from Pindar to Peisander. This passage is regularly accepted in the literature as a fragment of Peisander (Gleye, 1899, 505; PW; Dübner). According to the Souda, Peisander was an epic poet from Laranda in Lykaonia who produced a complete retelling of the myths in sixty books, beginning with the wedding of Zeus and Hera and including a Gigantomachy, for which this passage is the evidence (cf. Macrobius, *Sat.* V, 2.5). Discussion in PW makes Peisander responsible for Antiochene founding legends, which is stretching the evidence considerably. However, it is most unlikely that Malalas was quoting from Peisander directly – the reference was embedded in whatever authority he was consulting.

### **Pergamos the Pamphylian**

I §4, P9: the Ark's timbers are visible on Ararat, according to Josephos, Eusebios and Pergamos.

Pergamos is completely unknown and unidentifiable.

**Pheidaios of Corinth, ?2nd c. B.C.** [Ed.: FGrH I 30.]

V §49, Bo 117: Pheidaios of Corinth wrote an allegorized version of the Cyclops story; V §50, Bo 121: Pheidaios wrote a more truthful account about Kirke.

Pheidaios (or Pheidias) is an author known only from these references by Malalas, who represents him as having produced an allegorized version of, at least, Odysseus' wanderings. Given that the Trojan war was for some reason important to Malalas and that on other points of significance to him (e.g. the death of Julian) he collects conflicting accounts of the same episode, it is not improbable that Malalas added these remarks himself; they are, however, so vague that he need have known of Pheidaios' views only by hearsay.

**Philochoros, of Athens; c.340-267/61 B.C.** [Ed.: FHG I, 387; FGrH IIIb 328.]

II §28, Bo 45: on Dionysios' tomb near the Golden Apollo at Delphi, cited together with Deinarchos and Kephalion.

This quotation with its attendant references to other authorities reappears elsewhere, as is discussed under Deinarchos and Kephalion. Malalas did not know Philochoros, one of the most prolific of the athidographers, as an independent text.

**Philostratos:** historian, late 3rd c. [See: PLRE 1, 698. Ed.: FGrH IIa 99.]

XII §26, Bo 297: on Sapor's invasion of Syria, where Philostratos' account is contrasted with that of Domninos which Malalas prefers.

There would seem to be no other attestations to this writer, though the sack of Antioch referred to in the passage to be ascribed to Philostratos is to some extent confirmed by the *Res Gestae Divi Saporis* (Downey, 1961, 588-91). Is one to suspect then – given the notorious confusions surrounding the Philostratos clan (Bowersock, 1969, 2) – that Philostratos may be another fictitious author, perhaps fabricated by Malalas to lend authenticity to his narrative? This is probably a little extreme, but one is probably justified in considering that it was Malalas who inserted the reference to Philostratos into the source from which he was mainly borrowing (i.e. Domninos) and had consulted the text at first-hand.

**Phlegon of Athens:** P. Aetius Phlegon of Tralles, fl. 140. [See: PW 20, cols. 261-4. Ed.: FGrH IIb 257.]

X §14, Bo 240: on the darkness at Christ's death.

The citation of Phlegon (= fr. 16) in connection with the crucifixion occurs also in Synkellos (391. 18 = Africanus; 394. 7 = Eusebios; cf. Eusebios/Jerome, 1956, 174 d; the latter passage notes the absence of stars). This would appear to be part of the standard comment on the crucifixion, repeated also by Origen (2nd c.) and Philoponos (6th c.).

## Plato

IV §21, Bo 85: they say that Plato, in his treatise on Laws, mentioned Minos; VII §14, Bo 188: Plato, living in the time of Jaddus, wrote to Timaios (cf. Erbse, 1941, 204, no. 3).

The first comment is an extremely vague reference and tells us simply that Malalas was aware of the title of at least one of Plato's works. The second, which is also to be found in Cyril, *Contra Julianum* (PG 76, col. 553b), is part of the collection of sayings of the pagan oracles and philosophers foreshadowing Christian doctrine that was in wide circulation.

**Pliny:** C. Plinius Secundus, c. 24 B.C.-A.D. 79.

VII §6, Bo 178: Pliny, like Vergil, Livy and 'other historians' wrote on the rape of the Sabine women.

This reference is, like its companion references to Vergil and Livy, loose and is no indication that Malalas had consulted Pliny, or any of the other writers also mentioned.

**Plutarch:** L. Mestrius Plutarchus of Chaeronea, c. 50-c. 120.

I §3, P 7: Plutarch's version of the ball of fire is more truthful than Ovid's; II §45, Bo 56: Plutarch reproached image-makers in his *Ancient Philosophy*, and preferred the use of the sun and moon in Egyptian theology.

Both these comments are fairly loose references which do not compel the conclusion that Malalas had direct access to any work of Plutarch's. The first is part of local Antiochene

lore connected with the extinct volcanoes of Pagrae, as the comments on giants in the next sentence indicate. The second indicates that quotations from Plutarch, perhaps derived from the *De Iside et Osiride*, had entered Hermetic theological traditions (cf. Fowden, 1986, 138), several elements of which surface elsewhere in Malalas.

**Polybios:** C. Julius Sabbio Polybius, died 47. [See: PW 21, cols. 1579-80, Polybius 5. Ed.: FGrH IIb 254.]

VI §10, Bo 157: on Kroisos (= fr. 4), a citation combined with Thallos, Kastor and Herodotos, all ascribed to Theopilos.

An omnibus reference where Malalas is most unlikely to have known any of the texts directly. Gelzer (1885, II, 96, note 1) points out that this is not Polybios of Megalopolis but Claudius' freedman, who was much concerned with literary matters (Seneca, *Consol. ad Polybium* 8.2, 11.5.) and also involved in the collection of material for Claudius' works on Carthage.

**Porphyrrios:** philosopher, 214-301/4.

II §45, Bo 56: Porphyrios praises Plutarch in his philosophical chronicle.

This is surely a reference of the vaguest and most indirect variety. Only fragments of material attributable to Porphyry's chronicle survive (FHG III, 688 ff.; FGrH IIb 260) and its very existence has been seriously questioned (Croke, 1983a); the comment could possibly be intended to refer to Porphyry's *Lives of the Philosophers*.

**Priskos, of Panium:** 5th c. [See PW 23, cols. 9-10, Priscus 35; Blockley, 1981. Ed.: Blockley, 1983, 222-400.]

XIV §10, Bo 359: Priskos had written a history of the war with Attila while others had a different version of his death.

The eight books of Priskos' history of the mid-fifth century – a major source for subsequent historians such as Jordanes, Evagrius, Prokopios and John of Antioch, as well as Malalas – survive only in the portions that can be extracted from these authors, and from the Constantinian *Excerpta (de legationibus)*. Priskos was probably also used by the barely extant Eustathios of Epiphaneia (Blockley, 1981, 116), cited elsewhere by Malalas. Blockley identifies the following fragments of Priskos in Malalas: fr. 7 (XIV §15, Bo 361), 8 (XIV §16, Bo 361), 21.1 (XIV §10, Bo 358), 24. 2 (XIV §10, Bo 359). The confused nature of much of this narrative when it can be compared with other versions leaves open the possibility that, though it is possible that Malalas used Priskos directly, he may have known this material through Eustathios of Epiphaneia.

**Pythagoras of Samos:** 6th c. B.C.

VI §12, Bo 158: Pythagoras the Samian has written about the war between Kyros and the Samians; VI §13, Bo 159: Pythagoras wrote on arithmetic and incorporeal causes.

The first statement, giving historical information, is followed by a reference to Africanus, implying that this information was taken from his *Chronographia* – which is not unlikely if the Africanus source for Malalas was a text similar to the *Excerpta Barbari*.

The second statement is of a different type, dealing with the layer of 'Hermetic' material found in Malalas (cf. the comment on Sophokles' interest in first causes) and is attributed to Timotheos. Whether or not one concludes that this whole area derives from Timotheos (whose interest in religious speculation can be seen elsewhere), Malalas plainly had not read any Pythagorean texts for himself.

**Rheginos:** mythographer, 2nd c. [See: PW 2, cols. 474-5. Ed.: FHG II, 12, note.]

II §43, Bo 54: Rheginos has recorded the names of men who were deified.

Rheginos was a euhemerizing mythographer, of a somewhat shadowy variety; according to the Souda he was a grammarian and author of the *Polymnemon*. Rheginos, however, is not known directly to Malalas – the reference is very imprecise and, like the paraphrase of Diodoros on the euhemerizing process, has filtered through several intermediaries.

**Sallust:** C. Sallustius Crispus, 86-34 B.C. [Ed.: Ramsey, 1984.]

VIII §28, Bo 209: Magnus Paulus killed Perses of Macedonia, as Sallust mentions in his Catilinarian history, recording Caesar's speech (cf. *Cat.* 51. 5).

This is a very garbled passage. For Magnus Paulus read L. Aemilius Paulus and for Perses read Perseus; this information is then immediately reduplicated with the names Perseus and Lucius Paulus and attributed to Eutropius. Note that at VIII §33, Bo 212 Malalas records both Cicero and Sallust as poets. Malalas clearly has no real idea of Sallust or his work and obtained this nugget at the end of a long chain of witnesses.

**Servius:** grammarian, c. 400. [Ed.: Thilo/Hagen, 1878-81.]

I §3, P 8: on giants, Servius is the last of a series of authorities cited which include Ovid, Plutarch and Timotheos (= Servius on *Aen.* III, 578-82); VI §19, Bo 162: on Dido, in contrast to Vergil's version (= on *Aen.* I, 267, 343 and IV, 670); VII §9, Bo 181: on civil war in Rome after the rape of Lucretia (= on *Aen.* VIII, 646).

Patzig's review of Bourrier lists the possible candidates for 'Servius' and concludes that this Servius can only be the Vergilian commentator, given that convincing parallels can be found for all the citations (1901a, 604). All these references are, however, very loose and likely to have already been included in Malalas' source, whatever it was: there is no evidence here, yet again, that Malalas read a Latin text.

**Sisyphos of Kos** [See: Patzig, 1903. Ed.: FGh I 50.]

V §49, Bo 117: Sisyphos wrote a rationalizing account of Odysseus' encounter with Kyklops; V §50, Bo 119: Sisyphos and Diktys had both written about Kirke; V §59, Bo 132: Sisyphos was present at the Trojan war with Teukros and wrote about it.

Like the references to Diktys, these passages occur in an area which arguably has been very thoroughly moulded by Malalas himself. Sisyphos is otherwise unknown; the impression left from Malalas' text is that Sisyphos' novel is that of Diktys, but rewritten and recast from Teukros' viewpoint. (For a brief discussion of the problems concerning Diktys' text, see under Diktys.) The differences between Diktys in Malalas and the Latin Septimius could be due to recasting of the novel to make a Diktys/Idomeneus text fit a Sisyphos/Teukros text or to the insertion of odd extras (like the portrait list) of Greek and

Trojan heroes). The Trojan material takes up a disproportionate amount of space in the chronicle – was this emphasis already in Malalas' source, or did he himself add it in, to meet some of his particular interests?

**Sophokles** [Ed.: TrGF II, Adespota 618; Erbse, 1941, 140-3, 208.]

II §23, Bo 40-41: Sophokles wrote on Teiresias and talked of one God.

This is once again a passage with Hermetic or gnostic overtones (or whatever terminology seems appropriate to describe the layer of religious experience that hovered across the boundaries between Christian and pagan). Though included in the collections of tragic fragments this is generally regarded as a spurious piece. It appears in a cluster of citations in several texts (Bidez, 1902; Costanza, 1959; Brock, 1983; cf. TrGF II, 170); it is one of the pagan oracles that were part of the Theosophy surviving as the Tübingen Theosophy and which was put together in the early sixth century. Elsewhere (X §5, Bo 232) a similar text is attributed to Timotheos, which suggests that Malalas took over all such passages from this writer.

### **Sotates**

II §3, Bo 25: Sotates interpreted the names of the planets, which had originally been given by Manetho (and Seth).

Sotates is a completely unidentifiable mythographer. The name very probably conceals the title of a Hermetic/gnostic tract on star symbolism, perhaps the mysterious *Book of Sothis* which for Synkellos contained Manetho's cosmological teachings (cf. FGrH III 609, fr. 25-28; Adler, 1989, 60-5). This would not have been known directly to Malalas. Alternative, equally desperate identifications would be with either of the poets named Sotades (the Athenian comic poet: PW 3A, cols. 1206-7; or the Hellenistic iambic poet from Maroneia: PW 3A, cols. 1207-9).

**Tatian:** apologist, 2nd c.

X §15, Bo 242: Tatian, and Clement, the chroniclers, are cited for St Paul's activities in Antioch.

This is a generalized and indirect comment and tells us nothing about Malalas' acquaintance with Tatian's works.

**Thallos** [See: PW 5A, cols. 1225-6. Ed.: FGrH IIb 256.]

VI §10, Bo 157: (= fr. 8) Thallos (Thales: Ba) cited with Polybios, Kastor and Herodotos on Kroisos, with an overall acknowledgement to Theophilos.

This passage (as for Polybios, Kastor and Herodotos) is a reference of the most indirect variety: Malalas did not consult Thallos. Thallos was the author of a euhemerizing chronological work in three books (from the Trojan war to Olympiad 167, according to Eusebios) and was used by the Christian apologists; he may possibly have been the Samaritan Thallos, Augustus' secretary or Tiberius' freedman.

**Theophilos:** bishop of Antioch, died c.180 [Ed.: Grant, 1970.]

Preface: Theophilos is one of the authorities acknowledged by Malalas; I §14, P 18: an allegorical interpretation of Herakles is attributed to Theophilos; II §7, Bo 29: Io went to Syria and died there according to Theophilos, while others say she went to Egypt; III §6, Bo 59: Theophilos wrote on Egypt from Naracho onwards, while Manetho wrote on the earlier period; IV §20, Bo 85: Theophilos wrote on Demokritos and his philosophical precepts (Hermetic?); V §68, Bo 143 sub-text: Theophilos (C, Slav: om. Ba) cited for Euripides taking plots from Minos, Auleas etc.; VI §10, Bo 157: Theophilos is cited as the final authority on Kroisos, after Thallos, Kastor, Polybios and Herodotos; VIII §4, Bo 195: the total from Adam to Alexander is 5593, according to Theophilos; IX §10, Bo 220: on the fate of Cleopatra's body, contrasted with the views of local historians; X §2, Bo 228: with Clement and Timotheos, Theophilos is one of the chroniclers who agree among themselves and support a crucifixion date of 6000; X §32, Bo 252: on Anianos as successor to Mark in Alexandria; XVIII §8, Bo 428: again with Clement and Timotheos, Theophilos supports a From Adam date for the year of Justinian's second consulship which implies a crucifixion date of 6000.

It is generally supposed that this Theophilos is most probably the sixth bishop of Antioch (Devreesse, 1945, 114 ff.) who wrote books against heretics (Hermogenes and Markion), catechetical treatises and the three treatises to Autolycus, which attempt to reconcile Christian and pagan chronologies (amidst copious citations of previous authorities, including the Sibylline oracles). The comment in VIII §4 would seem to indicate that all the From Adam dates given by Malalas are to be derived from Theophilos. This, however, is hard to accept since none of Malalas' From Adam dates (see chapter 6, pp. 111-20) correspond to those of Theophilos, given in his chronological discussions in the *Ad Autolycum* (and usefully set out in Grant, 1970, xxiii-xv; cf. Grant, 1950). Furthermore the crucifixion date of 6000 for which Malalas argues with passion in X and XVIII is not supported by Theophilos: Theophilos' incarnation date (which is not spelt out in his surviving work) would seem to be 5515, implying a crucifixion date of around 5538 (Mango, 1980, 191). A crucifixion date of 6000 would seem to be unique to Malalas and is attested by no other writer (except possibly Timotheos, about whose views we can only conjecture). I would suggest that 'Theophilos' in VIII §4 should either be emended to 'Timotheos', or we should assume that another omnibus reference to the concordant chroniclers has fallen out at this point. Either way the idiosyncratic crucifixion date advocated by Malalas would be sheeted home to Timotheos, while the remaining From Adam dates may well be due to Malalas' own calculations – we have no evidence. The passage at IV §20 on Demokritos would seem to have Hermetic/gnostic overtones and something similar exists in the pagan oracles of the Tübingen Theosophy. I am inclined to think that, though Theophilos' works were extremely significant for the construction of a Christian historical standpoint and though he used many supporting quotations from pagan authors – possibly using a pre-Stobaeian anthology – his writings had been digested by one of Malalas' sources: Malalas himself did not use his work directly. It could, of course, also be that we need to consider another candidate altogether, for example, the fourth-century bishop of Alexandria who was author of a set of Easter tables; see chapter 2, p. 30.

**Timotheos** [See: Bourier, 1899; PW 6A, col. 1339, Timotheos 16.]

I §3, P 8: Timotheos wrote a rationalizing version of the serpent-footed giants; IV §12, Bo 76: cited as the authority for the Orphic quotations; VI §11, Bo 158: on the number of Israelites

who remained in Persia; VI §13, Bo 159: on the writings of Anaximander, as recorded by Pythagoras; X §2, Bo 228: with Clement and Theophilus, cited as supporting a crucifixion date of 6000; X §5, Bo 232: on the altar to the first-born god erected by Augustus; XVIII §8, Bo 428: again cited with Clement and Theophilus as the authorities supporting an implied crucifixion date of 6000.

A very shadowy figure, who is unknown outside Malalas' chronicle; from the citations in Malalas his work would have covered a very mixed bag of material, with a tendency to include 'pagan oracles', or Hermetic/gnostic elements, including the Orphic texts (the extracts cited under his name are accepted as credible fragments of the Orphic Rhapsodic Theogony; West, 1983, 220). Timotheos might well be Malalas' source for all the oracles included in the chronicle (II §3, Bo 25; II §5, Bo 26-7; II §23, Bo 40-1; III §13, Bo 65-6; IV §12, Bo 77-8; VII §15, Bo 188; X §5, Bo 232). These can, however, be paralleled in the Tübingen Theosophy, but this is plainly drawing on a collection of material which seems to have floated freely in sub-theological circles from the late fourth and early fifth centuries: portions, as mentioned previously, reappear in Cyril of Alexandria (mid-5th c.) and the Syriac collection published by Brock (1983); Erbse has reconstructed several layers, of which Malalas' text corresponds to his  $\omega$  – a short collection deriving from the fuller version made between the beginning of Zeno's reign and the anticipated year 6000 (in 507/508) by the Alexandrian era; Erbse (1941, 145) argues that  $\omega$  cannot have been compiled before 512. Because the 'first born god' oracle from the Theosophy is attributed to Timotheos in X §5, then it is arguable that all the others must be associated with him, and more extensive portions of the chronicle than those specifically acknowledged must be attributed to Timotheos. We must consider then that Timotheos was a, perhaps slightly older, contemporary of Malalas from whom he borrowed extensively, though Timotheos may have been simply the author of a text discussing the putative end of the world and millennial chronologies. While it is tempting – as with Domninos – to suggest that a known Timotheos, in this case a grammarian living in Gaza during the reign of Anastasios (PLRE 2, 1121), should be identified with the shadowy chronicler, the case cannot be made: Timotheos of Gaza may have written on animals (cf. I §3, P 8 on the serpent-footed giants) but none of his extant writings, and no ancient authority such as the Souda, offer even a hint that his interests bear any resemblance to those of Malalas' source.

#### **Timotheos, the Persian 'carrier'**

XVIII §30, Bo 444: information on the fate of the Manichees in Persia was provided by the Persian 'bastagarios' (carrier) who was baptised as Timothy.

Bourrier 1899, II, 56, speculates whether the two Timothys could be identical. This would have an Occam's razor justification. Note too that Malalas has much information on Persia in the early sections which it is tempting to associate with this Persian Timotheos and which, with the references to Nimrod and Zoroaster, has a strong Hermetic/gnostic streak which might be reflected in this passage in the reference to Manichees; it could also be that Timotheos was himself a Manichee (cf. p. 211 below). This, however, is rather tenuous as an argument, but from it the Timotheos, author of a fairly comprehensive attempt to correlate Biblical and Hellenic histories and the supporter

– according to Malalas – of an outré Christian chronology, whom we have already suggested was writing within Malalas' own lifetime, would gain a little more solidity. This is, however, an extremely fragile line of argument but slightly more tenable than the case for identifying Timotheos with the grammarian from Gaza.

**Tranquillus:** C. Suetonius Tranquillus, c. 69-c. 125. [Ed. Carter, 1984.]

II §10, Bo 34: Tranquillus (Ba: Suetonius Tranquillus CP, Slav) wrote on imperial robes and insignia.

Lydus (*De Mag.* I, 12) cites Tranquillus (= Suetonius) on Augustus' disapproval of some Romans seen in the hippodrome wearing barbarian dress (cf. *Aug.* 40): while not a parallel to Malalas' comment, it indicates that Suetonius was cited on this sort of topic. Malalas is most unlikely to be referring directly to the Latin text: this must be a piece of his general 'Roman lore'. One suspects that he may have derived the reference from Charax.

**Vergil** [Ed.: Mynors, 1969.]

V §59, Bo 132: Vergil wrote a sequel to Homer (the *Iliad* being based on Sisypheos of Kos); VI §19, Bo 163: Vergil's version of Aeneas and Dido is contrasted with that of Servius; VII §6, Bo 178: Romos and the rape of the Sabine women (Pliny and Livy are also cited); IX §10, Bo 220: Augustus engaged Antony and Cleopatra at Actium, as Vergil recorded in his *Making of the Shield* (= *Aeneid* VIII); XII §3, Bo 285: *Aeneid* IV, 302-3 quoted in connection with the Antiochene Maiouma.

Apart from the last example, all these are generalized references and do not demand close knowledge of the text; the last, almost certainly taken from Domninos – Malalas' source on Antiochene local history – is insufficient in view of Malalas' ignorance of Latin displayed elsewhere and the phonetic nature of the lines (granted they would have been distorted in transmission) to allow Malalas more than the barest acquaintance with Latin.

My judgement, on considering the above list of named sources, is that Malalas had *direct* access to the following authorities whom he cites (though note, as discussed elsewhere in this chapter, that he also used a number of other texts which he does not attribute to any authority):

Bassus, Brunichius, Charax, Domninos, Eustathios, Eutropius, Eutychianos, Nestorians, Philostratos, Priskos, Sisypheos/Diktys, Timotheos, Timothy the Persian carrier.

The following authorities were known only *indirectly*, at second (or even third or fourth) hand:

Africanus (in a text like the *Excerpta Barbari*), Aquila, Apollonios, Archilochos, Arrian, Auleas, Bottios, Kallimachos (in Charax), Kastor (through Africanus who was also known indirectly), Kephalion (in Domninos), Clement, Cyril, Deinarchos (in Kephalion), Didymos, Diodoros, Dionysios, Eirenaïos, Euripides, (Pseudo-)Eusebios, Florus, Fortunus, Herodotos, Homer, John, Josephos, Licinius, Livy, Lucan, Lucian, Manetho, Membronios of Babylon, Ninos, Ovid, Palaiphatos, Pausanias (embedded in Domninos), Peisander, Pergamos, Pheidaios, Philochoros (in Kephalion), Plato, Pliny, Plutarch, Polybios,



Porphyry, Pythagoras, Rheginos, Sallust, Servius, Sophokles, Sotates, Suetonius Tranquillus, Tatian, Thallos, Theophilos, Vergil.

If Malalas had access to these citations only indirectly, what then were the sources from which he took them? Bourier (as indicated earlier) was the last person to consider this question at length. His conclusions (Bourier, 1899, II, 61) after a detailed discussion of the text, its layers and cross-references (and this applies to I-XIV only) were as follows.

From *Domninos* Malalas has taken 1. the pre-history and legendary history of Antioch, and also Theban history; 2. the material on Pasiphae, Minotaur and Phaidra; 3. Trojan history; 4. Roman history from Herakles to Augustus, apart from the section between Tarquinius Superbus and Caesar; 5. history of Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic kingdoms; 6. Roman Kaisergeschichte (imperial history) to Leo I (alternating between Nestorianos and another source after Constantine I). *Domninos'* own sources, according to Bourier, would appear to have been: 1. one or more sources on the Hellenistic kingdoms, with an especial focus on Syria and Antioch; 2. one or more mythographic sources (Palaiphatos, Kephalion, Pheidaios), from which were taken Theban history, the Pasiphae episode, parts of the Trojan material and Aitolian history; 3. Diktys and Sisypheos for the Trojan material; 4. Servius for Roman history from Augustus, but with additional material from Caesar and Augustus; additional material on Julian.

From *Timotheos* Malalas has taken: 1. biblical-secular parallel history from Adam to Alexander the Great; 2. history of the Roman republic; 3. the chronological discussions and the oracle under Augustus; 4. possibly some of the post-Constantinian material. *Timotheos'* sources would appear to be: 1. a source based on Africanus-Eusebios with elements from Annianos and Panodoros; 2. a wide variety of authors (e.g. Clement, Theophilos, Cyril, etc.); 3. if *Timotheos* is also a post-Constantinian source, then he used Eustathios.

From *Nestorianos* Bourier concludes that Malalas has taken a selection of material that includes the narrative of Christ's life and whatever ecclesiastical history is mentioned by Malalas.

At this point Bourier's analysis begins to break down and he is compelled to assign to a possible fourth source (who might be *Timotheos*) everything that cannot neatly be attributed to *Domninos*, *Nestorianos* or *Timotheos*.

It seems useful to set out Bourier's conclusions in full (taken from Bourier, 1899, 58-61) as his study is not readily available, nor is it a particularly easy read, while its results are still presented in the scholarly literature though without his supporting arguments (references are by page and line of Bo).

| Book                 | Contents                                                                                             | Source                | Comments                                |
|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| I                    | <i>Biblical-secular parallel history</i>                                                             | Tim.                  | §8 = Domn.                              |
| I. 1-13              | a) Adam to Phalek                                                                                    |                       | a) cf. 34.11                            |
| I. 14-22             | b) Assyrian prehistory, to Perseus                                                                   |                       | b) cf. 59.8                             |
|                      | c) Italian prehistory, to Picus                                                                      |                       | c) cf. 65.5                             |
|                      | d) Egyptian prehistory, to Hermes                                                                    |                       | d) cf. 21.4                             |
| II23.1-27.18         | <i>Egyptian prehistory</i> from Helios to Naracho                                                    | Tim.                  |                                         |
| 28.1-31.22           | <i>Prehistory of Antioch</i> (founding of Iopolis)                                                   | Domn.                 |                                         |
| 32.1-34.14           | Herakles Tyrios, Kyros, Phalek                                                                       | Tim.                  |                                         |
| 34.15-39.11          | <i>Prehistory of Antioch</i> ; Perseus                                                               | Domn.                 | 34.18-35.4=Tim.                         |
| 39.12-53.14          | <i>Theban history</i>                                                                                | Domn.                 | 40.14-41.3,<br>45.2-9 = Tim.            |
| 53.15-IV85.17        | <i>Biblical-secular parallel history</i><br>Seruch to Abraham; Abraham to Moses<br>Joshua to Sampson | Tim.                  |                                         |
| 85.18-90.3           | Pasiphae-Minotaur-Phaidra                                                                            | Domn.                 | 86.12-19=Tim.                           |
| 90.4-20              | <i>Biblical-secular parallel history</i> Eli to David                                                | Tim.                  |                                         |
| V91.1-142.20         | <i>Trojan history</i>                                                                                | Domn.                 |                                         |
| 142.21-VI            | <i>Biblical-secular parallel history</i>                                                             | Tim.                  | 149.7-11=Domn.                          |
| 161.10               | David to Joakim; Joakim to Esdra                                                                     |                       | cf.169.1, 188.9                         |
| VII161.10-170.3      | <i>Italian prehistory</i> to Romulus                                                                 | Domn.                 | 161.1-2, 169.1-<br>19=Tim.              |
| VII171.1-<br>183.11  | <i>Roman kings</i>                                                                                   | Domn.                 |                                         |
| 183.12-187.22        | Februarius                                                                                           | Tim.                  |                                         |
| 188.1-4              | <i>Roman Republic</i>                                                                                | Domn.                 |                                         |
| 188.5-191.5          | <i>Biblical-secular parallel history</i> to Jaddus                                                   | Tim.                  | 190.5-7, 12-16 =<br>Domn.               |
| VIII192.1-<br>195.18 | Alexander the Great                                                                                  | Domn.                 | 193.13-194.2,<br>195.12-20, cf.<br>Tim. |
| 195.21-208.14        | <i>History of Hellenistic kingdoms</i><br>Macedon, Egypt, Asia, Syria                                | Domn.                 |                                         |
| 208.15-209.4         | Pyrrhos-Perseus                                                                                      | Tim.                  |                                         |
| 209.4-9              | <i>Conclusion of Macedonian history</i>                                                              | Domn.                 |                                         |
| 209.10-211.3         | Hannibal, Antiochos, Scipio                                                                          | Tim.                  |                                         |
| 211.4-213.4          | <i>Conclusion of Syrian history</i>                                                                  | Domn.                 |                                         |
| IX214.1-end          | <i>Roman imperial history</i>                                                                        |                       |                                         |
| 214.1-225.11         | Caesar to Octavian                                                                                   | Domn.                 | 218.1-221.2 end<br>of Egypt             |
| 225.12-XIII          | Augustus to Constantine the Great                                                                    | Domn. &<br>Nest.+Tim. |                                         |
| 324.13               |                                                                                                      |                       |                                         |
| 324.14-              | Constantine to Leo II                                                                                | Domn. &               |                                         |
| XIV376.20            |                                                                                                      | Nest+IV               |                                         |

Bourier presents a complex web of borrowing from the four sources which he considers underly Malalas' chronicle as we have it today. I do not propose to go into his points exhaustively, but simply wish to comment that he has shown clearly that the Pausanias quotations are embedded in material that can be attributed to Domninos (1899, I, 9 ff.); he has also shown that the phrase 'above mentioned' marks a disjunction, a shift between sources (1899, I, 12-14). Corroboration for this observation of Bourier's is provided by a text demonstrably used by Malalas but not mentioned by Bourier, the *Excerpta Barbari* (mentioned frequently already). This incorporates a document whose status is unknown, since it is one of the few elements in the *Excerpta* that cannot be

assigned to an author or context, and which underlies the Picus Zeus narrative in Malalas (*Exc. Barb.* 234.22-238.19; cf. I §§8-15 [P 12-19], VI §§16-18 [Bo 161-2]). The narrative in the *Excerpta* text is continuous, in Malalas it is divided and its resumption is marked by an 'above mentioned' phrase. Bourier has also demonstrated satisfactorily that Malalas interweaves sources and can do so clumsily (e.g. Perseus/ Perses of Macedon, and Lucius Paulus at VIII §28, Bo 209), repeating the same episode within a few lines with no indication – or recognition on Malalas' part – that the persons mentioned in the two episodes under slightly different names are identical. Bourier's conclusions that some types of material are to be associated with certain sources has a degree of validity; for example, all references to a *tyche* and all earthquakes are to be derived from Domninos since some of these references fall within areas that Bourier considers securely attributable to Domninos; similarly, all passages on omens are to be attributed to Timotheos (Bourier, 1899, I, 20). This argument, however, verges on the circular.

Bourier's arguments are most convincing when distinguishing between Timotheos and Domninos in the early books. They break down in the 'imperial' books where Bourier recognizes that Malalas is using a list of emperors, an ecclesiastical source, and other bits and pieces which he frequently admits he cannot place but is compelled to attribute to a useful catch-all called the Fourth Source (= IV in the table above). These are the sorts of criticisms made by von Stauffenberg (1931, 509). More importantly, however, Bourier, while recognizing that Malalas exists through the act of choosing and selecting from his sources, does in fact allow him little scope for initiative in manipulating the material after making the original choice. There is no sense in Bourier's study of the personality which has been sketched in chapter 1 above.

Let us return to the brief list given just now of the authorities that Malalas names and which one can be justified in assuming he consulted. Domninos, Timotheos and Nestorianos (all lost) are those whom Bourier suggested were in fact responsible for by far the greater part of Books I-XIV: and despite the lack of independently surviving texts it is hard to deny this. The reasons for considering that Malalas had direct knowledge of other authors vary. In two cases (Bassus and Brunichius) it is because of Malalas' claim that he had consulted these texts in person, with circumstantial details (the status of these remarks is discussed below, p. 214, when Malalas' technique of source criticism is considered). In other cases it is because the wording is full, accurate and can be compared directly with other versions of this material. This applies to the Trojan section from Sisyphe/Diktys; the Orphic texts, however, which seem to be convincingly accurate renderings, were very probably derived from Timotheos. In the case of Eutropius, Eutychianos and Priskos Malalas uses these authors to give alternative versions of an event (the death of Julian) he would seem to have found puzzling. While these writers, all lost, may have been subjected to this process of comparison by another historian, also lost – Eustathios of Epiphaneia, whom Malalas cites at XVI §9, Bo 399 – the interest in Julian fits in with other of Malalas' preoccupations (theurgic rites, reconciliation of pagan and Christian doctrine) and on balance one could argue that Malalas used these writers directly.

After this discussion of the status of Malalas' author citations and the major sources postulated by Bourier, it would seem useful to try some other approaches to the source question. It is necessary to consider some types of sources that we can be certain Malalas did use but which he does not name (and which Bourier did not consider).

There are, for example, a number of documents – letters and inscriptions – embedded in the chronicle. There is Veronica's letter to Herod, petitioning to be allowed to set up a statue of Christ (X §12, Bo 237-9); Malalas claims to have found it, and a list of 'emperors' of Judaea in the house of Bassus, a Christianizing Jew, in Paneas. In the sixth century this statue was on the pilgrim sight-seeing route. At XV §13, Bo 389, Verina's rescript, not now in Ba though firmly attested by other witnesses, probably came from the Antiochene city archives, while the extract from Caesar's proclamation of Antioch's autonomy (IX §5, Bo 216) certainly came from there, but probably filtered through Domninos. In the latter part of the chronicle Malalas makes frequent reference to letters to and from the emperor and high officials. Some are quoted verbatim (e.g. the letters from Koades at XVIII §44, Bo 449-50 and XVIII §53, Bo 454-5) but mostly there is just the notice of a letter; e.g. XVII §10, Bo 414-5: between Justin and Zilgibi; XVIII §60, Bo 465: Justinian and Sittas, *magister militum* in Armenia; XVIII §68-9, Bo 471-2: Justinian and Chosroes; XVIII §70, Bo 472: Justinian and Dorotheos, also *magister militum* in Armenia; XVIII §61, Bo 466: Justinian and the Arab phylarch Al-Mundhir; XVII §17, Bo 422: frequent correspondence between Justin and the two patricians sent to supervise the restoration of Antioch after the earthquake of 526. This last case seems an odd fact to record and probably denotes Malalas' familiarity with all the relevant documents. In other words, the letters mentioned in this part of the chronicle may all have been available in the office of the *comes Orientis* at Antioch and consulted by the author of the chronicle in preparing his work; indeed he may even have been involved himself in some of the transactions covered in these letters (cf. chapter 1, p. 11). In addition there are various references in the transactions attributed to Hermogenes (see below, pp. 209-10) which would relate to reports transmitted to and received from the imperial court. Similarly an Antiochene *scrinium* could have been the clearing house which threw up the report from Julian on the Axoumite embassy (XVIII §56, Bo 457-9).

The inscriptions are an interesting case.<sup>17</sup> These are ostensibly good evidence for what was visible in Antioch during Malalas' life-time, particularly since Malalas

<sup>17</sup>Inscriptions are cited by Malalas at: I §5, P 10: on Seth's astronomical discoveries, attributed to Josephos; I §13, P 17: on Zeus' tomb in Crete, ascribed to Diodoros; II §7, Bo 28, on Inachos' statue of Io; II §28, Bo 45: on Dionysios' tomb, ascribed to Philochoros, Deinarchos and Kephalion; III §13, Bo 65: Pharaoh Petissonios' oracle response at Memphis; IV §12, Bo 77: the Argonauts' oracular response at Kyzikos, on a temple of Rhea that subsequently became church of the Theotokos; IV §15, Bo 81: on Ganymede's sarcophagus, ascribed to Didymos; V §65, Bo 139: on the altar to the maiden sacrificed by Iphigeneia; VIII §17, Bo 202: on a statue erected by Seleukos; VIII §31, Bo 212: on two statues sent to Rome by Byblos; X §5, Bo 232: on the altar erected in Rome by Augustus, ascribed to Timotheos; X §45, Bo 261: *Ex praeda Judaea* (in Greek characters) on Titus' theatre in Daphne; X §51, Bo 265: on the talisman of Debborios, ascribed to Domninos; XI §8, Bo 275: on the temple at Daphne by survivors of the earthquake in Trajan's reign; XI §16, Bo 279: on the bust of Hadrian in the temple at Kyzikos; XII §12, Bo 290: on a statue in honour of the alytarch Artabanes, in Daphne; XII §20, Bo 291: on the statue of Helios in the Zeuxippon in

comments that several – both from the ‘mythological’ period and from what would now be accepted as the historical period – are visible ‘to the present’.<sup>18</sup> There are clear arguments, however, (cf. Downey, 1935) that some must have been cited from literary sources. For example, of the inscriptions listed in note 17 as visible to the present, that at I §5 is attributed to Josephos, that at I §13 to Diodoros, and that at X §5 to Timotheos. Of the other inscriptions recorded by Malalas, that at II §28 is attributed to Philochoros, Deinarchos and Kephalion, that at IV §15 to Didymos, and that at X §51 to Domninos. It was argued above that of these authors only Domninos and Timotheos would have been known directly by Malalas. It was also argued above that Timotheos’ apparent interest in oracles and Hermetic/gnostic religious ideas makes it likely that he was the source for all such elements in Malalas’ chronicle. Thus the oracular inscriptions recorded at II §13 and IV §12 (which like that at X §5 are also found in the Tübingen Theosophy) should be attributed to Timotheos, and ultimately to the collection of oracles that lies behind the Theosophy (Robert, 1968). Given this literary background the presumption must be that not only these but all the inscriptions were taken at second hand. It is interesting to note that, like the ‘to the present’ phrases listed at note 24 below and the list of provincial foundations given in note 22 below, the last citation of an inscription occurs under the reign of Theodosius II (408-450). This would seem to suggest that, apart from what must be connected with Timotheos, who would seem to be writing in the early part of the sixth century, Malalas derived many of these elements from a source that ended by the mid-fifth century. Of the various possibilities, Domninos would seem to be the most likely. Though we know nothing of his life and career other than what can be deduced from Malalas’ chronicle, he clearly wrote on Antiochene history. It is quite possible that the inscriptions directly connected with buildings in Antioch were filtered through his writings.

In view of his likely position in the office of the *comes Orientis* with its significant judicial functions Malalas was familiar with the law and with contemporary legislation. The chronicle, especially in the period of Malalas’ lifetime, shows a notable concern with the promulgation of new laws. One might speculate that notices of new laws were included because of their particular interest to someone who was part of the machinery for their implementation and to an audience familiar with their significance. Otherwise it is not apparent why laws against expenses of litigants and the receipt of fees by imperial officials, for instance, should be included. Many of the laws noted by Malalas are identifiable but many are not, primarily because they were not included in the subsequent

Constantinople; XIII §3, Bo 318: *Bono Constantino* (in Greek characters) on a statue erected in Antioch by Plutarchus; XIII §17, Bo 326: metrical inscription in Constantine’s church in Antioch; XIV §13, Bo 360: on the basilica erected in Antioch by Anatolius and funded by Theodosius II.

Inscriptions are referred to, but not cited, at: VIII §22, Bo 205: on the Charoneion at Antioch; XI §18, Bo 279: Hadrian’s inscription commemorating the re-erection of the Colossos of Rhodes; XI §24, Bo 281: on the paving of the streets of Antioch under Antoninus Pius.

<sup>18</sup>See I §5, P 10; I §13, P 17; III §13, Bo 65; V §65, Bo 139; VIII §31, Bo 212; X §5, Bo 232; XI §16, Bo 279; XI §24, Bo 281; XIII §13, Bo 360. An attempt at a full list of phrases ‘to the present’ is given below at note 24.

Codes and were not otherwise preserved.<sup>19</sup> The most famous example is Malalas' notice of the decree closing the schools at Athens (XVIII §47, Bo 451). What is not clear is in precisely what form Malalas used these statutes. In one instance he observes that the laws in question were set up in Greek on boards for public display (XVIII §67, Bo 471). Such a means of broadcasting new laws was common practice in the Roman empire but there is no reliable indication of how long such laws survived their public display. Most of the laws referred to by Malalas were probably still on view (cf. Scott, 1981a). It does not mean, however, that Malalas necessarily relied on transcripts of the public form of these laws. In fact it is not unreasonable to suppose that, given his likely position in the office of the *comes*, he could provide the brief summaries from memory alone which may well account for their formulaic language (cf. Scott, 1981a, 16). Alternatively, all new laws were promulgated through the *comes* so Malalas may have had access to the 'master copies' sent to Antioch when it came to the point of actually writing up this section of the chronicle.

In addition to these documentary elements whose ultimate origins have to be inferred there are a number of literary texts on which Malalas drew, without naming. An example of these is the *Excerpta Barbari*, or to be strictly accurate a text very like it. The Greek text of which the *Excerpta* is a Latin version was put together around 502 (Frick, 1893, cxxxvi). It has close parallels with Malalas in the ruler-lists (as was discussed in chapter 6, pp. 124-35); and in the passage on Pious Zeus in Book I (already mentioned above), the wording of the *Excerpta* can be used to explain some awkward phrases in Malalas' chronicle as we now have it (e.g. Ζύγιον Νέμεσιον, a bizarre epithet of Hera at I §8, P 13 becomes comprehensible when it is seen as a coalescence of two juxtaposed epithets in the *Excerpta*: Iram Zygiam et ... Nemesim multiforem<sup>20</sup>). Again, while this text might have been embedded in a chronicler writing between 502 and the 530s and used by Malalas, the most economical explanation is that Malalas used this, or a 'sibling' version directly.

<sup>19</sup>The laws referred to in the chronicle, excluding those before Anastasios (for which see Scott, 1981a, 25, note 18) are:

*Identifiable*: 1. *CJ* 1. 3. 42 (1st March 528): XVIII §11, Bo 430, on bequests made by bishops and others; 2. *CJ* 1. 53. 1 (27th or 29th November 520): XVIII §20, Bo 437, on preventing governors from exploiting their position; 3. *CJ* 4. 20. 16 (before 1st June 528): XVIII §20, Bo 437, on witnesses giving evidence, even against their will; 4. *Nov. Just.* 77 (528): XVIII §18, Bo 436, on castration for pederasty; 5. *Const. Summa* (529): XVIII §38, Bo 448, on publication of the *Code*.

*Not identifiable*: 1. XVI §14, Bo 401, branding of humans; 2. XVI §14, Bo 401, on inheritance by adopted children; 3. XVII §18, Bo 422 (A.D. 527?), punishment of rioters; 4. XVIII §20, Bo 437 (A.D. 528), on inheritance by natural children; 5. XVIII §20, Bo 437 (A.D. 528), on rejection of an inheritance; 6. XVIII §42, Bo 449 (A.D. 529), on banning pagans from office; 7. XVIII §47, Bo 451 (A.D. 529), on teaching philosophy in Athens; 8. XVIII §47, Bo 451 (A.D. 529), on gambling; 9. XVIII §67, Bo 470 (A.D. 531), on litigants' expenses; 10. XVIII §67, Bo 470 (A.D. 531), on receipt of official fees; 11. XVIII §78, Bo 478 (A.D. 532), on heretics and the orthodox faith; 12. XVIII §142, Bo 495 (misdated to December 562, actually 552), on the Chalcedonian faith.

<sup>20</sup>*Exc. Barb.* 236. 14-15. Note that the *Excerpta* survive only in a Latin translation; Frick (1893, 237. 14) suggests that the Greek original read "Ἡραν Ζυγίαν, καὶ ... Νέμεσιν πολύμορφον.

At V §70-72, Bo 144-149, Malalas relates the raid of Sennacherib of Assyria on Jerusalem; these pages reflect almost word for word the Septuagint text of *Isaiah* 36 and 37 (= 4 [=2] *Kings* 18-19). Though there is no acknowledgement of the borrowing (not even a vague reference to 'Hebrew scriptures' of the sort found elsewhere), one must – I think – assume that Malalas had a copy of the Old Testament before him as he put this section together. It is puzzling that this passage should be quoted at such length; given that for Malalas Assyria and Persia appear virtually interchangeable concepts (as is discussed in chapter 3, p. 65), it could be that this is an apotropaic reflection of recurrent concern in the face of Persian hostilities – eventually justified following the sack of Antioch in 540.

In other cases it is not possible to point to an extant text but an examination of the chronicle produces cohesive sets of material which are very likely to have been taken from a single source and applied by Malalas through his chronicle. Some of this material is formed by lists of rulers, which he probably found already collected together – like the lists of ancient rulers taken from the source akin to the *Excerpta Barbari*. Material of this sort would include the somewhat inaccurate lists of Seleucids and Ptolemies in Books VIII and IX (cf. Downey, 1938). There is also the list of imperial accessions and deaths (and portraits?) that forms the backbone of the chronicle from Book X onwards; this obviously included consular dates too and may well have originated from a set of consular fasti. Very probably available for Malalas from the Antiochene city archive (on which see below) would have been further lists such as the set of earthquakes which shows signs of a numbered sequence; it is possible that 'written-up' accounts of these horrifying experiences were attached to the bare enumeration of details of relief operations (cf. XVII §16, Bo 419; XVIII §112, Bo 485, and below, pp. 209).<sup>21</sup>

In late antiquity major cities kept public records of an official civic kind called *acta urbis* (for details see PW 1, cols. 290-5 and Croke, 1990). Moreover, such records had been kept throughout the Roman empire, originally at Rome and after 330 at Constantinople and probably other major capitals of the empire too. A long tradition stretched from republican *tabulae pontificum* through to the *acta diurna* / *acta urbis* of the empire under the jurisdiction of the *procurator ab actis urbis* and continued uninterrupted into the late empire. The *acta urbis* were essentially a record of civic ceremonial and the great state occasions: imperial births, accessions, arrivals (*adventus*), anniversaries, deaths and marriages; victories and the arrival of embassies; dedication of temples and other public buildings; supplication rituals for all sorts of natural prodigies etc. The traditional Roman ceremonial and cycle of commemorative feasts were transformed when the empire became Christianised from the fourth century. Most of the previous events continued to be celebrated in the same way, but in the context of a Christian liturgy, while the dedication of temples was replaced by the dedication of churches and the *adventus* ceremonial was extended to include the arrival of saintly relics in the major cities. While the *acta urbis* had always been available and were used by writers such as Tacitus and Pliny they took on an especial importance in the late empire because they lent themselves so readily to the annalistic chronicles which had become very popular and widespread. No

<sup>21</sup> All these items are listed out in chapter 6.

original part of the *acta urbis* survives so that their scope and format have to be inferred from the various chronicles – such as Malalas – who used them.

Malalas is a valuable source for the history of Antioch especially because he used local materials and writers so extensively. C.O. Müller (1839, 76-7) first proposed that he had used the local city chronicle and this was reiterated by Holder-Egger (1876, 241) before being taken up and expanded by Freund (1882, 7-28) who suggested that he mainly used this source indirectly. In Freund's view the chronicle had been used not so much by Malalas as by earlier writers on whom Malalas had drawn: Pausanias (on the origins and early history of Antioch), Nestorinos (to A.D. 474) and Domninos (to A.D. 491) who was followed by the monophysite chronicler Theophilus until 529. Each of these had made use of the Antiochene city chronicle which began in the time of Caesar (Freund, 1882, 17), the earliest entry preserved in Malalas being the edict of Caesar promulgated at Antioch, his *adventus* and building in the city (IX §5, Bo 216), though it possibly included Pompey's earlier departure from Antioch (VIII §32, Bo 212). The city chronicle was probably, in Freund's view, the ultimate source for Malalas' accounts of imperial arrivals and departures at Antioch, imperial building and for local earthquakes – all the sorts of things normally found in city chronicles (but which may equally well have derived from documents available in the office of the *comes Orientis*).

To what extent Malalas used the Antiochene city chronicle at first hand is unclear: clearly much was filtered through Domninos and, before him, Pausanias. There is a good deal of material in the later books which sits well with what is found elsewhere in city chronicles: building (XV §11, Bo 385; XVI §8, Bo 398), urban riots (XV §15, Bo 389-90; XVI §2, Bo 393; XVI §6, Bo 396-8; XVII §12, Bo 416); prodigies such as earthquakes (XIV §36, Bo 369), comets (XVII §4, Bo 411), fires (XVII §14, Bo 417; XVIII §62, Bo 467) and other curious happenings (XIV §38, Bo 370; XVI §5, Bo 395; XVII §7, Bo 412); the death of a holy man and the translation of his remains (XIV §37, Bo 369); Justinian's donations to Antioch (XVIII §45, Bo 450; XVIII §48, Bo 452). In addition, it is possible that some of the notices concerning successive *comites Orientis* or patriarchs in Antioch (see chapter 6, pp. 160-3) also derive from the city chronicle. In the strict sense the *acta* were a brief public record of the key events in the ceremonial life of the community probably compiled on a daily basis (*acta diurna*) but summarised annually into a yearly extract of highlights.

The office responsible for maintaining this record (originally the *procurator ab actis urbis*) held its own materials, either separately or as part of the city archives (*tabularia*; see below). These raw materials would possibly include copies of official reports of disasters (*relationes*) and of the 'announcements' emanating from the imperial court and elsewhere. Possibly too the archives held copies of laws and decrees promulgated in Antioch and transcripts of ceremonial and public occasions involving the emperor or his representative in Antioch, the *comes Orientis*. Records of events presided over by the *comes* would include proceedings in the hippodrome in Antioch. So when Malalas cites, in relation to the changing of Antioch's name, what was found ἐν τοῖς χαρτίοις ... τῶν τὰ ἄκτα γράφοντων τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως (XVIII §29, Bo 443), he is probably referring to documents contained in the archive from which the *acta urbis* (ἄκτα τῆς πόλεως)



were constructed. In other words, the *acta* included acclamations shouted on public occasions. This particular acclamation was apparently half a century old when it was brought to light from the *acta*. Acclamations were an important accompaniment to the public ceremonial and the acclamations shouted in the presence of imperial officials in Antioch were officially recorded and periodically forwarded to the emperor, as required (Liebeschuetz, 1972, 209-11).

Also from the city archives would have come the list of events dated by the Antiochene calendar and whose insertion into the chronicle is arguably to be attributed to Malalas himself (see chapter 6, pp. 151-53). The sequence of the *comites Orientis* and patriarchs that can be reconstructed from the reign of Zeno onwards might have been available from the city records also or, if Malalas was an official attached to the *comes Orientis*, this information might have been available from records kept in that *scrinium*. Of interest in this connection is Malalas' focus on the foundation of provinces and the establishment of cities: does this also arise out of Malalas' professional life as a member of a legally-oriented bureau? Of interest too, for his understanding of historical causation, is his insistence that a province name must be derived from a person, even if the results are – from a modern standpoint – quite unhistorical. Thus Polemo was responsible for the creation of Pontus Polemoniacus (X §39, Bo 257), Lykaonia was named for its former toparch Lykaon (IX §13, Bo 222), Arabia for the Saracen Arabas and Bostra for Augustus' general Bostros (IX §16, Bo 223), HelenouPontos for Constantine's mother (XIII §12, Bo 323), and so forth; one should remember the earlier naming of Phoenicia, Syria, and Cilicia by Phoinix after himself and his sons (II §8, Bo 30); cf. chapter 3, p. 62.

The list of the creation of provinces that can be extracted from the chronicle raises a further issue.<sup>22</sup> When was the material on which Malalas was drawing put together?

<sup>22</sup>The following list of references supplements the partial list, in Greek, given in chapter 8, pp. 226-8: IX §12, Bo 221: Pompey captured Bithynia; IX §13, Bo 222: Augustus created Galatia, captured Lydia and Pamphylia, created Phrygia Pacatania, captured Lykaonia; IX §16, Bo 223: Augustus captured Phoenice and Arabia; X §10, Bo 235: Tiberius subjugated Cappadocia; X §39, Bo 257: Nero created Pontus Polemoniacus; X §46, Bo 261: Vespasian created Macedonia II, dividing it from Macedonia I, and divided Europe from Thrace; XI §7, Bo 274: Trajan created Mesopotamia and Dacia Ripensis; XI §11, Bo 277: Trajan created Dacia I and II; XII §30, Bo 300: Aurelian made Arabia a province; XII §30, Bo 301: Aurelian created Dacia Ripensis (*pace* Trajan!); XII §34, Bo 302: Carus created Caria; XIII §3, Bo 318: Constantine created Euphratesia; XIII §6, Bo 319: Constantine created Palestine III; XIII §11, Bo 323: Constantine created Phrygia Salutaris; XIII §12, Bo 323: Constantine renamed Bithynia HelenouPontos; XIII §27, Bo 336: the Romans ceded Mygdonia to the Persians; XIII §35, Bo 342: Valens created Cappadocia II, dividing it from Cappadocia I; XIII §37, Bo 345: Theodosius I divided Phoenice Libanensis from Phoenice Maritima, and divided Pontus to create Haemimontus; XIII §42, Bo 347: Theodosius I divided Nova Epirus from Old Epirus, and divided Palestine II from Palestine I (*pace* Constantine and Palestine III); XIII §44, Bo 348: Theodosius I divided Galatia II from Galatia I; XIV §24, Bo 365: Theodosius II created Lykia (dividing it from Lykaonia), Cilicia II (dividing it from Cilicia I), Syria II (dividing it from Syria I) and Honorias (dividing it from Bithynia); XVIII §39, Bo 448: Justinian created Theodorias.

A corollary to this is the list that can be compiled of the creation of metropoleis and the bestowal of city rights on a community: X §46, Bo 262: Vespasian made Herakleia a metropolis; XI §7, Bo 274: Trajan made Amida a metropolis; XII §21, Bo 294: Severus made

The creation of Honorias by Theodosius II in the early fifth century is noted (XIV §24, Bo 365),<sup>23</sup> and then no further changes in provincial structures are mentioned until Justinian is recorded as creating Theodorias in 535 (XVIII §39, Bo 448; Jones, 1964, 881, note 20). Did Malalas use a list that closed in the reign of Theodosius II, which he updated with a foundation that took place in his own lifetime? Some confirmation that Malalas was using sources which ended in the early to mid-fifth century comes from the lists that can be drawn up of phrases denoting that an object, or custom, exists 'to the present'.<sup>24</sup> We should note that the arguments used to show that most of the

Laodikeia a metropolis for the duration of his reign; XII §34, Bo 303: Carus constructed a walled fortress, gave it city rights and named it Carrhae; XII §48, Bo 313: Salamis, following an earthquake, had its name changed to Constantia and is now the metropolis of Cyprus; XIII §3, Bo 318: Constantine made Hierapolis a metropolis; XIII §10, Bo 323: Constantine gave Constantinople imperial status; XIII §12, Bo 323: Constantine gave Souga in Bithynia city status and named it Helenoupolis; XIII §37, Bo 345: Theodosius I made Emesa a metropolis; XIII §39, Bo 345: Theodosius made Resaina a city named Theodosiupolis; XIII §42, Bo 347: Theodosius I gave city status to Dyrrachium and made Scythopolis a metropolis; XIII §44, Bo 348: Theodosius gave Pessinus city status; XIV §24, Bo 365: Theodosius made Myra a metropolis, likewise Apameia, Anazarbos, and Herakleia; XVI §10, Bo 399: Anastasios fortified Dara, gave it city status and named it Anastasiupolis; XVIII §12, Bo 430: Justinian restored Sykai, gave it city status and renamed it Justinianoupolis; XVIII §31, Bo 444: Justinian made Anasarthon a city, renaming it Theodorias; XVIII §39, Bo 448: Justinian made Laodikeia a metropolis.

In addition Malalas frequently comments on the metropolitan status of a city that is mentioned in passing.

<sup>23</sup>Though note that Jones, 1964, 1461, comments that Malalas' source must have meant Theodosius I.

<sup>24</sup>I §4, P 9: the timbers of the ark are on Ararat in Pisidia, according to Pergamos the Pamphylian; I §5, P 10: the stone pillar with Seth's astronomical discoveries remained on Mount Siris, according to Josephos; I §11, P 15: the Persians have preserved Zoroaster's remains; I §12, P 16: Ares is called Baal by the Persians; I §13, P 17: Picus Zeus' tomb is in Crete, ascribed to Diodoros; II §4, Bo 26: the Scythians followed Sostris of Egypt from Asia to Persia, where they have remained; II §7, Bo 28: the Argives say that Io is a secret name of the moon; II §7, Bo 29: the inhabitants of Iopolis on Mount Silpios are called Ionitai and the Syrian Antiochenes annually knock on the doors of the Hellenes, asking for Io; II §8, Bo 31: the Tyrians perform a memorial rite to commemorate the attack on the city and the capture of Europe; II §10, Bo 33: after the discovery of the murex, the Romans developed a distinctive imperial dress and the toga for the consuls, which they continue to wear; II §17, Bo 36: the statue of Perseus holding the Gorgon that he erected outside Amandra (later Iconium) still stands; II §20, Bo 38: Persians revere fire (specifically the fire that fell from heaven); II §33, Bo 48: the spring by which Dirke's body was left is still known by that name; II §36, Bo 50: in the course of the Oidipous story there is the comment that Oidipous' feet were put into a block of wood (rather like stocks) and that this is like the punishment still known among soldiers as the 'cuspos' (but cf. chapter 4, p. 73); III §2, Bo 58: Sidon captured Canaan, now known as Palestine, and built Sidon which is now within the territory of Phoenice; III §14, Bo 66: the oracle given by Pythia to the Pharaoh is engraved at Memphis above where the Nile floods; IV §1, Bo 68: the Sikyonians are now known as Helladikoi; IV §11, Bo 76: Marsyas flung himself into a river, which is called Marsyas; IV §13, Bo 78: Sosthenion, named after the Argonauts' encounter with Amykos and a vision of an angel, where a temple was erected which was later converted to a chapel of the Archangel Michael by Constantine; V §7, Bo 97: Achilles' army was known as Myrmidons, but are now known as Bulgars; V §65, Bo 139: the inscription on the statue of the sacrificed Nyssa 'remains until now'; V §67, Bo 141: the river Typhon is now known as the Orontes; V §67, Bo 142: the bronze statue of Orestes to commemorate his relief from madness stands 'to the present day'; it is called 'The Runaway'

inscriptions cited by Malalas were known to him from his literary sources and not direct observation also apply to these phrases. Admittedly their status varies: remarks such as those at V §67 on the names of the Orontes or Seleukeia are plausibly the result of local knowledge; the comments on the current visibility of the oracular utterances recorded at III §14 or X §5 (attributed to Timotheos) which are also to be found in the Tübingen Theosophy clearly tell us nothing about the status of these hypothetical objects in the sixth century, while the remark on the statues erected to Herakles at VI §16 is also to be found in the *Excerpta Barbari* (238. 25), Malalas' unacknowledged source at this point; other comments, as was the case with the inscriptions, are specifically attributed to authorities (e.g. Pergamos the Pamphylian at I §4 on the present location of the ark). Care needs, therefore, to be exercised in any attempt to use these phrases in the reconstruction of Malalas' own life and movements (cf. chapter 1, pp. 5-6). The last phrase of this sort comes from the reign of Leo I. This would fit in, more or less, with

'till the present'; V §67, Bo 142: Palaiopolis is now known as Seleukeia; VI §16, Bo 161: gold and porphyry statues set up in honour of Herakles by the Italian rulers who were descended from him still stand; VI §61, Bo 165: the river Phorbas is now known as the Acheloos; VII §1, Bo 171: the arms of Herakles are in the shrine of Picus Zeus in the Forum Boarium in Rome; VII §2, Bo 172: the use of the imperial plural and imperial busts continued 'from that time till the present'; VII §3, Bo 173: the Romans celebrate the festival of 'On the Field of Mars' annually; VII §7, Bo 179: country women who graze sheep are still called *lykainai*; VII §7, Bo 180: the celebration of the Brumalia (for which Malalas has just given an origin) has persisted 'to the present day', as has the custom of 'friendly gatherings'; VII §9, Bo 183: Vindicius' noble behaviour led to the festival of Consilia (= Consualia), which is still celebrated (Livy is the authority for this); VII §12, Bo 187: the festival of Februarius is held annually in every Roman city, according to Brunichius; VIII §1, Bo 193: Diskoi in Bithynia had its name changed to Chrysopolis, which it is still called, because Alexander issued much gold there; VIII §3, Bo 194: the Persians erected a bronze statue of Alexander in Babylon, which still stands; VIII §10, Bo 197: the river Drakon now known as Orontes, also Typhon and Ophites; VIII §22, Bo 205: the Antiochenes still call the apotropaic cliff-carving Charonion; VIII §31, Bo 212: the statues of Athene and Zeus Keraunios were sent by Byblos to Rome, where they still remain; IX §14, Bo 222: the Agrippianon is now known as the Ampelion bath; X §5, Bo 232: the altar on the Capitol set up by Augustus and its inscription stands 'to the present day', according to Timotheos; X §8, Bo 233: a statue of Tiberius was set up at the navel (*omphalos*) of the city and had an eye (*ophthalmos*) on it and still stands; X §45, Bo 261: Titus set up a marble statue of himself in Daphne on the site of a theatre that had previously been a Jewish synagogue; X §49, Bo 263: Paris, Domitian's favourite, built a bath and house for himself in Antioch called Paradise, which still stands and in which he is buried; XI §10, Bo 277: bronze female statues of Christian martyrs under Trajan still stand in the public bath; XI §16, Bo 279: Hadrian set a huge bust of himself on the temple in Kyzikos, with an inscription; XI §24, Bo 281: Antoninus Pius recorded his building works at Antioch in an inscription at the Gate of the Cherubim; the monument is still there; XII §41, Bo 309: the area around the statue of Diocletian in Alexandria is still known as Diocletian's Horse; XIII §3, Bo 318: Plutarchus, governor of Antioch, melted a statue of Poseidon and turned it into a statue of Constantine, with an inscription; XIII §8, Bo 322: the celebration of Constantinople's Anniversary as instituted by Constantine has continued 'to the present day'; XIII §39, Bo 345: Theodosius pulled down temples in Constantinople, making the temple of Helios into the Courtyard of Helios, as it is still known; XIII §39, Bo 346: Theodosius made Resaina a city and renamed it Theodosiupolis, a status it has kept from that day to this; XIV §11, Bo 359: Theodosius built the Great Church in Alexandria, which is still known as the church of Theodosius; XIV §13, Bo 360: Theodosius gilded what is still known as the Golden Gate in Constantinople, likewise the Golden Gate in Antioch; XIV §43, Bo 372: Leo I built the New Colonnade, called this 'to the present day'.

what Malalas tells us of Nestorianos, whose work apparently ended in 474 with the death of Leo II, or – equally well – with Domninos. By contrast the list of the foundation *tychai* of cities ends with that of Constantinople (cf. chapter 3, p. 57); the purpose of the original list, however, may have been to demonstrate the unique status of Constantinople's foundation (on Christian principles) and need not be an indication that it was drawn up in the fourth century.

Several references have been made already to the archives of Antioch. In a Roman provincial capital such as Antioch there were various different archives (PW 4A, cols., 1962-9, at 1966-7; Gross, 1950). In addition to those of the city itself, for its civic and administrative life, there were those for the imperial administration: i) the *tabularium Caesaris* which maintained records of the financial management of the imperial estates; ii) the archives of the provincial governor of Syria; iii) the archives of the *comes Orientis* responsible for all the provinces of the Eastern vicariate. Since Antioch was the headquarters for the *magister militum per Orientem* there was probably a military archive too. Across these different archives there was doubtless much duplication of documentation as a consequence of the intrinsic administrative overlap finally acknowledged by the restructuring in 535 (*Nov. Just.* 8. 5) which virtually amalgamated the offices of the *comes* and the provincial governor.

Of special interest for the chronicle of Malalas is the archive of the *comes Orientis*. For the late fifth-sixth centuries Malalas is the main, sometimes the only, source for the successive *comites* (see chapter 6, pp. 160-2). As proposed elsewhere (chapter 1, p. 11), Malalas himself may have been associated with the office of the *comes*. At any rate there is much information in the chronicle which would appear to reflect the perspective of the *comes*. Such information highlights the functioning of the office as a conduit for the flow of information between the imperial court and the eastern provinces. It was the office of the *comes* which received decrees and news sent from the court at Constantinople to Antioch and the other provinces of the East such as when Justinian bestowed special favours on Antioch (XVIII §29, Bo 443; §45, Bo 450; §48, Bo 452) and possibly the Nika riot (XVIII §71, Bo 473-7); likewise the office of the *comes* was responsible for reporting news to the emperor from the East: events such as the rebellion at Caesarea in 484 (XV §8, Bo 382-3), the proclamation at Antioch of Leontios as emperor, for which Malalas includes the actual decree (XV §13, Bo 389), negotiations with Caucasian potentates (XVII §7-9, Bo 412-5) and an invasion of the Sabir Huns (XVIII §70, Bo 472ff.). The rebellion of the Samaritans in 529 and their proclamation of Julian as emperor provide a good example of this process at work: the governors of Palestine and the *dux* Theodore reported the rebellion to Justinian, perhaps indirectly through Antioch so that the news reached Constantinople at the same time as the pretender's head; subsequently the emperor moved to replace the *dux* with an Antiochene named Eirenaios (XVIII §35, Bo 445-7). Also instructive is Malalas' notice of the Samaritans' overtures to the Persians when they were at war with the Romans: Justinian received an account of the inquisitorial proceedings conducted by the *magister militum per Orientem* in Antioch (XVIII §54, Bo 456).

The accounts of natural disasters at Antioch and throughout the East which present details of the resultant damage are arguably based on the official accounts prepared for the imperial court in order to secure the traditional imperial consolation and tax remissions (Leopold, 1986). That such documents were indeed quite detailed is evident from the abbreviated accounts of the major earthquakes in Antioch in 458 (XIV §36, Bo 369) and 526 (XVII §§16-22, Bo 419-424). This same pattern of disaster, a report to court followed by a tax remission applies to Malalas' accounts of the fires in Antioch in 520 (XVII §14, Bo 417) and 531 (XVIII §62, Bo 467), the flood in Edessa (XVII §15, Bo 418-9) and earthquakes in Gabala (XV §4, Bo 378), Rhodes (XVI §18, Bo 406), Anazarbos (XVII §15, Bo 418), Pompeiopolis (XVIII §19, Bo 436-7), Laodikeia (XVIII §28, Bo 443), Amaseia (XVIII §37, Bo 448) and Myra (XVIII §40, Bo 448). This pattern of report also fits the notices of major factional or urban violence: the Antiochene troubles in 490 (XV §15, Bo 389-90), 507 (XVI §6, Bo 397-8), 523 (XVII §12, Bo 416), 529 (XVIII §41, Bo 449) and 531 (XVIII §64, Bo 468). A similar imperial document probably also forms the basis of Malalas' account of the construction of Dara (XVI §10, Bo 399) and the reconstruction of Palmyra (XVIII §2, Bo 425-6), Martyropolis (XVIII §5, Bo 427), Anasarthon and Susa (XVIII §31, Bo 444). The archives of the *comes* also seem the likely source of Malalas' notice concerning the creation of the province of Theodorias from part of two Syrian provinces (XVIII §39, Bo 448).

It is also arguable that Malalas used oral informants to supplement his written sources: this would seem the most reasonable interpretation of the phrase in the preface ('that came to my hearing'). From his terminology it would seem that Malalas is associating this type of information with the period from the reign of Zeno onwards, that is, from Book XV to the end. As has been noted before, Malalas states at the end of XIV that Nestorianos' account ended with the death of Leo II; this would seem to mark a move away from Malalas' dependence on material that had already been collected. The situation, however, may not be as clear cut as that since Malalas acknowledges Eustathios of Epiphaneia, whose history – no longer extant – covered Zeno's reign (and earlier events) up to the outbreak of Anastasios' Persian wars.

It is, of course, from the nature of the evidence hard to pinpoint precisely what Malalas took from his supposed oral informants, but it is possible to make several suggestions. Malalas, for example, gives a detailed report of Vitalian's rebellion in 513, and reports especially conversations between Anastasios, Marinus the Syrian and Proklos on how to burn Vitalian's ships with elemental sulphur (XVI §16, Bo 403-5). There are also circumstantial details given on the *Trisagion* riot of 512, which in Malalas' account (XVI §19, Bo 407-8) centered on the person and house of this same Marinus. It would seem not unlikely that Malalas gained this information from Marinus himself, a fellow Syrian, who had begun his career in the Constantinopolitan bureau of the *comes Orientis*, rose to become praetorian prefect for the East (between 512 and 515 and again in 519) and had died by 539 (PLRE 2, 726-9: Marinus 7). Malalas could have met Marinus in Constantinople, perhaps in 520 (see chapter 1, p. 6).

It could also be suggested that Hermogenes, *magister officiorum* during the period of the Persian war of 529-533, was another possible informant. Malalas provides a full and

detailed account of the wars in XVIII §34 (Bo 445), §36 (Bo 447-8), §44 (Bo 449-50), §50 (Bo 452-3), §53-4 (Bo 454-6), §56 (Bo 456), §58 (Bo 460), §60-1 (Bo 461-7), §§65-6 (Bo 468-70), §§68-9 (Bo 471-72), §76 (Bo 477-8). At the outbreak of the war in 529 'the Scythian Hermogenes, the *ex-magister* and a learned man, was sent to the Persian regions' (§34, Bo 445). Theophanes, obviously drawing on the full text, adds the precise focus – Hermogenes arrived in Antioch on 12th May. In July, Malalas continues, 'the king of the Persians, Koades, received the *magister* Hermogenes who had been sent on an embassy of friendship with gifts marking the proclamation of the emperor Justinian' (§36, Bo 447-8). Next we find Hermogenes returning from Persia with Koades' reply to Justinian and the letter is quoted in full (§44, Bo 449-50). Then in 530 Hermogenes and Rufinus are sent as ambassadors to Persia (§50, Bo 452-3). Once again Theophanes adds details from the original Malalas which underline the focus of Malalas' source – they set out from Antioch in March. Having encamped at Dara and taken part in the battle which, Theophanes adds, took place in June, Rufinus goes on to Koades – in August according to Theophanes. 'At the end of September' he returns with a treaty which is quoted in full (§53, Bo 454-5). Next he is sent back to Koades, only to find that he has gone back on the treaty (§53, Bo 455-6). Then a Persian ambassador is sent to Constantinople (§56, Bo 456), and a Roman army subsequently dispatched (§58, Bo 460) while Hermogenes is once again sent to the East (§60, Bo 461). There follows a detailed account of the movements of both armies (§§60-1, Bo 461-7) which culminates in another long account introduced by the words 'In that year a report was sent from Hermogenes concerning the battle which had taken place between Romans and Persians' (§65, Bo 468), and concluding with the retention of the Roman ambassadors on Roman territory (§66, Bo 470). Malalas next reports the death of Koades and the accession of Chosroes and the attendant diplomatic exchanges between Roman and Persian envoys (§68, Bo 471-2). There follows the proposal for a three months' treaty, its acceptance by Justinian and the return of Rufinus and Strategios (§69, Bo 472). Finally, Rufinus is sent back to ratify the treaty in 533, and he returns subsequently with Hermogenes (§76, Bo 477). The account is concluded by a summation of the terms of the treaty and the duration of the war, referring back to his previous account of the war under Anastasios (XVIII §76, Bo 478).

It has always been acknowledged that Malalas' account of this Persian war, even when compared to the eye-witness account of Prokopios, is very detailed and reliable (e.g. Bury, 1923, II, 81 ff.). There is an emphasis on the troop movements in and out of Antioch and the narrative includes two letters sent by Koades which are reproduced verbatim (and which provide useful insights into imperial nomenclature in the sixth century). Since all his information on the Persian war is set in the context of the movements of Roman ambassadors, it would appear that the chief envoy Hermogenes was the source of most of Malalas' information. Malalas may therefore have obtained this information as a personal friend, but more likely because he was involved in the transmission of the ambassador's reports through the office of the *comes Orientis* in Antioch.

Timothy the Persian carrier ('who was baptised and renamed Timotheos') seems another likely candidate for the role of oral informant. At XVIII §30, Bo 444, he is cited for an account of the Persian persecution of the Manicheans and their bishop Indarazar. The assumption is that Timotheos was a Manichaean who escaped. The phrase used of his testimony (διηγῆσατο 'related') is not one of the regular phrases used by Malalas in citing an authority (συνεγράψατο 'recounted' would be more usual). It is tempting to see in Timotheos the mechanism whereby Malalas acquired all his special information on matters Persian (see chapter 3), but this can only be speculation; equally speculative are suggestions that this Timothy/Timotheos is to be equated with Malalas' major source Timotheos, even though Timotheos, with his interest in Hermetic/gnostic theology discussed above (p. 195), must be dated to the first part of the sixth century, not too far distant in time from the Persian and what can be assumed to be his interests.

Further than this in the search for passages derived from oral informants it is hard to go. Some sections in XVIII (e.g. §23, Bo 439-40, on Eulalios' provision for his daughters; or §51, Bo 453-4, on the travelling showman) have the signs of being good stories that might well have circulated on the streets of Constantinople – but that is unprovable. Much the same could be said of the account of the courtship and marriage of Theodosius II, at XIV §3 ff (Bo 352 ff.), from which the bridesow has entered the Byzantine literary – and ultimately folk – tradition (Treadgold, 1979) and Paulinus' Phrygian apple ended up in European folk-lore (Fourrier, 1960, 252). But this is even more speculative and Malalas' information on Theodosian court matters, despite its air of gossipy intrigue, may well have been derived from Eustathios of Epiphaneia.

In all this discussion so far the chronicle has been treated as a unified whole. This was partly to counteract the effect of Bourier's analysis since he divided the chronicle at the end of XIV and thus missed the significance of those features that are present throughout the whole work (such as the From Adam dates, the earthquake list, the portraits, etc). Nevertheless there is a break in the work, as has been discussed in chapter 1 in connection with the question of the chronicle's editions. The most likely point is at XVIII §76, Bo 478, with the conclusion of the Endless Peace. What follows from this point on is arguably the work of the person who constructed the main chronicle despite the changes in format and focus (as was discussed previously; see chapter 1, pp. 22-24 and this chapter, p. 169). Though there are no back references after XVIII §14, Bo 431, where the comment on Herakles from Spain harks back to VI §16, Bo 161, and XVIII §76, Bo 477, with the comment that the war begun under Anastasios (cf. XVI §9, Bo 398) was now concluded, the interests remain the same. The focusses of the chronicle remain constant across the division. Thus the chronicle is still structured by imperial reigns (as it has been since Book X), which open with a notice of accession, indication of the reign length and (almost invariably) a portrait, and close with a comment on the mode of death and the emperor's age (though it should be noted that perhaps the death notices of Zeno, Anastasios and Justin, in XV-XVII, are less succinct than those in XI-XIV, and the portraits vary in style). The main topics covered by the chronicle continue to be rebellions and uprisings (e.g. XV §1-7, Bo 377-82 [Basiliskos], §8, Bo 382-3

[Samaritans], §§12-14, Bo 385-9 [Illus], XVI §3, Bo 394 [Isaurians], XVI §16, Bo 402-6 [Vitalian], XVII §8, Bo 412 [Vitalian], XVIII §35, Bo 445-7 [Samaritans]);<sup>25</sup> civic disturbances and riots (e.g. XV §15, Bo 389-90 [Antioch], XVI §4, Bo 394-5, §19, Bo 406-7 [Constantinople], §6, Bo 395-8 [Antioch], §15, Bo 401-2 [Alexandria], XVII §12, Bo 416-7 [universal]);<sup>26</sup> imperial building activities (e.g. XVI §8, Bo 398, §10, Bo 399, XVII §17, Bo 422, §19, Bo 423, XVIII §5, Bo 427, §12, Bo 430, §17, Bo 435-6);<sup>27</sup> earthquakes (e.g. XV §4, Bo 378, XVI §18, Bo 406, XVII §15, Bo 417-9, §16, Bo 419-21, XVIII §19, Bo 436-7, §27, Bo 442-3, §28, Bo 443).<sup>28</sup> The main centre of interest is still Antioch; Basiliskos' usurpation, for example, (XV §§1-7, Bo 377-82) is recounted from an Antiochene standpoint; appointments that are noted are those for Antioch (e.g. *comes Orientis*: XVI §2, Bo 392, §6, Bo 396, XVIII §2, Bo 425; or patriarch: XVI §11, Bo 400, XVII §22, Bo 423-4); major earthquake reports concern Antioch (e.g. XVII §16, Bo 419-21, XVIII §27, Bo 442-3 cf. §29, Bo 443-4), though this does not mean that events in Constantinople are passed over (cf. XVI §13, Bo 400-1, XVII §2, Bo 410-1, §3, Bo 401, §5, Bo 411, XVIII §22, Bo 438-9, §23, Bo 439-440, §24, Bo 440-1, §25, Bo 441). Affairs in the West of the empire, that is, in areas other than Antioch, Syria or Constantinople, continue to receive little attention (cf. XV §§9-10, Bo 383-6, on Theoderic, who seems to have been brought in because of a formal move in connection with consular appointments).

Equally there is no identifiable change in linguistic usage. Stylistically it is very hard to point to any lexical, syntactical or morphological changes of any significance between XVIII – or any portion of it – and the rest of the chronicle. Rüger (1895, 10) observed that the preposition count in XVIII is markedly higher than in any other book, but he points out that these prepositions are almost all found in temporal phrases. What is being registered is the increasing number of 'annalistic' entries, which does not necessarily mean a change in author but rather a change in method when dealing with contemporary, or nearly contemporary, material. Rüger also pointed to some unique

<sup>25</sup>Cf. X §25, Bo 247, §43, Bo 259, §45, Bo 260: Jews; XI §23, Bo 280: Egyptians; XII §19, Bo 290: Albinus; XII §21, Bo 292-4: Niger; XII §26, Bo 295-7: Mariades; XII §28, Bo 299: Zenobia; XII §41, Bo 308-9: Egyptians; XIV §40, Bo 371-2: Aspar; XIV §45, Bo 372-4: Ricimer.

<sup>26</sup>Cf. X §20, Bo 244-5: Antioch; XII §49, Bo 314: Antioch; XIII §43, Bo 347-8: Thessalonike; XIII §49, Bo 348-9: Rome; XIV §34, Bo 368: Greens.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. X §8, Bo 232-3, §18, Bo 243, XI §14, Bo 277-8, §24, Bo 280-1: Antioch; X §53, Bo 267-8: Anazarbos; XI §11, Bo 277: Daphne; XI §16, Bo 279: Kyzikos; XI §18, Bo 279: Rhodes; XII §2, Bo 283: Antioch; XII §11, Bo 289: Nikomedeia; XII §20, Bo 291-2: Byzantion; XII §22, Bo 294-5: Antioch; XII §27, Bo 298: Emesa; XII §30, Bo 299-300: Rome; XII §33, Bo 302, §38, Bo 306-8: Antioch; XII §40, Bo 308: *Limes*; XIII §3, Bo 318, §14, Bo 324, §17, Bo 325-6, §29, Bo 338, §30, Bo 338-9, §40, Bo 346-7: Antioch; XIII §8, Bo 320, §39, Bo 345: Constantinople; XIII §12, Bo 323: Souga; XIV §12, Bo 359-60: Crete; XIV §13, Bo 360: Antioch; XIV §20, Bo 363: Nikomedeia; XIV §29, Bo 367: Tripolis.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. X §3, Bo 229: Diospolis; X §18, Bo 243: Antioch 2; X §23, Bo 246: Smyrna, etc.; X §28, Bo 250: Crete; XI §8, Bo 275: Antioch 3 and Rhodes 2; XI §16, Bo 279: Kyzikos; XII §11, Bo 289: Nikomedeia 3; XII §28, Bo 298: Nikomedeia 4; XII §48, Bo 313: Salamias; XIII §12, Bo 323: Maximianoupolis 2; XIII §35, Bo 342: Nikaia; XIV §12, Bo 359: Crete; XIV §20, Bo 363: Nikomedeia 5; XIV §22, Bo 363: Constantinople 1; XIV §29, Bo 367: Tripolis; XIV §36, Bo 369: Antioch 4; see also the list in chapter 6, pp. 155-60.



prepositional usages in XVIII,<sup>29</sup> but these are too few to support arguments for a change in author. Rüger also considered that XVIII showed more neologisms than the other books but suggested that the most likely reason for this was that Malalas had now ceased to rely on any written sources and, though he had undoubtedly recast many of his borrowings in earlier books, was now free from the constraints of his sources' linguistic usages. Some changes in vocabulary can certainly be observed: an earthquake, for example, becomes σεισμός, 'earthquake', rather than θεομηνία, 'wrath of God' (cf. chapter 6, p. 159). But again these are all very small pegs on which to hang a major change, especially as some of the most conspicuous features of Malalas' prose (his use of λεγόμενος, ὀνόματι, etc) continue (though it should be noted that these phrases are not unique to Malalas, as is discussed in chapter 8, p. 224).

There are, however, differences in focus in XV onwards. There is, for example, an increased interest in bureaucratic matters: as remarked above, the appointments are noted of the *comes Orientis* (e.g. XVI §2, Bo 392; XVII §22, Bo 424; XVIII §2, Bo 425) and of the patriarchs of Antioch (e.g. XVII §6, Bo 411, §11, Bo 415-6), and also for the institution of the *vindex* (XVI §12, Bo 400), and the creation of the post of *magister militum per Armeniam* (XVIII §10, Bo 429-30). There is an interest shown in legislation and tax-matters (XVI §3, Bo 394, §7, Bo 398, §14, Bo 401; XVIII §11, Bo 430, §20, Bo 437) and in 'foreign relations' with an emphasis on troop movements and the ranks of the commanding officers (cf. XVI §9, Bo 398-9, §17, Bo 406; XVII §9, Bo 412-3, §16, Bo 420; XVIII §4, Bo 427, §6, Bo 427, §§13-14, Bo 430-2, §21, Bo 437-8) while a number of documents are incorporated (e.g. XVIII §15, Bo 433-4, §23, Bo 439-40). As well as the regular earthquake notices, other portents, such as comets or shooting stars, are now noted (e.g. XVII §4, Bo 411) though this is more characteristic of XVIII after §70.

The differences in pace and nature of entry that can now be observed are due to Malalas' use of a different type of source – in this case a Constantinopolitan city chronicle. When Constantinople was founded in 330 as a Christian capital it began by adopting the traditional Roman calendar and ceremonial. A copy of the official list of consuls was brought from Rome and kept up to date. It formed part of the local *acta urbis* which now recorded the important events of the new capital – the accession and deposition of emperors, victories, arrival of relics and so on. Such a document was used by the so-called *Fasti Hydatiani* in the fifth century, by Marcellinus in the sixth and the *Chronicon Paschale* in the seventh. All three texts demonstrate close affinities as has long been understood (Holder-Egger, 1877; Mommsen, 1892 and 1894). Precisely how long some version of the *acta* was continued at Constantinople cannot be determined but there are traces of the kind of material usually found in the *acta* at least into the eighth century (Freund, 1882, 34-53; Whitby, 1982/3, 1-20). Although individual authors may not necessarily have consulted the *acta* at first hand there were in circulation highlights, summaries and extracts of the *acta* and these could be used in any combination by chroniclers and historians. That seems to be the explanation for the fact that later writers such as Kedrenos (11th c.), and Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos (14th c.) frequently

<sup>29</sup>E.g. λάθρα, περαιτέρω, ἐπέκεινα, πέριξ; Rüger, 1895, 10.

preserve authentic information for, say, the fifth and sixth centuries (or even earlier) which was overlooked by chroniclers much closer to the events in question (Mommsen, 1857, 625-6; Freund, 1882, 50-53).

That Malalas may have used the *acta* of Constantinople was originally suggested by Holder-Egger (1877, 88) and subsequently explored by Freund (1882, 48-50). There are some similarities between Malalas and other witnesses to the *acta*, namely the *Fasti Hydatiani* (references in Mommsen, 1894, 45, note 1), but there are no firm grounds for saying that Malalas used the *acta* directly at these points. The one part of the chronicle where the *acta* seem to have been employed extensively is in the extension of the work from 533 contained in the updated edition in Book XVIII. There almost the entire content is Constantinopolitan and Malalas' method seems fairly consistent. The events recorded largely correspond to the traditional pattern of the *acta urbis*: dedication of churches (XVIII §109, Bo 484; §113, Bo 486; §128, Bo 489-90; §137, Bo 492; §143, Bo 495), statues (§82, Bo 479; §94, Bo 482), and public baths (§17, Bo 435-6); riots (§71, Bo 473-7; §99, Bo 483; §105, Bo 484; §108, Bo 484; §135, Bo 490-1; §138, Bo 492); victories (§81, Bo 479; §116, Bo 486; §140, Bo 492), *adventus* (§97, Bo 483; §124, Bo 489); embassies (§106, Bo 484); a trial (§101, Bo 483) and natural phenomena such as earthquakes (§77, Bo 478; §102, Bo 483; §112, Bo 485; §118, Bo 487; §§123-4, Bo 488-9), thunder and lightning (§103, Bo 483-4), a comet (§122, Bo 486), drought (§139, Bo 492) and plague (§92, Bo 482; §120, Bo 488; §127, Bo 489).

Having thus indicated, in fairly general terms, the types of sources that Malalas used in different areas of his chronicle<sup>30</sup> it seems useful to conclude with some observations on the comments that Malalas himself makes on his source material.

There are two occasions, which have been mentioned above (pp. 174-5), where Malalas remarks that he himself had found the account he has just given. The first concerns the statue of Christ at Paneas found in Bassus' house (X §12, Bo 239) and the other Brunichius' account of Februarius which he found in Thessalonike (VII §12, Bo 187). The circumstantial nature of these comments tends to give them credibility (though one must bear in mind that the novelists of late antiquity, like Diktys, were inclined to produce even more detailed descriptions of when and where their fabrications were unearthed).

On other occasions Malalas gives two versions of an event and comments that he prefers one to the other. This is his regular practice when dealing with Hellenic mythology in the early books: he gives one account according to the poets and then another from a rationalizing or euhemeristic source; e.g. at I §3, P 7: Ovid is contrasted with Plutarch; II §2, Bo 24: Homer with Palaiphatos; II §13, Bo 34: Euripides with Boutios; II §34, Bo 49 and IV §24, Bo 88, 90: Euripides with Kephalion; II §42, Bo 53: Euripides with Palaiphatos; IV §11, Bo 77: 'the poets' with Ninos and Lucian; IV §17, Bo 83: Palaiphatos with 'the poets'; V §49, Bo 117: Euripides with Pheidaios and Homer; V §49 and 50, Bo 117, 120: Homer with Pheidaios. For Malalas in all these

<sup>30</sup>Detailed discussion of the sources used in each book will be contained in the forthcoming commentary.

instances 'poetic', used of a verse writer, is a derogatory expression. He can also extend it to an author who, so far as is known, used prose: at VIII §19, Bo 204, Malalas remarks that Pausanias' account of Seleukos' naming of Antioch was nonsense and adds that he 'has written much else poetically'. Elsewhere Malalas comments on the veracity of the version that he gives; e.g. at V §50, Bo 121, Pheidaios' account of Kirke is more truthful than that of Homer.

This comparison process continues in the sections of the chronicle where it is no longer a question of contrasting verse and prose accounts. Thus at XII §26, Bo 297, Domninos' account of Valerian's Persian campaign is contrasted, favourably, with that of Philostratos; at XIII §23, Bo 332, however, Eutychianos' narrative of Julian's death is simply different from that of Magnus of Carrhae, though a few paragraphs later yet another version of Julian's death – this time unattributed but involving St Basil's premonitory dream – concludes with the remark that Eutropius did not agree in every detail.<sup>31</sup> At XIV §10, Bo 359, Priskos' account of Attila is contrasted with a brief statement of what 'others' say. 'Others' also appear at II §7, Bo 29 to contrast with Theophilos' statement that Io died in Syria ('she died in Egypt'), or at IX §10, Bo 220, Theophilos' account of Cleopatra's death is contrasted with that of unnamed writers on 'the local history of Alexandria the Great'.

The impression left by these remarks is that Malalas is conscientiously attempting to reconcile the material he has collected in order to present an account that is rational and consistent with his understanding of the world.<sup>32</sup> This process is also applicable to his views on cosmic chronology, that is, to the dates From Adam discussed in chapter 6 which underlie the whole chronicle. In the two surviving chronological excursuses (X §2, Bo 228 and XVIII §8, Bo 428) there are eloquent statements of honest puzzlement as Malalas attempts to reconcile conflicting dates for the incarnation and crucifixion, and thus for the stage of the millennium in which the world now exists. He makes it plain that the calculation that he attributes to Clement, Timotheos and Theophilos is preferable to the one he attributes to Eusebios. His final comment sums up the difficulties that must have beset chroniclers in the ancient world when faced with lists of rulers, and no universal chronological system in consistent use: he warns his readers not to add up all imperial reigns without careful thought since some emperors ruled together and their reign lengths overlapped. A similar comment comes at XV §6, Bo 380, where Malalas notes that not all historians agree as to whether the period of Basiliskos' usurpation should be included in the total number of years for Zeno's reign.<sup>33</sup>

Cross-references exist within the chronicle, demonstrating that a single mind controlled the overall structure. The use of προειρημένος ('aforementioned') to mark the disjunction between two sources has already been mentioned; elsewhere the finding of Diktys' text is mentioned in Claudius' reign (V §59, Bo 132-3; cf. X §28, Bo 250); the

<sup>31</sup>That Malalas gives three versions of the death of Julian possibly indicates that this was an issue of major concern to him.

<sup>32</sup>Compare the illuminating comments of Adler, 1989, on the way in which Synkellos re-wrote the Jewish pseudepigraphica to conform to his world-view.

<sup>33</sup>Note that Marcellinus, *s.a.* 491.1, writing *circa* 519, makes a similar observation; Mommsen, 1894, 94.

back reference at XVIII §14, Bo 431, to Herakles in VI §16, Bo 161, has been discussed already, as has the notice in XVIII §76, Bo 478, at the conclusion of Justinian's first Persian war that had its beginning under Anastasios (cf. XVIII §54, Bo 455-6 and XVI §9, Bo 398); the chapel of the Archangel Michael at Sosthenion is referred to at IV §13, Bo 78-9 with a forward reference to Constantine's interest in it (cf. Mango, 1984), and at XVI §16, Bo 403 during the account of Vitalian's rebellion; XVIII §2, Bo 426, on Palmyra's connection with Goliath picks up V §69, Bo 143.

To sum up: we should accept the broad outlines of Bourier's argument that Malalas drew on a few major sources – Domninos, a historian of Antioch who had probably digested much material from the Antiochene archives; Nestorinos, who was probably responsible for the fragments of early church history that Malalas includes and Timotheos, who had certainly collected Orphic and Hermetic/gnostic texts. But onto the material he selected from these Malalas has grafted much else, not the least being his own calculation of years From Adam. From Zeno onwards his reliance on earlier writers is more problematical and whatever narrative historian he may have had before him (perhaps Eustathios of Epiphaneia) was supplemented by oral information and archival material to which his professional life gave him access. Overall one can discern a homogeneity of interest and outlook, as is indicated in chapters 3 and 4, which reveals that Malalas was controlling and adapting the material he took over. The concluding portion of the chronicle becomes, in the second edition, more or less a version of the Constantinopolitan city chronicle. Though the signs of Malalas' earlier preoccupations are less apparent, the lack of linguistic disjunction and the fact that the complete chronicle circulated under his name in the early 580s means that, despite the invitation in the preface to successors to take up the chronicle where he left off, we must envisage Malalas as having controlled the whole work to the end.

# THE LANGUAGE OF MALALAS

Malalas' chronicle is of considerable interest in the history of the Greek language; indeed, until recently this was the only level on which it was treated as a serious document. Many of the chronicle's linguistic patterns find parallels only in the informal levels of Koine Greek and especially in the non-literary papyri of the early Christian and early Byzantine periods. In fact no other surviving writer of the time presents such a persistent disregard for the rules of classical usage over so long a text. It may be that Malalas' Syriac background is here asserting itself over his Hellenic education; it may be that the polemical purpose of the chronicle demanded that it should be aimed at an audience for whom this was the appropriate linguistic level.

Several specialised studies have been written on features of his language, though not all are widely available. A detailed reassessment will become necessary once the promised new edition is available. In the meantime, this chapter will begin with a brief summary of published conclusions, with some additional material on vocabulary and style, and an emphasis on the problems of placing the work in its linguistic context. Next will come a slightly more detailed examination of two features of Malalas' style which attracted attention when the 1986 translation was under discussion: the stylised portraits of Homeric heroes and Roman emperors and a large group of repeated phrases which often have to do with governmental matters and which have suggested to us that Malalas had an administrative perspective on history.

## 1: General survey

Alan James<sup>1</sup>

A recent writer on the language of Malalas (Helms, 1971/2, 313) states that his chronicle is the first sizable work of medieval Greek in which the popular language prevails over the traditional literary language. This echoes the judgement expressed by Krumbacher

<sup>1</sup>Extensive use has been made in this study of Helms, 1971/2, Merz, 1910/11, Rüger, 1895 and Weierholt, 1963. Brief reference will be made to these works but they should be consulted for full details concerning most of the matters that will be treated, apart from vocabulary and style. Further useful parallels can also be found in Gignac, 1977 and especially 1981. Completeness over so wide a field, however, can only be attempted in a much longer study than the present.

(1897, 327), and it will be largely substantiated by the present study. But a strong note of caution needs to be sounded on the difficulty of contrasting literary Greek with the spoken vernacular, and this could hardly be done better than by the following words of Browning:

All literature and all written documents of late antiquity and the middle ages show a mixture of diverse elements, the continuously developing language of the people being adulterated in varying degrees and in various ways by classicising Greek. This is true even of texts ostensibly written in popular Greek. The knowledge of writing could only be acquired by some study, however superficial, of the literary language and elements of the classical tradition, and writing could not be practised without making concessions to that tradition. (Browning, 1983, 4.)

Chapter 7 has suggested that few of the numerous historians and chroniclers cited by Malalas were actually read by him. His knowledge of ancient history is so sketchy and idiosyncratic that his reading is unlikely to have included the works of such authors as Herodotos, Thukydides and Xenophon, and a glance at his work indicates that he did not attempt to emulate their language or style. This impression is overwhelmingly reinforced by comparison with the voluminous works of a contemporary of Malalas, Prokopios of Caesarea. Prokopios' language belongs wholly to the archaizing literary tradition and reflects virtually nothing of the vernacular Greek of the sixth century A.D. His style is elaborate and learned to the extent that for almost every expression 'respectable' literary precedent can be found, and he positively cultivates those usages that had been most completely abandoned by the vernacular, such as final clauses with ὅπως and temporal ones with ἡνίκα. A sharper linguistic contrast could hardly be imagined between two authors with time, place and subject matter in common, though – as is pointed out in chapters 1, p. 5 and 4, pp. 69-71 – they do also share a number of common attitudes.

The impression given by this comparison that Malalas' language is relatively close to the contemporary vernacular will be corroborated by most of those features of it that have been selected for mention in what follows. But in order to gain a balanced picture of its relationship both to the vernacular and to classicising literature it would be useful to call attention to the features that link it more with the latter and differentiate it from the former. This, however, is unfortunately not possible: our knowledge of the vernacular itself is so inadequate that we cannot go very far in separating those features of the literary language that were also still at home in the vernacular from those that were not.<sup>2</sup> Consequently this whole aspect of the subject must very largely be left aside, whilst its disquieting importance is not forgotten.

One further preliminary matter must be considered. The fact that the only surviving manuscript of Malalas' chronicle as an independent work in Greek, as well as being lacunose, presents a version that is in parts substantially abridged may well lead one to doubt whether the original wording has been preserved with sufficient accuracy to allow us to assess its linguistic character. But one may derive reassurance from the evidence of

<sup>2</sup>With the publication of the first two volumes of Gignac's exhaustive survey of the grammar of the non-literary papyri of the early Christian period the tools for such a study are now becoming available.

extant excerpts, fragments and some other texts which appear to have been copied accurately from a full version of the work (especially the *Excerpta* of Constantine Porphyrogennetos, together with the Tusculan Fragments and the *Chronicon Paschale*, as is discussed further in the next section), since they clearly indicate that the wording has not been much affected by abridgement.<sup>3</sup> Also, the same conclusion is strongly suggested by the high degree of consistency in the manuscript as regards those linguistic features which may be judged to reflect the vernacular – and which would thus have been most vulnerable to later attempts at improvement. Furthermore, ‘improvement’ of the text at the hands of modern scholars has not been extensive, which is one happy result of the large measure of neglect accorded to the work.

Reflection of the vernacular may first of all be observed in several features of the morphology of Malalas’ verbs. The tendency for aorists in -ov to be replaced by new forms in -α is seen in the occurrence of εἶπα, ἤγαγα, ἔβαλα, γενάμενος, εἶλα, ἦλθα, ἦδρα, ἔπια, ἔπεσα, ἔφυγα (cf. Merz, 1910/11, 33-6). But for the most part Malalas seems to have resisted this tendency, perhaps consciously, and so he much more often retains the classical aorists in -ov. The confusion of aorist and perfect forms, common in the vernacular by his time, appears occasionally in forms like Malalas’ δέδωκαν, πεσότα, εἰσελθότος, φυγότος (cf. Festugière, 1979, 230), and the tendency to substitute ου for ω in contracted verbal endings is shown in his ὑπήντων, ἥπατοῦντο, συναριστοῦντο, ἐμελέτουν, ἐτίμουν (Merz, 1910/11, 36-7; cf. Gignac, 1981, 362-3). He also has a few late forms of εἰμί – ἤμεθα, ἔσο for ἴσθι, ἦν for ἦσαν, and of some other -μι verbs – δόσας for δούς, θήσας for θεῖς, στήσας for στάς (Merz, 1910/11, 37-40). Reduction in the use of the participle and development towards the invariable participle in -οντας is seen in a few expressions like the following: πλήθος οἰκοῦντα (III §6, Bo 60), τὸ λείψανον ὄντα (III §12, Bo 64), τὸ γένος πλασθέντα καὶ λαβόντα (IV §10, Bo 75), τὸ Πάνθεον μέλλοντα συμπίπτειν (IX §5, Bo 217), τετράπυλον ὄντα μικρόν (IX §15, Bo 223), τὸ βάνδον συλληφθέντα (XVIII §60, Bo 464); cf. Merz, 1910/11, 40-41 and Festugière, 1979, 232. As regards the augment, Malalas seems to show some resistance to tendencies in the vernacular. It is exceptional for him to omit an augment even in the form of lengthened initial vowel or diphthong, and he very rarely admits a wrongly augmented non-indicative form. There are a few doubly augmented forms (Merz, 1910/11, 9-17). Positive archaism is shown in a few distinctively Attic future middles, but with any such features occurring only rarely one must allow for the possibility of inadvertent reflection of sources.

This last consideration must certainly be applied to such a point of syntax as the very few occurrences of the optative, the abandonment of which in the popular language is otherwise reflected by Malalas, as is that of the dual, which he never uses (Merz, 1910/11, 41). The tendency to confuse aorist and perfect forms, noted above, was paralleled by a general loss of semantic distinction between the two tenses, and that is everywhere reflected in Malalas’ usage. The proper meaning of the perfect and pluperfect

<sup>3</sup>Browning, in a review of Weierholt’s work (1964, 351-2), criticised the latter for lack of attention to this matter. But Krumbacher (1897, 330) had already accurately judged the bearing on it of the excerpts.

tended to be taken over by periphrastic tenses, especially with εἰμί and an aorist or perfect participle, which are used occasionally by Malalas (Merz, 1910/11, 41). The use of the future also declined sharply and tended to be replaced either by the present or by periphrasis. Malalas has the present in place of the future occasionally and one or two examples of ἔχω plus infinitive as an equivalent (Merz, 1910/11, 26; cf. Gignac, 1981, 239-41). Decline in the use of the participle, also noted above, led to confusion between its syntactical function and that of the finite verb, and this is one of the most characteristic features of Malalas' language (Weierholt, 1963, 69-70, 76-8; Festugière, 1979, 232-3). The following is a typical example: καὶ πέμψας αὐτῷ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰουστινιανὸς στρατηλάτας τρεῖς, Γιλδέριχ καὶ Κήρυκον καὶ Εἰρηναῖον, μετὰ πολλῆς βοηθείας Ῥωμαϊκῆς, καὶ συγκρούσαντες πόλεμον, ἔπесον ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων πολλοί (XVIII §4, Bo 427; cf. Festugière, 1979, 234-5). But in this category too caution is necessary, for not all the examples of participial confusion in Ba are derived from the original Malalas text: for instance, an apparently extreme case at XVIII §12, Bo 430 is likely to have resulted from clumsy abbreviation by Ba of an original text like the *Chronicon Paschale* (cf. CP 618. 14-17).

The changing and unstable function of the participle occasionally makes itself felt in Malalas' expression of subordinate or reported statements, with participles replacing finite verbs. Loss of distinction in the vernacular between the use of ἵνα for final clauses and of ὥστε for consecutive clauses is reflected by a few examples in Malalas of reversal of these functions (Weierholt, 1963, 65). A vernacular usage common in Malalas is ἵνα plus subjunctive in place of the infinitive after verbs of wishing, ordering, etc. (Weierholt, 1963, 58-9). When the infinitive is used by Malalas after such verbs, it is quite often strengthened by either ὥστε or τοῦ (Weierholt, 1963, 52-3). Purpose is sometimes expressed in Malalas by διὰ τό plus infinitive (Rüger, 1895, 34), which later must have been affected by the above-mentioned tendency of the infinitive to be replaced by a ἵνα clause so as to produce the modern γιὰ νά plus subjunctive. Distinction between εἰ and ἔάν had been lost in the popular language, and the latter predominated. It is therefore a little surprising that Malalas uses εἰ much more often than ἔάν, perhaps because he also follows common usage in marking indefinite relative clauses with ἔάν, in place of ἅν (Helms, 1971/2, 354-7, 378). But another difference between Malalas' usage and that of the vernacular is his avoidance, almost complete, of ὅταν and ὡςάν for temporal clauses (Helms, 1971/2, 368-71, 383-5; cf. Weierholt, 1963, 59-60). Again, it may be correct to discern here some measure of conscious distancing from the vernacular on Malalas' part. But one expression strikingly favoured by him for introducing temporal clauses is only plausibly explicable as a reflection of the vernacular. The phrase ἢ μόνον, 'as soon as', occurs twenty-six times, but is almost completely unknown elsewhere.<sup>4</sup> Weierholt (1963, 60-61) may be correct in supposing it to be, in origin, a corruption of εἰ μόνον.

An area of usage which indicates as clearly as any the relationship of Malalas' language to the vernacular is that of prepositions. Already by his time the tendency

<sup>4</sup>Browning, 1964, 351-2, notes one example in Mark the Deacon's *Life of Porphyry of Gaza*, which is a seventh-century recension of an early fifth-century work.



towards the dominance of the accusative case after prepositions was far advanced, and with it went the replacement of *ἐν* by *εἰς*. Accordingly, the fact that Malalas uses *ἐν* much more often than *εἰς* may be another indication of resistance to some aspects of the popular language. However, a large measure of uncertainty is observable in this area on Malalas' part. *ἐν* actually replaces the more correct *εἰς* with verbs of motion quite often, but also frequent is the opposite phenomenon of *εἰς* expressing static position in place of *ἐν*, and there are a few cases of *εἰς* plus accusative in place of instrumental dative (Rüger, 1895, 45-9). Static position is also sometimes expressed by *παρά*, *πρός* and *ὑπό* plus accusative (Rüger, 1895, 29, 31, 35). Confusion of accusative and genitive with *μετά* occurs a number of times (Rüger, 1895, 42-5). Finally, one may note several unique aberrations: *ἄμα* plus genitive (V §5, Bo 95), *ἕως* plus accusative (XII §41, Bo 309), *ἀνά* plus genitive in a distributive sense (XVIII §24, Bo 440), and *ἐν* plus genitive (XVIII §97, Bo 483).

Vocabulary is much more difficult to assess for the present purpose, especially as regards uncommon words, because of the often misleading effect of accidental survival or loss – as well as the tendency to reflect sources which we have already seen. The following lists are offered, however, in the hope that they will have some cumulative significance for the characterisation of Malalas' language, even though they are far from exhaustive.

In the first place it should be emphasised that a very large proportion of Malalas' vocabulary is wholly neutral, as far as we can tell, in terms of the difference between literary language and the vernacular, although, as already stated, it would be largely futile to try to identify what would have been perceived as distinctively literary and alien to the vernacular. One can only observe that there is little that can be recognised as such today. It might be an enlightening exercise to compile from Prokopios' vocabulary a list of as many synonyms as possible for words used by Malalas, but that enlightenment must remain theoretical for the present. What can be demonstrated with much less labour is the use by Malalas of a considerable number of mostly quite common words in senses which are markedly different from their early or classical ones, and which are all first attested not earlier than the Roman Imperial period, in some cases not more than a century or so before Malalas' time. Here is a selection of such words: *ἀποζώννυμι* = 'dismiss from office' (XIV §38, Bo 370; XVIII §89, Bo 480; XVIII §134, Bo 490; cf. *ζώννυμι* = 'appoint' (XVIII §87, Bo 480), *βάιον* = 'heat', 'course in hippodrome' (XIII §30, Bo 340; XVIII §71, Bo 474), *γοργός* = 'quick' (II §14, Bo 36), *δημοκρατῶ* = 'riot' (X §20, Bo 244; XVII §12, Bo 416), *διαδέχομαι* = 'appoint successor to', 'dismiss' (IX §12, Bo 221; XIII §29, Bo 338; XV §13, Bo 388; XVIII §4, Bo 427 etc.), *ἐγκάθετος* = 'resident' (VII §11, Bo 185; XIII §4, Bo 319; XIII §21, Bo 329), *εἷλημα* = 'arch', 'vault' (X §8, Bo 232; XIII §30, Bo 339; XVIII §128, Bo 490; XVIII §143, Bo 495), *Ἑλλην* = 'pagan' (II §45, Bo 55; X §31, Bo 252; XIV §38, Bo 369 etc.), *ἐλλόγιμος* = 'eloquent' (XIII §18, Bo 326), *ἐπιρρίπτω* (intrans.) = 'attack' (II §8, Bo 30; V §11, Bo 102; XIV §10, Bo 358 etc.), *θεσπίζω* = 'decree' (VII §2, Bo 172; IX §24, Bo 226; XVIII §42, Bo 449 etc.), *καθαίρω* = 'strip of office', 'degrade' (XVI §11, Bo 400; XVIII §18, Bo 436; XVIII §83, Bo 479), *λεῖψανον* = 'corpse' (XVIII §48, Bo 452), *πρώην* = 'formerly' (III

§12, Bo 64; IV §4, Bo 70; V §43, Bo 109 etc.), *στήλη* = 'statue' (II §7, Bo 28; V §67, Bo 141; V §73, Bo 149; VI §16, Bo 161 etc.), *συγχωρῶ* = 'forgive' (XII §21, Bo 293; XVIII §22, Bo 439), *σφενδόνη* = 'far end of circus' (VII §4, Bo 175; XII §38, Bo 307), *τρακτᾶτον* = 'device', 'tactic' (XVIII §64, Bo 468), *τύραννος* = 'usurper', 'rebel' (X §20, Bo 245; X §38, Bo 257; XII §21, Bo 294; XIII §19, Bo 328 etc.), *φανερὸς* = 'certain', 'some' (*τις*) (V §41, Bo 108; V §57, Bo 130; VII §11, Bo 184; X §23, Bo 246 etc.), *φωτίζω* = 'baptise' (XVIII §6, Bo 427); see Festugière, 1978, for a more detailed list.

A smaller number of words used by Malalas is not attested at all until similarly late dates, although they may have existed earlier, such as the following: *ἀγυροπράτης* = 'money-dealer' (XVIII §137, Bo 492; XVIII §141, Bo 493), *ἄσπρος* = 'white' (XII §7, Bo 286; XII §8, Bo 287; XII §44, Bo 310 etc.), *βασταγάριος* = 'porter', 'carrier' (XVIII §30, Bo 444), *θεομηνία* = 'wrath of God' (i.e. earthquake, natural disaster; X §18, Bo 243; X §23, Bo 246; X §28, Bo 250 etc.), *κωμοδρομῶ* = 'wander from village to village' (XVIII §51, Bo 453), *στιχάριον* = 'tunic' (XVII §9, Bo 413), *φορεσία* = 'costume' (II §9, Bo 32; XVIII §13, Bo 431; XVIII §71, Bo 475). A few words in this category are of uncertain, non-Greek origin, like *βάνδον* = 'banner', 'band of soldiers' (XVIII §60, Bo 464; XVIII §64, Bo 468), and *σόκ(κ)ος* = 'lasso' (XVIII §21, Bo 438). The latter also appears in the diminutive form *σοκάριον*, the ending of which, being an abbreviation of *-ιον*, is significant, since it belongs distinctively to the contemporary vernacular.<sup>5</sup> Another example of this type in Malalas is *βοῦγλιν* (XVIII §141, Bo 493; cf. *infra*). These two categories are particularly important in showing the rejection of Atticism and a degree of preference for the reality of the common language of his day.

The overwhelming majority of foreign words in the Greek vernacular of the sixth century A.D. came from Latin. Many of them were administrative and military terms, whilst others were more miscellaneous, though notably words for measures and certain trade objects and artefacts. The total of Latin words used by Malalas is very considerable, and in this he faithfully reflects the popular language. But one must be careful not to exaggerate the significance of this, because many of the Latin words were unavoidable as being technical terms without Greek equivalents; thus it is the non-technical words, as well as technical terms for which Greek equivalents existed, that give a better indication of linguistic level. It is certainly true that the number of these in Malalas is large enough to confirm the general impression of his closeness to the popular language. In the administrative and military categories some Latin technical terms were normally avoided because of the existence of well-established Greek equivalents, e.g. *ἐπαρχία* = *provincia*, *ἐπαρχος* = *praefectus*, *σύγκλητος* = *senatus*, *συγκλητικός* = *senator*, *ὑπατος* = *consul*, and in these cases Malalas uses only the Greek words. But in a few cases, where presumably popular or official usage was less uniform, Malalas uses both the Latin word and its Greek equivalent in a random way, e.g. *ἰνδικτίων* and *ἐπινέμησις*, *σάκρα* and *θεῖος τύπος* ('imperial rescript'), *τριβοῦνος* and both *φύλαρχος* and *χιλίαρχος*. Here the

<sup>5</sup>Though note Bury's comment (1897, 220) that a later hand has not infrequently inserted an 'o' into these neuter forms in Ba, thus creating a false impression of the manuscript's linguistic usage.

linguistic mixture of Latin and Greek in his environment, heightened by the prominent position also held by Syriac, overwhelms any concerns he may have felt for stylistic uniformity.

The following list is not exhaustive, but represents a substantial proportion of Malalas' Latin-based words: (τὸ) ἄρμα (XIII §33, Bo 341; XVI §4, Bo 394) = *armati*, ἀνγουστάλιος (XI §23, Bo 280; XVI §15, Bo 401), βῆλον (XV §5, Bo 380; XVIII §71, Bo 474; 'banner'), βήναβλον (VI §19, Bo 163) = *venabulum*, βοῦγλιν (XVIII §141, Bo 493) = *pugio*, δισιγνατεύω (VII §9, Bo 182; XVII §8, Bo 412) = *designo*, δοῦξ (XV §8, Bo 382; XVIII §16, Bo 435; XVIII §26, Bo 441 etc.), ἐξέρχεται (XVIII §34, Bo 445), ἐξπέδιτον (XII §41, Bo 309; XIV §23, Bo 364; XIV §44, Bo 373 etc; 'army'), ἰλλούστριος (XVII §12, Bo 416; XVIII §29, Bo 444), ἰνδουλεντία (XII §21, Bo 293; XII §41, Bo 309), καστέλλιον (XIII §32, Bo 341; XV §12, Bo 386; XVIII §66, Bo 469 etc.), κάστρον (XIII §21, Bo 329; XV §5, Bo 380; XVIII §31, Bo 444 etc.), κεντηνάριον (XVI §16, Bo 406; XVII §14, Bo 417; XVII §22, Bo 424 etc.; 'sum of money'), κόμβεντος (V §11, Bo 102; VII §10, Bo 183; XVIII §22, Bo 438; XVIII §141, Bo 494), κόμης (XIII §4, Bo 319; XIII §17, Bo 326; XIII §27, Bo 336 etc.), κουβουκλείον (II §13, Bo 35; IV §21, Bo 86; X §13, Bo 239 etc.) = *cubiculum*, κουβικουλάριος (XIV §15, Bo 361; XVIII §71, Bo 476; XVIII §110, Bo 484), κουράτωρ (XVIII §23, Bo 440; XVIII §141, Bo 493 etc.), ληγάτον (XVIII §23, Bo 440; 'legacy'), λίμιτον (II §8, Bo 30; V §65, Bo 139; VIII §23, Bo 206 etc.) = *limes*, μάγιστρος (XIV §6, Bo 356; XV §12, Bo 386; XVIII §44, Bo 449 etc.), μανδᾶτον (V §42, Bo 108; VII §6, Bo 178; XIV §2, Bo 352 etc.), νοτάριος (XVIII §43, Bo 449), πάκτον (X §7, Bo 232; XII §6, Bo 286; XIII §17, Bo 326 etc.), παπυλεών (V §11, Bo 101; V §46, Bo 114; XIII §23, Bo 332 etc.) = *papilio* ('tent'), πλουμίον (XVII §9, Bo 413) from *pluma* ('embroidery'), πραῖδα (V §43, Bo 108; X §45, Bo 260; XVIII §21, Bo 438 etc.), πραιπόσιτος (XIII §31, Bo 340; XIV §15, Bo 361; XVI §20, Bo 408 etc.), πραισεντον (XIV §46, Bo 375; XV §7, Bo 381; XVII §5, Bo 411 etc.) = *praesens* ('bodyguard'), πραιτώριον (XIII §4, Bo 319; XVI §6, Bo 397; XVII §14, Bo 417 etc.), πρόκενσος (XIII §35, Bo 343; XIII §45, Bo 348; XIV §26, Bo 366) = *processus* ('imperial progress'), ῥήξ (VII §11, Bo 184; VIII §29, Bo 209; IX §21, Bo 225 etc.), ῥήγισσα (XVIII §13, Bo 430 and 431), σίγνον (XIII §2, Bo 316; XVIII §50, Bo 453; XVIII §71, Bo 475 etc.), σιλέντιον (XVIII §22, Bo 438; XVIII §30, Bo 444; XVIII §141, Bo 494; 'imperial audience'), σκρινιάριος (XVIII §10, Bo 429 and 430), ταβλίον (XVII §9, Bo 413; 'stripe'), from τάβλα = *tabula*, τρακτεύω (VII §9, Bo 181; XVI §12, Bo 400), τριομβυράτωρ (IX §2, Bo 214; IX §9, Bo 218; IX §11, Bo 221) = *triumvir*, τροῦλλος (XVIII §128, Bo 489 and 490; XVIII §143, Bo 495; 'dome') from *trulla* ('ladle'), φόλις (XVII §7, Bo 412; XVIII §23, Bo 439; 'coin'), φοσσεύω (XV §14, Bo 389; XVIII §61, Bo 465; XVIII §66, Bo 469; 'besiege') from *fossa*, φουλκίζω (XVIII §13, Bo 431; XVIII §119, Bo 487) from *furca* ('gibbet'). As Körting (1879, 20) points out in his full list of Latin words in Malalas' vocabulary, 157 different words are employed on approximately 800 occasions, a small though not negligible proportion of the approximately 94,000 word occurrences in the Bonn edition of the chronicle.

A special category of words is provided by about a hundred passages of personal description. Nearly sixty of these are of Roman emperors, occurring near the beginning of the account of each reign, and about thirty are of heroes and heroines in the account of the Trojan War which occupies Book V. They are formally stereotyped and consist very largely of a bald string of adjectives describing, for the most part, physical features. The adjectives are nearly all compounds, of a kind that could be freely coined by any Greek writer. The fact that a substantial proportion of these occur nowhere else, as well as the uniqueness of the descriptions to Malalas' chronicle, apart from some echoes in later works, has led some to consider that Malalas probably invented them (Sophroniou, 1965). This phenomenon is discussed at greater length below (pp. 241-3).

The last group of comments is more purely stylistic than the others and is concerned with the most prominent forms of repetition in Malalas' language. In the bald narrative of a chronicle a great deal of repetition, especially of certain expressions of time, is only to be expected, so much so that it might almost be asserted that no one whose stylistic sensibility was liable to be offended by repetition was likely to undertake a work of this kind. Certainly Malalas seems to have exerted almost no effort to vary the monotonous repetition of phrases like ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας (ὑπατείας), ἐν τῷ --- ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας, μετὰ τὴν βασιλείαν, ἐβασίλευσε, ἕως τῆς (τοῦ) νῦν, and ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ χρόνῳ or, less frequently, (ἐν) τῷ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ.<sup>6</sup> The last two phrases, however, exhibit a feature that is much less strictly required by the nature of the work, a feature we may call the redundant demonstrative. Both αὐτὸς ὁ and ὁ αὐτός are in Malalas' language, as presumably in the vernacular, an undifferentiated, all-purpose demonstrative, although he does quite often use οὗτος, possibly for the purpose of stronger emphasis (cf. Gignac, 1981, 166, 177 with further discussion promised in the as yet unpublished vol. 3; Festugière, 1978, 223). The important stylistic point is that he applies them to almost any proper or common noun with extreme frequency and mostly far beyond the needs of clarity, so that it becomes an ubiquitous, cloying mannerism. Similar in effect is his frequent use of ὁμοίως and ὡσαύτως and wholly redundant qualification of persons and things with λεγόμενος and ὀνόματι. The overall stylistic effect of this is closely akin to that of an English legal document with its superabundance of 'said', 'aforesaid', and 'likewise', and as regards Malalas' own historical context one naturally assumes that he reflects very closely the characteristic language of officialdom and bureaucracy, the relentless aim of which would have been the avoidance of ambiguity in total disregard of style. (This point is discussed further in the next section.) Language used in this way is automatically devalued, and the repeated expressions become mere colourless markers, as is the case also with Malalas' virtually formulaic application of θεῖος and θεϊότατος to emperors and of σοφός and σοφώτατος to the authors whom he cites, like the English 'honourable member' for parliamentarians and 'learned colleague' in legal discourse.

Malalas' style is thus purely functional, and no perceivable attempt has been made to render it attractive aesthetically or even to reduce the monotony of its repetitiveness. For

<sup>6</sup>Malalas uses the singular χρόνος regularly in the sense of 'year', which is attested much earlier, at least in non-literary sources. He expresses 'time' usually with the plural χρόνοι or sometimes with καιρός.

this reason it has earned the contempt of classically-trained modern readers. On the other hand, it is not unlikely that stylistic simplicity added to the chronicle's effectiveness, and is at least partly responsible for the immense influence which it has exercised. Malalas appears to have estimated correctly the needs of a large number of potential readers. The 1986 translation tried hard to reflect the language of the original with a similarly blunt and unvarnished level of English: in fact, it could be said that few texts are likely to lose so little in translation as Malalas' chronicle.

## 2: Formulaic phraseology

Michael Jeffreys

It has been proposed elsewhere in this volume (see chapter 1, p. 11) that Malalas was an official in the imperial government of Antioch. Part of the evidence adduced was the fact that he seems always more interested in the governmental side of political events – embassies and letters in international affairs, provincial reorganisations and aspects of disaster relief in the empire, rather than the campaigns, the administrative problems and the disasters themselves to which these governmental structures refer. It was noted also that he is very precise in his use of court and military terminology. In this section we shall explore the style and narrative techniques of the chronicle from the same point of view: it seems to us that not only the selection of events covered but the language and formulaic phraseology used in narrating them belong to the world of the imperial official. This belief decisively influenced the translation we published in 1986.

The first level at which to approach the question is that of the overuse of the demonstrative adjective (ὁ) αὐτός (as mentioned in the previous section); it is to be found in many places where 'this', 'that', 'the same' or 'the said' are inappropriate to the sense, in English or any other translation. As one example among many, here is XVIII §22, Bo 438-439, with 'the said' inserted in brackets to indicate cases of (ὁ) αὐτός in Bo. Only once has the demonstrative survived the translation process into readable English to appear in the final version – the paragraph's second word:

In that year Probus the patrician, a relative of the emperor Anastasios, incurred anger for having slandered the (said) emperor Justinian. A *silentium et conventus* was held to produce a written record, and when all the proceedings had been read out to the emperor after (the said) Probus' conviction at a full meeting of the senate, the (said) emperor took the proceedings and tore them up, saying to (the said) Probus, 'I forgive you for the offence which you committed against me. Pray then that God too may forgive you'. The (said) emperor was applauded by the senate.

The reasons for this usage, even the force of the word in the different situations in which it is used, are not easy to state with precision. The framework which we feel most likely is that of bureaucratic linguistic over-determination, best exemplified in English by the use of words like 'the said' or 'the beforementioned'. We did not attempt to include the pleonasm in the 1986 translation, since we found that the resulting

sentences were too clumsy and frequently the connotations of our attempted versions were inappropriate. 'The said' is too obtrusive, whereas if we used 'this' we were reminded of cockney story-telling ('There was this emperor and he had this son ...'), rather than a bureaucratic context.

Parallel usages which we would ascribe to the same excessive precision of reference are phrases used with names and places, especially λεγόμενος and ὀνόματι ('named', 'called'). These two words are used just under 400 times altogether in the 496 pages of Bo. It is again difficult to understand the precise reference in any individual case: for example, does the use of such qualifiers imply that the name with which they are associated is introduced as a new element in the story, as would be the case in conventional modern narrative? There are certainly frequent examples when this cannot be so, when the name has already appeared in the same area of the narrative and must be known to the reader. One class of problematical examples is the build-up of more than one such instance in the same sentence, e.g. 'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος ὁ λεγόμενος Ἐπιφανὴς ἔκτισεν πρῶτον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ ἔξω τῆς πόλεως τὸ λεγόμενον βουλευτήριον ... (X §9, Bo 234). We also find 'a woman named Sphinx', (γυνή τις ὀνόματι Σφίγξ) being introduced twice, apparently as a new element on each occasion, on two consecutive pages of the Oidipous story (II §37, Bo 50, and §38, Bo 51). We who have translated Malalas' text have certainly been left with a sense that these patterns are overused.

But these obtrusive problems for the translator are only the tip of the iceberg of the verbal and stylistic patterning in the chronicle which seems to us to be traceable to the same causes. The chronicle format compels the repetition of many similar narrative elements (e.g. imperial births and deaths, personal descriptions, records of natural disasters and relief efforts, provincial reorganisations etc.). For most of these Malalas is content to use a few phrases and restricted vocabulary which often seem like a limited range of clichés of imperial propaganda (cf. Scott, 1981a, for the formulaic references to imperial legislation). One has frequently the impression that the event is narrated for us in the same terms that might have been used in the official publication of imperial announcements, reducing a complex pattern of different episodes to a standard report format.

As one example one may give a sample of Malalas' notices of the foundation of provinces and metropolitan provincial capitals.<sup>7</sup> These sentences need no translation,

<sup>7</sup>We shall confine discussion to those provincial foundations during the Roman imperial period which use the stereotyped phraseology, passing over incidental references in other frameworks, although their anachronism is often an eloquent testimony to the inflexible unhistoricity of Malalas' thinking: e.g. [of the ark] εὐρέθη αὐτὴ ἡ κιβωτὸς καθίσασα ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν Ἀραράτ τῆς Πισιδίας, ἥστιν ὅς ἐστιν μητρόπολις Ἀπαμεία, ... (I §4, P 9), [of the Argonauts] καὶ εἰσελθόντες νυκτὸς παρέλαβον τὴν Κύζικον, μητρόπολιν τῆς Ἑλλησπόντου ἐπαρχίας (IV §12, 77) and [of the naming of the Blue faction at the foundation of Rome] τὸ δὲ Βένετον ἐκάλεσαν ἐκ τοῦ εἶναι ὑπὸ τὴν Ῥώμην ἐπαρχίαν μεγάλην χώραν λεγομένην Βενετζίαν, ἥστιν ὅς ἐστιν Ἀκυληία ... (VII §5, Bo 177).

A full list of the passages in which the foundation of a province is mentioned, irrespective of their phraseology, is given in chapter 7, p. 205, note 22.

since it is plain that there is constant repetition of a small group of phrases, providing variations on the following pattern: 'he created province x, dividing it off from province y, giving the rights of a metropolis and a governor to city z'.

X §46, Bo 261: 'Εποίησε δὲ καὶ ἐπαρχίαν Μακεδονίαν δευτέραν, ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης αὐτὴν ἀπομερίσας.

X §46, Bo 262: Καὶ τὴν Εὐρώπην δὲ ἀπὸ Θράκης ἐμέρισε, κτίσας Ἡράκλειαν πόλιν τὴν πρῶην λεγομένην Πείρινθον· ἦντινα ἐποίησε μητρόπολιν, δοὺς αὐτῇ ἄρχοντα.

XI §7, Bo 274: 'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἐποίησε καὶ τὴν Ἀμιδαν μητρόπολιν, καλέσας ἐπαρχίαν Μεσοποταμίαν, ἀπομερίσας αὐτὴν ἀπὸ Ὀσδρηνῆς, δοὺς καὶ ἄρχοντα αὐτῇ καὶ δίκαιον μητροπόλεως.

XIII §3, Bo 317-318: 'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς Κωνσταντῖνος βασιλεὺς καὶ τὴν Εὐφρατησίαν ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, ἀπὸ Συρίας καὶ Ὀσροηνῆς μερίσας καὶ δοὺς δίκαιον μητροπόλεως ἐν Ἱεραπόλει.

XIII §35, Bo 342: 'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς Βάλης καὶ τὴν δευτέραν Καππαδοκίαν ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, ἀπομερίσας αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης.

XIII §37, Bo 345: 'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἀπεμέρισε καὶ τὴν Φοινίκην Λιβανησίαν ἀπὸ τῆς Παράλου καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, δοὺς δίκαια μητροπόλεως καὶ ἄρχοντα ὀρδινάριον Ἐμέζη τῇ πόλει.

XIII §37, Bo 345: 'Ο αὐτὸς δὲ βασιλεὺς καὶ τὸν Πόντον μερίσας ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, ἦντινα ἐκάλεσεν Αἰμίμοντον.

XIII §42, Bo 347: 'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς Θεοδόσοις ἐμέρισε τὴν νέαν Ἥπειρον ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, δοὺς δίκαιον πόλεως καὶ ἄρχοντα Δορραχίω πόλει.

XIII §42, Bo 347: Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ δευτέραν Παλαιστίνην ἐμέρισεν ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, δοὺς δίκαιον μητροπόλεως καὶ ἄρχοντα τῇ λεγομένη Σκυθῶν πόλει.

XIII §44, Bo 348: 'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς καὶ τὴν δευτέραν Γαλατίαν ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης μερίσας ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, δοὺς δίκαιον πόλεως καὶ ἄρχοντα Πισινούντι τῇ πόλει.

XIV §24, Bo 364-365: 'Ο αὐτὸς δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, ἀπομερίσας ἀπὸ τῆς Λυκαονίας, ἦντινα ἐκάλεσε Λυκίαν, δοὺς δίκαιον μητροπόλεως καὶ ἄρχοντα τῇ λεγομένη πόλει Μύρα τῆς αὐτῆς Λυκίας.

XIV §24, Bo 365: Ὁμοίως δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς καὶ Συρίαν δευτέραν ἀπομερίσας ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἐπαρχίας, δοὺς δίκαιον μητροπόλεως καὶ ἄρχοντα τῇ Ἀπαμείᾳ τῇ πόλει, καὶ Κιλικίαν δευτέραν ἀπομερίσας ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, δοὺς δίκαιον μητροπόλεως καὶ ἄρχοντα Ἀναζάρβω τῇ πόλει.

XIV §24, Bo 365: Ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἐπαρχίαν, ἀπομερίσας ἀπὸ τῆς Βιθυνίας, ἦντινα ἐκάλεσεν Ὀνωριάδα εἰς ὄνομα τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεοῦ Ὀνωρίου δοὺς δίκαιον μητροπόλεως καὶ ἄρχοντα Ἡρακλείᾳ, πόλει τῆς Πόντου.

XVIII §38, Bo 448: 'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἀπεμέρισεν ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας τῆς πρώτης Συρίας Λαοδίκειαν καὶ Γάβαλα καὶ Πάλτον τὰς πόλεις, καὶ ἀπὸ

Ἀπαμείας τῆς δευτέρας Συρίας Βαλανέας πόλιν, καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐπαρχίαν, ἥντινα ἐπωνόμασε Θεοδωριάδα, δούς αὐτῇ καὶ μητροπολιτικὸν δίκαιον.

For the sake of the argument, the example given above is itself a limited, bureaucratic action, the creation of a province, where the temptations for formulaic phrasing are obvious. Malalas' attitudes, however, are even clearer if one examines a series of events with unquestioned human interest, like the earthquake records summarised in chapter 6, at pp. 155-60. Malalas proves the depth of his personal reaction to earthquakes by his elaborate and emotional descriptions of the two great sixth-century catastrophes which destroyed Antioch, of one of which at least he must have been an eye-witness. At other times, however, when he was not personally involved, he pays far more heed to the due processes of official reaction than to the events themselves and their victims. The earthquake has to be given a number for official reference purposes, notice has to be taken of the reporting of the damage to the imperial centre, the emperor's reaction must be recorded and the assistance he makes available must be listed, often with some indication about how the cash involved was spent. All this is the sort of information contained in reports produced in a major imperial centre like Antioch (see chapter 1, p. 10, and chapter 7, pp. 208-9; cf. Croke, 1990). Only sometimes within this framework is there room for a statement about the unusual qualities of the event itself, as it affected the inhabitants of the devastated city. Though considerable space is devoted to earthquakes in the chronicle, we are more often given the point of view of an imperial investigator (or a relief organiser at Red Cross headquarters) rather than that of the narrative historian with an interesting story to tell, let alone the human interest approach of the twentieth-century news media.

Other lists could be constructed from phrases found in the following contexts (I provide in each case one or two examples out of many, and the list of contexts too could be vastly extended):

**Imperial births, regnal periods and deaths:** Καὶ τελευτᾷ ὁ αὐτὸς Νέρων, ὦν ἐνιαυτῶν ξθ'. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν Νέρωνος ἐβασίλευσε Γαλβᾶς Αὐγουστος μῆνας ζ' (X §§40-1, Bo 258; for further examples consult the list in chapter 6, p.139-141). This pattern could, of course, have derived from a schematic chronicle source – but its regular use without adaptation is consistent with the point I am trying to make.

**Temporal phrases:** Τῷ δὲ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ ... (In that year ... ; XVIII §45, Bo 450 etc.). Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ὑπατείας Δεκίου (In the consulship of ... ; XVIII §46, Bo 450 etc.). Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς βασιλείας (In the reign ... ; XVIII §52, Bo 454 etc.).

**Imperial displeasure and punishment:** Καὶ ἀγανακτήσας κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐδήμυσεν αὐτόν (... became angry with him ... and confiscated his property; XIV §15, Bo 361). Καὶ ἀγανακτήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς κατ' αὐτῶν διεδέξατο αὐτούς (... the emperor was angry ... and dismissed them; XVIII §4, Bo 427) etc.

**Patterns of descendance:** ἐκ γένους is found in the sense of 'of the family of' (e.g. II §8, Bo 31: ἐκ γένους Πίκου Δίος), or 'of the race of' (e.g. VII §12, Bo 186: ἐκ γένους ἐστὶ τῶν Γάλλων) etc.



**A nickname or surname:** τὸ ἐπὶ κλην. ... Μαξιμιάνος ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ κλην 'Ερκούλιος ... (Maximian also named Herculus; XII §45, Bo 311); 'Αντίοχον τὸν ἐπὶ κλην Χούζωνα ... (Antiochos nicknamed Chouzon; XIII §40, Bo 346) etc.

**Official naming or renaming of places:** usually – though by no means always – called after members of the imperial family with the phrase εἰς τὸ ὄνομα; e.g. ἦν ἐπωνόμασεν Ἰὼ εἰς ὄνομα τῆς σελήνης (which he named Io[polis] after the moon; II §7, Bo 28); 'Ανάσαρθον μετεκάλεσε Θεοδοριάδα εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τῆς Αὐγούστας (he renamed Anasarthon Theodorias after the Augusta; XVIII §31, Bo 444) etc.

**Different cities:** events occurring in, or material to be distributed to a range of places: κατὰ πόλιν. συνάξει τὸν κατὰ πόλιν ... ὄντα ἐγκάθετον στρατόν (the army stationed in the various cities; VII §11, Bo 185); εἰς τὸ εὐτρεπίσαι κατὰ πόλιν ἀπόθετα σίτου (to prepare granaries in each city; XVIII §63, Bo 467).

**Joining battle:** συμβάλλω πόλεμον. συνέβαλον πόλεμον (fought a battle; II §26, Bo 43); πόλεμον ... συμβαλόντων (joined battle; XVIII §57, Bo 459).

**Honorary titles for writers:** σοφός or σοφώτατος is used regularly and indiscriminately to qualify the authorities whom Malalas cites, from the Prologue ('learned historians') onwards; note that Hermogenes, probably one of Malalas' oral informants is 'a learned man' (σοφώτατος; XVIII §34, Bo 445).

A concerted attempt was made in the 1986 translation to achieve a consistent version wherever possible for the same phrase in all contexts. We decided that it is important for most readers and users of the text to be aware of the way in which the chronicler's limitations of vocabulary and phraseology may reflect – or even cause – limitations on historical understanding, smoothing out the differences between one period and another by the use of the same cliché, reducing the whole timespan of the chronicle to an undifferentiated present, which is usually Malalas' own Antiochene and Constantinopolitan sixth-century present (cf. chapter 3, pp. 60-61). An extreme example of this treatment is the way in which we have translated words from the root βασιλ- consistently with words from the imperial framework, 'imperial', 'emperor', even in cases where English usage cries out for 'royal' and 'king'. We hope that this outraging of readers' sensibilities will have helped to keep the issue of the historicity of Malalas' world-view in the front of their minds.

It may be asked, in conclusion, how far it is possible in so fluctuating a tradition and on such insubstantial issues as, for example, redundant demonstratives to prove that the style belongs to the sixth-century Malalas and not some previous or subsequent author or scribe. Against the ascription to an earlier writer used by Malalas one may cite the substantial consistency of the style throughout the surviving chronicle. With regard to the possibility of this feature having been introduced, or greatly magnified, after the sixth century, one may use examples based on the redundant demonstratives, which are easy to remove and, if our own reaction is anything to go by, among the most annoying of the repetitive features. They are indeed less frequent in witnesses to the text other than Ba. However, a significant number of times, one finds that an early witness like the Tuscullan Fragments or the *Chronicon Paschale*, or an accurate transcription like the Constantinian *Excerpta*, has even more of the elements in question than Ba, as in VII §6, Bo 175:

‘Ο δὲ Ῥώμος βασιλεὺς πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ Ἥλιου καὶ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτὸν τεσσάρων στοιχείων τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ πρῶτος ἐφεῦρε, καὶ ἐπετέλεσεν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῆς δύσεως, ἥτοι τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἄρμασι τετραπῶλοις ...

cf. CP 208. 11-16:

‘Ο δὲ αὐτὸς Ῥώμος βασιλεὺς πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ Ἥλιου καὶ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτὸν τεσσάρων στοιχείων τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ πρῶτος ἐφευρὼν ἐπετέλεσεν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ χώρᾳ τῆς δύσεως, ἥτοι τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἄρμασι τετραπῶλοις ...

In other cases it is plain that the process resulting in the abbreviated form in which Book XVIII now appears has involved the omission of some of the words in question, as in XVIII §109, Bo 484:

Μηνὶ ἰουνίῳ κη΄, ἰνδικτιῶνι τῇ αὐτῇ, ἐγένετο τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ ἡ κατάθεσις τῶν τιμῶν λειψάνων Ἀνδρέου, Λουκᾶ καὶ Τιμοθέου ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει· καὶ διήλθεν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Μηνᾶς μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἁγίων λειψάνων καθήμενος ἐν ὁχήματι βασιλικῷ.

cf. TF fr. 4, 24. 11-25. 9:

Μηνὶ ἰουνίῳ, εἰκάδι ὀγδόῃ, ἡμέρᾳ τρίτῃ, ἰνδικτιῶνι τῇ αὐτῇ, μετὰ τὴν ὑπατείαν Βασιλείου ἔτους ἐνάτου, ἐγένετο τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ κατάθεσις τῶν ἁγίων λειψάνων Ἀνδρέου, Λουκᾶ καὶ Τιμοθέου ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τῶν αὐτῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει· καὶ διήλθεν ἐπίσκοπος Μηνᾶς μετὰ τῶν αὐτῶν ἁγίων λειψάνων καθήμενος ἐν ὁχήματι βασιλικῷ, κρατῶν τὰς τρεῖς θήκας τῶν ἁγίων λειψάνων εἰς τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἄλλο ἓν ὄχημα βασιλικόν, ὃ δὴ τοῦτον προήγεν τὰ αὐτὰ ἅγια λείψανα, καὶ τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Μηνᾶν.

Or a further example – XVIII §141, Bo 494:

... καὶ ἐκβληθεὶς ἐκ τῶν ὄρων, ὡς οἶα κατὰ βασιλέως σκεψάμενος, καὶ ἐξετασθεὶς, κατέθετο ὅτι καὶ Ἰσάκιος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης ὁ κατὰ Βελισσάριον τὸν πατρίκιον καὶ αὐτὸς σύνοιδε τῇ αὐτῇ ἐπιβουλῇ, καὶ Βίτος δὲ ὁ ἀργυροπράτης καὶ Παῦλος ὁ ὑποπτίων Βελισαρίου.

cf. *De Insidiis* 49, Bo 174.24-9:

... καὶ ἐκβληθεὶς ἐκ τῶν ὄρων ἐξεταζόμενος κατέθετο ὅτι καὶ Ἰσάκιος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης ὁ κατὰ Βελισάριον τὸν πατρίκιον καὶ αὐτὸς σύνοιδε τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἐπιβουλῇ, ὡς οἶα καὶ δανεισαμένου χρυσίον Μαρκέλλου παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰσακίου, καὶ Βίτος ὁ ἀργυροπράτης καὶ Παῦλος ὁ ὀπτίων τοῦ αὐτοῦ Βελισαρίου σύνοιδαν τὴν αὐτὴν σκέψιν.

The conclusion from all this seems plain. Malalas' work has a large percentage of bureaucratic formulas. In his style form has triumphed over content and the mind-set revealed is that of an official form asking a standard and limited group of tick-box questions about each category of event and showing little interest in what happened beyond the information which this process brings. There is no direct logical connection between the metaphor of this comment and the conclusion that the narrator's style was

formed in an Antiochene office, but we hope that the thought will strike others, as it has us, as a likely and useful insight.

### 3: Portraits

#### Elizabeth and Michael Jeffreys

##### 1. *Methodological problems*

As was pointed out earlier in this chapter (pp. 224) Malalas includes in his chronicle brief verbal portraits of a number of prominent figures. These fall into three main categories (of unequal size): portraits of the Greek and Trojan heroes (V §§ 13-40, Bo 103-7<sup>8</sup>), the Apostles (X §§35, 37, Bo 256, 257<sup>9</sup>), and the Roman emperors (X §7, Bo 232 onwards<sup>10</sup>).

It should be noted that there are some textual problems connected with these passages: the portraits of Agamemnon, Menelaos, Achilles, Patroklos, Aias Telamonios, Odysseus, Diomedes, Nestor, Protesilaos, and most of that of Palamedes fall in the lacuna in Ba at f. 49v. They can be reconstructed, however, with a surprising degree of detail despite the problems posed by language and form, on the basis of the Slavonic translation<sup>11</sup> and the portrait passages preserved by Dares (in Latin), Isaac Porphyrogennetos (Greek prose) and John Tzetzes (Greek verse of several varieties), on all of whom see briefly chapter 9, pp. 265-66. The results of this reconstruction are set out in the 1986 translation (V §§13-21, cf. §§22-40, Bo 103-7), with reference to the relevant literature. Equally there were undoubtedly once portraits attached to the emperors listed in the other major lacuna in Ba, at XII §25, Bo 295; but while much of the outline of Malalas' entries at this point can be reconstructed from the *Laterculus Malalianus* and Skoutariotes' chronicle (as was attempted in the 1986 translation), this is not the case with the portraits. Virtually only that of Heliogabalus survives: 'He was eloquent, an excellent man, fierce in battle, gentle, wise, swift, conciliating all and justifiably loved by all' (Sk 33. 31). No attempt has been made in the following list to include material from this lost area of Book XII. Elsewhere portraits have fallen out of Ba (which, as discussed in chapter 9, p. 246, demonstrably and frequently abbreviates the text of the original chronicle); this is the case for Leontios (XV §13, Bo 388) where the Slavonic translation and the *Chronicon Paschale* give quite a clear idea of what must previously

<sup>8</sup>Included in this group should be the portraits of Phaidra and Hippolytos, for reasons which will be discussed later.

<sup>9</sup>The description of Adam (I §1, P5) gives his height and other dimensions only, with none of the descriptive vocabulary found elsewhere: it has not been included in the following lists.

<sup>10</sup>This group should also be extended to include the brief portraits of Alexander and Cleopatra; although these are not quite the same as the others in that there is not a stream of compound adjectives, they are part of the same tradition of brief impressionistic verbal sketches.

<sup>11</sup>The Slavonic texts for the entire chronicle were read from the manuscripts by Simon Franklin (see chapter 9, pp. 276-87); for the vocabulary of the portrait passages in the Slavonic version, cf. Chernysheva, 1983.

have stood in the Greek, and at XIV §4, Bo 355, where the *Chronicon Paschale*'s account of Eudokia extends that of Ba.

Before looking at the questions generated by the presence of these portraits, it will be useful to list out the terms used and the personages to whom they are applied.<sup>12</sup> This list will indicate that the vocabulary of these passages is uniform, in spite of the widely separated areas of the text in which they are found.

## 2. Portrait vocabulary

ἀγαθός (good): Nerva (X §53, Bo 267).

ἀγκυλόρινος (with a hooked nose): Antenor (V §36, Bo 106).

ἀγράμματος (unlettered): Justin (XVII §1, Bo 410).

ἀνακαθήμενος (upright in posture): St Peter (X §35, Bo 256).

ἀναφάλας (with receding hair): Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), St Peter (X §35, Bo 256), Florianus (XII §32, Bo 301), Carinus (XII §36, Bo 304), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).

ἀνδροειδής τὴν πλάσιν (with a masculine build): Kassandra (V §39, Bo 106).

ἀνθηροπρόσωπος (with a florid complexion): Nero (X §29, Bo 250), St Paul (X §37, Bo 257), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).

ἀνθηρόχειλος (with red lips): Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106).

ἀπλόθριξ (with straight hair): Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*<sup>13</sup>), Protesilaos (V §21, Bo 103\*), Palamedes (V §22, Bo 103\*), Troilos (V §33, Bo 105), Augustus (IX §23, Bo 225), Gaius (X §17, Bo 243), Nero (X §29, Bo 250), Otho (X §42, Bo 258), Titus (X §47, Bo 262), Pertinax (XII §15, Bo 290), Valerian (XII §26, Bo 295), Claudius Apollonianus (XII §28, Bo 298), Quintilian (XII §29, Bo 299), Probus (XII §33, Bo 302), Carus (XII §34, Bo 302), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303), Maximian Herculeus (XII §45, Bo 311), Marcian (XIV §28, Bo 367).

ἀρχιγένηιος (with the beginnings of a beard): Protesilaos (V §21, Bo 103\*), Helenos (V §32, Bo 105), Paris (V §34, Bo 105), Gaius (X §17, Bo 243), Commodus (XII §1, Bo 283).

<sup>12</sup>For passages containing this vocabulary see IV §24, Bo 88 (Phaidra and Hippolytos); V §1, Bo 91 (Helen); V §10, Bo 100 (Diomeda); V §11, Bo 101 (Chryseis); V §§13-40, Bo 103-107 (Greek and Trojan heroes); VIII §3, Bo 195 (Alexander); IX §10, Bo 219 (Cleopatra); IX §22, Bo 225 and X §6, Bo 232 (Augustus); X §7, Bo 232 (Tiberius); X §17, Bo 243 (Caligula); X §22, Bo 246 (Claudius); X §29, Bo 250 (Nero); X §35, Bo 256 (St Peter); X §37, Bo 257 (St Paul); X §41, Bo 258 (Galba); X §42, Bo 258 (Otho); X §43, Bo 259 (Vitellius); X §44, Bo 259 (Vespasian); X §47, Bo 262 (Titus); X §48, Bo 262 (Domitian); X §53, Bo 267 (Nerva); XI §1, Bo 269 (Trajan); XI §13, Bo 277 (Hadrian); XI §21, Bo 280 (Antoninus Pius); XI §28, Bo 281 (Marcus Aurelius); XI §32, Bo 282 (Lucius Verus); XII §1, Bo 283 (Commodus); XII §14, Bo 290 (Pertinax); XII §15, Bo 290 (Didius Julianus); XII §18, Bo 291 (Septimius Severus); XII §23, Bo 295 (Geta); XII §24, Bo 295 (Caracalla); XII §25, Bo 295 sub-text (Heliogabalus); XII §26, Bo 295 (Valerian); XII §27, Bo 298 (Gallicus); XII §28, Bo 298 (Claudius II); XII §29, Bo 299 (Quintillus); XII §30, Bo 299 (Aurelian); XII §31, Bo 301 (Tacitus); XII §32, Bo 302 (Florian); XII §33, Bo 302 (Probus); XII §34, Bo 302 (Carus); XII §35, Bo 303 (Numerianus); XII §36, Bo 304 (Carinus); XII §37, Bo 306 (Diocletian); XII §45, Bo 311 (Maximianus); XII §47, Bo 312 (Galerius); XII §48, Bo 313 (Constantius I); XII §49, Bo 314 (Maximus Licinius); XIII §1, Bo 316 (Constantine); XIII §17, Bo 325 (Constantius II); XIII §18, Bo 326 (Julian); XIII §26, Bo 334 (Jovian); XIII §28, Bo 337 (Valentinian I); XIII §34, Bo 342 (Valens); XIII §36, Bo 343 (Gratian); XIII §37, Bo 344 (Theodosius I); XIII §46, Bo 349 (Arcadius); XIII §48, Bo 349 (Honorius); XIV §4, Bo 354 (Eudokia); XIV 28, Bo 367 (Marcian); XV §13, Bo 388 (Leontios: Slav and *De insid* only); XVI §1, Bo 392 (Anastasios); XVII §1, Bo 410 (Justin); XVIII §1 (Bo 425 (Justinian).

<sup>13</sup>An asterisk indicates that this descriptive element is not present in Ba, usually because it occurs in one of the reconstructed descriptions from the major lacuna in Book V.

- ἀσκητική (ascetic): *Kassandra* (V §39, Bo 106).  
 ἀσσοκούρος (with closely cropped hair): *Probus* (XII §33, Bo 302).  
 ἀσφαλής (cautious): *Antenor* (V §36, Bo 106).  
 βαθεῖς ἔχων τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς (with deep-set eyes): *Trajan* (XI §1, Bo 269).  
 βαρύφωνος (deep-voiced): *Hektor* (V §30, Bo 105).  
 βλέφαρα ἔχουσα κεχολλαῖσμένα (with painted eyelids): *Hippodameia* (V §11, Bo 101).  
 γαληνότατος (of a most calm disposition): *Claudius* (X §22, Bo 246).  
 γελασίνας ἔχουσα ἐν ταῖς παρειαῖς (with dimples in her cheeks): *Andromache* (V §38, Bo 106).  
 γενήτις (with a beard): *Antoninus Verus* (XI §32, Bo 282).  
 γενναῖος (valiant): *Philoktetes* (V §25, Bo 104), *Deiphobos* (V §31, Bo 105), *Galba* (X §41, Bo 258) *Otho* (X §42, Bo 258), *Gallienus Licinianus* (XII §27, Bo 298).  
 γέρων (old): *Tiberius* (X §7, Bo 232); *St Peter* (X §35, Bo 256), *Nerva* (X §53, Bo 267), *Pertinax* (XII §14, Bo 290).  
 γλαυκή, γλαυκός (grey-eyed): *Diomeda* (V §10, Bo 100), *Aineias* (V §35, Bo 106), *Vitellius* (X §43, Bo 259), *Domitian* (X §48, Bo 262), *Diocletian* (XII §37, Bo 306).  
 γλαυκόφθαλμος (with grey eyes): *Odysseus* (V §18, Bo 103\*), *Claudius* (X §22, Bo 246), *Hadrian* (XI §13, Bo 277).  
 γλυκός (agreeable): *St Paul* (X §37, Bo 257).  
 γοργή, γοργός (quick): *Andromache* (V §38, Bo 106); *Achilles* (V §15, Bo 103\*).  
 γρυπόρυγχος (with a hooked nose): *Galba* (X §41, Bo 258).  
 δασυπώγων (with a bushy beard): *Agamemnon* (V §13, Bo 103\*), *Menelaos* (V §14, Bo 103\*), *Nestor* (V §20, Bo 103\*), *Idomeneus* (V §24, Bo 104), *Locrian Ajax* (V §26, Bo 104), *Troilos* (V §33, Bo 105), *Nero* (X §29, Bo 250), *Vitellius* (X §43, Bo 259), *Nerva* (X §53, Bo 267), *Hadrian* (XI §13, Bo 277), *Antoninus Caracalla* (XII §24, Bo 295), *Valerian* (XII §26, Bo 295), *Gallienus Licinianus* (XII §26, Bo 298), *Probus* (XII §33, Bo 302), *Maximus Licinianus* (XII §49, Bo 314).  
 δειλός (timorous): *Paris* (V §34, Bo 106), *Antenor* (V §36, Bo 106), *St Peter* (X §35, Bo 256), *Vitellius* (X §43, Bo 259), *Valerian* (XII §26, Bo 295).  
 διμοιρίαία, διμοιρίαῖος (of medium height): *Idomeneus* (V §24, Bo 103), *Deiphobos* (V §31, Bo 105), *Andromache* (V §38, Bo 106), *Odysseus* (V §18, Bo 103\*), *Tiberius* (X §7, Bo 232), *St Peter* (X §35, Bo 256), *Vitellius* (X §43, Bo 259), *Nerva* (X §53, Bo 267), *Hadrian* (XI §13, Bo 277), *Commodus* (XII §1, Bo 283), *Septimius Severus* (XII §18, Bo 291), *Claudius Apollianus* (XII §28, Bo 298), *Quintilian* (XII §29, Bo 299), *Tacitus* (XII §31, Bo 301), *Probus* (XII §33, Bo 302), *Justin* (XVII §1, Bo 410).  
 δόλιος (crafty): *Antenor* (V §36, Bo 106).  
 δριμύτατος (extremely sharp): *Florianus* (XII §32, Bo 301).  
 δρόμαξ (fleet of foot): *Troilos* (V §33, Bo 105).  
 δυνατός ἐν ἰσχύϊ (of great strength): *Hektor* (V §30, Bo 105).  
 ἐλλόγιμος (eloquent): *Paris* (V §34, Bo 106), *Antenor* (V §36, Bo 106), *Hadrian* (XI §13, Bo 277), *Tacitus* (XII §31, Bo 301), *Maximian Herculus* (XII §45, Bo 311), *Julian* (XIII §18, Bo 326), *Eudokia* (XIV §4, Bo 354).  
 ἐνδρανής (energetic): *Theodosius I* (XIII §37, Bo 344), *Arcadius* (XIII §46, Bo 349).  
 ἐξακιονίτης (Exakionite): *Constantius* (XIII §17, Bo 325), *Valens* (XIII §34, Bo 342).  
 ἐπίρινος (with a hook nose): *Pertinax* (XII §14, Bo 290).  
 εὐγενής (noble): *Agamemnon* (V §13, Bo 103\*), *Patroklos* (V §16, Bo 103\*), *Hektor* (V §30, Bo 105), *Kassandra* (V §39, Bo 106).  
 εὐειδής (handsome): *Hadrian* (XI §13, Bo 277).  
 εὐήλιξ (well grown): *Pyrrhos Neoptolemos* (V §27, Bo 104), *Paris* (V §34, Bo 105), *Antoninus Pius* (XI §21, Bo 280), *Leontius* (XV §13, Bo 388\*).  
 εὐθετος (well-knit): *Protesilaos* (V §21, Bo 103\*), *Idomeneus* (V §24, Bo 103), *Philoktetes* (V §25, Bo 104), *Helenos* (V §32, Bo 105), *Gaius* (X §17, Bo 243), *Maximus Licinianus* (XII §49, Bo 314).  
 εὐθώραξ (with a good chest): *Pyrrhos Neoptolemos* (V §27, Bo 104), *Deiphobos* (V §31, Bo 105), *Pertinax* (XII §14, Bo 290).  
 εὐκέφαλος (with a good head): *Idomeneus* (V §24, Bo 104).  
 εὐκίνητος (athletic): *Paris* (V §34, Bo 106).

- εὐμασθος (with good breasts): Helen (V §1, Bo 91), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106).  
 εὐμετάβλητος (changeable): St Peter (X §35, Bo 256).  
 εὐμήκης (of good height): Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Priam (V §29, Bo 105), Gaius (X §17, Bo 243), Antoninus Verus (XI §32, Bo 282), Antoninus Caracallus (XII §24, Bo 295).  
 εὐμορφος (handsome): Protesilaos (V §21, Bo 103\*), Nero (X §29, Bo 250), Eudokia (XIV §4, Bo 354), Justin (XVII §1, Bo 410), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).  
 εὐογκος (sturdy): Hektor (V §30, Bo 105), Claudius (X §22, Bo 246), Hadrian (XI §13, Bo 277).  
 εὐόμιλος (well-spoken): Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*), Hekabe (V §37, Bo 106), St Paul (X §38, Bo 257).  
 εὐόφθαλμος (with good eyes): Tekmessa (V §12, Bo 103), Patroklos (V §16, Bo 103\*), Protesilaos (V §21, Bo 103\*), Idomeneus (V §24, Bo 103), Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Priam (V §29, Bo 105), Deiphobos (V §31, Bo 105), Troilos (V §33, Bo 105), Paris (V §34, Bo 105), Hekabe (V §37, Bo 106), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106), Cassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Augustus (IX §22, Bo 225), Tiberius (X §7, Bo 232), Vitellius (X §43, Bo 259), Nerva (X §53, Bo 267), Marcus Antoninus (XI §28, Bo 281), Antoninus Verus (XI §32, Bo 282), Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Quintilian (XII §29, Bo 299), Probus (XII §33, Bo 302), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303), Maximian Herculus (XII §45, Bo 311), Maximus Licinianus (XII §49, Bo 314).  
 εὐοφρως (with good eyebrows): Helen (V §1, Bo 91), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106); Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*).  
 εὐπαίδευτος (well-educated): Agamemnon (V §13, Bo 103\*), Palamedes (V §22, Bo 103\*).  
 εὐπάρειος (with good cheeks): Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106).  
 εὐπρεπής (beautiful): Cleopatra (IX §10, Bo 219), Leontius (XV §13, Bo 388\*).  
 εὐπρόσωπος (with a good face): Patroklos (V §16, Bo 103\*), Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*), Protesilaos (V §21, Bo 103\*); cf. 'with a calm face' Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*).  
 εὐπώγων (with a good beard): Patroklos (V §16, Bo 103\*), Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*), Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*), Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Hektor (V §30, Bo 105), Deiphobos (V §31, Bo 105), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), St Peter (X §35, Bo 256), St Paul (X §37, Bo 257), Marcus Antoninus (XI §28, Bo 281), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303), Maxentius Galerius (XII §47, Bo 312).  
 εὐρινος (with a good nose): Helen (V §1, Bo 91), Astynome (V §10, Bo 100), Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101), Agamemnon (V §13, Bo 103\*), Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*), Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*), Idomeneus (V §24, Bo 104), Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104), Hektor (V §30, Bo 105), Troilos (V §33, Bo 105), Paris (V §34, Bo 105), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), Hekabe (V §37, Bo 106), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106), Cassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106), Augustus (IX §22, Bo 225), Nero (X §29, Bo 250), St Paul (X §37, Bo 257), Antoninus Pius (XI §21, Bo 280), Gallienus Licinianus (XII §27, Bo 298), Carus (XII §34, Bo 302), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303), Maximian Herculus (XII §45, Bo 311), Constantius Chlorus (XII §48, Bo 313), Justin (XVII §1, Bo 410), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).  
 εὐσεβής (pious): Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), Theodosius I (XIII §37, Bo 344).  
 εὐσθενής (strong): Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88), Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Paris (V §34, Bo 105), Antoninus Caracallus (XII §24, Bo 295), Maximian Herculus (XII §45, Bo 311).  
 εὐσχυλτος (quick moving): Neoptolemos Pyrrhos (V §27, Bo 104), Aurelian (XII §30, Bo 299).  
 εὐστηθος (with a good chest): Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*), Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), Vitellius (X §43, Bo 259), Commodus (XII §1, Bo 283), Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Carus (XII §34, Bo 302), Maximus Licinianus (XII §49, Bo 314), Justin (XVII §1, Bo 410), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).  
 εὐστολος (with a good figure, well built): Phaidra (IV §24, Bo 88), Helen (V §1, Bo 91), Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101), Tekmessa (V §12, Bo 103), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106).

- 106), Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Antoninus Pius (XI §21, Bo 280), Eudokia (XIV §4, Bo 354), Anastasios (XVI §1, Bo 392).
- εὐσύμβουλος (a good counsellor): Nestor (V §20, Bo 103\*).
- εὐσύνθετος (well-built): Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*).
- εὖσωμος (with a good body): Nerva (X §53, Bo 267).
- εὐτακτος (well-disciplined): Nero (X §29, Bo 250).
- εὐτράχηλος (with a good neck): Andromache (V §38, Bo 106), Kassandra (V §39, Bo 106).
- εὐχαράκτηρος (with good features): Helen (V §1, Bo 91), Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*).
- εὐχαρής (charming): Helen (V §1, Bo 91), Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Paris (V §34, Bo 106), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106).
- εὐχρoος (with a good colour): Gaius (X §17, Bo 243), Titus (X §47, Bo 262), Antoninus Caracallus (XII §24, Bo 295), Constantius Chlorus (XII §48, Bo 313).
- ἠθικός (moral): St Paul (X §37, Bo 257).
- ἡσυχος (peaceable): Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88), Hekabe (V §37, Bo 106), Kassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Hadrian (XI §13, Bo 277), Constantius Chlorus (XII §47, Bo 313), Constantine (XIII §1, Bo 316), Gratian (XIII §36, Bo 343).
- θαυματουργῶν (working cures): St Peter (X §35, Bo 256).
- θεοφιλῆς (dear to God): Constantine (XIII §1, Bo 316).
- ιερατική, ιερατικός (priestly): Kassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Hadrian (XI §13, Bo 277).
- ιερός (religious): Commodus (XII §1, Bo 283).
- ἰσχυρός (powerful): Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*), Patroklos (V §16, Bo 103\*), Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*), Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*), Idomeneus (V §24, Bo 104), Helenos (V §32, Bo 105), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106).
- καθάρια, καθάριος (refined): Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106), Eudokia (XIV §4, Bo 354), Leontius (XV §13, Bo 388\*).
- καλλίμασθος (with beautiful breasts): Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101).
- καλλίφωνος (with a lovely voice): Helen (V §1, Bo 91).
- καλός (handsome): Priam (V §29, Bo 105).
- καμπυλῶρινος (with a crooked nose): Maximus Licinianus (XII §49, Bo 314).
- καταγύναιος (womaniser): Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Antoninus Verus (XI §32, Bo 282).
- κατεσταλμένος (sedate): Priam (V §29, Bo 105).
- κάτοφρυς (with beetling eyebrows): Paris (V §34, Bo 106).
- κονδοειδής (short): Astynome (V §10, Bo 100), Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*), Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Kalchas (V §28, Bo 105), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), Kassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Cleopatra (IX §10, Bo 219), Augustus (IX §22, Bo 225), Claudius (X §22, Bo 246), St Paul (X §37, Bo 257), Otho (X §42, Bo 258), Vespasian (X §44, Bo 259), Marcus Antoninus (XI §28, Bo 281), Antoninus Getas (XII §23, Bo 295), Valerian (XII §26, Bo 295), Florianus (XII §32, Bo 301), Carus (XII §34, Bo 302), Carinus (XII §36, Bo 304), Maxentius Galerius (XII §47, Bo 312), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).
- κονδόθριξ (with short hair): Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88), Tiberius (X §7, Bo 232), St Peter (X §35, Bo 256), Titus (X §47, Bo 262), Domitian (X §48, Bo 262), Trajan (XI §1, Bo 269), Marcus Antoninus (XI §28, Bo 281), Antoninus Verus (XI §32, Bo 282), Tacitus (XII §31, Bo 301), Anastasios (XVI §1, Bo 392).
- κονδοτράχηλος (with a short neck): Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*).
- κυνηγέτης (a hunstman): Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88).
- λαβραγόρας (with a bragging voice): Palamedes (V §22, Bo 203\*).
- λεπτακινός (thin): Tiberius (X §7, Bo 232).
- λεπτή, λεπτός (slender): Astynome (V §10, Bo 100), Palamedes (V §21, Bo 203\*), Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104), Antenor (V §36, Bo 106), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106), Augustus (IX §22, Bo 225), Nero (X §29, Bo 250), Titus (X §47, Bo 262), Domitian (X §48, Bo 262), Marcus Antoninus (XI §28, Bo 281), Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Valerian (XII §26, Bo 295), Quintilian (XII §29, Bo 299), Aurelian (XII §30, Bo 299), Tacitus (XII §31, Bo 301), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303), Diocletian (XII §37, Bo 306), Constantius Chlorus (XII §48, Bo 313).

- λεπτόρινος (with a delicate nose): Tekmessa (V §12, Bo 103), Tacitus (XII §31, Bo 301).
- λεπτοχαράκτηρος (with delicate features): Tekmessa (V §12, Bo 103), Gaius (X §17, Bo 243), Trajan (XI §1, Bo 269), Marcus Antoninus (XI §28, Bo 281), Didius Julianus (XII §15, Bo 290), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303).
- λευκή, λευκός (fair-skinned): Helen (V §1, Bo 91: as snow), Diomeda (V §10, Bo 100), Astynome (V §10, Bo 100), Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101), Agamemnon (V §13, Bo 103\*), Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*), Protesilaos (V §21, Bo 103\*), Palamedes (V §22, Bo 103\*), Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104), Kalchas (V §28, Bo 105), Helenos (V §32, Bo 105), Paris (V §34 (Bo 105), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), Antenor (V §36, Bo 106), Cassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106), Claudius (X §22, Bo 246), St Peter (X §35, Bo 256), Domitian (X §48, Bo 262), Antoninus Pius (XI §21, Bo 280), Marcus Antoninus (XI §38, Bo 281), Commodus (XII §1, Bo 283), Claudius Apollonianus (XII §28, Bo 298), Florianus (XII §32, Bo 301), Carus (XII §34, Bo 302), Carinus (XII §36, Bo 304), Diocletian (XII §37, Bo 306), Maxentius Galerius (XII §47, Bo 312), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).
- λευκόπυρρος (with fair to ruddy skin): Patroklos (V §16, Bo 103\*).
- λευκόχροος, λευκόχρους (white skinned): St Paul (X §37, Bo 257), Galba (X §41, Bo 258), Hadrian (XI §13, Bo 277), Antoninus Geta (XII §23, Bo 295).
- μακρή, μακρός (tall): Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101), Protesilaos (V §21, Bo 103\*), Palamedes (V §22, Bo 103\*), Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Hektor (V §30, Bo 105), Helenos (V §32, Bo 105), Antenor (V §36, Bo 106), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106), Nero (X §29, Bo 250), Galba (X §41, Bo 258), Titus (X §47, Bo 262), Domitian (X §48, Bo 262), Trajan (XI §1, Bo 269), Pertinax (XII §14, Bo 290), Didius Julianus (XII §15, Bo 290), Aurelian (XII §30, Bo 299), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303), Diocletian (XII §37, Bo 306), Maximian Herculus (XII §45, Bo 311), Constantius Chlorus (XII §48, Bo 313), Constantine (XIII §1, Bo 316), Marcian (XIV §28, Bo 367), Anastasios (XVI §1, Bo 392).
- μακρόρινος (with a long nose): Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*), Priam (V §29, Bo 105), Helenos (V §32, Bo 105), St Peter (X §35, Bo 256), Nerva (X §53, Bo 267), Marcus Antoninus (XI §228, Bo 281), Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Quintilian (XII §29, Bo 299).
- μακροχαράκτηρος (with long features): Andromache (V §38, Bo 106).
- μάκροψις, μακρόψις (with a long face): Phaidra (IV §24, Bo 88), Nestor (V §20, Bo 103\*), Palamedes (V §21, Bo 103\*), Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Paris (V §34, Bo 106), Claudius (X §22, Bo 246), Quintilian (XII §29, Bo 299), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303).
- μανικός (deranged): Galba (X §41, Bo 258).
- μάντις (seer): Kalchas (V §28, Bo 105), Cassandra (V §39, Bo 106).
- μεγαλοπώγων (with a large beard): Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291).
- μεγαλόρινος (with a large nose): Nestor (V §20, Bo 103\*).
- μεγαλόστομος (with a large mouth): Paris (V §34, Bo 106), Antoninus Geta (XII §23, Bo 295).
- μεγαλόφθαλμος (with large eyes): Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101), Agamemnon (V §13, Bo 103\*), Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*), Nestor (V §20, Bo 103\*), Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106), Nero (X §29, Bo 250), Pertinax (XII §14, Bo 290), Valerian (XII §26, Bo 295), Gallienus Licinianus (XII §27, Bo 298).
- μεγαλόψυχος (magnanimous): Agamemnon (V §13, Bo 103\*), Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*), Palamedes (V §22, Bo 103\*), Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Gaius (X §17, Bo 243), Antoninus Pius (XI §21, Bo 280), Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Gallienus Licinianus (XII §27, Bo 298), Claudius Apollonianus (XII §28, Bo 298), Aurelian (XII §30, Bo 299), Carinus (XII §36, Bo 304), Diocletian (XII §37, Bo 306), Constantius Chlorus (XII §48, Bo 313), Constantine (XIII §1, Bo 316), Constantius (XIII §17, Bo 325), Valens (XIII §34, Bo 342), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).



- μέγας (large): Agamemnon (V §13, Bo 103\*), Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*), Nestor (V §20, Bo 103\*), Priam (V §29, Bo 105), Troilos (V §33, Bo 105); cf. μέγας τὸν ὄγκον τοῦ σώματος (with a large massive body): Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*).
- μελάγκορος (with black pupils): Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*), Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Paris (V §34, Bo 105), Kassandra (XVIII §39, Bo 106), Valerian (XII §26, Bo 295).
- μελάγχρως, μελάγχρους (dark-skinned): Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88), Tekmessa (V §12, Bo 103), Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*), Idomeneus (V §24, Bo 103), Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Hektor (V §30, Bo 105), Deiphobos (V §31, Bo 105), Tiberius (X §7, Bo 232), Nerva (X §53, Bo 267), Trajan (XI §1, Bo 269), Antoninus Verus (XI §32, Bo 282), Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Gallienus Licinianus (XII §27, Bo 298), Quintilian (XII §29, Bo 299), Probus (XII §33, Bo 302), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303), Maximian Herculius (XII §45, Bo 311).
- μελάνθριξ (with black hair): Tekmessa (V §12, Bo 103), Agamemnon (V §13, Bo 103\*), Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Troilos (V §33, Bo 105), Paris (V §34, Bo 105), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106), Maximus (XII §49, Bo 314).
- μελίχρως, μελίχρους (with honey-coloured skin): Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Troilos (V §33, Bo 105), Hekabe (V §37, Bo 106), Didius Julianus (XII §15, Bo 290).
- μικρόμασθος (with small breasts): Astynome (V §10, Bo 100).
- μικρόπους (with small feet): Kassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106).
- μικρόσμιος (with a small upturned nose): Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106).
- μικροφθαλμος (with small eyes): Palamedes (V §22, Bo 103\*), Antenor (V §36, Bo 106), Gaius (X §17, Bo 243), Otho (X §42, Bo 258), Titus (X §47, Bo 262), Antoninus Geta (XII §23, Bo 295), Aurelian (XII §30, Bo 299).
- μειζοπόλιος (with greying hair or beard): Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*), Claudius (X §22, Bo 246), St Paul (X §37, Bo 257), Galba (X §41, Bo 258), Hadrian (XI §13, Bo 277), Antoninus Geta (XII §23, Bo 295), Antoninus Caracallus (XII §24, Bo 295), Quintilian (XII §29, Bo 299), Florianus (XII §32, Bo 301), Carus (XII §34, Bo 302), Numerian (XII §35, Bo 303), Maximian Herculius (XII §45, Bo 311), Constantius Chlorus (XII §48, Bo 313), Anastasios (XVI §1, Bo 392), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).
- μυστική (with mystic knowledge<sup>14</sup>): Cleopatra (IX §10, Bo 219).
- ξανθοαρχιγένειος (with the beginnings of a fair beard): Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104).
- ξανθόκομος (with fair hair): Astynome (V §10, Bo 100).
- ξανθοπώγων (with a fair beard): Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*).
- ξανθός (with fair hair): Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*), Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*), Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*), Nestor (V §20, Bo 103\*), Helenos (V §32, Bo 105), Antenor (V §35, Bo 106), Domitian (X §48, Bo 262).
- ξανθοφρυς (with fair eyebrows): Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104).
- ξηρὸς τῷ σώματι (withered in body): Trajan (XI §1, Bo 259).
- ξηρόψις (with a shrivelled face): Diocletian (XII §37, Bo 306).
- ὀγκόμασθος (with heavy breasts): Kassandra (V §39, Bo 106).
- ὀδόντας ἔχων μεγάλους (with large teeth): Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88).
- οἰνοπαῖς τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς (with wine-coloured eyes): Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*), Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*), Palamedes (V §22, Bo 103\*), Helenos (V §32, Bo 105), St Peter (X §35, Bo 246), Vespasian (X §44, Bo 259), Antoninus Pius (XI §21, Bo 280), Florianus (XII §32, Bo 301).
- οἰωνοσκόπος (soothsayer): Kalchas (V §28, Bo 105).
- ὀλοπόλιος (with completely grey hair or beard): Kalchas (V §28, Bo 105), Nero (X §29, Bo 250), St Peter (X §35, Bo 256), Pertinax (XII §14, Bo 290), Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Aurelian (XII §30, Bo 299), Tacitus (XII §32, Bo 301), Diocletian (XII §37, Bo 306), Justin (XVII §1, Bo 410).
- ὀξύχολος (swift to anger): St Peter (X §35, Bo 256).

<sup>14</sup>Note that this term is used elsewhere of a variety of figures; cf. the list in chapter 3, pp. 63-4.

- ὀπισθοκόμος (with hair combed back): Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106).
- ὀργίλος (irascible): Gaius (X §17, Bo 243), Vespasian (X §44, Bo 259), Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Maxentius Galerius (XII §47, Bo 312), Maximus (XII §49, Bo 314), Honorius (XIII §48, Bo 349).
- οὔλη, οὔλος (curly): Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104), Hektor (V §30, Bo 105), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106), Cassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Tiberius (X §7, Bo 232), Nerva (V §53, Bo 267), Leontius (XV §13, Bo 388\*), Justin (XVII §1, Bo 410).
- οὔλόθριξ (with curly hair): Helen (V §1, Bo 91), Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101), Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Idomeneus (V §24, Bo 104), Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Antoninus Verus (XI §32, Bo 282), Didius Julianus (XII §15, Bo 290), Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Antoninus Caracallus (XII §24, Bo 295), Gallienus Licinianus (XII §27, Bo 298), Carinus (XII §36, Bo 304), Maxentius Galerius (XII §47, Bo 312), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).
- οὔλόξανθος (with fair curly hair): Commodus (XII §1, Bo 283).
- ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχουσα μεγάλους (with large eyes): Helen (V §1, Bo 91).
- παρθένος (virgin): Diomeda (V §10, Bo 100); Tekmessa (V §12, Bo 103), Cassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106), Eudokia (XIV §4, Bo 354).
- παχύρινος (with a thick nose): Diocletian (XII §37, Bo 306).
- παχύς (fat): Patroklos (V §16, Bo 103\*), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), Antoninus Verus (XI §32, Bo 282), Florianus (XII §32, Bo 301), Carinus (XII §36, Bo 304).
- παχύχειλος (with thick lips): Probus (XII §34, Bo 302).
- περίοργος (very quick): Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Gaius (X §17, Bo 243), Arcadius (XIII §46, Bo 349).
- πλάτωψις, πλατόψις (with a broad face): Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88), Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Deiphobos (V §31, Bo 105), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), Vespasian (X §44, Bo 259), Antoninus Pius (XI §21, Bo 280), Commodus (XII §1, Bo 283), Antoninus Geta (XII §23, Bo 295), Claudius Apollianus (XII §28, Bo 298), Probus (XII §34, Bo 302), Carinus (XII §36, Bo 304).
- πλατύς (broad): Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Otho (X §42, Bo 258), Maxentius Galerius (XII §47, Bo 312).
- πολεμιστής (fighting man): Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Valens (XIII §34, Bo 342); cf. ἀπονενοημένος πολεμιστής (reckless fighting man): Meriones (V §23, Bo 103); δεινὸς πολεμιστής (fierce fighting man): Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*); δυνατὸς πολεμιστής (strong fighting man): Patroklos (V §16, Bo 103\*), cf. Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*), Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*); ισχυρὸς πολεμιστής (powerful fighting man): Troilos (V §33, Bo 105); πικρὸς πολεμιστής (fierce fighting man): Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104); τολμηρὸς πολεμιστής (bold fighting man): Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*), Protesilaos (V §21, Bo 103\*), Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104); φοβερὸς πολεμιστής (tremendous fighting man): Hektor (V §30, Bo 105).
- πολιός (with grey hair or beard): Priam (V §29, Bo 105), Vespasian (X §44, Bo 259), Trajan (XI §1, Bo 269), Antoninus Pius (XI §21, Bo 280), Valerian (XII §26, Bo 295), Marcian (XIV §28, Bo 367).
- πολύβουλος (full of good counsel): Palamedes (V §22, Bo 103\*).
- πολύθριξ (with thick hair): Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Nestor (V §20, Bo 103\*), Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Kalchas (V §28, Bo 105), Leontius (XV §13, Bo 388\*).
- πολύϊστωρ (an eloquent historian): Antenor (V §36, Bo 106).
- προγάστωρ (with a large belly): Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*), Vespasian (X §44, Bo 259), Antoninus Geta (XII §23, Bo 295), Probus (XII §33, Bo 302).
- προκοίλιος (with a big paunch): Claudius Apollianus (XII §28, Bo 298).
- προπετής (impulsive): Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104).
- πυρράκης, πυρρακῆς (with a ruddy complexion): Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), Vitellius (X §43, Bo 259), Vespasian (X §44, Bo 259), Antoninus Pius (XI §21, Bo 280), Probus (XII §33, Bo 302).
- πυρρόθριξ (with red hair): Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104).
- πυρρός (ruddy): Constantius (XIII §1, Bo 316).
- πυρρόχροος (with a ruddy skin): Priam (V §29, Bo 105).

- σγουρός (curly hair): Aias Telamonios (V §17, Bo 103\*).
- σιμός (with an upturned nose): Commodus (XII §1, Bo 283), Antoninus Getas (XII §23, Bo 295), Maxentius Galerius (XII §47, Bo 312).
- σκνιφός (mean): Valerian (XII §26, Bo 295).
- σοφός (learned): Probus (XII §32, Bo 302).
- σπανός (thin, of hair or beard): Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88), Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Titus (X §47, Bo 262), Carinus (XII §36, Bo 304), Constantius Chlorus (XII §48, Bo 313).
- στραβός (with a squint): Lokrian Aias (V §26, Bo 104), Hektor (V §30, Bo 105).
- στρεβλόρινος (with a crooked nose): Meriones (V §23, Bo 103), Antoninus Verus (XII §32, Bo 282), Antoninus Caracallus (XII §24, Bo 295).
- στρεβλόστομος (with a twisted mouth): Claudius Apollianus (XII §28, Bo 298).
- στρογγύλωψις, στρογγυλώψις (with a round face): Diomeda (V §10, Bo 100), Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104), Cassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Anastasios (XVI §1, Bo 392), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).
- στυφόμενος τοὺς πόδας (with crippled feet): Septimius Severus (XII §18, Bo 291), Marcian (XIV §28, Bo 367).
- σύμμετρος (of medium height): Patroklos (V §16, Bo 103\*).
- σύνοφρυς (with eyebrows that met): Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101), Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Priam (V §29, Bo 105), St Peter (X §35, Bo 256), St Paul, X §36, Bo 257), Didius Julianus (XII §15, Bo 290).
- σώφρων (chaste): Phaidra (IV §24, Bo 88), Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88), Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*), Honorius (XIII §48, Bo 349).
- τελεία, τέλειος (well grown): Phaidra (IV 26, Bo 88), Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88), Helen (V §1, Bo 91), Diomeda (V §10, Bo 100), Hekabe (V §37, Bo 106), Gallienus Licinianus (XII §27, Bo 298).
- τελειοπώγων (with a full beard): Maximian Herculus (XII §45, Bo 311).
- τετράγωνος (four-square): Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*).
- τιμητικός (bestowing honours): Gratian (XIII §36, Bo 343).
- τολμηρός (bold): Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104). τολμηρὸς πολεμιστῆς (bold fighting man): Menelaos (V §14, Bo 103\*).
- τοξότης εὐστοχος (an accurate archer): Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Paris (V §34, Bo 106).
- τρακταίστης (administrator): Maximus Licinianus (XII §49, Bo 314).
- ὑπερήφανος (arrogant): Carus (XII §34, Bo 302).
- ὑπογελῶντα ἔχων τὸν χαρακτῆρα (with a cheerful appearance): St Paul (X §37, Bo 257); cf. ὑπογελῶν (smiling): Antoninus Pius (XI §21, Bo 280).
- ὑπόγλαυκος (with greyish eyes): Pyrrhos Neoptolemos (V §27, Bo 104), Priam (V §29, Bo 105), St Paul (X §37, Bo 257), Commodus (XII §1, Bo 283), Claudius Apollianus (XII §28, Bo 298), Carus (XII §34, Bo 302).
- ὑπόκυρτος (with a slightly hunched back): Helenos (V §32, Bo 105), Domitian (X §48, Bo 262), Diocletian (XII §37, Bo 306).
- ὑπόξανθος (with fairish hair): Helen (V §1, Bo 91), Diomeda (V §10, Bo 100), Patroklos (V §16, Bo 103\*), Protesilaos (V §21, Bo 103\*), Andromache (V §38, Bo 106), Cassandra (V §39, Bo 106), Claudius Apollianus (XII §28, Bo 298).
- ὑπόπυρρος (with a rather ruddy complexion): Nestor (V §20, Bo 103\*), Justin (XVII §1, Bo 410).
- ὑπόσιμος (with a slightly upturned nose): Hippolytos (IV §24, Bo 88), Diomeda (V §10, Bo 100), Diomedes (V §19, Bo 103\*), Deiphobos (V §31, Bo 105), Tiberius (X §7, Bo 232), Otho (X §42, Bo 258), Valerian (XII §26, Bo 295), Claudius Apollianus (XII §28, Bo 298), Florianus (XII §32, Bo 301).
- ὑπόστραβος (with a slight squint): Galba (X §41, Bo 258), Didius Julianus (XII §15, Bo 290), Maxentius Galerius (XII §47, Bo 312).
- ὑπότραυλος (with a slight lisp): Claudius Apollianus (XII §28, Bo 298).
- ὑποφάλακρος (slightly bald): Antoninus Getas (XII §23, Bo 295), Aurelian (XII §30, Bo 299), Tacitus (XII §31, Bo 301).
- ὑπόχλωρος (with rather sallow skin): St Peter (X §35, Bo 256).

- φαλακρός (bald): St Paul (X §37, Bo 257), Vespasian (X §44, Bo 259).  
 φιλήδονος (pleasure-loving): Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*), Paris (V §34, Bo 106).  
 φιλόγελως (fond of laughing): Hippodameia (V §11, Bo 101).  
 φιλοκτίστης (fond of building): Tiberius (X §7, Bo 232), Commodus (XII §1, Bo 283), Diocletian (XII §37, Bo 306), Valens (XIII §34, Bo 342).  
 φιλόσοφος (a philosopher): Domitian (X §48, Bo 262).  
 φιλοστρατιώτης (a keen soldier): Maximus Licinianus (XII §49, Bo 314).  
 φιλότιμος (generous): Hekabe (V §37, Bo 106), Antoninus Verus (XI §33, Bo 282), Justin (XVII §1, Bo 410).  
 φρόνιμος (wise, sensible): Odysseus (V §18, Bo 103\*), Nestor (V §20, Bo 103\*), Palamedes (V §22, Bo 103\*), Philoktetes (V §25, Bo 104), Helenos (V §32, Bo 105), Aineias (V §35, Bo 106), St Peter (X §35, Bo 256), St Paul (X §37, Bo 257), Tacitus (XII §31, Bo 301), Theodosius I (XIII §37, Bo 344).  
 χθαμαλός (short): Alexander (VIII §3, Bo 195).  
 χριστιανός (Christian): Jovian (XIII §26, Bo 334), Valentinian (XIII §28, Bo 337), Theodosius I (XIII §37, Bo 344), Justinian (XVIII §1, Bo 425).  
 ψελλός (with a stutter): Hektor (V §30, Bo 105), Otho (X §42, Bo 258).  
 ὤκως τοὺς πόδας καὶ τοῖς ἄλμασι δόκιμος (swift-moving and skilled at jumping): Achilles (V §15, Bo 103\*).  
 ὡραία (beautiful): Hekabe (V §37, Bo 106), Polyxene (V §40, Bo 106).

### 3. *Significance of portraits*

A few general points to start with. First, the majority of these descriptive terms refer to physical attributes. Some, however, refer to moral traits, e.g. ἀγαθός, ἀσκητική, ἀσφαλής, γαληνότητος, γενναῖος, γλυκύς, δειλός, δόλιος, δριμύτατος, ἐλλόγιμος, ἐνδρανής, εὐγενής, εὐόμιλος, εὐπαιδευτος, εὐσεβής, εὐχαρής, ἥσυχος, καθάριος, μαρτυρικός, μεγαλόμυθος, οἰζύχολος, ὀργίλος, σκνιφός, σώφρων, τολμηρός, ὑπερήφανος, φιλήδονος, φιλόγελως, φρόνιμος (see Fleschenberg, 1909 for a brief discussion of these non-physical terms and their combinations, usually beginning with the physical but ending with at least one or two moral epithets). Some refer to other attributes which it is hard to include strictly in either the physical or the moral category – for example, that the person was a hunter, eloquent, a virgin, a good counsellor, a bold fighting man, good at jumping, a soothsayer, possessed of mystic knowledge, was a good administrator, ill-educated, etc. Or there may be additional comments (not included in the list above); e.g. Helen was ‘a tremendous sight among women’ (φοβερόν θέαμα εἰς γυναῖκας), St Peter spoke through the Holy Spirit and St Paul was inspired by it, or the figure concerned had different coloured eyes (e.g. Alexander the Great and Anastasios). In the group of Greek and Trojan portraits ages are sometimes given (e.g. for Diomedea, Astynome, and Polyxene), especially – it would seem – to emphasize feminine youthful charm. Ages are given in connection with emperors, but only at their deaths and not strictly as part of the portraits (cf. the list in chapter 7, pp. 139-41). In addition, we are sometimes told in connection with the portrait which circus faction an emperor supported (cf. the passages on Antoninus Caracallus, Gallienus Licinianus, Claudius Apollianus, Probus, Carinus, Maxentius Galerius, or Justinian); or which sect they favoured (e.g. Constantius and Valens were Exakionite, or Arians, while Jovian, for example and presumably in contrast to Julian, is simply Christian). Occasionally other information unrelated to appearance or character is given: e.g. Aurelian wore a diadem with a star.

Many of these words are compounds, some of them preserved for the first time in Malalas' text. In most cases the meaning is obvious, though some (e.g. οἶνοπαῆς τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, presumably connected with the Homeric word οἶνον) remain a little obscure and odd. Charalambakis (1978) provides a useful discussion of the etymologies and usages of many of these words and phrases. He concludes that the following words and phrases have no recorded occurrence prior to Malalas' chronicle: ἀγκυλόρινος, ἀναφάλας, ἀνθηροπρόσωπος, ἀνθηρόχειλος, ἀσσόκουρος, γενηίτης, γρυπόρυγχος, δρόμαξ, εὐμασθος, εὐστηθος, εὐχαράκτηρος, καλλίμασθος, καμπυλόρινος, καταγύναιος, κάτοφρυς, κονδοειδής, κονδόθριξ, λεπτόρινος, λεπτοχαράκτηρος, μακρόρινος, μακροχαράκτηρος, μάκρωσις, μεγαλοπώγων, μελάγκορος, μικρόμασθος, μικρόπους, μικρόσιμος, ξανθοαρχιγένειος, ξάνθοφρυς, ξήρωσις, ὀγκόμασθος, παχύρινος, περίγοργος, πλάτοψις, στρεβλόρινος, στρεβλόστομος, στρογγύλοψις, τελειοπώγων, τρακταῖστίς (Charalambakis, 1978, 37).

Then it is worth noting that, although it would seem that there is a systematic policy of including a portrait for each emperor, there are two interruptions in the process as preserved in Ba. One occurs in Book XIII where there are no descriptions for Constantine II or Constans and only a very abbreviated one for Constantius II and for Julian and Jovian. This corresponds to a discernible reduction in the detail and precision of Malalas' account of that period. In fact from XIII onwards most of the descriptions lose their regular shape and verve and tend to be comments on moral qualities rather than on physical characteristics. They do, however, pick up in detail later and full comments are provided, for example, on the state of Anastasios' eyes and beard, that Justin was 'a veteran of war' (ἐν πολέμοις κοπωθεὶς), and Justinian came from Bederiana in Thrace. There is also a further interruption at XV §1, Bo 377, where there is no description in Ba for Zeno, and only a very feeble attempt at one in the Slavonic translation (see the sub-text, *ad loc.*, of the 1986 translation). In both these instances it is tempting to speculate that these variations from what looks like a regular pattern may indicate a change in the source that Malalas was using.

This leads on to several questions: where did Malalas find this portrait technique? Did he write these passages himself or did he derive them from his sources? If the latter, what antecedents did they have? The answers to some of these questions may vary between the three different groups of portraits.

Malalas, however, did not invent this technique. A number of papyri from Egypt, dating from third century B.C. to the third century A.D. indicate that a similar vocabulary and style of succinct description had been developed as a means of legal identification, chiefly for taxation records but also as a way of identifying soldiers and later for tracing runaway slaves. The most detailed collection of these documents remains that made by Fürst (1902, 397-406 and 597-614; cf. Evans, 1935, 64) in the course of his examination of the Greek and Trojan portraits in Malalas' text. In the documents cited by Fürst we find words such as λευκόχρως, μελίχρως, εὐμεγέθης, ὀξύρρινος, πυρράκης, ἐπίγρυπος, στρογγυλοπρόσωπος, σύνοφρυς etc, etc. He considered that this process of εἰκονισμός, iconistic portraiture, was native to Egypt and only entered the Greek literary tradition after the Ptolemaic period. Misener (1924, 103), however, indicated that its roots can be seen

as far back as the Homeric poems. Certainly it came to be recognized in the rhetorical handbooks as a device closely akin to *χαρακτηρισμός*, as definitions by Trypho and Polybios indicate: it was intended to be 'a terse description of personal appearance designed either as a means of legal identification or as an ornament of style' (Walz, 1832-6, VIII, 614, 751; Misener, 1924, 97). These two purposes came to be of equal weight in the use of these descriptions. The first was the practical – the technique enabled tax collectors, recruiting officers and law enforcement agents to give quick verbal identifying sketches of individuals. In this connection it is interesting to note that at X §33, Bo 254 Nero is convinced that Simon Magus is not Jesus on the basis of Pilate's verbal portrait (Pilate characterised Simon as having long hair and being very fat). The second was the ethical and rhetorical – comments on character became a literary ornament, and physical attributes came to be associated with character traits. This was taken up by writers on physiognomy, of which the chief surviving specimens are [Pseudo-] Aristotle's *Physiognomica* and Polemo's *De Physiognomia* (the latter surviving largely in an Arabic translation; both edited by Förster, 1893). Traces of the theories put forward by these authors can be discerned in Latin historians (Evans, 1935; Coussin, 1953) and elsewhere in writers of the early Christian centuries (Evans, 1941). Preliminary observations indicate that suggestive results might emerge from a detailed examination of the descriptions in Malalas on these lines, but that the similarity is not close. Malalas' descriptions of emperors, for example, bear no resemblance to those of Suetonius which arguably have been influenced by the physiognomic tradition of iconistic portraits, especially as represented by Polemo.

Of the three portrait groups in Malalas, that of the Greek and Trojan heroes has generated the most discussion, largely for textual reasons. The debate began in connection with the original form of Diktys, whose narrative is the basis for Malalas' account of the Trojan War. It has continued because of the need to fill the lacuna in Ba (see especially Fleschenberg, 1908; Patzig, 1911 and also Fürst, 1901 and 1902). As discussed elsewhere (chapter 7, pp. 176-77) the original Greek text of Diktys does not survive independently, though there is some evidence for its continued circulation into the tenth century. The passages attributed to Diktys, and also to Sisypheos of Kos, by Malalas are very close to the Latin version of Septimius, whose authenticity as a translation of Diktys has been vouched for by papyrus fragments of the original Greek (Eisenhut, 1973). However, the portrait passages do not appear in Septimius, even though Malalas (V §41, Bo 107) explicitly attributes them to Diktys: writing descriptions of the heroes formed part of his activities as Idomeneus' scribe on the spot at Troy. Versions of the portraits do appear in Dares' much briefer account of the Trojan War (also linked with Diktys), though the resemblances frequently break down over details. Certainty is probably not attainable on this issue but one logical conclusion would be that the portraits were inserted during a rewriting of Diktys' text. Between the stage represented by Septimius and the text preserved by Malalas the order of events has been substantially recast to reflect the point of view of a new narrator, Teukros. It is tempting to attach this rewriting, and the introduction of the portraits which may have accompanied it, to the otherwise unknown name of Sisypheos of Kos.

It is worth noting that the portraits attached to Phaidra and Hippolytos at IV §24 are in an area of text to be associated with Domninos; could Book V as we have it be in the form given it by Domninos, with little or no intervention from Malalas? Or do the Phaidra and Hippolytos portraits simply testify to the universal popularity of this stylistic feature? It also remains possible that Malalas composed the descriptions himself. In favour of this is an undeniable similarity of vocabulary from beginning to end of the chronicle (both Helen of Troy and Justinian, for example, had good noses and curly hair). Even a *terminus ante quem* is hard to establish, since he could easily have modelled the later imperial portraits on the earlier examples.

The second group of portraits consists of two only, the descriptions of the Apostles Peter and Paul. Fürst (1902, 407 ff.) has found extensive parallels for these in early Christian apocryphal literature; e.g. in the *Passio Pauli* Paul is described as ἔγκυφος ὦν τὸ σῶμα καὶ μέλας τὸ γένειον, φαλακρὸς τὴν κεφαλὴν. Confirmation of the extent to which the iconistic type of verbal portraiture had permeated literary genres is provided by the curious collection of descriptions made by a certain Elpius (= Ulpius?) the Roman, probably in the tenth century (Chatzidakis, 1938, 395). Apparently designed to aid ecclesiastical painters, Elpius' text gives synopses of the physical appearance of the Old Testament prophets, Christ, the apostles, the early fathers of the church and some recent patriarchs. Amongst the sources on which he draws is Malalas, for the descriptions of Peter and Paul (and also for Adam).

The third group of portraits, of emperors, is the most extensive. As remarked already, from Book X onwards the pattern is that an imperial accession notice includes a verbal portrait, though there are disruptions to this pattern in Books XIII and XV. Were the portraits included in Malalas' sources? It can be suggested (cf. chapters 6, p. 142 and 7, p. 187) that Malalas used a schematic list of emperors that included their ages at death and modes of death; might this also have included the portraits? Is this source to be identified with Nestorianos, whose chronicle Malalas acknowledges at the end of Book XIV as ceasing with the death of Leo II? This would give a straightforward explanation for the omission of a portrait of Zeno at the beginning of XV, but gives no reason why there should be no portraits for Constantine's immediate successors in XIII (though, as already noted, Malalas' treatment of this period as a whole is somewhat attenuated). As for sources later than Nestorianos, very little survives of the written material – like Eustathios of Epiphaneia or the Constantinopolitan city chronicle – on which Malalas may also have been drawing for the late fifth century and the sixth century. It seems most likely that Malalas wrote for himself the descriptions of the emperors from Anastasios onwards, during the period for which he was drawing on mainly oral sources. It should also, however, be kept in mind that Malalas would have been familiar with the official imperial portraits and statues that would have been conspicuous in Antioch: he would have every opportunity to be aware of the accepted image of the emperors both of his own lifetime and of the recent past (cf. chapter 5, pp. 99-100).

It should be noted that verbal portraits remained part of the Byzantine historiographical tradition, as is discussed by Head and Baldwin.<sup>15</sup> Very striking are some portraits in Theophanes from the period immediately after the end of Malalas' chronicle: e.g. Justin II (Th 241.28-9) is τῷ γένει Θράξ, μεγαλόψυχός τε καὶ εἰς πάντα ἐπιδέξιος, φιλοκτίστης, while Tiberius (Th 247. 31) is στυφόμενος τοὺς πόδας. While this tradition was continued by Psellos, for example (Head, 1980, 231 ff.), the last clear instance of portraits with concise vocabulary in the manner of Malalas comes in the ninth century, from the fragmentary *Scriptor incertus de Leone* (Grégoire, 1936; Browning, 1965, 410-11).

As is regularly the case when attempting to untangle the layers of Malalas' chronicle and its possible sources, clear-cut answers are impossible. Given the degree of homogeneity in the portrait vocabulary, one could suggest – as an extreme possibility – that Malalas himself wrote all the portraits and inserted them throughout the chronicle. But the fact that Dares knew a portrait list of Greek and Trojan heroes and that much of Malalas' phrasing can be paralleled in documents up to the third century makes this unlikely. More tenable would be the proposition that Malalas (or a predecessor like Domninos who is now indistinguishable from Malalas) found the Greek and Trojan portraits already in his pseudo-Homeric source and in addition had access to a list of emperors with not dissimilar portraits; his contribution was to impose his own linguistic and lexical preferences over all the portraits and to continue the imperial list up to his own day.

<sup>15</sup>Head, 1980 and Baldwin, 1981a provide general discussions of physiognomic literature and the literary evidence for the appearance of Byzantine emperors down to Constantine XI; cf. Cox, 1983, 12-16.



# THE TRANSMISSION OF MALALAS' CHRONICLE

In this chapter an attempt will be made to survey the way in which Malalas' chronicle has been treated in three main historiographic traditions – the Greek, Slavonic and the Syriac. One further text, the *Laterculus Malalianus*, a Latin version of a portion of the chronicle, will be examined in some detail since, although it is not a major element in the tradition of historical composition in the West, it is a puzzling document of some significance for the chronicle's textual history and has recently been re-interpreted.

## 1: Malalas in Greek

Elizabeth Jeffreys

The two main stages of composition of Malalas' chronicle have been discussed previously in chapter 1 (at pp. 17-25) and in chapter 7 in connection with the chronicle's sources (pp. 211-14). It was argued there that the first edition extended to 532 (and was written shortly after that date) while the second was complete in the early years of the reign of Justin II and covered all of Justinian's reign, to 565, and perhaps the first nine years of Justin's, to 573/4. Use was very soon made of this chronicle. The text, however, has not survived in a complete form and much of it has to be reconstructed from excerpts made for a variety of reasons. This section will look at the Greek witnesses, by and large in chronological order, and – since the Greek is, not surprisingly, the fullest element in this textual tradition – will indicate at what points the other linguistic traditions are connected to the Greek. Brief comments will also be made about what might be deduced concerning the purposes of the various exccrptors.

It is necessary, however, to start outside the chronological sequence as this will demonstrate the nature and complexity of the problem. The main witness for the text of Malalas' chronicle is, of course, Ba, the Oxford manuscript Baroccianus 182. Although it is lacking its opening and closing folios (containing all of Book I and the opening words of II, and the last pages of XVIII) this is the only manuscript to contain anything approaching the complete text. It consists of 322 parchment folios,<sup>1</sup> written throughout

<sup>1</sup>There are several numbering systems present in Ba: i) in the centre of each recto, running from 1-321, with the number 28 duplicated (these are the numbers used by Neumann, 1880); ii) a similar (Arabic) numeration in the top right corner of each recto, commencing at f. 21 with the number 30 (i.e. with a difference of 9 from the central numeration); from 28bis (central

in the same regular minuscule of the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries (Coxe, 1855; Weierholt, 1965). It is thus a late witness and, though not necessarily the worse for this (on the principle of textual criticism *recentiores sed non deteriores*), preserves a text that has in places been copied carelessly, perhaps because the low language level encouraged inattentive scribal habits – phrases, for example, have fallen out (XVIII §12, Bo 430, is ungrammatical in Ba but when read in conjunction with the *Chronicon Paschale* syntax can be restored) and proper names are frequently garbled (e.g. in the king list at IV §25, Bo 90). Elsewhere the distortions would seem to be made deliberately: for example, the idiosyncracies of the underlying chronological framework of dates From Adam have been misunderstood (in X §2, Bo 228; XV §16, Bo 391; and XVIII §8, Bo 428) and the figures in the text altered to conform to what had become the standard Byzantine system (as is discussed in chapter 6, pp. 116-19). There is, however, evidence that some of these peculiarities may have been in the text from an early stage; e.g. (though this example occurs in P rather than Ba) the form Phthachion, rather than Phaethon, is present in all extant witnesses to Book I (§3, P7) and gives rise to a strong presumption that this was Malalas' own spelling. As well as these errors, the text preserved in Ba has been abbreviated in the later books and much material relating to Antiochene affairs has been omitted, as can be seen from a comparison with the Tusculan Fragments (at, e.g., XIII §46, Bo 348-9) or Evagrius (at, e.g., XV §11, Bo 386). Ba is thus a somewhat imperfect witness to Malalas' original chronicle. Fortunately it can be supplemented from excerpts that can be convincingly identified in other chroniclers and historians.

There are, in addition, five major lacunas in the text as preserved in Ba. Four of these are due to physical damage to Ba itself, and from the gathering marks remaining on the manuscript it is possible to calculate how many folios are missing.<sup>2</sup> Thus, there are nine folios (containing Book I and the first few words of II) lost at the beginning before the present f.1 (that is, one complete gathering and the first sheet of the second); one folio between 49v and 50r (at V §12, Bo 103. 10-11); two folios between 318v and 319r (at XVIII §129, Bo 490) and a further two after 322r (XVIII §145, Bo 496), these sheets being the missing first two and last two of the final gathering.<sup>3</sup> The fifth lacuna (at XII §25, Bo 295.15) had occurred at an earlier stage in the transmission of the text and, unlike the others, is not marked by a textual hiatus in Ba.

Without entering on a full codicological discussion of Ba, it has a number of features that are worth mentioning. There are frequent marginal notes. Some are in what appears to be the same hand as the main text and are usually indications of the contents; e.g., from Book III, 21v *περὶ Μελχισεδέκ*, 22r *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*, *περὶ Ἰσιόδου* (sic) etc.

numeration) the corner number is cancelled and replaced by an accurate running total; thus f. 28bis is marked 38 29; this is the numeration currently in use; iii) from ff. 3-20 the notation in the top right corner is in Greek (δ-κα).

<sup>2</sup>Using the current numeration and not that of Neumann (1880), there are gathering marks visible at 87 (ιγ), 95 (ιδ), 103 (ιε), 111 (ις), 119 (ιζ), 127 (ιη), 135 (ιθ), 151 (κα), 159 (κβ), 167 (κγ), 175 (κδ), 183 (κε), 191 (κς), 199 (κζ), 207 (κη), 215 (κθ), 223 (λ), 231 (λα), 239 (λβ), 263 (λε), 271 (λς), 279 (λζ), 287 (λη), 295 (λ\* = λθ).

<sup>3</sup>The comments of Neumann (1880) and Bury (1897) that the last few folios are written in a more compressed hand and with more abbreviations are not especially convincing, though the question is of relevance to discussions of the extent of the chronicle.

Others are in a later hand and note the authorities cited (e.g. 1v Palaiphatos, 2r Manetho, 3r Cyrillus). This same hand has added what seem to be chapter numbers (e.g. at 4r: C4; 7r: C5; 9v: C6 etc) and, at the same time, has inserted paragraph marks (§) in the body of the text.<sup>4</sup> These occur in every book except X. It is probably this hand which has inked over faded portions of the text throughout the manuscript, and thus caused great problems over the status of the difficult date at XVIII §8 (f. 275v) where the second figure in one of the numerals has been treated in this way (cf. Bury, 1897, 229). Elsewhere the original, brown, ink has eaten through the parchment.

The text runs continuously, with divisions between the books marked by a line of simple pen ornamentation, followed by the number of the previous book and the title of the new one; thus on 21r we find λόγος δεύτερος:- λόγος γ' χρόνων θεογνωσίας ἀβράαμ, with λόγος γ' in the margin (though elsewhere it is the number of the previous book that is noted in the margin, e.g. at f. 263r). The only exception occurs at the end of XVI, which finishes at the top of 262v, leaving the rest of the page blank, while XVII starts at the top of the next folio, which is also the start of a new gathering (λε).

This defective text has to be supplemented, as has long been recognised: Book I in Hody's edition and followed by Dindorf in the Bonn edition, for example, is represented by sections taken from the ninth-century chronicler George Monachos. However, Book I and the first sections of II do exist independently. These are to be found in a tenth-century manuscript, containing a collection of chronological and ecclesiastical texts and divided between Paris (Suppl. Gr. 682, ff. 9-14 = P in the 1986 translation) and Mount Athos (Vatopedi, 290, f. 148 = V). The existence of the portion in Paris has been known since Istrin's edition of the Slavonic text (Book I, including the Greek text from P, was published in 1897) but V has all too frequently been overlooked (Gelzer, 1894; Richard, 1955, 334). Since the section in V breaks off in the middle of II §2, Bo 24, we have no idea how much of Malalas' chronicle was reproduced in that manuscript; other chronographic texts in the manuscript include lists of Roman and Byzantine emperors and the patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem (Richard, 1955, 333). The passages from Malalas, however, are very close to the text preserved in Ba, as far as can be judged from the brief overlapping portions of Book II.

The lacuna in Book V, the portrait list of the Homeric heroes, can be covered quite satisfactorily from the Slavonic translation, supplemented by Isaac Porphyrogenetos'

<sup>4</sup>Whose hand this is, is not certain: it may be that of Chilmead but is clearly not that of Gregory who writes in a square, aggressive style (cf. Oxford, Rawlinson D 1083: the notes in which, *inter alia*, Gregory identifies the chronicle in Ba as that of Malalas from the reference to the statue from Paneas made by John of Damascus; see chapter 10, p. 316). The chapter numbers are a puzzle: they have no connection with the printed edition, nor with Chilmead's surviving notes and fair version of both text and translation for that edition (Oxford, Misc. Gr. 291 [text and translation], and Misc. Gr. 330 [notes]). They do, however, correspond with two of the three chapter markings in a Latin version of Book IX only, in Trinity College, Dublin (TCD MS 415, ff. 29-34); this version has no connection with that of Chilmead and was probably made by Bishop Ussher (of chronological fame, and on whom see, briefly, chapter 10, p. 319). The hand in TCD 415 could conceivably be the same as that which has inserted the chapter and paragraph mark in Ba. Are we to accuse Bishop Ussher not only of having read Malalas and of having translated a portion but also of having tampered with the manuscript and added to subsequent editors' linguistic headaches?

pamphlet 'On the personality and appearance of the Greeks and Trojans at Troy', from several of John Tzetzes' works on Homeric topics and the passage on portraits in the Latin text of Dares (see chapter 8, p. 242). The lacuna in XII cannot be filled so satisfactorily as the Slavonic omits this section,<sup>5</sup> and it can be restored in outline only from the imperial list in the *Laterculus Malalianus* and the summaries in Skoutariotes, while there are more substantial passages preserved in *De insidiis*. The attribution of material from other texts, such as *Chronicon Paschale*, George Monachos, Kedrenos or Leo Grammatikos, is much more problematic at this point. The lacunas in XVIII can be filled with some certainty from Theophanes, with the proviso that Theophanes has tinkered with Malalas' language and has also had access to other sources some of which (e.g. the putative Constantinopolitan city chronicle discussed in chapter 7, pp. 213-14) may also have been available to Malalas. The borderline between sections taken from Malalas in Theophanes' chronicle and Theophanes' additional entries derived from other sources is frequently not clear cut.

Nevertheless the fact remains that when attempting to reconstruct the text of Malalas' chronicle, either in a 'conventional' edition or in a translation (as was done in 1986), Ba has to be used as the base text throughout, apart from I §§1-15 (i.e. the whole book), II §1 (the first three words), V §§13-21 (Bo 103), XII §25 (Bo 295, in the subtext), XVIII §§129-132 (Bo 490) and XVIII §§ 145 (Bo 496, last phrases) onwards.

It is interesting to note that, although the chronicle was very soon used by Malalas' contemporaries – John of Ephesos, for example, and Evagrius (as is discussed below) – the text's independent existence has been precarious. Apart from Ba<sup>6</sup> the chronicle has to be extracted from deep within other chroniclers who rarely acknowledge their debts (John of Ephesos, Evagrius and Michael the Syrian are exceptions), though such tacit borrowing is, of course, quite normal in the chronicle tradition. Malalas' chronicle is not unique in this dependence for its survival on a single manuscript for the histories of Psellos, Anna Komnene and Kinnamos, for example, are in the same state, but it is interesting that this has occurred to a text that was as widely used as Malalas' seems to have been. Nevertheless there are enough indications to show that many copies did indeed exist; while that used by Theophanes in the ninth century may have been defective (see pp. 268-76 below), that available to Skoutariotes in the thirteenth was not and came from a branch of the textual tradition different from that of the eleventh- or twelfth-century Ba since it includes material from the lacuna in XII.

Although the Slavonic translation acts as an extensive and useful witness to Malalas' text (see pp. 276-87 below), Ba none the less provides the *sole evidence* for the chronicle for a significant portion of the text at: V §73, VI §§1, 2, VII §13, VIII §§2, 17, X §§8, 19, 20, XI §§3-7, 9, 11, 14-16, 22, 30, XII §§2-9, 11, 16, 19, 38-44, 46, 48, XIII §§4,

<sup>5</sup>Is it significant that the Slavonic texts show no knowledge of Malalas from XII §25, Bo 295, the start of the lacuna in Ba's text, to XIII §18, Bo 326, a point at which Ba's narrative is again condensed and verging on the lacunose on the reigns of Constantine the Great's immediate heirs (cf. the subtext in the 1986 translation, *ad loc.*)?

<sup>6</sup>There are odds and ends of semi-independent quotations from Malalas in various late mss: e.g. Barberini 237, Angelicus 65 (see Moravcsik, 1958, 330; Colonna, 1956, 74 and Weierholt, 1965).

6, 9, 12-14, 16, 29, 30, 33, 39-42, 44, XIV §2, XVIII §22, 24, 26, 31, 33, 37, 39-41, 44-5, 48, 55, 57-70, 72-4, 76, 79-82, 84, 91, 101, 117, 126, 133, 135, 137, 144. Several of these passages deal with Malalas' idiosyncratic chronological framework, but most are concerned with events in Antioch, categories of information that would clearly be of limited interest to later excerptors.

While we have no evidence from the first part of the sixth century that the first edition of Malalas' chronicle was read and used at that time, the final version certainly was excerpted within a very few years of completion.

Perhaps the earliest writer to borrow from Malalas was the ecclesiastical historian **John of Ephesos**, who died *circa* 586 and wrote in Syriac. The complex textual tradition that obscures this writer's text for us is discussed later in this chapter, at pp. 304-6: we need to remember here that the second part of John of Ephesos' *Ecclesiastical History*, in which he can be shown to have used Malalas, survives independently only in brief fragments while more substantial portions of Malalas-based material taken from John of Ephesos can be identified in the ninth-century chronicle of **Pseudo-Dionysios of Tel-Mahre** (also written in Syriac). By the time of the death of John of Ephesos, however, within a decade or less of the probable completion of Malalas' chronicle, he had taken extensive portions from it into his own work. Since John of Ephesos was based in Constantinople there is perhaps no especial significance in this, though it could be that the chronicle came quickly to his attention as the work of another Constantinopolitan-based compatriot. The Malalas-derived portions of John of Ephesos that survive independently (see XVII §§14, 16, XVIII §§19, 27-8, 52, 92-3, 112, 118) show that he was especially interested in Malalas' accounts of earthquakes, though comparison with the equivalent passages in the chronicle indicates that John has heightened the emotional tone. The material in Pseudo-Dionysios that can be traced back to Malalas through John of Ephesos is more varied in range (see XIV §§29, 36, 37, 39, 41-3, 46-7, XV §§3-6, XVI §9-11,<sup>7</sup> 18, XVII §§4, 6, 15-16, 22, XVIII §§6, 14-5, 19, 27-8, 30, 42, 92-3, 96, 112, 118-9, 122, 124) and though also inclined towards natural disasters – earthquakes, comets and the like – does include imperial accessions and deaths, rebellions as well as some ecclesiastical events (e.g. involving Severus: XVII §6, Bo 411) and embassies with no obvious Syrian connections (e.g. XVIII §§14-15, Bo 431). The combined evidence of John of Ephesos and Pseudo-Dionysios does not, regrettably, give a clear indication of the point at which Malalas' chronicle ended (Nau, 1897, 493 assumes that it ended with the death of Justinian, while Witakowski [see p. 304-6 below] finds no decisive evidence on this topic in the surviving material). Perhaps the most significant point to be derived from the Syriac historiographic tradition that used Malalas is that the version of the chronicle available to John of Ephesos combined both the Antiochene first edition (that went to 532) and the Constantinopolitan-based extension that makes up the larger part of XVIII and assumed that this combined version was the work of the one author, Malalas (known to him as John of Antioch).

The other author to make almost immediate use of Malalas was **Evagrius of Epiphaneia** (532/7-593/4), an advocate based in Antioch and author of an *Ecclesiastical*

<sup>7</sup>Note that this passage is to be connected with the chronicle of Joshua the Stylite.

*History* that functioned as a continuation of those of Sokrates, Sozomen and Theodoret. His work is notable for its careful use of documentation and citation of authorities (e.g. Ev V. 24, 219.11 ff.; Allen, 1981). One of these authorities is a 'John the Rhetor', referred to on five occasions (Ev I. 16, 25.29: the translation of the relics of Ignatios; Ev II. 12, 64.11: the earthquake of 458 in Antioch; Ev III. 10, 109.10: murder of bishop Stephen; Ev III. 28, 124.19: Mammianos' rebuilding in Antioch; Ev IV. 5, 156.8: earthquake of 520). From the similarities between Evagrius' version and that of Malalas (in Ba) in the case of the murder of Stephen (cf. XV §6, Bo 380) and the earthquake of 520 (cf. XVII §16, Bo 419), it is plain that this John the Rhetor must be John Malalas (cf. Brooks, 1892, 299).<sup>8</sup> There are also other passages in Evagrius, not signalled by him, which nevertheless show clear signs of indebtedness to Malalas' account.<sup>9</sup> It is equally plain, however, that – despite the similarities – the text used by Evagrius was very different from that now existing in Ba: e.g. the earthquake of 458 (XIV §36, Bo 369) is recounted at greater length by Evagrius (cf. the more extensive earthquake narratives based on Malalas found in John of Ephesos), as is Mammianos' building activity (cf. XV §11, Bo 385) while the details on Ignatios do not appear in Ba's text at all.<sup>10</sup> Of especial interest is Ev IV. 5 (cf. Malalas XVII §16, Bo 419 ff.), where Evagrius comments that this is the last event in the narrative of John the Rhetor. As has been discussed elsewhere in this volume (in chapter 1, pp. 17-19 and later in this chapter at p. 286), this is the strongest external evidence for the existence of a first edition of the chronicle. Brooks suggested that this version must have extended (despite Evagrius' wording) to the end of the reign of Justin I, covering all the present XVII, and perhaps went as far as the chronological excursus of XVIII §8, Bo 428 (though see chapter 1, pp. 11-12 and chapter 6, pp. 111-20 for discussions on the nature of that passage, revising the traditional view). Evagrius' testimony about the extent of the chronicle is thus ambivalent; it is also something of a puzzle that, writing some fifty years after the completion of this putative first edition and when the second edition was circulating in Constantinople, there is no sign that he had access to the latest version. One might think in terms of a copy left in Antioch on Malalas' departure for Constantinople in the 530s. Nevertheless it would seem that, especially after the end of the history of Eustathios of Epiphaneia in 502 but also for events before then, Evagrius found Malalas useful as a source on secular events in Antioch, whether imperial visitations (e.g. that of Eudokia, cf. Mal. XIII §8, Bo 321), building programmes or earthquakes; and he notes on one occasion that Malalas' account

<sup>8</sup>It should be noted that Evagrius is careful to distinguish between John the Rhetor (= Malalas) and John Scholastikos, subsequently patriarch of Constantinople, to whom he refers as John ἐκ τοῦ Σηρημίου.

<sup>9</sup>E.g. at Malalas XIV §§ 4 (Ev I. 20, 28. 23-30), 8 (Ev I. 20-21, 28. 30-29. 1,7-9), 10 (Ev I. 17, 26. 25-6), 13-4 (Ev I. 18, 27. 18-28. 3; II. 7, 54.6-10), 26 (Ev II. 7, 54. 10-30), 40 (Ev II. 16, 66. 14-18), XV §§5-7 (Ev III. 8, 108. 6-10; III. 10, 109. 8-12; III. 24, 122. 1-8), 9 (Ev III. 27, 124. 9-18), XVI §7 (Ev III. 39, 136. 32-33), 9 (Ev III. 37, 135. 27-136.7), 12 (Ev III. 42, 144.24-28), 16-9 (Ev III. 43-4, 145. 1-146. 30), XVII §§1 (Ev IV. 1, 153.5-11), 2 (Ev IV. 2, 153. 17-154. 5), 6 (Ev IV. 4, 154. 22-155. 17), 8 (Ev IV. 3, 154. 17-20), 11 (Ev IV. 4, 155. 21-22), 14 (Ev IV. 5, 155.23-6), 15 (Ev IV. 8, 159.10-23), 18 (Ev IV. 9, 159.24-29).

<sup>10</sup>These changes are only partly due to a change in language register; most are due to the presence of additional information.

was careful (Ev II. 12, 64.10; cf. XIV §36, Bo 369).

That the combination of the Antiochene and Constantinopolitan elements circulated together is confirmed by the **Tusculan Fragments** which are clearly from a manuscript of the chronicle itself, although in this case the name Malalas is not attached to the text. These fragments, so-called because found in the Basilian monastery of Grottaferrata in Tusculum near Rome, are the underlying text on palimpsest sheets and are in an uncial hand of the late sixth or early seventh centuries (Mai) or mid-seventh century (Cavallo/Maehler): see the facsimiles in Mai, 1839, after p. 28 and Cavallo/Maehler, 1987, plate 49a. They are now bound, out of order, as *Cryptoferratensis* Za XXXIV, ff. 62r-69v; Patzig, 1890/1, 9 has shown that they are the remnants of four gatherings. The manuscript is spaciously laid out, apparently with spaces either for illustrations or headings (on f. 67r; Mai, 1839, 11), but it is now hard to read, following Cardinal Mai's notorious attempts to bring up the faded ink with walnut juice. The text in these fragments shows once again that what survives in Ba has been abbreviated; the excisions may be large (as at XIII §46, Bo 348 = TF II where a long passage on John Chrysostom is preserved in the Tusculan Fragments but not Ba) or small (as at XVIII §106, Bo 484 = TF IV 23 where details on the date have dropped out). Since they must be close in date to the time of the chronicle's composition, the Tusculan Fragments, despite the frequent need for emendation, are a valuable witness to the original chronicle (cf. Patzig, 1890/1, 5-8) and are especially useful in XVIII §§105-112, Bo 484-5 (= TF IV) where they support the suggestion that much material in Theophanes at this point is derived from Malalas, though not always represented in Ba. The phrase 'our lord Justinian' at XVIII §105, Bo 484 (= TF IV 22) has given rise to the suggestion that this passage was written and copied during Justinian's life-time; while composition of this portion of the chronicle before 565 seems dubious but not impossible, it is less probable and certainly unprovable that the manuscript of the Tusculan Fragments itself dates from such a time, as Mai's arguments suggest (cf. chapter 11, pp. 330-2).<sup>11</sup>

The next writer to make use of Malalas' chronicle was **Johannes Antiochenus** or **John of Antioch**, yet another literary figure from Antioch liable to be confused with Malalas, in addition to the patriarch John Scholastikos in Constantinople and the patriarch John of Antioch (631-49). John of Antioch's history has with difficulty been distinguished from that of Malalas by both medieval and modern scholars (cf. Patzig, 1901 and Pigulevskaya, 1941, as discussed later in this chapter, at p. 302 and in chapter 11, at pp. 331-34). The problem arises because John of Antioch's history survives in fragments and in a tradition whose muddiness approaches that of Malalas. There is one manuscript which seems to give a fairly full text for Books I and II (Paris, Gr. 1630, ff. 236-9 = B in the subtext to the 1986 translation), excerpts in *De insidiis* and *De virtutibus* (the 'Constantinian fragments' in the literature on John of Antioch), another set of excerpts in Paris, Gr. 1763 (the 'Salmasian fragments') and entries in the *Souda* which can be associated with John of Antioch because of their subject-matter. While the Constantinian fragments can readily be accepted as an accurate representation of the contents of John of Antioch's history, the status of the Salmasian fragments is more

<sup>11</sup>TF is witness at XIII §21-2, 46, XIV §§8-10, 18-26, XVIII §§105-112.

dubious and has generated much heated discussion since the only witness now surviving is the copy made by C. Saumaise (1588-1653) and the text is only with difficulty reconcilable with that in either B or the Constantinian material; after the anguish of the earlier years of this century, the consensus seems to have developed that the Salmasian fragments can be accepted as a genuine paraphrase of John of Antioch's chronicle, of unknown date. It is now clear that John of Antioch is a discrete personality whose world history, written in the early seventh century, ran from Adam to 610 (Hunger, 1978, I, 326).

The confusion of this history with Malalas' chronicle was intensified by the fact that John of Antioch drew extensively on Malalas for the early sections of his work. This is clearly demonstrated by B whose title (fr. 2 in FHG IV, 540) paraphrases what can be deduced to have been the title of Malalas' chronicle; B can, in fact, for large sections of I and II be regarded almost as another manuscript of Malalas' text, and hence its separate nomenclature in the subtext to the translation.<sup>12</sup> John of Antioch would seem to have been a sober historian of the Roman empire. He turned to the early books of Malalas for narrative material on the legendary history of the early kingdoms, where biblical history was interwoven with secular, but after paraphrasing Malalas' lengthy entry on the Trojan War (in Book V) and taking Malalas' discussion of the hippodrome symbolism (from Book VII) he made little serious use of the chronicle thereafter.<sup>13</sup> This would seem to indicate that, while there were a number of historians available to excerpt and paraphrase on the Roman republican and imperial period (in particular Dio Cassius), Malalas' was, in the first part of the seventh century, the only narrative history easily to hand which dealt with the earliest period, having superseded works such as those of Africanus (written in the third century) or Panodoros (from the early fifth century) and providing a more substantial account than that in the Alexandrian world chronicle that lay behind the *Excerpta Barbari*.

At about the same time that John of Antioch was writing his history, the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* also turned to Malalas' chronicle for fairly extensive segments of narrative. The *Chronicon Paschale*, which originally went from Adam to the 20th year of Heraclius' reign (i.e. to 629), now survives only to 628; it was presumably put together during the 630s, probably by a cleric associated with the patriarch Sergius (610-638) (cf. Beaucamp *et al.*, 1979; Whitby, 1989). As set out in his preamble, the author's aim, like that of Africanus in the third century and Synkellos later, was to calculate an accurate basis for reckoning the date of Easter. To this end he combined a number of chronological constructs – years from Adam (*anno mundi*), Olympiads, consulships, imperial regnal years, indictions, etc. – on to which he grafted relevant narrative or exegetical passages. (Hunger, 1978, I, 328-9 gives a brief conspectus of some of his sources.) A secular historian of whom he made considerable use was

<sup>12</sup>Though regrettably this was not carried out consistently; B in the subtext to Book I = JA, ms B; JA in II-III §13 refers to B; JA in Book V and thereafter refers to the Constantinian fragments, except in Book VII when the reference is to the Salmasian fragments.

<sup>13</sup>John of Antioch is a witness throughout I, apart from §9 (as B), II §§1-9, 11-21, 27, 29, 35-40, 43, III §§2, 5, 7-10, IV §§1, 4, 6, 7-9, 11-13, 18-9, V §§2-7, 43, 61-2, VII §§4-5, VIII §§3, 21, 28, X §§13, 30.



Malalas, especially for the legendary first kingdoms (but not for the Trojan war); unlike John of Antioch, the *Chronicon Paschale* also borrows passages on imperial history.<sup>14</sup> Like most of the excerptors the *Chronicon Paschale* is only occasionally interested in the Antiochene sections. Since the author has his own chronological axe to grind he ignores Malalas' idiosyncratic series of dates From Adam. When the *Chronicon Paschale* has taken material over from Malalas there is little rewriting and thus these passages form an extremely useful check on the text preserved in Ba; the chief exceptions are dates by the Roman calendar (e.g. at XIV §4, Bo 355; cf. CP 578) which – since these are not normally part of Malalas' chronological system – are always likely to be insertions. As a general principle, the *Chronicon Paschale*'s scientific approach to the astronomical basis of his calculations makes Malalas seem a headstrong amateur.

That the *Chronicon Paschale*, a chronicle with an ecclesiastical purpose, and John of Antioch, a secular historian, should both turn to Malalas for narrative history of the early kingdoms suggests strongly that there was no other such text available. It also suggests that for neither was there a problem with the linguistic and literary level at which Malalas wrote.

The pattern of quotations from Malalas in the *Chronicon Paschale* provides some evidence that different editions continued to circulate. Where John of Ephesos and the Tusculan Fragments show that the second edition to 565 (at least) was available from the 580s, the *Chronicon Paschale* seems to have used an edition that went no further than 532 (we cannot tell how far the version of Malalas used by John of Antioch extended). No material in the *Chronicon Paschale* can be traced with certainty to Malalas after XVIII §78 and even that entry is doubtful (CP 629.10-20, cf. XVIII §78, is the full text of Justinian's edict on the creed: Malalas' regular practice with such edicts is to give the opening phrases only or a brief summary, cf. XVIII §42, Bo 449; §67, Bo 470). It is much more likely that the text of Malalas available to the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* ended after the Nika riot passage (XVIII §71, Bo 473-7) and may possibly have been physically defective (cf. p. 275 below). Of the subsequent passages in XVIII (§§142, 143, Bo 495) which apparently correspond to entries in the *Chronicon Paschale*, the first is a notice of the Oecumenical Council of 553, where the fifty-page entry in the *Chronicon Paschale* has little to do with the brief note in Malalas, and the second is an account of the rebuilding of Hagia Sophia where a comparison of the two texts suggests not direct borrowing but a common source in the putative Constantinopolitan city chronicle.

On a slightly different level John Moschos, who died probably in 619 after a peripatetic life in Egypt and Syria, included in his *Pratum Spirituale* a redaction of the curious tale of Anastasios' dream foretelling his death (XVI §§20, 22, Bo 408-9). Of textual interest since it sheds light on an unusual adjective in Malalas at that point, the

<sup>14</sup>The *Chronicon Paschale* is a witness at: I §§7-15, II §§1-10, 13-21, 43, 45, V §§70-72, VII §§1-7, 17, VIII §7, IX §§1-3, 5, 7-9, 20, 22, X §§14, 16, 21, 40-3, 45-8, 51-2, 54, XI §§2, 17-18, 29, XII §§12-15, 17-18, 20, 22, 25, 28, 30, 33, 35-6, 50, XIII §§7-8, 10, 18-20, 23-28, 31-2, 35-7, 46, XIV §§3-8, 10, 16, 22, 26-8, 31, 34, 37-43, 47, XV §§2-3, 5, 7-8, 10-11, 16, XVI §§1, 4, 10, 19, 20, 22, XVII §§1-4, 9-10, 18, 23, XVIII §§1, 3, 4, 12, 17, 20, 38, 71, 77, 78, 142, 143.

occurrence of this story in a collection of morally edifying tales indicates that Malalas was read for some unexpected purposes. It may, however, be relevant that this story, with the odd feature of the fourteen years to be erased from Anastasios' life, is possibly best explained as having some reference to the passing of the sixth millennium, by most calculations during the reign of Anastasios: this may account both for its inclusion by Malalas and its selection by John Moschos. In a not dissimilar fashion John of Damascus (c.650-c.750) cited the passage on the famous statue of Christ set up at Paneas by the woman with the issue of blood (X §§11, 12, Bo 236-7) in one of his homilies in defence of the use of icons.<sup>15</sup>

The next surviving historian to make use of Malalas' chronicle was John, bishop of Nikiu in Egypt, who in the 690s was a prominent ecclesiastical administrator in the Coptic church. His world chronicle from Adam to the last years of Constans II (641-68) exists only in a mutilated and much translated form; perhaps written originally in Greek though with some parts in Coptic (to judge, it seems, from distorted names), it was subsequently translated into Arabic and finally, in 1601, into Ethiopic, the only version to have come down to us. In the transmission process large sections, chiefly for the years 610-640, were lost. Prominent among the texts on which John of Nikiu drew was Malalas' chronicle; the pattern of borrowing is similar to that observed in John of Antioch and the *Chronicon Paschale*. John of Nikiu is interested in narratives on the early kingdoms, rationalized Hellenic mythological figures, and rulers from the imperial period; purely Antiochene matters, on buildings or civic rituals, are noticed only if there is a religious connection (e.g. XI §10, Bo 276; cf. JN 72. 3-11, Antiochene martyrs under Trajan). Though many passages can be clearly connected with their source in Malalas,<sup>16</sup> two factors prevent John of Nikiu being of decisive value as a witness to the original Malalas: 1. the text which results from the double translation paraphrases the original rather than producing verbatim versions (in contrast to the *Chronicon Paschale*'s regular practice); and 2. the text also adds in scriptural analogies (in the manner of John of Ephesos). It is nevertheless interesting to observe that, having used XV-XVII extensively if succinctly (picking out the best stories), the last point at which John of Nikiu can be seen to use Malalas' text is at XVIII §35 (Bo 445; cf. JN 93. 4-9), the Samaritan revolt of 529. This leaves the suspicion that the version of Malalas available to him, in the late seventh century, was also the first rather than the second edition, and lacked the Constantinopolitan segment.

At about the time when John of Nikiu was using Malalas' chronicle in Egypt another copy had travelled to a Western milieu where portions, from Book X and notices of imperial reign lengths, were translated into Latin in what is now known as the

<sup>15</sup>*De Imaginibus Oratio* III: PG 94, cols. 1369-73.

<sup>16</sup>JN is a witness at I §§1, 3-5, 7-10, II §§1, 5, 7-9, 14, 16-20, 36, 43, III §§2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, IV §§3, 4, 6, 8, 10-13, 17, 19, V §§42, 69, VI §§6, 7, 9-11, 19, 24, 25, VII §§1-3, 6, 7, 18, 19, VIII §§1, 4-7, 11, 13, 18, 19, 23, IX §§1, 3, 6, 9, 16, 17, 24, X §§10, 48, 52, 54, XI §§8, 10, 20, 23-7, XII §§30, 50, XIII §§2, 3, 5, 11, 18-20, 22, 25-28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 45, 49, 50, XIV §§3-6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 21, 22, 28, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, XV §§4-7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16, XVI §§4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 19, XVII §§1, 2, 4, 6, 9-12, 14-16, 18, 19, 23, XVIII §§4, 6, 13-16, 35,

***Laterculus Malalianus.*** Jane Stevenson, in a later section of this chapter (pp. 287-99), discusses cogent reasons for considering this to be a text of the late seventh, rather than eighth, century and for associating it with the circle of Theodore of Tarsos in Rome and Canterbury, rather than with the computational debates originated with Bede (as has been the received opinion since Mommsen's edition). In the context of the transmission of the text the use Theodore, or his associate, made of Malalas is interesting for several reasons. This is the first occasion, that we can observe, where Malalas' text has been excerpted extensively for topics other than narratives of legendary or imperial history.<sup>17</sup> And it is specifically Malalas' idiosyncratic calculations of the dates From Adam and hence for Christ's crucifixion and incarnation and the inception of the seventh millennium that have been taken up: this chronological framework is regularly ignored or emended by other copyists or excerptors (as has been done by Ba, making nonsense of the passage at X §2, Bo 228). The computistical manuscript context of the *Laterculus* is paralleled by that of the fragment on Christ's birth attributed to Hesychios (early 6th c.; this passage is discussed further in chapter 2, at p. 36). This fragment too is connected with X §2,<sup>18</sup> and it too survives – in several manuscripts – accompanied by extracts from a variety of scriptural and ecclesiastical works on the chronology of Christ's life on earth. In the study of Malalas the *Laterculus* has come to have an importance out of all proportion to its extent since the list of imperial reign lengths tacked on at the end not only enables the lacuna at XII §25 to be sketched in but may imply that the version of the chronicle used by the excerptor continued to 573/4 (as is discussed in chapter 1, p. 24). Whatever conclusions are to be drawn from this, it is relevant here to note that this list does indicate at the very least that the copy available to the excerptor was of the second edition and included the Constantinopolitan Book XVIII.

With the text called somewhat cryptically in the subtext to the 1986 translation *EcclHist*, and more accurately entitled *Selections from the Ecclesiastical History*, we enter even murkier textual areas. The *Ecclesiastical History* from which the selections were made is that of Theodore Anagnostes (or Lector), a cleric – a reader – attached to Hagia Sophia during the reign of Anastasios (491-518). As well as the *Historia Tripartita* (a condensation of the ecclesiastical histories of Sozomen, Sokrates and Theodoret) he wrote an *Ecclesiastical History* of his own, covering the years 439-527 (Hansen, 1971, i ff.). This, however, survives only in fragmentary form and has to be reconstructed from a variety of witnesses, including an epitome incorporated into a longer work extending to the early seventh century and itself only surviving in fragments. Theodore's text has been pieced together in Hansen's edition, a work of vast erudition but baffling layout. The *Selections from the Ecclesiastical History* (Paris, Gr. 1555A, ff. 7r-23v, a manuscript of the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries edited in Cramer, 1839, 87-114) with which we are concerned is one witness to the epitome that includes Theodore's *Ecclesiastical History*.

<sup>17</sup>LM is a witness at IX §25, X §§1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 14, 17, 22, 29, 41, 42-4, 47, 48, 53, XI §§1, 13, 21, 28, 32, XII §§1, 14, 15, 18, 23-36, 45, 49, XIII §§1, 17, 18, 26, 28, 34, 36, 37, 46, 48, XIV §§28, 35, 47, XV §1, XVI §1, XVII §1.

<sup>18</sup>It is not, however, entirely clear whether the passage attributed to Hesychios is Malalas' source or derived from it (cf. the passage on Phalek in Prokopios of Gaza's commentary on *Genesis*; see chapter 6, p. 113); Hody, 1691 at Bo lii (cf. chapter 2, p.36).

The text contained in the *Selections* falls into two sections. The first, and longer (Cramer, 1839, 87-111.31), with entries from several sources including Theodore, contains material starting from the birth of Christ to the reign of Phokas (602-610) with the last event being the deaths of the patriarchs Theodore of Alexandria and Anastasios of Antioch in 609. This section has nothing to do with Malalas, though a number of passages are reflected in Theophanes' chronicle and refer to events also recorded by Malalas; these passages, somewhat illogically because they tell us more about Theophanes than Malalas, have been noted in the subtext to the 1986 translation (at XVII §§18, 19, 22, 23, XVIII §§29, 35). The second and shorter section of the *Selections* (Cramer, 1839, 111.32-114.31), which starts with the persecution under Licinius but then leaps a century or so to the emperor Leo, is not differentiated in any way in Cramer's edition but is in fact from a totally different source. This is not Theodore Anagnostes but does have some verbal connection with Malalas' chronicle as well as – again – with Theophanes. This text is cited in the subtext to the 1986 translation at XVIII §§71, 83, 86, 104, 109, 113, 115, 118, 124, 125, 128, 143, 152. It is not in itself a particularly significant witness to the wording or overall content of the entries in Malalas, especially since the extracts cease at 563 and thus cannot be used as evidence for the original length of Malalas. It is, however, a good example of the interweaving of chronicle material that went on in the middle Byzantine period since some of these passages are also reflected in the Great Chronographer (e.g. GrChr 7, 8, 11; see below). It would be rash to speculate on who borrowed from whom; all – Malalas, the addendum to the epitome of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Theodore, the Great Chronographer and Theophanes – may well have had independent access to a common source, perhaps the city chronicle of Constantinople that is discussed in chapter 1, at p. 22, and chapter 7, at p. 213.

The Great Chronographer (or Μέγας Χρονογράφος) is a shadowy figure, remnants of whose history<sup>19</sup> lurk in the interstices of the unique tenth-century manuscript of the *Chronicon Paschale*, Vat. Gr. 1941, on ff. 242v-244v, 272v and 282v. The first set of passages from the Great Chronographer, fourteen in all, is inserted on a page left blank in the course of the *Chronicon Paschale*'s account of the Nika riot, which was taken from a defective exemplar, while the last passage on Maurice is added in the margin to the section on his deposition. We are concerned here with the first set of extracts; these deal with natural disasters – usually earthquakes – and riots and run from the reign of Zeno to that of Leo IV. If we accept Whitby's argument that Theophanes (at Th 278.30-279.1) can be shown to be using the passage on Maurice from the Great Chronographer (and his discussion of Theophanes' interweaving of elements from Theophylakt and the Great Chronographer is convincing), then the conventional dating of the Great Chronographer can stand. This is put in the late eighth century, that is, before Theophanes wrote his chronicle in 812/5 and after the last event in the surviving fragments, the earthquake of 451 (fr. 14). That said, there are some striking resemblances between passages on the sixth century found in the Great Chronographer and other writers on the period, notably Malalas, Theophanes and the last section of the *Selections* from

<sup>19</sup>The most recent edition is that of Whitby, 1982/3, which seems unaware of that of Schreiner, 1975.

the *Ecclesiastical History*, as has just been mentioned. Some of the resemblances simply derive from the fact that the same episode is reported, while in other cases the verbal echoes are striking. The pattern is probably best set out as a list:

*GrChron*, cf. *Mal*, *EccHist*, *Th*: *GrChron* 1 = *Mal* XV §11, *EccHist* 112. 11-18, *Th* 125. 29-126. 5; *GrChron* 8 = *Mal* XVIII §118, *EccHist* 113. 25-30, *Th* 222.25-30; *GrChron* 11 = *Mal* XVIII §128, *EccHist* 114.14-22, *Th* 232.27-233.3.

*GrChron*, cf. *Mal*, *Th*: *GrChron* 4 = *Mal* XVII §16, *Th* 172.11-19; *GrChron* 6 = *Mal* XVIII §19, *Th* 216. 17-22; *GrChron* 9 = *Mal* XVIII §93, *Th* 224. 11-13.

*GrChron*, cf. *EccHist*, *Th*: *GrChron* 7 = *EccHist* 112.19-27, *Th* 181. 26-31.

The verbal similarities between the Great Chronographer and the entries in Malalas are, however, only sufficiently close to allow the Great Chronographer to be considered a possible witness to the original wording of Malalas, and thus to appear in the subtext to the 1986 translation, at Malalas XVIII §§93, 118, 128 (that is, *GrChron* 8, 9, 11). While it is tempting to suggest that a fuller version of Malalas Book XVIII was the source for the sixth-century material common to these writers, the evidence is simply insufficient to be conclusive. The only defensible position on this issue would seem to be that these passages point to the existence of a common source, a chronicle covering the sixth century – possibly Malalas, but perhaps that hypothetical Constantinopolitan city chronicle that is making so frequent an appearance in this section.

Theophanes the Confessor (*circa* 760-818) made extensive use of Malalas from XIII onwards in his *Chronographia*,<sup>20</sup> a chronicle covering the years 284-813 and written in 810-814 from materials passed on to him by his friend George Synkellos. Important though Theophanes' evidence is, it has to be used with care. Unlike some other excerptors Theophanes cannot be trusted to have preserved the exact wording of the text in front of him. The *Chronicon Paschale*, for example, copied passages literally, redundant pronouns and all, and can often be used with confidence to suggest emendations to Ba. Theophanes, on the other hand, perhaps because Malalas' vocabulary and style were not to his taste, paraphrases rather than copies: the sense is retained but only some of the original wording. A quick glance at XIV §16, Bo 361, shows the difference between the way in which the *Chronicon Paschale* (at 588. 6-589. 5) and Theophanes (at 96. 31-97. 15) treat the same passage; from the point of view of a textual critic, the *Chronicon Paschale* is by far the more useful witness. In addition to rewriting, Theophanes is also inclined to redate the extracts from Malalas. Thus, for example, XVIII §15, Bo 433, is redated to 542/3 from 528, §21, Bo 437, to 538/9 from 528, §30, Bo 444, to 523/4 from 528, §46, Bo 450, to 539/40 and §51, Bo 453, to 534/5 from 529; the most striking instance is XVIII §56, Bo 457-60, which is moved to 571/2 from 530, but there may be other reasons for this, as is indicated in the next paragraph and in the appendix to this section (pp. 268-76). Theophanes' textual testimony is not always pellucid: his account of the Nika riot includes, for example, two irreconcilable initial passages before

<sup>20</sup>Th is cited as a witness at: XIII §§47, 49, XIV §§8, 15, 16, 38, 42, XV §§5, 7, 9, 11-14, 16, XVI §§1, 3-5, 10, 13, 15-17, 20, 22, XVII §§2-10, 12, 14-18, 20-3, XVIII §§1-4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13-21, 25, 27, 29, 30, 32, 34-6, 42, 43, 46, 50-4, 56, 71, 75, 83, 85-8, 90, 92-100, 102-116, 118-25, 127-9, [130-2], 134, 138-41, 143, [146-9, 152]. Cf. Rochow, 1983.

embarking on a narrative taken from Malalas,<sup>21</sup> and one of the most important manuscripts of his chronicle (Paris, Gr. 1710, of the tenth century) preserves significant variations on XVIII §51, Bo 453 (= Th 224. 15-27) which are no longer in the main tradition. Nevertheless Theophanes' chronicle cannot be ignored even for detailed textual purposes, as is clearly shown by the Tusculan Fragments, which at XVIII §§105-112, Bo 484-5, confirm that many of the additional phrases in Theophanes must be attributed to the original Malalas.

Theophanes provides invaluable evidence for the content of the lost folios at the end of XVIII. Ba breaks off at XVIII §129, Bo 490, and most of what follows in Theophanes to the point where Malalas resumes again (that is, Th 233. 11-237. 1) can with reasonable certainty be assumed to derive from Malalas since at that point Malalas has for several pages (since Th 222. 25 at least) been Theophanes' main source (and prior to that has been interwoven with clearly identifiable extracts from Prokopios). The 1986 translation printed these sections, italicized, from Theophanes to fill the lacuna, though well aware that this was only an approximation of the original version. Ba breaks off again in the course of XVIII §145, Bo 496, and again Theophanes contains entries which must have come from the last sections of the chronicle, though here it is more difficult to determine which. That Theophanes was not copying everything in Malalas is shown by two passages from *De insidiis* (included as XVIII §§150, 151 in the translation) which must have come from Malalas after the point at which Ba now ends but which are not represented in Theophanes. This bears on the vexed question of the ending of Malalas, whether the chronicle extended to 565 or 573/4, as has been discussed in chapter 1, p. 24. Decisions are complicated by the fact that there is no break in style or content in Theophanes in the area between the last extract assignable to Malalas (XVIII §145 = Th 239.4-6) and the death of Justinian (Th 241.3-4, where Theophanes' use of the same figures as in XVIII §1 for the length of Justinian's reign is the strongest proof we have that the chronicle did continue to 565) and the first years of Justin. Entries in Theophanes are progressively drawn from an Alexandrian source (at, e.g., Th 241. 6-15, 241. 26-242. 7, 242. 13-19) and Theophylakt Simokatta (Th 244. 12-13, 245. 13-26, 246. 28-9, 247. 3-17, 248. 14-249. 11, 250. 13-23, etc) but typical 'chronicle' entries, e.g. on buildings (Th 243. 10-14), embassies (Th 240. 13-15), disasters (240. 18-22), notable deaths (240. 24-6), imperial portraits (241. 28-9), etc, continue. The situation is not made any clearer by the material noted earlier that is common to Malalas, the last section of the *Selections from the Ecclesiastical History*, the Great Chronographer and Theophanes and which leads to the supposition that all this could be drawn from a common source which would have been available to Theophanes as well as the earlier writers. In that case it would be impossible to separate out from Theophanes alone what might have been derived from Malalas, in order to reconstruct the last sections of the chronicle.<sup>22</sup> What is more, the situation is further bedevilled by the possibility

<sup>21</sup>Cameron (A.D.E.), 1976; Maas, 1912; see also pp. 271-3 below.

<sup>22</sup>Nevertheless the 1986 translation, which elsewhere (e.g. V §51, Bo 122) included passages similarly hard to authenticate as genuine Malalas but equally as interesting as evidence of the development of the tradition, should logically have included much of Th 241. 5-244. 12, 246. 11-247. 3 in the subtext.

(discussed in the next section) that Theophanes' copy of Malalas was imperfect, since Theophanes shows no knowledge of Malalas between XVIII §56 and §71, Bo 456-473, while XVIII §56 is misplaced in Theophanes' text to the reign of Justin II.

Like the majority of the excerptors of Malalas, Theophanes is not interested in the chronicle's idiosyncratic chronological underpinning, which is utterly at variance with his own. However, while ignoring the excursus of XVIII §8, Bo 428, Theophanes has nevertheless retained from Malalas enough of the excursus that once stood at XV §16, Bo 391, and which dealt with the passing of the sixth millennium by the symbolic Eusebian calculation, to enable its reconstruction with crucial assistance from one figure preserved by Michael the Syrian (see chapter 6, pp. 117-18 and this chapter at p. 301).

It is perhaps worth noting at this point that Synkellos, who compiled the chronicle to which Theophanes provided the continuation and who probably had a considerable input into the chronicle that goes under Theophanes' name (Mango, 1978), makes very little use of Malalas. He plainly knew Malalas' work for his account of the dividing of the nations, from the *Liber Generationis* (of Hippolytos, writing c. 222-235; Mommsen 1892, 85), reflects Malalas' version as well as the more usual one (cf. Bauer, 1905, 216).<sup>23</sup> He makes no reference, however, to Malalas in his discussions of alternative world chronologies, which is not surprising since Synkellos is precise and detailed where Malalas is broad-stroked and polemical, and only the scantiest of hints in one or two ruler lists suggest that Malalas – as opposed to the Alexandrian world chronicle that is reflected in the *Excerpta Barbari* – may lie behind them. Taking the Synkellos/Theophanes chronicle as a whole, it is worth noting a complete reversal of what had looked like a regular pattern; Malalas has been ignored as a source on legendary history but utilized extensively for the imperial period.

We come now to an anonymous world chronicle, compiled not too long after Theophanes had written his. This is the 'Εκλογὴ τῶν Χρονικῶν (*Extracts from Chronicles*), referred to as A in the 1986 translation. This survives in a Paris manuscript of the eleventh century (Paris, Gr. 1336, ff. 143-161), and cannot be far distant in time from Ba. Its title announces that the chronicles from which the extracts have been made are John (i.e. Malalas) for the period from Adam to Julius Caesar, Synkellos from Caesar to Diocletian and Theophanes from Diocletian to Leo V (the Armenian) and that it concludes with the reign of Michael (Michael I Rangabe, 811-813). The manuscript, however, is incomplete and breaks off, with a torn and half empty sheet, in the reign of Trajan. The greater part of the section derived from Malalas has been edited by Cramer (1839, 231-242), who recognized that A gave a more authentic text of the first book of Malalas (missing in Ba) than did the version of George Monachos included by Dindorf in his 1831 edition. A does indeed offer a very useful witness for the original Malalas<sup>24</sup> but regrettably does not cover a very extensive area of the chronicle, while there are also lacunas in what it does cover. In addition, Cramer did not publish all the sections that can be traced to Malalas, though what he omitted is admittedly condensed and scrappy. The lacuna in the published portion occurs at Cramer, 1839, 239. 24, between ff. 149v

<sup>23</sup>Synk is cited at: I §6.

<sup>24</sup>A is cited at I (throughout), II §§1, 3-5, 7-9, 23, 44, 45, III §§1-5, 7, 13, IV §§8-10.

and 150r; II §§10-43, Bo 33-54, is missing (II §23 having been taken out of order), assuming that at this point the excerptor is continuing to take over Malalas' text virtually complete. The unpublished portions, which were read for the 1986 translation but not cited in it, cover IV §12 (the Argonauts at Kyzikos), §20 (Demokritos), VII §15 (Plato on the divine), §§17-19 and VIII §1, 3 (Alexander's ancestry); these occur on ff. 152v-154r. The next sections in A are not from Malalas but extracts from that chronicle begin again on f. 155r with portions on Alexander from VIII §4 and §5 and conclude at the top of 156r with VII §13 (on the names of the months); from this point on the chronicle, having arrived abruptly at Julius Caesar, is taken from Synkellos. A seems, as usual, not to have been attracted by Malalas' chronological structures but to have focussed on his treatment of legendary history and the pagan oracles foreshadowing Christ. It is interesting that, while A has selected the month names as an element of continuity (almost his bridging point) into the imperial period, he has not used the section on the Trojan war and Aeneas' settlement in Italy but has emphasised the role of the Hellenic Alexander.

Another anonymous world chronicle also provides excellent testimony for the wording of the original Malalas and interesting sidelights on why the chronicle might continue to be consulted. This is the *Ἐκλογὴ Ἱστοριῶν*, cited as C in the 1986 translation and contained in Paris, Gr. 854, ff. 71-99 (published by Cramer, 1839, 166-230). It was written, according to the concluding section of its preamble (Cramer, 1839, 168. 25) in 886<sup>25</sup> and, according to the title, was intended to conclude with the reign of Anastasios, though it now breaks off in the reign of Ozias (Uzziah). Of general interest as it derives most of its early sections from the (now lost) chronicle of Eusebios, its relevance to Malalas lies in its extensive Trojan section, which is a very close transcription of much of Book V,<sup>26</sup> though with a number of additional passages (especially at Cramer, 1839, 213. 16-216.5, cf. V §51). The Trojan material in Malalas is derived from the 'novel' of Diktys of Crete (date unknown, perhaps 2nd-4th cc.) which survives in full only in the Latin version purporting to be that of a certain Septimius. The Latin differs markedly from the Greek as presented in Malalas and the last years of the nineteenth century saw discussion on Diktys as part of the heated debate on the 'Johannesfrage' (see chapter 10, p. 336). Had Diktys ever existed as an independent Greek text? This was solved by the publication of two papyrus fragments in Greek with clear connections to episodes in Septimius (Eisenhut, 1969 and 1973). Nevertheless the text ascribed to Diktys by Malalas differs markedly from that of Septimius: the order of episodes is different, it is told from the viewpoint of Teukros and not Idomoneus and there are passages – like the portrait lists discussed in chapter 8, pp. 231-44 – that are not in the Latin version. It should also be remembered that, as well as Diktys, the Trojan sections of the chronicle are also ascribed to Sisypchos of Kos and added in are

<sup>25</sup>The date has to be emended from 886 to 889; see Cramer, 1839, 165 and Gelzer, 1885, II, 298-315, at 299. Roger Scott (see chapter 2, p. 44) has pointed out that it is somewhat unusual that a ninth-century compilation, that proclaims its debt to Eusebios, should aim to conclude not in the compiler's lifetime but in the early sixth century: does C then conceal a hitherto unnoticed sixth-century chronicle, perhaps that of Eustathios of Epiphaneia?

<sup>26</sup>C is cited at: IV §§1, 12, 13, V §§1-12, 41-69, VII §§4-5, XIII §7.



rationalizing interpretations attributed to Pheidaios of Corinth (both unattested elsewhere). The simplest explanation would thus be that what is found in Malalas is a reworking of Diktys by Sisypheos. However, the presence of the extra passages in C, as well as similar and additional scraps in the Souda and Kedrenos which also must derive from the same Trojan material, add further questions. Was all this originally in Malalas? Or did Diktys' novel, either in its original form or reworked by Sisypheos or another, continue to have an independent existence, and was this available in the ninth century to C, in the tenth to the Souda and in the eleventh to Kedrenos?<sup>27</sup> It should be noted that C knows more of Malalas than merely the Trojan section (which argues against C having consulted an independent Diktys): Malalas has been plundered for the Argonauts' oracle at Kyzikos and hippodrome symbolism. C has a clear idea of world history, derived from Eusebios, in which the legendary kingdoms had a part (Cramer, 1839, 175. 4-176. 14) though biblical history was the dominant element. Malalas' chronicle was not used to supplement the sparse outlines on, say, Ninus or Zoroaster, derived from Eusebios, but when it came to the Trojan war – a pivotal element in Eusebios' chronological reckoning – then a lengthy supplement was inserted, from Malalas. Had C survived in full, it would have been very interesting to see how much legendary material on the early years of Rome (to which logically the Trojan war was leading) the author had chosen to take over.

Also from the ninth century comes another world chronicle, but one which had a wider circulation since it survives in numerous manuscripts: the chronicle of **George Monachos**. Written from a fiercely iconodule standpoint (cf. Prologue, 3. 16 ff.), it was intended to extend to 867, though it only ever reached to 842. George Monachos' orthodox views have moulded his conception of the past: the high-points, for him, of Hellenic mythology and legendary history are touched on (in paragraphs on, for example, Kronos, Ninus or Perseus) but his real interests are theological, as can be seen in the comments he appends to his section on Seruch, the first maker of idols; here a few lines, taken from Malalas, on the deification of heroes, are followed by a diatribe, from St Athanasios, on the misguided nature of Hellenic thought. When George Monachos wishes to touch on legendary history, the authority to whom he turns is Malalas, though his compressed and partisan treatment of such topics means that the borrowings are not of decisive use for the establishment of the text of the original Malalas. George Monachos, however, knew the whole chronicle and material which reflects it appears until well into Malalas' Book XVIII; but since for the later period he is also drawing on Theophanes, for whom Malalas is a major source, the independent status of some of the apparent reflections of Malalas is in doubt.<sup>28</sup> The purely Antiochene passages and Malalas' From

<sup>27</sup>There is a substantial bibliography on this issue, e.g. Patzig, 1892; Griffin, 1907; see Noack, 1892 for a moderately clear statement and a final diagram of textual relationships that might not be too far from reality.

<sup>28</sup>GM is cited at: I §§1, 5, 7, 8, II §§4-9, 16-20, 43-5, III §§1, 2, 5, IV §19, VI §§5-11, 13, 14, 18, 24, VII §§1-4, 7, 10-12, 17, 19, VIII §§1, 3, IX §§1, 3, 13, 16, X §§3, 10, 32-5, 37, 51, XI §§17, 32, 33, XII §§14, 17, 25, XIII §§7, 17, 43, 47, XIV §§4-6, 8, 23, 27, XV §5, XVI §§5, 16, 19, 22, XVII §§7, 16, XVIII §§18, 19, 27, 51, 52, 85, 90, 92, 96, 103, 112, 118, 122, 124, 127.

Adam dates are, of course, of no interest to George Monachos, who for the later books has tended to take material on imperial accessions and natural disasters.

When Constantine Porphyrogenetos (905-959) came to have texts excerpted for the historical encyclopaedia that he instigated, Malalas was amongst the authors selected. This contrasts with Photios a century earlier, for the *Bibliotheca* does not mention Malalas – despite the many historians, both secular and ecclesiastical, that were included in the some 278 notices of authors read.<sup>29</sup> The purpose of Constantine Porphyrogenetos' huge enterprise is explained in the preamble that seems to have been attached to each section: useful passages were to be culled out under fifty-three headings from books he had had especially brought together since the multitude and complexity of works then available made easy assimilation impossible. Of the one complete and three incomplete sets of excerpts that have survived Malalas appears in two – the *De insidiis* and the *De virtutibus et vitiis*.<sup>30</sup> Since, following the regular pattern of the Constantinian *Excerpta*, the passages have been copied out virtually unchanged linguistically and with no abridgement, they thus provide an excellent control over the wording of Ba. In addition, *De insid* 14-23 and *De virt* 7 contain passages that occurred in the lacuna now at XII §25, Bo 295, and thus help to fill it. *De insid* 50 and 51, while demonstrating that the chronicle certainly continued beyond 563 and the point where Ba now breaks off, complicate the issue since the extracts correspond with nothing in Theophanes, whose chronicle in that area is using Malalas extensively, and they cannot be securely placed. The extracts terminate in both sections with the phrase 'The end of the history of John Malelas'; while the phrase 'The end' is conventional and is used of all authors and tells us nothing about the true length of the chronicle being excerpted (contra chapter 1, p. 24), the spelling 'Malelas' rather than 'Malalas' is worth noting (cf. the discussion on the form of Malalas' name in chapter 1 at p. 3 and later in this chapter at p. 306). In the tenth century, the – presumably authoritative – copy of Malalas' chronicle used for the imperial team of excerptors was of the second edition, that is, it included the Constantinopolitan eighteenth book, though we cannot tell whether it ended in 565 or 573/4; this is of interest since not so very long afterwards, the Slavonic translation seems to have been made from a shorter version (as is discussed later in this chapter, at pp. 284-85).

Also from the tenth century, the encyclopaedia known as the *Souda* (or *Suidas*) includes a number of articles which reflect Malalas' text,<sup>31</sup> with a preponderance of

<sup>29</sup>It might be suggested that Photios was not concerned with chronicles and world histories and hence would have no interest in a work such as that of Malalas; he does however include a notice on Julius Africanus (cod. 34) and Hesychios (cod. 69), but admittedly cites only Eusebios' *Ecclesiastical History* (cod. 27) and not his chronicle.

<sup>30</sup>The *Excerpta* appear as follows: *De insid* V §60-67, IX §§7-11, X §§13, 14, 21, 40, 52, XI §§33, XII §§14, 17, 21, 23, 25, 30, 33, 47, XIII §§36, 38, XIV §§14, 40, 41, 45, XV §§8, 9, 12-15, XVI §§2-4, 6, 15, 16, 19, XVII §§2, 5, 8, XVIII §§35, 43, 71, 89, 119, 141, 150, 151; *De virt* I §4, II §§29-34, IV §§18, 21, 23, 24, X §§49, 54, XII §§25, 50, XIII §§28, 31, 32, 34, XIV §§8, 19, 32, XVI §5.

<sup>31</sup>Su is cited at: I §§12-15, II §§1-5, 7, 9, 10, 13-21, 30, 32, 35-41, 43-45, III §§1, 2, 10, IV §§4-11, 14, 15, 18, 23, V §§2, 43, 46, 51, 52, VI §§7, 8, 11, 22, VII §§1, 7, 19, VIII §§23, X §§5, 28, 30, 33, 49, 53, XII §§20, 21, XIII §§28, 31, XIV §§15, 16, 19, 38.

entries on Hellenic mythology. These passages, however, almost certainly derive from the Constantinian *Excerpta* (de Boor, 1912; *idem*, 1914/19) and the compiler of the Souda seems generally to have worked from previous lexica and anthologies wherever possible. The items derived from Malalas are thus of interest in that they indicate what might seem to have been considered Malalas' special contribution to the background information needed in tenth-century Byzantium, but they are not of decisive importance for the reconstruction of the text, especially as many are very brief.

With the tenth-century chronicle of Pseudo-Symeon passages taken from Malalas become involved in the complex network of middle Byzantine chroniclers whose patterns of borrowing and adaptation have yet to be definitively established. Amongst the texts yet to be fully edited is the chronicle originally ascribed to Symeon the Magister and now known as Pseudo-Symeon. It is found in the noted Paris manuscript (Paris, Gr. 1712, ff. 18-272) that also contains the unique surviving copies of the chronicles of Leo the Deacon and Psellos. Only the last portion of Pseudo-Symeon's work, covering the years 813-963, has been published; the chronicle as a whole was presumably compiled in the last quarter of the tenth century. The chronicle falls into fairly distinguishable segments: from creation to Julius Caesar, from Caesar to Diocletian, from Diocletian to Leo V, and from Leo V to Romanos II. It is only the final portion that has any value as an independent history, the previous sections being compiled from earlier writers. For the period from the creation to Julius Caesar (ff. 18-74), the sources seem to be John of Antioch, Synkellos, a version of the Epitome<sup>32</sup> and Malalas; the details have yet to be fully analysed and the best discussion remains that of Markopoulos (1978, 52-98). For the section from Caesar to Diocletian (ff. 74-82) the main source is the Epitome, while from Diocletian to Leo V (ff. 82-235) Pseudo-Symeon is virtually another manuscript of Theophanes (cf. Praechter, 1896). Perhaps it should be noted here that for the section on the early empire (Caesar to Diocletian), Pseudo-Symeon is closely connected with the chronicle contained in Vat. Gr. 163 (Praechter, 1896); this is cited once in the 1986 subtext, though for a difficult point in XVIII §47, Bo 451, from a later section which has affinities with Malalas that have yet to be fully explored. Pseudo-Symeon is, however, relevant to the history of Malalas' text and its transmission only for the segment up to Julius Caesar; it has therefore been included in the 1986 translation only for books I-X.<sup>33</sup> Once again it is plain that it is Malalas' treatment of Hellenic mythology and the legendary rulers of the ancient world that has attracted Pseudo-Symeon, though he is also interested in what Malalas has to say about the early history of Rome; equally, however,

<sup>32</sup>The so-called 'Epitome' is an anonymous chronicle considered to be based on the now lost work (which went to 713 but was later continued to 842) of Traianos Patrikios, who lived under Justinian II; various redactions (the 'Epitome A' and 'Epitome B') were the basis first for the chronicle of Symeon the Logothete and then for later versions of that chronicle which went under the names of Theodosius Melitenos, Leo Grammatikos, etc (Moravcsik, 1958, 516; Hunger, 1978, I, 354-7).

<sup>33</sup>PsS is cited at: I (throughout), II §§1, 3-9, 13-26, 28, 29, 31-42, III §§2, 9, 10, 13, 14, IV §§1, 2, 4, 6-13, 15, 17-25, V §§1-12, 41, 43-6, 48, 50-2, 54-8, 62-5, 67, VI §§24, 25, 29, VII §§1-5, 7, 10-12, 17-19, VIII §§1, 3, IX §§3, 4, 9, X §5. Note that Pseudo-Symeon is, to f. 81v, a main source for Kedrenos; references in the subtext to PsS thus tend to coincide with those to Ke.

he has used John of Antioch on these matters, also largely derived from Malalas. Interspersed throughout these 'mythological' passages is much biblical history and this seems to be where Pseudo-Symeon's main interests lie; as with Theophanes, his versions of Malalas can rarely be used as a decisive witness to the wording of any passage.

With the work ascribed in some manuscripts to **Leo Grammatikos** we move into the eleventh century and further into the tangled web of the Logothete chronicles. The world chronicle ascribed to Symeon the Magister and Logothete (a contemporary of Constantine Porphyrogennetos and at first assumed to be responsible for the chronicle of Pseudo-Symeon) went to the year 948 and was compiled largely from a reworking of the *Epitome*. It has survived in a number of redactions and continuations and under many names, one of which is **Leo Grammatikos**. This version was completed in 1013. The passages that are connected with Malalas<sup>34</sup> have become rather remote reflections of that chronicle and are of little value in reconstructing any original wording. They come from throughout the chronicle and fall into the 'normal' categories of Hellenic mythology, imperial acts and natural disasters (with a fair sprinkling of 'good stories' – like the imposter with the silver statues from XVI §5, Bo 395, and the showman's clever dog from XVIII §51, Bo 453).

**Kedrenos** brings us back to a somewhat surer, though still at times dubious, connection with Malalas' text. Some time in the late eleventh or early twelfth century George Kedrenos wrote a world chronicle to the year 1057. The latter portion (for 811-1057) is an almost word-for-word transcription of the chronicle of Skylitzes, while the earlier portions are based nearly as closely on Pseudo-Symeon. A comparison between the two shows that though Kedrenos adds in a certain amount (especially, though not solely, on biblical topics) and rearranges the sequence of material slightly, very little that is in Pseudo-Symeon is omitted. The same pattern of interests then, shown by Pseudo-Symeon's borrowings from Malalas, is also present in Kedrenos.<sup>35</sup> Interesting sidelights on the phraseology of passages derived from Malalas are thus nearly always to be attributed to Pseudo-Symeon and the material available to him (as, for example, in the additional Trojan sections at V §51, Bo 122). This is, of course, not to deny any independent action by Kedrenos but the absence of a critical edition of either chronicle does not make the clarification of an already complex situation any easier. Kedrenos, for the latter part of his chronicle, is making extensive use – via Pseudo-Symeon – of Theophanes and thus of Malalas but since he would seem also to have had independent access to Theophanes, though not Malalas, there are occasional useful insights (Praechter, 1897) despite the fact that many of the borrowings have been paraphrased.

As we follow the fate of Malalas' chronicle we come now to two literary figures in

<sup>34</sup>LG is cited at: I §§1, 6, 8, 9, 12-14, II §§22, 23, III §2, IV §§1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 25, IX §1, X §5, XI §17, XIII §46, 47, XIV §§8, 16, 23, 27, 38, XV §16, XVI §§5, 16, 19, 20, XVII §§1-3, 7, 8, 15, 16, XVIII §51, 130.

<sup>35</sup>Ke is cited at: I (throughout), II §§1, 3-11, 13-26, 28, 29, 31-45, III §§2, 7, 9-14, IV §§1, 2, 4, 6-13, 15, 17-25, V §§1-12, 22, 41, 43-6, 48, 50-2, 54-8, 62-7, VI §§5-16, 18-25, 29, VII §§1-5, 7, 10-12, 17-19, VIII §§1, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11, 23, IX §§1, 3, 4, 9, X §§1, 5, 26, 32-5, 51, XI §17, XII §§25, 30, XIV §§4, 8, XV §§11, 16, XVI §§10, 19, 20, XVII §§1-3, 6, 9, 12, 14-16, XVIII §§1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 27, 35, 38, 42, 46, 51, 90, 95, 96, 102-110, 112, 116, 129, [130-132], 138-140, [148, 149, 152].

the twelfth century who are not historians but who demonstrate that, though by now the verbal influence of Malalas on the chronicle tradition has lessened, copies of the full chronicle were still available: it is, after all, to the late eleventh or early twelfth century that Ba, the most complete surviving copy, is to be dated.

Isaac Porphyrogennetos is probably to be identified with Isaac (1093-c.1151), the third son of Alexios I Komnenos, founder of the Kosmosotira monastery, author of several short works and sponsor of some of the more spectacularly illuminated manuscripts to survive from the Komnenian renaissance (Barzos, 1984, I, 238-54; Hunger, 1978, II, 58; Anderson, 1982). As mentioned earlier, he wrote two short pamphlets on Homeric topics, one on 'What Homer left out' and the other giving verbal portraits of the Greek and Trojan heroes at Troy. Isaac explains that he found it most unsatisfactory that the *Iliad* should describe at great length a brief sequence of events outside Troy without telling the eager reader how the heroes got there, or what happened to them afterwards; so, having spent some time in research, he proposed to fill the gap and set out his results in simple prose (verse was too demanding). The first section is based mainly on Apollodoros' *Bibliotheca* and the Euripidean tragedies and has no textual connection with Malalas. The second, however, has.<sup>36</sup> The portraits are attributed to Diktys, thus demonstrating that they are derived from Malalas' version and not an independently circulating copy of the novel since the genuine Diktys, on the evidence of the Latin Septimius, did not contain these passages (Griffin, 1907; Noack, 1892; cf. chapter 8, p. 242). Isaac's testimony is invaluable since it supports enough of the readings in the Slavonic translation to enable the lacuna in Ba (at V §§12-21, Bo 103) to be filled with some conviction. Isaac's self-imposed task, together with his assumption of familiarity with the Homeric epics, tells us something about the important position that Homer continued to hold in Byzantine literary circles.

Similar remarks can be made, rather more emphatically, about John Tzetzes, who devoted a significant element of his voluminous outpourings to Homeric themes. Tzetzes (*circa* 1110-1180) was one of the first *literati* to support himself almost entirely by his writing and his teaching. From his letters and the *obiter dicta* in his other works much is known of his life and personality (PW 7A, cols. 1959-1211). He was a cantankerous and difficult man who considered he was surrounded by enemies and identified himself with the ill-used Palamedes (e.g. *Iliad Allegories*, Prologue, 927; *Chiliades*, III, 176 ff.). His authorial interventions as a self-conscious writer rather lessen the usefulness of some of the quotations from his sources. Some of his activities are relevant to the history of the transmission of Malalas' chronicle since he – like Isaac Porphyrogennetos – was well aware of it; while he shows special knowledge of the Trojan section in Book V, he did presumably know the whole chronicle although the traceable borrowings come from the early books dealing with Hellenic mythology. In several places (e.g. *Iliad Allegories*, Prologue 275; *Chiliades*, II, 314) Tzetzes refers to Ἰωάννης Ἀντιοχεύς. Patzig (1901) has demonstrated that this refers to Malalas and not to John of Antioch, a distinction that needs to be made carefully since the Trojan sections of John of Antioch, in so far as they are extant, were developed from those of Malalas. Elsewhere Tzetzes also calls this

<sup>36</sup>IP is cited at V §§13-40.

source John of Antioch τοῦ ἐπὶ κλήσιν Μαλέλης (*Iliad Allegories* 245; *Chiliades*, V, 833). Tzetzes shows close knowledge of the Diktys-derived material from Malalas in his hexameter poems on Homeric themes (the *Antehomerica*, *Homerica* and *Posthomerica*), in the Proemium to the *Allegories on the Iliad*, in the *Exegesis ad Iliadem* and in several places in his *Chiliades* (a farrago of ill-considered trifles, essentially a verse commentary on his letters), and his scholia to Lykophron's abstruse poem *Alexandra*. All these references tend to be brief. From the point of view of Malalas' text, the details derived from the portrait list are of most value (as was the case with Isaac Porphyrogenetos) though this time their transference into hexameters (in the *Antehomerica*) and political verse (in the *Allegories*) decreases their usefulness. The attention which Tzetzes feels impelled to pay to this Homeric-based material and the vehemence with which he takes issue with certain aspects of it (particularly the role played by the Olympian deities) are an interesting insight into one Byzantine's attempt to come to terms with his Hellenic intellectual heritage.<sup>37</sup>

Constantine Manasses, a contemporary of Tzetzes, shares some of his interest in – and emphasis on – the Trojan war as an element in the Byzantine past but his source was John of Antioch rather than Malalas (e.g. Man. 1358, cf JA 24.3, on king David as a potential Trojan ally; Jeffreys, 1978, 126). Although there is a certain superficial similarity in the episodes common to both Manasses and Malalas, derived from the general literary tradition, Manasses cannot be shown to have used Malalas. It is none the less striking that his structuring of ancient history reflects that which had been laid out by Malalas (cf. chapter 2, p. 51; Jeffreys, 1979).

It is during the twelfth century too that Michael the Syrian, patriarch of Antioch from 1166-1199, cited John of Antioch, that is, Malalas, in his vast compendium of world history. As is discussed below (in this chapter, at pp. 306), his knowledge of Malalas' chronicle came at third hand, from John of Ephesos through Pseudo-Dionysios. Nevertheless Michael the Syrian preserves one crucial figure which enables sense to be made of Malalas' unusual dates From Adam.<sup>38</sup> This occurs at XV §16, Bo 391, and was not cited in the subtext to the 1986 translation since its significance was not then appreciated; see chapter 6, pp. 117-18 for further comments.

With the chronicle of Theodore Skoutariotes, written some time after 1282, we come to the last excerptor of Malalas whose work can be used as a guide to the phrasing and content of the original chronicle. Skoutariotes was a prominent member of the court of Theodore II Laskaris (1254-8); he subsequently supported Michael VIII Palaiologos' (1259-82) policy on Church Union, becoming δικαιοφύλαξ and also bishop of Kyzikos, and in 1277 took part in a mission to Rome. His chronicle is a scrappy affair, with a strong emphasis on biblical history and no interest whatever in Hellenic mythology or the legendary past. Once, however, his chronicle has arrived at the last Ptolemies and switched to Roman history, Malalas becomes an important source, though in a disjointed

<sup>37</sup>Tz is cited at: TzI V §§1-5, 13-40; TzPh V §§13-40; TzAh V §§13-40; TzHist (= *Chiliades*) V §§51; TzScholLyk V §§51; TzEx X §28.

<sup>38</sup>MS is cited at: XVIII §§6, 11, 14, 18, 19, 20, 27, 28, 30, 35, 38, 42, 49, 92, 93, 96, 109, 112, 118, 119, 136.

fashion. Skoutariotes' borrowings are confined almost entirely to notices of imperial accessions and deaths. These are, however, of considerable value since Skoutariotes' copy of Malalas was complete and his chronicle provides an outline of the contents of the lacuna in Book XII that can be used in conjunction with the list of reign lengths from the *Laterculus Malalianus* to sketch in the missing material.<sup>39</sup>

After Skoutariotes in the late thirteenth century there are no other witnesses in the Greek tradition that can be shown to contain precise verbal borrowings from Malalas' chronicle. Nevertheless the somewhat undigested mass of material making up the chronicle that goes under the name of *Dorotheos of Monemvasia*, including as it does a reworking of a popular paraphrase of Theophanes, continues to reflect the by now all-pervasive pattern of ancient history devised by Malalas, as is discussed in chapter 2, pp. 52-54.

Not only was Malalas' chronicle of great importance within the Greek historiographic tradition, it entered and influenced that of neighbouring societies: the roles it played in the Slavonic and Syriac traditions, and its restricted but striking role in the Latin West, are discussed in the next sections of this chapter. But it also seems that the chronicle entered the Armenian tradition too: though no translation is known, the historian *Moses Khorenats'i* seems to reflect phraseology from Malalas (and the *Chronicon Paschale*) in a few places (Thomson, 1978, 22-3).<sup>40</sup> However, Khorenats'i's own life-time is a matter of debate: ostensibly writing in the fifth century, which would make verbal connections with Malalas puzzling, he may well have been active in the ninth. The phrases concerned are, however, not of great textual importance and are a frail basis out of which to construct a lost Armenian version.<sup>41</sup>

This section has attempted to indicate in chronological order what the witnesses are from whose testimony we can try to reconstruct the text of Malalas' chronicle as it was in 565, or 573/4. It is clear that Malalas' chronicle was thoroughly quarried by later writers, but for a variety of purposes. His approach – despite its very considerable eccentricities of interpretation, both chronological and doctrinal – must have filled a need or gap; certainly it looks as though no other narrative – as opposed to schematic<sup>42</sup> – chronicle was available for later writers to use. Perhaps, however, the reason for his success was his straightforward style which made few demands on his readers, who thus preferred his text to that of other more complex writers; certainly linguistic considerations did not prevent the reasonably stylish John of Antioch from making wholesale borrowings. It is instructive that, despite its importance in the tradition, the chronicle survives in only one manuscript, and that not a complete one; that is, once the chronicle had been quarried then it ceased to have any intrinsic or independent value. This, of course, had also been the

<sup>39</sup>Sk is cited at: I §§1, 2, 4 VI §§6-11, 24, 25, VII §3, 4, IX §1, X §§5, 41-3, 46, 48, 52, 54, XI §§13, 26-9, XII §§13, 17, 25, 28, 31, 33-7, XIII §§28, 31, 43, 49, XVI §§20, 22, XVII §2, XVIII §130.

<sup>40</sup>MK is cited at: VI §9, XII §§20, 31-3, 35.

<sup>41</sup>The Georgian translation noted by Krumbacher (1897, 329) remains, as Gleye (1913) commented, untraceable and probably mythical.

<sup>42</sup>E.g. the lists in the *Excerpta Barbari*.

fate of the earlier chroniclers who were Malalas' predecessors – both the serious chronographers, such as Africanus, Eusebios, Annianos or Panodoros, and the narrative writers such as Domninos or Nestorinos (Malalas' own probable immediate sources for much of the text), or any of the other historians no longer extant (like Magnus of Carrhae or Eustathios of Epiphaneia). Once a historian or chronicler has been updated and continued then that version could be abandoned in favour of the new. While we may speculate what our picture of Malalas would have been had not Ba survived, it says something for the universality of Malalas' appeal in the Byzantine world that so much can be traced, and over so long a period.

## 1: Appendix. A lacuna in Theophanes' text of Malalas?<sup>43</sup>

Michael Jeffreys

If one sets up a table to represent Books XVII–XVIII of Malalas' chronicle – 87 pages of the Dindorf edition (Bo) – it is easy to plot out the passages from Malalas used by Theophanes. Most of the data is conveniently available in the margins of de Boor's edition of Theophanes and even more detail is given in a recent article of I. Rochow (1983). In both cases, however, the lists are provided according to the sequence of passages in Theophanes, not that in Malalas. This fact has concealed the likely existence of the lacuna which is the subject of this paper. Such a table will show, of course, extensive use of Malalas by Theophanes: my own version<sup>44</sup> indicates some reflection at least by Theophanes of Malalas' material on 67 of the 87 pages concerned. What is more surprising is the disposition of the twenty unused pages of Malalas. Thirteen of them fall in a single block (covering XVIII §§57–70, Bo 459–72), making an almost fourteen-page gap in Theophanes' use of Malalas, since his use of Bo 459 ends at line 3. No other gap in my table for XVII–XVIII extends beyond two pages<sup>45</sup>.

What is more, Theophanes is not the only writer to ignore this passage. The *Chronicon Paschale* (very patchy in its attestation to Malalas Book XVIII) takes nothing from Malalas between §§38–71, Bo 448–475, the excerpts from *Ecclesiastical History*

<sup>43</sup>I must record my thanks for the assistance given by Roger Scott in preparing the final version of this appendix. Though not convinced by the arguments given here, he was sufficiently intrigued to criticise them carefully and force me to look for less absolute ways of expressing them. Since any further response to my arguments will have more to do with Theophanes than Malalas, he considers it more appropriate to make that response elsewhere.

<sup>44</sup>I refer to an annotated notebook, constructed in the course of compiling the sub-text that appears in the 1986 translation.

<sup>45</sup>Since nearly all of the many references to the text of Malalas in this discussion will be to Book XVIII, the book number XVIII will be systematically omitted.



published by Cramer nothing between §§35-71, Bo 447-473, George Monachos nothing between §§52-75, Bo 454-477, Kedrenos nothing between §§51-90, Bo 453-481. The Constantinian *De Insidiis* include nothing between Excerpts 45 (§43, Bo 449) and 46 (loosely reflecting §71, Bo 473): admittedly there is little in the intervening pages to attract an excerptor interested in plots and riots.<sup>46</sup> Among the Syriac texts which make direct or indirect use of Malalas, we have found nothing in the fragments of John of Ephesos to reflect any passage from Malalas between §§52-92, Bo 454-482, nothing in the chronicle ascribed to Dionysios of Tel Mahre between §§42-92, Bo 449-482 and nothing in Michael the Syrian between §§49-92, Bo 452-482. The Slavonic translation and John of Nikiu's Ethiopic version do not come into question for this part of XVIII. In fact the best endeavours of the Australian Malalas project have failed to turn up any text showing significant similarity in wording to that of Ba, or any passage from which that manuscript may be an abbreviation, between the end of the narrative of the embassy to Axoum (§56, Bo 459. 3) and the beginning of the passage referring to the Nika riot (§71, Bo 473. 5). Both the beginning and the end of this putative lacuna are provided by sentences shared only between Malalas and Theophanes.

This substantial and unusual gap in the later attestation of Malalas' text, covered uniquely by the survival of Ba, demands examination. Of course, an apparent gap in one branch of Malalas' textual tradition could mark nothing more sinister than an addition in another. Here, however, it is difficult to explain this passage as an interpolation of the scribe of Ba or one of his predecessors, for the resultant text is very detailed and convincing; it is Theophanes who shows inadequacy at this point, as we shall see. There is no other passage in Ba where interpolation on so grand a scale has been suspected. Why then, we must ask, was the passage omitted? Was it deliberately excluded by some copyist or Theophanes himself, or should the gap be traced to physical manuscript damage at some stage in the tradition? I believe that the latter explanation is much more likely, and I shall give my reasons in the rest of this appendix.

Let us begin with the contents of the fourteen pages concerned, that is, §§57-70, Bo 459-72. They include the capture of Carthage by Gelimer, the ransom of some Roman prisoners from Al-Mundhir, the Kallinikon campaign ending in the capture of Abgersaton, a fire and riot at Antioch, a campaign centred around Martyropolis, some imperial legislation, the death of Koades and accession of Chosroes, negotiations over the recognition of that accession, persecution of the 'Manichaeans' in Persia and a raid by the Sabir Huns. The material is varied and it is difficult to imagine a viewpoint from which it could all appear trivial; thus one looks for a good reason for the omission. The only drawbacks in this passage that I can think of for a chronicler are the general fullness of its treatment of a brief period and the textual length of some of the individual episodes. If Theophanes knew this material and thought of including it, he would have had to enter most of it under A.M. 6023 and the balance under A.M. 6024, which is already long because of the Nika riot. It could be argued that he deliberately excluded it as unsuitable

<sup>46</sup>Though a riot in Antioch (§64, Bo 468) and the tricking of the Persian Manichaeans (§69, Bo 472) might have drawn his attention.

for his chronicle format.

However, when we examine the immediate context in Theophanes, this hypothesis becomes less attractive, for he does not seem at this moment to be trying to avoid long and apparently unsuitable passages. After failing to include the fourteen pages of material in question, covering most of A.M. 6023 and much of 6024, he then proceeds to add immediately the Kalopodios dialogue, an item longer and more static than any in the missing Malalas section. This seems to derive from a source other than Malalas.<sup>47</sup> There follows a full summary of the Nika riot description from Malalas (though with unusual variations, including the omission of the most crucial passage – see below). Then, after the eight-line entry for A.M. 6025, Theophanes loosely attaches to A.M. 6026 a huge *précis* of Prokopios' Vandal war narratives, some twenty-nine closely-printed pages in de Boor's edition. In view of these facts the balance of probabilities begins to tip against the suggestion that Theophanes had the missing passage of Malalas before him but chose to reject it. He could, after all, have included it in summary form, as with the Nika riot and other passages from Malalas, and the Prokopios narrative to which I have just referred. It begins to seem more likely that these pages were not available to him and were physically missing from his text of Malalas.

One passage in the missing pages – that on the accession of Chosroes – should have interested Theophanes from the point of view of his chronological framework. He shows no sign of having seen it. Malalas correctly places the accession of Chosroes within the month of September 531. Theophanes had brought Chosroes to the throne some five years too soon in A.M. 6018, in the penultimate year of Justin I. This error may be followed throughout the long period of common rule between Chosroes and Justinian, where Theophanes gives the former a higher regnal year than the latter, who had been, in fact, the first to accede. This mistake caused him to make changes both at the beginning and end of Chosroes' reign: he has twice corrected 'Koades' in Malalas to 'Chosroes' for events he places in A.M. 6021 (§36, Bo 447. 22: Th 178. 27; §54, Bo 455. 12: Th 179. 4), and once has changed 'Chosroes' in a passage taken from Theophylakt Simokatta to 'Hormisdas' (Th Sim III. 10.6 (130. 18): Th 247. 3), since his calculations, based on false premises, tell him that the latter must have come to the throne by A.M. 6066. It might thus be surmised that Theophanes is unlikely to have read and rejected the firm chronological data of §68, Bo 471. 4-10, giving the correct month for Chosroes' accession.

This is unfortunately not a very strong argument, since Roger Scott has warned me that Theophanes' chronology for Persian kings is notoriously erratic, reaching its nadir in A.M. 5918, where Vararanes' accession is dated to the eleventh year of his own reign (Th 85. 24). The cases mentioned above are also not the only places where his false Persian dates force him to rewrite his sources. In spite of this, however, I would prefer to place some importance on the likely absence of the date for Chosroes' accession from Theophanes' copy of Malalas' text, and suggest this as one of the reasons for his confusion and credulousness over other Persian dating lists. The alternative of ascribing

<sup>47</sup>See Maas, 1912, 46-51; Cameron (A.D.E.), 1976, 318-29; Baldwin, 1981, 301-6, and the extensive bibliography cited there.

every error to Theophanes' incompetence, without seeking to explain his mistakes where material exists to explain them, seems methodologically unsatisfactory.

For the firmest evidence, we should examine in detail the passages in Theophanes preceding and following the proposed lacuna – an embassy to Axoum and the Nika riot respectively. Do we find here the decisiveness and composure of one who has read the intervening pages of Malalas and come to the conclusion that they are best omitted, or the bafflement of one faced with a lacuna in his main source for this part of his chronicle? We shall look at this matter in connection with the end of the lacuna first, then return to the beginning.

The first half of Theophanes' account of the Nika riot is one of the most discussed passages in the historiography of the sixth century. It appears to have no less than three introductions, none of which is satisfactorily integrated with any of the others (Cameron [A.D.E.], 1976, 322). Clearly introductory sentences may be found at Th 181. 24-5, 181. 32 and 184. 3-4. The narrative begins with a brief summary of the riot as a whole, which is found in almost identical form in the extracts from the *Ecclesiastical History* published by Cramer (cf. the previous section, pp. 255-56). Theophanes then proceeds, with no clear narrative articulation, to transcribe the *Akta* chanted in the hippodrome against Kalopodios; recent publications (see note 47 above) have confirmed Maas' view that this scene is unlikely to be correctly placed among the immediate preliminaries of the riot. Among other arguments, it is enough to observe that Kalopodios and the deep grievance expressed against him by the Greens in the *Akta* are not mentioned in any of the sources certainly connected with the riot itself, where complaints are expressed over the actions of several other imperial officials, and that the *Akta* show the Greens and Blues in their normal adversative roles, whereas the key element in the Nika riot is cooperation between them against Justinian and the imperial authorities. The third introduction is derived from Malalas.

The first page of common material here between Malalas (§71, Bo 473) and Theophanes (184. 3-11) would be, by the theory proposed here, the first passage of Malalas available to Theophanes after the lacuna. It shows an unusual degree of alteration by Theophanes of words certainly derived from Malalas. Rochow, who has compared all of Theophanes' borrowings with their sources in Malalas, describes the differences here in strong language: 'Theoph. stark verkürzt, läßt ganze Sätze aus, hat aber andererseits auch Zusätze, außerdem einige Abweichungen' (Rochow, 1983, 467). The introductory formulas are similar in the two texts, apart from Theophanes' meaningless μαῖστόρων for Malalas' ἄλαστόρων (§71, Bo 473. 6; Th 184. 2). Theophanes then jumps over the arrest of the seven rioters narrated in Malalas (§71, Bo 473. 9-10) to record only the impaling of three of them. He adds the (surely unlikely) fact that two of them *twice* survived execution, while Malalas makes this occur only once (§71, Bo 473. 11; Th 184. 6-7). In Ba the crowd then acclaim the emperor, while in Theophanes their reaction seems to have been constructed out of the next event provided by both texts: they cry 'Take them to the church!' (§71, Bo 473. 14-15; Th 184. 7-8). Most striking of all, a few lines later Theophanes omits the famous scene in the hippodrome when the Blues and Greens denied their essential nature as focuses of opposite sporting loyalties by agreeing

to joint action. As Bury said, 'This union is the key to the whole episode, and the narrative of Theophanes is vitiated by its omission' (Bury, 1897a, 102). If Theophanes had before him a full version of Ba, perhaps the longer text (a complete Malalas?) which we may reconstruct from Ba, the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes himself, the degree of incompetence shown in this summary is extreme.

Why was this scene omitted? Here is Bury's answer, from an article which is still the best guide to the relationships between the various texts giving versions of the riot: 'Theophanes thought that the scene in the Hippodrome described by Malalas ... was the same as that in which the altercation between Justinian and the Greens respecting Calopodius had occurred, and which he had already described from another source. He therefore omitted it, to the detriment of his whole story' (*ibid.*). Cameron reports this judgement, and adds, 'He reckoned (mistakenly, of course) that he had made a great find: a verbatim transcript of the scene which Malalas had merely described. So, naturally enough, thinking that he had given a full transcript, he excised Malalas' description' (Cameron [A.D.E.], 1976, 326). Cameron finds confirmation of this logical nexus in Theophanes' insertion of the word 'immediately' in copying out Malalas' introduction to the riot.

Neither Bury nor Cameron nor any other commentator I have read seems to have noticed that there is no reflection in Theophanes of any of the material in the previous fourteen pages of Malalas – the putative lacuna – immediately preceding the page or two of common material whose unusual degree of divergence we have just discussed. We may thus have a lacuna ending in a passage of dubious transmission. Would it not be reasonable to argue from the putative lacuna to suggest an explanation for the condition of the page or pages which followed it? Perhaps the same cause which had removed folios and caused the lacuna had also torn or rubbed subsequent pages or otherwise rendered them difficult to read?<sup>48</sup> In that case one might suggest an amendment to the sequence of causation proposed by Bury and Cameron. Perhaps the discovery of the Kalopodios *Akta* was not the primary cause. Perhaps Theophanes failed to include Malalas' scene of factional reconciliation in the hippodrome because he had not seen it or could not read it, or at least could not make out enough of it for a connected and convincing account. It could be for this reason that he sought out and found what he thought was a fuller version of the scene, the *Akta*, and inserted it. I have no suggestion to make as to why this was placed near the beginning of Theophanes' account, rather than later, at the point where (according to this hypothesis) the illegible reconciliation was omitted. But this is no drawback to the argument, since it is as much of a problem to other reconstructions of events, like those of Bury and Cameron which make the omission more deliberate, as it is to that proposed here.

However, whether this subsidiary hypothesis is accepted or not, the evidence of Theophanes' Nika riot account for the argument of this paper as a whole is unmistakable. We asked whether Theophanes was acting with the assurance of one who had deliberately

<sup>48</sup>In reading Bury, 1897a, 101-2, one is tempted to try a little papyrology in reverse, to attempt to plot the common material between Bo and Th on a page, so as to leave room for a regularly-shaped tear or hole or other form of codicological degeneration.

edited out a substantial passage of his source, or with the puzzlement of one trying to overcome the problems of a lacuna. The text strongly suggests the latter: in fact, short of making his problems explicit, it is difficult to see how Theophanes could have indicated his bafflement more clearly than by including three separate and unconnected introductions to the same event. That event is the one immediately following the fourteen-page gap. Viewed from this end, the gap looks very like a lacuna.

Roger Scott has pointed out to me that after the pages dealing with the Nika riot, there is another significant gap in Theophanes' attestation of Malalas, from §§72-82, Bo 477. 4-479. 6, broken only by one item of information from Malalas §75, Bo 477. 10-12. We have here information provided in scraps, very suitable for Theophanes' chronological framework, and for a period when he was less overwhelmed with material than for the years just before the Nika riot. There seems no obvious reason for these omissions. Scott wonders whether the lacuna (if it existed) might have been longer than that posited in this paper, with the Nika riot material as a separate group of folios loose from the binding of the volume. This passage would thus have the same status as that of the folio containing the embassy to Axoum (see below), with the one difference that the Nika riot is firmly dated in the text, and so would be unlikely to stray from its proper context. This proposal of a longer lacuna has a great deal of merit. Its main drawback is the existence of §83, Bo 477.10-12, included by Theophanes at exactly the correct point, after the Nika riot: this must have been included, by Scott's hypothesis, on the loose Nika riot sheets, and would thus have been copied out with them.

We should now turn from the end of the posited lacuna to its beginning. Here the most striking point is that the last event recorded by Theophanes before it, the embassy to Axoum (§56, Bo 456-8), is placed by him a long way out of chronological order, as reflected in the text of Malalas. It has been transposed from A.M. 6023, where it should be placed according to Malalas' dating sequence and that of modern historians to A.M. 6064, where it is the last parallel to Malalas marked by de Boor and Rochow in the text of Theophanes (see Kavar, 1960, 62-3, especially note 12). Theophanes seems to have been willing to move Malalas' events about, particularly in taking them from Justinian's earlier years, where information is plentiful, to supplement the sparser material of his middle years.<sup>49</sup> At the end of Justinian's reign, however, Theophanes shows much more respect for Malalas' sequence, and follows the order of Ba quite scrupulously. Overall, with the exception of the Axoum embassy, the most extensive changes in order are from A.M. 6022 to A.M. 6036 (a performing dog) and A.M. 6020 to A.M. 6035 (another Ethiopian passage, transposed perhaps for reasons not unconnected with the moving of the passage which we are examining). Nothing prepares us, however, for the 41 year jump in the dating of the Axoum embassy ('Am auffälligsten ist die Umstellung der Episode p. 244. 14ff.'; Rochow, 1983, 473), especially as it vaults out of Justinian's reign, thus crossing Theophanes' period of accurate use of Malalas' chronology in A.M. 6039-6055; these dates act as a barrier not crossed by any other of Theophanes' changes.

<sup>49</sup>The problem is stated by Scott, 1985, 105, note 69; the solution adopted by Theophanes can be seen by collecting examples of the phrase 'an zeitlich früherer Stelle' in Rochow, 1983, especially on p. 468.

No other Justinianic passage is transposed even half as far.

This is an extreme case of Theophanes' arbitrary flouting of the dates he found in his sources, but not so extreme as to constitute a distinct problem, since a lesser degree of arbitrariness is a regular feature of his approach. The existence of a problem only becomes interesting when we notice a ready-made solution. If the fourteen-page gap in the attestation of Malalas' passages in Theophanes does represent a lacuna, then it would not be surprising if the folio or folios immediately preceding it had also been loosened from their position in the manuscript, without actually having been lost. They could then have been available to Theophanes as a separate, floating extract of uncertain position in the sequence of events.<sup>50</sup> However, since Theophanes chose to use this after all the other extracts dependent on Malalas, one could also surmise that it had been placed, perhaps even attached, at the end of his manuscript of Malalas. Let us look at the passage in detail (for what follows, cf. Rochow, 1983, 472).

By Malalas' version, the ambassador sent to Axoum (who is unnamed in Ba) was dispatched by Justinian (also unnamed in this area of Ba) to Elesboas of Axoum. Justinian had been told by Rufinus that Koades had broken the peace, and so sent the ambassador to stir the Ethiopians to declare war on Persia. There is also a brief mention of a previous war between the Axoumitai and the Homeritai. Theophanes names the ambassador (Julian) but not the Roman emperor (at the date where he puts the passage, Justin II). Elesboas he renames Arethas, while Koades has become Chosroes (II), according to a pattern which by now is familiar. The occasion of the embassy is an unexplained request from the Homeritai, but its purpose is parallel to that given by Malalas, to persuade Arethas to declare war on Chosroes.

This passage stands out as a more formal linguistic element within the less formal surrounding text of Malalas. One may surmise that its style is directly influenced by having been copied from the ambassador's report, an idea confirmed by an intrusive first person in the narrative (με: §56, Bo 458. 7). A major element of the unusually high style is the avoidance of the repetition of proper names, after they have been established in the first few lines, a practice which contrasts with the usual repetitiveness and specificity of Malalas' writing. It occurs to me that this fact could have left the episode difficult for Theophanes to handle, if it had slipped out of order: if a separate folio or folios available to Theophanes had started at any point after Bo 457. 7, he would have received the impression that the reason for the ambassador's journey was something to do with the Homeritai. He could then have read the whole of the rest of the account without finding more than two points which could be used as dating criteria, both of them names: 'Koades' at Bo 458. 12 and 'Elesboas' at Bo 458. 17. In fact, the common wording between Malalas and Theophanes starts at Bo 457. 8, and both the names which could have served as dating criteria have been changed. On the assumptions proposed here, the preceding lines of Theophanes would be inventions, or derived from another source – perhaps a combination of both, for the petition of the Homeritai could have developed out

<sup>50</sup>Bury (1897b), in his review of Krumbacher's *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, suggests – only to dismiss as totally unsupported – this possibility.

of Bo 457. 7, while the addition of the name 'Julian' is an accurate detail,<sup>51</sup> though not at present preserved in Ba.

Any view of Theophanes' practice here which is not based on the hypothesis of a lacuna and loose pages is likely to convict him of another piece of incompetence or falsification. His only discernible purpose is to motivate the renewal of hostilities with Persia in A.M. 6064. This was not a serious problem: Theophanes himself already provides, for the same purpose, two other reasons and a pretext, all derived from Theophylakt Simokatta.<sup>52</sup> Justin is already shown causing offence by receiving an embassy from the Turks and by refusing to pay subsidies and to send back Armenian rebels who had taken refuge with him. What was the need for further motivation, especially as it needed the misdating of an event by forty-one years and changing most of the *dramatis personae*? But if, as suggested here, we speak of a seventeen-page gap in Theophanes' attestation of Malalas rather than a fourteen-page gap,<sup>53</sup> with a folio or folios corresponding to the first three of those pages not lost but left loose – or, better still, attached at the end of the text of Malalas – then the scope of Theophanes' arbitrariness is much reduced. After its first few lines, which may or may not have been present in the narrative as it was available to him, the passage contains little to tie it to its true position near the beginning of Justinian's reign. It would have been easy for him to conclude that it belonged in A.M. 6064.

It is time to sum up evidence for and against the lacuna which is the main subject of this section, a gap of fourteen (or, perhaps, seventeen) pages in Theophanes' text of Malalas. We have seen that the material was not trivial, that Theophanes, though not showing much respect for Malalas at this point, was equally not concerned to avoid long passages unsuitable for the chronicle format, that he may not have seen the notice of Chosroes' succession, that he seems puzzled, searching for supplementary material for the Nika riot narrative, at the point where the lacuna would end, while he has also displaced in a puzzling way the last event before the lacuna. The fact that one hypothesis is able to solve or help to solve so many diverse problems carries considerable conviction, given the hypothetical nature of the question posed. The assumption of this lacuna seems to me by far the best explanation for these phenomena.

The long list of other texts sharing the same gap, given at the beginning of this appendix, contains several writers who are often dependent on Theophanes, and so are not independent witnesses to the lacuna. In fact only the *Chronicon Paschale* and John of Ephesos are certainly not influenced by Theophanes, since they predate him. Unfortunately neither can be used as firm evidence for or against the existence of the passage under discussion in the texts of Malalas which they knew. The *Chronicon Paschale*, as stated earlier, is patchy in its cover of Book XVIII (cf. the previous section, p. 253), and also seems to have an independent subsidiary lacuna just before its account of

<sup>51</sup>Kawar, 1960, 61-6; PLRE 2, 388, s.v. Elesboas.

<sup>52</sup>Th Sim III 9, 5-10 (128. 21 - 129. 16): Th 245. 13-24. There is a reference in Theophylakt at this point to the role of the Homeritai, but there it is a question of the Persians stirring them up against the Romans, not of the Romans inciting them against the Persians, as in Theophanes.

<sup>53</sup>Assuming for the moment that there is not even more to add from after the Nika riot passage, as discussed above.

the Nika riot (see Cameron [A.D.E.], 1976, 324). This substantially reduces its evidence in connection with the larger lacuna which is in question. The surviving fragments of John of Ephesos, together with the results of his influence on the Syriac chronicle tradition, show an emphasis on events which may be signs of the wrath of God – earthquakes, signs in the sky, epidemics etc. No such events are found in the material we are discussing. It is tempting to suggest that the lacunose text of Malalas available to Theophanes is somehow connected with other similarly lacunose texts which may have influenced the *Chronicon Paschale* and John of Ephesos. In the present state of the evidence, however, such a hypothesis is premature.

In conclusion, we may use this hypothesis to shed a tiny ray of light on the date at which the text of Malalas, or at least the copy used by Theophanes, came to an end. The fact that Theophanes connected Malalas' account of the Axoum embassy with events of the year 572 is some evidence that he regarded Malalas' text as continuing that far. It has even some weight as an indication that the text ended around then, especially if we imagine loose sheets on the Axoum embassy to have been attached at the end of Theophanes' copy of Malalas. In that case, Theophanes' vote in the debate on the end of Malalas' text tends more towards 574, the date derived from the *Laterculus Malalianus*, than to 565, the end of the reign of Justinian, or to the date a few years earlier when Ba in fact breaks off.

## 2: Malalas in Slavonic

Simon Franklin

The Slavonic version of the chronicle of John Malalas is among the most celebrated of all medieval Slavonic translations from Greek. It is also among the most enigmatic. For Byzantinists the Slavonic translation provides the fullest text of Malalas outside the Greek of Ba (cf. pp. 245–49 above): it contains complete or excerpted versions of all eighteen books; and, despite some substantial lacunae, it apparently reflects, in places, a fuller Greek text than that of Ba. For Slavists the translation is especially significant in the cultural history of Russia: the translation itself was probably produced in Bulgaria, but the extant manuscripts are all Russian, and from the eleventh century to the end of the fifteenth century the Russians repeatedly turned to Malalas as one of their main narrative sources of information on the history of mankind.

The study of the Slavonic Malalas, conducted with intermittent intensity since the translation was first identified in the mid-nineteenth century, can be divided quite neatly into two phases. The first phase belonged to those Byzantinists who would have subscribed to Matthew Spinka's view (Spinka/Downey, 1940, 4) that 'the question of primary interest to the scholar is the relation of the Slavonic version to the Greek text' (e.g. Sreznevsky, 1879; Haupt, 1880; Jagic, 1880; Gleye, 1894; Shestakov, 1894, 1895; cf. Shustorovich, 1969). The second phase has been dominated by Slavists more



concerned with the history and cultural implications of the translation in Russia (Orlov, 1926, 1947; Udal'tsova, 1965; Shustorovich, 1968; Deryugin, 1975; Tvorogov, 1975, 1979, 1983), and with its linguistic properties (Kopylenko, 1953, 1957; Dostál, 1963; Chernysheva, 1982, 1983, 1983a).

The chronological and intellectual link between these two phases of study is the work of V.M. Istrin. Istrin realised that it was precarious to pontificate on the relationship of the Slavonic to the Greek in the absence of a critical edition of the Slavonic text, and that the Slavonic text could only be established through a critical examination of the tradition of Malalas in Russia. Extracts from a few manuscripts had been published previously (Obolensky, 1851; Popov, 1866). Istrin's edition, which appeared in parts over the course of nearly twenty years (Istrin, 1897-1914), reconstituted the source for Byzantinists, while his basic account of the textual history of Malalas in Russia has become broadly accepted (Weingart, 1922, 18-51; Sorlin, 1973, 393-6; Meshchersky, 1978, 79-85). The thorough re-examination of the Slavonic texts by the Soviet scholar O.V. Tvorogov (1975, etc.) is essentially a development and refinement of the work of Istrin.

From the time of Istrin until the Australian Malalas project of the 1980s and the appearance of the English translation (Jeffreys/Jeffreys/Scott, 1986), the place of the Slavonic in the textual tradition of the chronicle has not been the subject of fresh investigation. Spinka's partial and uneven English translation of Istrin does not tackle the textual questions directly. Now, in the subtext to the translation of Malalas, the Slavonic material is for the first time used in conjunction with the full range of other textual witnesses to Malalas and for the full length of the chronicle. My purpose here, in this brief supplementary survey, is twofold: first, to describe the evidence, that is, the extant texts, from which the Slavonic material in the subtext is derived; and secondly, to consider the Slavonic translation in the broad context of the textual tradition of Malalas.

The Slavonic Malalas does not actually exist, except as a modern editorial extrapolation. We can be reasonably sure that there was once a time when it did exist; but the earliest extant manuscripts are separated from the translation by about five hundred years, and from Malalas himself by nearly a thousand years of scribal and editorial interference both in Greek and in Slavonic. And these manuscripts contain not only Malalas, and not the complete Malalas, but extracts from Malalas embedded in composite compendia of world history. The extracts vary in length from a few phrases to several books. Some are preserved *verbatim*, others are paraphrased. In other words, the Slavonic Malalas reaches us in abbreviated and interpolated form. In order to understand how the translated sections of the original Malalas can be prised free from the compendia and decontaminated from the interpolations, one has to consider the nature of the compendia themselves; and this, in turn, requires a brief excursus on the forms of historiography practised in medieval Russia.

There are two main genres of historical writing in Russia before the sixteenth century (see especially Likhachev, 1947; Tvorogov, 1975; *Materialy*, 1985, 16-184). On the one hand there are the Russian chronicles: mainly annalistic compilations of native history, constantly updated, revised and recombined. Many of the chronicles start with a short

account of world history culled from Byzantine sources (Shakmatov, 1940); some of them cite Byzantine works from time to time thereafter; but the focus of the chronicles is local. On the other hand there are historiographical compendia, or *khnografiy*, containing world history and composed almost entirely from Byzantine sources in translation – principally George Monachos (translated in combination with the Logothete) and John Malalas. The compendia do not merge with the native chronicles so as to form continuous histories from the creation to the Russian present: most of them end in the mid-tenth century, where the chronicle of the Logothete runs out.

The compendia vary in size, in the range of their sources, and in the method of their composition. Some are drastically abbreviated and paraphrased. Others, the larger compendia, are put together not by paraphrase but by the techniques of mosaic or collage (*pace* Gleye, 1894, 580): the translated Byzantine works were excerpted and recombined chunk by chunk, rather than being retold, and the textual integrity of each excerpt is preserved. Small sections may occasionally be omitted, but the styles of the various sources are not homogenised, and there are few local glosses or commentaries. Thus the 'interpolations' in the text of Malalas can quite simply be removed, since nearly all of them are clearly identifiable from other surviving translations of Byzantine works. The scope and quality of the Slavonic Malalas is therefore uneven. Those sections of the chronicle which survive only in the paraphrasing compendia, though important as indicators of the extent and influence of the original translation, are of strictly limited value as witnesses to the text of the chronicle. But where Malalas survives in one or more of the large mosaic-style compendia, then the text is maintained conservatively: conservatively, that is, from the editorial point of view, though of course it is subject to the distortions both of translation itself and of several centuries of transmission in manuscripts. Variation in the scope and quality of the Slavonic Malalas, therefore, is due chiefly to variations in the scope and compilative method of the respective compendia. Thus a survey of the Slavonic Malalas must begin with a survey of the compendia. The most important among them are:

1a. *The Archive Compendium (Ark)*: part of a fifteenth-century manuscript (Moscow, TsGADA *fond* 181 no. 3 279/658) which also contains the Pereiaslavl' chronicle. *Ark* includes sections of Malalas, Books I-II and most of IV-X. The extracts from Malalas, though cited *in extenso*, constitute only a small part of the full compilation: they are joined by the Octateuch and commentaries thereon, by 1-4 *Kings*, the Alexander novel, Josephos' *Jewish War*, and fragments of George Monachos (Obolensky, 1851; Sreznevsky, 1879).

1b. *The Vilna Compendium (Vil)*: a sixteenth-century manuscript (BAN Litovskoy SSR 109/147) of a compendium similar to that in *Ark*, but with a slightly fuller text and without *Ark*'s occasional interpolations (Istrin, 1893, 317-46; Meshchersky, 1955; *Materialy*, 1985, 175-6).<sup>54</sup>

<sup>54</sup>Since the completion of this study my attention has been drawn to a third manuscript of this compendium: Warsaw, BOZ, IV-83, wrongly described as a *Paley* by Shchapov (1976, 29-30), unpublished, and unidentified until studied by Professor M. Taube of Jerusalem, whom I thank for informing me of his discovery.

## 2. *The Hellenic and Roman Chronicler (EL)*:

a) First redaction (*EL-1*): four manuscripts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; mainly world history from Nebuchadnezzar to Romanos Lekapenos, based on interlaced segments of Malalas and George Monachos, plus the Alexander novel.

b) Second redaction (*EL-2*): nine manuscripts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and numerous fragments; from the same archetype as *EL-1*, but expanded and interpolated with a wide range of further translated sources (Tvorogov, 1975, 111-27; *Materialy*, 1985, 103-4).

*EL-1* and *EL-2* contain substantial parts of Malalas, Books VI-X, XIII-XVII and the start of Book XVIII. *EL-1* and some manuscripts of *EL-2* also contain fragments of Malalas, Books I, II, IV. However, the sources and textual history of this 'introductory' section are more obscure (Popov, 1866, 1-95; Tvorogov, 1975, 127-35, 274-305; Tvorogov, 1979; Franklin, 1982).

Between them *Ark/Vil* and *EL* provide the main bulk of the Slavonic Malalas in its fullest form and in the greatest number of decent manuscripts. They have been extensively mined by modern editors, but neither *Ark/Vil* nor any version of *EL* has yet been published in full (*EL-2*, edited by Tvorogov, is apparently due to appear in the series *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey*). The other textual witnesses to the chronicle are sparser and more problematic.

3. *The Sophia Compendium (Soph)*: a sixteenth-century manuscript (Leningrad, GPB, Soph. 1454): a short history of the world from the creation to Romanos Lekapenos, mainly from Malalas and George Monachos. *Soph* contains heavily abbreviated and paraphrased fragments from all eighteen books of Malalas, including the only surviving Slavonic remnants of Books XI-XII. It has recently been published in full, and collated with its main sources (Tvorogov, 1983).

4. *Varia*: *Ark/Vil*, *EL* and *Soph* are the main independent branches of the textual tradition. Smaller segments of the Slavonic Malalas are found in several compendia and chronicles which are intricately and not always clearly related both to each other and to *EL*. Books VII and IX are cited in the *Khronograf po velikomu izlozheniyu (KVI)*, a clumsily-named hypothetical compilation (based on George Monachos) which, at least for events from Nebuchadnezzar to Romanos Lekapenos, is reckoned to be a common source for several extant compendia: the long and short 'chronographic' versions of the *Paleya* (eleven manuscripts), the 'Trinity' compendium (three manuscripts), and *EL-2* (Tvorogov, 1975, 46-97). Manuscripts of the long 'chronographic' *Paleya* also contain an appendage which is close to the 'introductory' section of *EL*, with extracts from Malalas, Books I, II, IV: these are perhaps linked to the early pre-Nebuchadnezzar section of *KVI* (Tvorogov, 1975, 127-35; Tvorogov, 1979; Franklin, 1982). Scraps of Malalas, Books II, IV, V not found elsewhere are in the *Tikhonravov Compendium (Tikh)*: one manuscript of the sixteenth century, which itself is partly derived from the 'Trinity' compendium (Istrin, 1912a; Istrin, 1914, 49-52). Occasional quotations from Malalas, and echoes of Malalas, occur in the *Primary Chronicle* as well as in its continuation in the *Hypatian Chronicle* (Books I, II, IV in the entry for the year 1114, and diverse scraps thereafter) (Istrin, 1897a; Orlov, 1926; Orlov, 1947; Shakhmatov, 1940, 72-80; see also *Materialy*, 1985, 165-7).

**5. *Malalas at second-hand*:** Malalas also reached the Slavs pre-excerpted, via translations of other Byzantine works which themselves used Malalas, notably George Monachos and the occasional miscellany (e.g. Istrin, 1920-30; Abramovich, 1928). These secondary borrowings testify to the pervasive presence of Malalas in the Eastern Orthodox world, and doubtless an absolutely exhaustive edition of Malalas ought to take them into account, but their value as primary evidence for the text of Malalas is minimal.

Such are the late and diverse real texts whose portions that derive from Malalas, when lifted from their mosaic settings, are reassembled to form the Slavonic Malalas. What, in sum, do they provide? A phrase-by-phrase collation with all the other texts derived from Malalas' chronicle is a job for a future editor of the Slavonic. Here I am concerned only to indicate the approximate extent of what survives in Slavonic, and the variations in quality. For this purpose it is convenient and sufficient to make a rough comparison with the 'base' text as presented and paragraphed in the English translation (1986).

The Slavonic lacks: Book III §4, V §§70-3, VI §§1-2, VII §13, VIII §§2-4, 17; X §§8, 19, 40, 46, 49-50, XI §§2-11, 14-6, 18, 22-7, 29-30, XII §§2-9, 11, 12, 16, 19-21, 25-50, XIII §§1-17, 28-50, XIV §§2, 5, 7, 23, XVI §§2, 4, 6, 8, 15, 17-8, XVII §§5, 8, 19, 20, XVIII §§2, 14- end.

The Slavonic has substantially reduced or paraphrased versions of: Book II §43-5 III §§2, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, V §69, VIII §§1, 5, 13, 14, 18, IX §1, X §9, 18, 44, 47-8, 51-4, XI *passim*, XII *passim*, XIII §§21, 27, XIV §§1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 13, XVI §§3, 10, 12, 16, 21, XVII §§10, 12, 22, XVIII §3.

Taken together, these two lists represent the approximate boundaries of the 'defective' portions of the Slavonic Malalas: i.e. those sections which, by comparison with Ba, are either missing or much reduced. If we ignore the occasional small gaps, the 'defective' portions can be collected into a number of large chunks: Book III, Books V-VI §2; VIII §§1-5, 13-14, 17-18; X §44 - XIII §17; XIII §27 - XIV §8. There are also sporadic reductions throughout XVI and XVII, while XVIII lacks §14 to the end, that is the entire text after Bo 431. 13 (note that Tvorogov in *Materialy*, 1985, 167 rather overstates the 'fullness' of the Slavonic, especially for XIII-XIV). Most of the major chunks of defective text appear as a result of editorial decisions made by the compilers of the compendia as they switched from source to source. Thus, for example, the break at the end of V and the start of VI coincides with a change of subject, from Troy back to the Jews. The huge gaps from the end of X to the middle of XIII occur because for this entire period, from Trajan to Constantine, the compiler of *EL* preferred George Monachos (Tvorogov, 1975, 279-81), while *Soph* (which shows that the original translation did include these portions) provides only a desultory and partial paraphrase. The smaller omissions do not necessarily occur only at the joins between sources, and we cannot be certain whether they reflect the decisions of Russian compilers or the peculiarities of the Greek text from which the Slavonic was translated. The absence of most of XVIII raises special questions which we shall consider later.

This, in broadest outline, is all the Slavonic Malalas that we have, or all that has been discovered and identified.

From the raw material of the compendia we travel both forwards and backwards in time: forwards to Istrin's critical edition, and backwards through the history of *Malalas* in Russia to – most tentatively – the 'original' translation. Only then will we be in a position to consider the place of the Slavonic *Malalas* in the broader textual tradition of the chronicle.

The defects of Istrin's edition are fairly easily listed: Istrin did not use all the manuscripts of the compendia; he failed to spot occasional scraps of *Malalas* even in the manuscripts which he did use; in reassembling the mosaic he was fallible in his restoration of the correct order of its pieces (see the transposition at VI §28, Bo 169, and the remnant of a larger transposition – partially corrected by Istrin – at XV §13, Bo 387, and XVI §19, Bo 406); his editorial practices were not consistent; he could not collate his text with the full range of other witnesses to *Malalas*; and finally, the several instalments of Istrin's edition are not readily available, even in major libraries.

These are criticisms of detail. In a wider perspective Istrin's achievement was considerable: he did use the best manuscripts of the fullest compendia, and no substantial new sections of the Slavonic *Malalas* have been discovered since his time. In the crucial task of disentangling *Malalas* from the compendia, Istrin's judgement has been overwhelmingly vindicated. Only a very few fragments are seriously claimed to have been overlooked by Istrin: Meshchersky (1956) correctly recovered a couple of sentences from VIII §32, Bo 212, and X §§44-5, Bo 259, which had been buried in *Arkh/Vil*'s text of Josephos; Tvorogov's restored narrative from *EL* at XIV §10, Bo 358 (Tvorogov, 1975, 138) does probably come from the original translation, though Tvorogov is rash to conclude that it therefore reveals a lacuna in the Oxford manuscript; Shustorovich (1970) is on more shaky ground with a proposed addition from *EL* at I §10, P 14, since *EL* lacks support not only from the Greek of P (Paris, Suppl. Gr. 682; cf. p. 247 above), but also from *Arkh/Vil*. Though a new edition of the Slavonic *Malalas* would obviously be desirable, the more pressing need is for the publication of the primary material: the Russian compendia.

The Slavonic *Malalas*, as reconstituted from the compendia, can be given at least the rudiments of a history in Russia. To judge from the proliferation of manuscripts, world history (and consequently *Malalas*) enjoyed a heightened popularity from the second half of the fifteenth century (Tvorogov, 1975, 31-2). The origins of *EL*-1 and *EL*-2 themselves are obscure and contentious, but the highly influential *EL*-2 seems to have links with Novgorod and Moscow from the late-fourteenth or early-fifteenth centuries (Kloss, 1972; cf. Likhachev, 1948). The shared archetype of *Arkh* and *Vil* can be traced to the southwestern principality of Galicia and to the mid-thirteenth century, possibly to the year 1262, while the resonances from *Malalas* in the *Hypatian Chronicle* appear in a section of it which was edited in Galicia at about the same time (Weingart, 1922, 40-3; Orlov, 1926; Orlov, 1947). The borrowings in the *Chronicle* are not derived from the archetype of *Arkh* and *Vil*, but from a similar (lost) compendium of translations. From thirteenth-century Galicia we step back to eleventh-century Kiev: *KVI* and the source of the 'introductory' portion of *EL* are cited in the *Primary Chronicle*, in the passages which were probably compiled in Kiev towards the end of the eleventh century (Tvorogov, 1974;

Tvorogov, 1979; Franklin, 1982). By that time, therefore, the Slavonic Malalas not only already existed, it had already been used and cited in native historical writing. Thus, reversed into their proper order, the main dateable phases of the Malalas tradition in Russia are: eleventh-century Kiev, thirteenth-century Galicia, and Novgorod and Moscow from the late-fourteenth century onwards. If one were to arrange an itinerary around the notable sites of medieval Russian literary culture, this is precisely the route which one would probably select. Malalas is not an obscure backwater in Russian cultural history: he appears close to the source, and he habitually reappears in the mainstream.

The next step backwards in time takes us from the relative light of the Russian tradition to the murky obscurity of the translation itself. There is no extra-textual evidence as to where and when the translation was produced. A passage in *Arkh* at the start of Book V, where a certain Gregory claims to have translated books for Symeon of Bulgaria (Sreznevsky, 1879, 118; also in the Warsaw manuscript, BOZ 83: see Shchapov, 1976, 27-30), in fact refers not to Malalas but to the Octateuch, which precedes Malalas in the compendium (Weingart, 1922, 30-9). Nevertheless, most scholars accept that the language of the extant text does support a tenth-century Bulgarian provenance (Istrin, 1913; Kopylenko, 1953; Kopylenko, 1957).

More important than the provenance, for textual critics, is the *nature* of the translation, its methods and techniques. The Slavonic Malalas, so far as it survives, is a corrupt muddle of late and interpolated manuscripts of uneven quality. Even the better-preserved sections teem with problematic readings, with variants and distortions. Whole sentences are mangled, crucial concepts are lost or changed, names and numbers are in chaos. It is not an easy text to work with, nor always easy to make sense of, and certainly not easy to establish which of the deviations of detail should be attributed to Slavonic scribes and editors, which to the translator, and which to the translator's Greek source. General verdicts vary. Gleye (1894) pronounced it a bad translation because it contained errors, and this opinion was shared by Spinka (Spinka/Downey, 1940, 9). Istrin (1913, 43-4) reckoned it a good translation done by a competent linguist who cared about his Slavonic. Dostál (1963, 667-9) calls it a free adaptation.

No verdict can be reached comfortably, in the absence of a set of full manuscripts both in Greek and in Slavonic. Nevertheless, Istrin's analysis does reveal features consistent enough to indicate at least some aspects of the translator's method. Many Slavonic translators – notably, in a historiographical context, the translator of George Monachos – felt bound to reproduce as precisely as possible not only the sense of their Greek originals but also the form; to maintain the syntactic and grammatical structures and even the word-order. Frequently, indeed, this formal mimicry was allowed to impair the sense (see Thomson, 1988). But the translator of Malalas does seem to have allowed himself more latitude in choosing an appropriate form of expression. For example, he regularly switches actives and passives, replaces noun-combinations with noun-adjective combinations, transposes comparatives and superlatives, turns indirect speech into direct speech, and adds occasional glosses to explain transliterated terms. None of this is very shocking. If the translator of Malalas was marginally more flexible than some of his colleagues, it was not because he was trying to 'adapt' rather than to translate, but

because for him the translation of meaning into Slavonic took precedence over the exact reproduction of form. As in any translation, semantic changes are inevitable; so, over a long text, are mistakes. Such deviations may be culturally significant (Franklin, 1983), but they are not our chief concern here. The textual point is that at the level of *expression* the extant Slavonic *Malalas* can be used as a guide to a hypothetical Greek original only with extreme caution. 'Reverse translation' (as Haupt, 1880; Gleye, 1894) can be proposed only where a consistent pattern of adjustment is discernible (as in the repetitive portrait vocabulary in Book V), or where the specific circumstances of a passage warrant it.

However, such dire and proper warnings should not be over-stressed. We need not share fully in Spinka's disappointment, or in his apparent surprise, that the 'original' translation has been lost (Spinka/Downey, 1940, 5). Subject to the vagaries of its transmission in the manuscripts the translation remains a translation, not a paraphrase. Expression may be marginally altered or corrupted, but facts remain. Wherever detailed comparison is possible, the Slavonic translator is shown to have been thorough and conscientious (Chernysheva, 1983a). Certainly he was fallible, but there is nothing to suggest that he intentionally omitted, changed or added any substantive information. Significant textual variants should not be attributed to the translator: they must be explained textually, with reference to the textual history of *Malalas* both before and after the translation was made.

Abstract assertions about hypothetical translations ring somewhat hollow unless they are backed up with real texts. Our journey through the Slavonic *Malalas*, from the extant compendia to the presumed translation, is complete. Finally we are in a position to cross the bridge of language, to consider the Slavonic *Malalas* not just as a witness to itself but as a version, among others, of the chronicle.

When the first scraps of the Slavonic *Malalas* were made known, its value as a witness to the chronicle was obvious: lumps of text absent in Ba, and numerous small fragments, could now be restored with the aid of the Slavonic. However, as further non-Slavonic extracts from *Malalas* came to be identified and studied alongside the Slavonic, so the 'new' material in Slavonic came to be duplicated or at least echoed elsewhere. Some scholars therefore concluded that the Slavonic *Malalas* was not so significant as had been thought (e.g. Weingart, 1922, 45; Spinka/Downey, 1940, 4-5). This conclusion implies a curious attitude to textual history, as if it were somehow better to have a single unverifiable text than to have several texts which support or modify each other. On the contrary: if the fragments from *Malalas* outside Ba are frequently similar to the Slavonic, then this only strengthens the claims of the Slavonic to be treated seriously within the tradition of the chronicle, whatever damage translators, scribes and editors may have inflicted. The value of the Slavonic is thereby increased rather than diminished.

In several places the Slavonic is still the only surviving text apart from Ba. These are (ignoring the many small fragments within paragraphs): Book III §6, IV §16, VI §§3-4, 17, 26-8, VII §§8-9, 14-6, VIII §§12, 14-6, 20-2, 24-34, IX §§12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23, X §§6, 9, 15, 18, 20, 23-5, 27, 31, 36-9, XI §§12, 19, 31, XIV §§17, 30, 33, 44, 46, XVI §21, XVII §13, XVIII §§5, 8, 9. Elsewhere Ba and the Slavonic, when not

themselves defective, are joined by at least one other source. The detailed contribution of the Slavonic, the value of its specific variants and additions throughout the chronicle – these are matters for the subtext in the translation (1986), and perhaps for a future critical edition. At present our objective is merely to raise the more general questions of textual history: is there any pattern in the textual characteristics and affiliations of the Slavonic? Does it seem to be linked to any particular branch of the Malalas tradition, to any particular text or set of texts? Or are its variants random, independent, *sui generis*?

Over the course of the text, as the divers sources periodically join, desert and rejoin the chronicle, so the Slavonic seems to flit from Ba to variant and back again, and from variant to variant. Noting this apparent lack of consistent affiliation, Shestakov (1894, 504) pronounced a miracle: the Slavonic version, he claimed, confirms 'as if by magic' the best readings and the significant additions from all the other sources for Malalas. This, as Shestakov would perhaps have admitted, is an overstatement. For example, the Slavonic is close to Evagrius at XV §11, Bo 385, and XVII §1 ff, Bo 410, but lacks Evagrius' important additions surely derived from Malalas at XIV §13, Bo 360, and §26, Bo 365. The Slavonic and *De Insidiis* both supplement Ba at XV §13, Bo 387 and §15, Bo 389, but the Slavonic sticks with Ba against the extra text of *De Insidiis* at XIV §40, Bo 371. Yet the point behind Shestakov's exaggeration is valid: despite its own peculiar history, the Slavonic Malalas does seem to be a periodically reliable guide to a perfectly decent Greek text of the chronicle. Does this Greek text, the 'original' for the translation, have any detectable specific features? To explore this highly speculative question let us first consider the overall shape and scope of the Slavonic.

The biggest 'gap' in the Slavonic is the apparent loss of most of Book XVIII. The surviving text stops at XVIII §13, Bo 431.13. Since all the other large gaps can easily be attributed to Russian editors who snipped out pieces for their collage, it seems natural to assume that there was once a 'full' Slavonic Malalas (reflecting a 'full' Greek redaction) which became seriously truncated in transmission. Moreover, such editorial surgery even fits the known practices of Russian compilers, who rarely showed much interest in detailed Constantinopolitan history. From the composite translation of George Monachos with the Logothete, for example, editors regularly omitted almost all of the chronicle of the Logothete (Franklin, 1983, 515-8). Yet in the case of Book XVIII of John Malalas there are indications that this natural supposition may be false.

The large gap at the end of the Slavonic Malalas cannot be traced to the editor of *EL*, who, after his final citation from Malalas, states that his own source runs out at this point: 'The Hellenic Chronicler ends'. He then switches over to George Monachos (Tvorogov, 1975, 283). The 'Hellenic Chronicler', not only in *EL* but also in *Tikh*, is closely associated with 'John' ('from Antioch'). The precise relationship between 'John' and the 'Hellenic Chronicler' is unclear, but in practice they both mean a version of the Slavonic Malalas: *EL* is itself entitled the 'Hellenic and Roman Chronicler', and after a passage from Epiphanius of Salamis on the creation, it commences with the preamble to Book I of Malalas ('A report by John, formerly of the city of Antioch ...'). *Tikh*'s quotations from Malalas are introduced as the words of 'John of Antioch, from the Hellenic Chronicler' and 'from the chronicle of John, that is, from the Hellenic



Chronicler' (Istrin, 1912a, 3-10). We must conclude that the Slavonic Malalas was not truncated by the compiler of *EL*: that *EL* used a text of the Slavonic Malalas ('the Hellenic Chronicler' or 'John of Antioch') which already lacked most of Book XVIII.

*EL*'s immediate source was not the only truncated version of the Slavonic Malalas. Indeed, there is no evidence, as yet, to show that the rest of XVIII *ever* existed in Slavonic. Nowhere, even in the compendia which are wholly unconnected with *EL*, has any subsequent fragment of Malalas been identified: not in *Soph*, which paraphrases all eighteen books and which includes remnants of text to cover all the other major omissions in *EL*; not in *Tikh*, KVI or the *Hypatian Chronicle*. In a work so regularly and so variously used, this absolutely consistent gap is surprising. One must suspect that most of XVIII is consistently absent because it was never present: that the 'complete' Slavonic Malalas was translated from a Greek version which itself lacked most of what eventually became XVIII.

The internal divisions in the Slavonic, so far as they have been preserved, also differ slightly from those of the surviving Greek texts. The extant headings for Books I, VII, IX, X are similar to those of Ba and P. The division between VII and VIII is located differently: Slavonic VIII ('Concerning the emperor Tarquinius') starts at VII §8, Bo 180.14, although with 'the end of Book VIII' (Tvorogov, 1975, 277-8) the Slavonic is back in step with the Greek. However, when the Slavonic headings re-emerge at the start of XVII the correlation has changed: XVII is labelled 'Book XVI', and XVIII ('The reign of Justinian' in Ba) is labelled XVII (and entitled 'The sixth fall [= earthquake] in Antioch'). Again, the peculiarities of the Slavonic may reflect the peculiarities of a Greek version.

Among the many Slavonic additions and variants to Ba three categories of information are especially prominent: occasional naming of sources (e.g. II §19, Bo 37; V §59, Bo 132, §68, Bo 142); chronologies (e.g. X §2, Bo 228; XVII §§16-8, Bo 419-22; XVIII §1, Bo 425, §3, Bo 425, §8, Bo 428) and Antioch (e.g. XV §11, Bo 385; XVII §7, Bo 412, §§15-8, Bo 418-422). The extra Antiochene emphasis, more prominent even than in the text of Ba, is thus enhanced by particular extra portions of text, and by the headings of the later books, as well as by the absence of the vast Constantinopolitan sections of XVIII.

The peculiarities of the Slavonic Malalas can be explained in a variety of ways. A confusion in the manuscripts might have arisen at any stage; or the Byzantines might have handed the Slavs a defective copy; or they could even have split the work deliberately, giving world history to the translator and keeping for their own use the Constantinopolitan narrative of XVIII. Any neat explanation is problematic, since the Slavonic text itself is not neat: the Antiochene heading to the final book (XVIII, or Slavonic XVII) does not actually correspond to the remnants of its contents; and the text does not reach a natural conclusion, but rather breaks off in mid-narrative.

Yet however loose the ends (and the end), the extant Slavonic Malalas does provide at least some material which appears to support one of the general hypotheses on the textual history of the chronicle. The Slavonic is not the only 'truncated' version of Malalas. Evagrius tells us that his 'John the Rhetor' (= Malalas) ends with the account of the

earthquake at Antioch at XVII §16, Bo 419-421. The Slavonic also shows an affinity with Evagrius' 'John the Rhetor' in some of its supplementary Antiochene passages. The textual hypothesis proposed by Patzig (1890/1) and Brooks (1892) – but without reference to the Slavonic – is that the shorter Malalas is not truncated at all; that in fact it reflects the scope of the 'original' Malalas. The 'original' Malalas is represented as a chronicle in seventeen books, heavily Antiochene, though finished in Constantinople (ca. 529-532: cf. Udal'tsova, 1971, 19), and brought down either to the chronological excursus at XVIII §8, or possibly to the quake and renaming of Antioch at XVIII §§27-9 (Bo 442.18-444.4; cf. the title of the Slavonic XVII), or the conclusion of the Endless Peace (XVIII, §76: see above, chapter 1, pp. 18-19, for a discussion of these issues). Neither Evagrius nor the Slavonic fit this description in all its particulars, but together they provide the strongest evidence outside Ba that such a version of Malalas, whether 'original' or not, might have existed. Without examining the hypothesis in detail, we may summarise the additional evidence of the Slavonic, which has not been adequately taken into account.

The Slavonic roughly corresponds to a hypothetical early redaction both in its overall shape and in certain chronological details. We have already surveyed the shape of this redaction: a chronicle in seventeen books, notably Antiochene, ending soon after the excursus at XVIII §8 but before the 'sixth' Antiochene quake at XVIII §27 (Bo 442.18-9; we recall that the final book in Slavonic is entitled the 'Sixth fall in Antioch').

The chronological details are more delicate. I mention three of them. Firstly, in the preamble to Book I the Greek of P lists Malalas' sources: written works by several named authorities, 'up till the events of my own life-time which came to my hearing, I mean indeed from Adam to the reign of Zeno and those who ruled afterwards'. The Slavonic makes a far more exact distinction: written authorities for the distant past, then 'events which have come to my hearing, I mean from the reign of Zeno ...' This suggests an earlier Malalas, whose precise statement of method was conveniently fudged when the chronicle was later augmented. Secondly, an admittedly awkward chronological addition in the Slavonic at XVIII §8, Bo 428, seems to refer directly to the time of writing (the seventh indiction and Justinian's second consulate) or at least to deal with chronological and eschatological concerns specific to that time (Franklin, 1987). And thirdly, the Slavonic manages to bypass the objections of Shestakov (1895), who argues that the entire chronicle must have been put together after the death of Justinian, since the sum of the years of Justinian's reign is given at the start of XVIII, in a passage retained in the Slavonic. The Slavonic does indeed retain the chronologies at XVIII §1, Bo 425, but it conspicuously lacks one item of information: the length of Justinian's reign (Istrin, 1914, 26.2). A numeral is missing. It is simple to conjecture appropriate reasons within the framework of the textual hypothesis: perhaps the original numeral was smaller than the total number of years of Justinian's reign, and subsequent editors dropped it as anomalous or incomprehensible.

The evidence of the Slavonic Malalas, therefore, indicates that it was ultimately derived from an early version of the chronicle, completed *circa* 529-532, perhaps from a somewhat augmented version of the 'original' chronicle. Indeed, there may well have

been several augmented early versions produced and copied during this period, before the 'second edition' of 565-573/4. This hypothesis may help to account for the variety of endings included in the extant sources.

Nevertheless, the evidence of the Slavonic is not in itself sufficient to prove the case. Nor, conversely, should the extant Slavonic be accorded additional authority from its tenuous association with a hypothetical early redaction. A millennium of manuscripts cannot be so easily swept aside, and each Slavonic reading must be judged on its own merits. Eventually fragments of the latter part of XVIII may well be detected in Slavonic manuscripts as yet uninvestigated, and this discussion will be instantly unmasked as spurious. My limited purpose has been to explain and explore such Slavonic material as happens to be available and known. In the conclusion, as in the material, there is no finality. One hopes that those who have most direct access to the widest range of manuscripts – scholars in the Soviet Union – will again follow the example of Shestakov and Istrin, not just in their admirable attention to the textual and cultural tradition of Malalas in Russia, but also in a renewed attention to the broader problems of the chronicle.

### 3: Malalas in Latin

Jane Stevenson

The *Laterculus Malalianus* is preserved in a single manuscript (Rome, Vat. Pal. Lat. 277), written probably in Rome in the early eighth century,<sup>55</sup> but the text itself was probably composed in Canterbury towards the end of the seventh century. Specific dating and localising criteria include two references to Irish scholarship, and one to the recent erection of a basilica to the Virgin in Rome.<sup>56</sup> The *Laterculus* is known to scholarship, following Mommsen, as a chronicle-text; it is based in part on Malalas' chronicle. However some two-thirds of its length is completely independent of Malalas and although it takes its structure from Malalas (a correlation of the Gospels and Roman imperial history), its independent content is basically exegetical. In fact, I hope to show later on that the historical element is no more than a component of the exegesis. Its manuscript context, also, sets it among exegetical and computistical writings.<sup>57</sup> Its arguable attribution to Theodore of Canterbury gives it an interest and importance out of all proportion to its modest length for Canterbury was the first school of Christianity and

<sup>55</sup>Mommsen, 1898; there is also an edition by Cardinal Angelo Mai (1843), reprinted in PL 94, 424-47. See Traube, 1895, and Mommsen, 1895.

<sup>56</sup>This is argued at length in my forthcoming book on Theodore of Tarsos. The text of the *Laterculus* and its references to Rome and the Irish have been commented on by a number of writers. Its existence was noted by Kenney, 1921, 518, note 7; McNally, 1961, 305-16, at 309; *Scriptores*, 1973, 189; Jones, 1975, xiv. None of these writers gave the work much thought, and all of them assumed that its origins were in Rome itself.

<sup>57</sup>See note 59 below.

Latin literacy in Anglo-Saxon England: first in time and second only to Jarrow in importance.<sup>58</sup>

It will be noted that I have dated the *Laterculus* somewhat earlier than the eighth century proposed in the edition of Mommsen, which has set the terms for all subsequent discussion of this text. This is not an arbitrary decision. Having transcribed the single manuscript with exemplary fidelity, Mommsen analysed the resulting edition in the light of his near-encyclopaedic knowledge of early medieval Latin, and voiced his conclusions – and those of Harnack and Traube – in the two-page essay which has since done duty as the basis for all discussion. Mommsen noted the important Proba parallel, but the parallels he finds with Vergil are so slight as to denote nothing more than his sensitivity to an unexpectedly literary flavour in the writer's vocabulary – they mostly consist of a single word. His reason for assigning the text to a late date lies in the combination of the apparently Insular connections of the writer, evidenced by his antipathy to the Irish, and the presence among the early works of the Venerable Bede, datable to the early 700s, of a recalculation of the date of creation which put the age of the world in the fourth millennium rather than the sixth. So Mommsen's date is fixed by reference to Bede, the author of the only surviving Insular work to engage in this sort of chronographic revisionism, even though, obviously, Bede was not an Irishman. But placing this text in the mid-eighth century is problematic on a number of grounds, not the least of which is the date of the one surviving manuscript which is written in a swift and workmanlike, though not particularly elegant, Italian hand, of a type especially associable with Rome. The affinities of this script, and even more, the style of its decorative capitals, suggest that the manuscript may have been written in the *early* eighth century. The nature of the material it contains, which includes two Insular computistical works and some texts of Isidore (who was much admired in the British Isles as early as the second half of the seventh century),<sup>59</sup> gives a strong impression that the collection had been put together by an Insular scholar, whom one would not expect to find writing in an expert Roman uncial hand (that is, Vat. Pal. Lat. 277 is likely to be a copy of the original collection). The reading *suminantur* for *ruminantur* in §4 (Mommsen, 1898, 427) is a further corroboration of the thesis that the *Laterculus* was copied, rather than surviving as an authorial autograph, and moreover, that the exemplar from which it was copied was written in an Insular minuscule hand.<sup>60</sup> Thus, the *termini* provided by the original

<sup>58</sup>This is not exclusively a modern perception. A tenth- or eleventh-century monk called Gausbertus placed Theodore and Hadrian at the head of the entire Insular contribution to Continental learning and literature; see the text in Delisle, 1890, at 311-2.

<sup>59</sup>Two out of the seven works included in Pal. Lat. 277 are almost certainly Irish in origin – a further indication that the collection was put together in an Insular milieu. The manuscript contains two short works by Isidore, *Liber praefationum ueteris nouique testamenti* and *De ortu et obitu sanctorum patrum*, the *Laterculus*, the Hiberno-Latin Ps.-Isidore *Quaestiones tam de nouo quam de uetere testamento*, a brief, unidentifiable computistical fragment, the Hiberno-Latin 'Acti [suppositi] concilii Caesareae' (also a computistical text), and Pope Leo the Great's *Sententiae de apocryphis scripturis*. This odd mixture of texts suggests the possibility that the original compiler was one of the several Southumbrians to have been educated both at Canterbury and in Ireland, or that he belonged to one of the Anglo-Irish missionary groups working on the Continent.

<sup>60</sup>See the discussion below, at p. 291.

writing of Malalas' chronicle in the late sixth century and the transcription of the unique manuscript from an apparently Insular exemplar in the early eighth combine to place the *Laterculus* solidly in the seventh century, and its polemically anti-Irish statements place it in Anglo-Saxon England.

When seeking to localize a conspicuously scholarly text in early Anglo-Saxon England, most modern scholars would naturally think of Bede's school at Jarrow. But even Jarrow itself lay in Canterbury's debt. Benedict Biscop, who was later to found Wearmouth and Jarrow, was on his third visit to Rome when he was entrusted by the Pope in 668 with the task of conveying the elderly monk Theodore of Tarsos, the newly created archbishop of Canterbury, together with his companion Hadrian from Rome to England, where they arrived in 669. Benedict lived with Theodore and Hadrian in Canterbury for two years, as abbot of St Paul's (later St Augustine's), before Hadrian was ready to take over this responsibility. He then returned to his native Northumbria and founded there a school which was, briefly, the light of the West. And Bede, who was its chief glory, spoke in the highest terms of the education which Theodore and Hadrian offered at Canterbury. He said of Albinus, Hadrian's successor:

in tantum studiis scripturarum institutus est, ut Grecam quidem linguam non parua uero parte, Latinam non minus quam Anglorum, quae sibi naturalis est, nouerit. (V. 20; Colgrave/Mynors, 1969, 530.)

Bishop Tobias of Rochester, another Canterbury alumnus, is also described by Bede as knowing both Greek and Latin (*ibid.*, 474; V. 8). Bishop Aldhelm (640-709), however, our main surviving witness to the school of Canterbury, does not seem ever to have learned Greek, although his extraordinary learning stretched far and wide across the field of Latin literature, classical and Christian in a way which Bede himself could not match, and he is witness to the existence of a remarkable library in Southern England. It is also worth noting that the Canterbury archives appear to have been one of Bede's most significant historical resources. Abbot Albinus was both the instigator of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, and one of Bede's chief informants, as Bede's Preface bears witness. But the achievement of Theodore and Hadrian was a matter of reportage only until Bernhard Bischoff and Michael Lapidge began to uncover the Canterbury origins of parts of the early medieval glossary tradition.<sup>61</sup> The authors cited by name in the Canterbury glosses include Epiphanius of Cyprus, John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus, Theophilos (of Alexandria?) and Josephos. Far more Greek than Latin writers are so honoured.<sup>62</sup> Our *Laterculus Malalianus*, which is a historical exegesis of the life of Christ, is the sole surviving complete text<sup>63</sup> from seventh-century Canterbury, and its characteristics are therefore of the highest significance.

<sup>61</sup>The full results of this are due to be published in their edition of the *Libellus Glosarum*, forthcoming in *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England*. Meanwhile, both have made some preliminary remarks, in Bischoff, 1966, 206-09, and in Lapidge, 1986, 45-72.

<sup>62</sup>For a full account of the Greek and Latin sources, see Bischoff and Lapidge's forthcoming edition. I am grateful to Dr Lapidge for the privilege of seeing parts of their text in typescript.

<sup>63</sup>As distinct from the somewhat fragmentary glossaries, the *Penitential* (both of which traditions give us Theodore's thought at second hand), Theodore's octosyllable poetry, and some official correspondence.

The first thing to be said about it is that it vindicates Bede's claim that Greek was taught at Canterbury to that first generation of students (*ibid.*, 474, 530: V. 8 and V. 20). It proves that Greek texts were available, and used, in Anglo-Saxon England. It also shows that Canterbury was almost the only Western school in the seventh century to teach the exegetical methods of the school of Antioch.<sup>64</sup> The *Laterculus* demands a thorough re-examination of the entire question of the relationship between Insular Latin culture and the East and calls into question fundamental assumptions about what is Irish and what is English.

My reasons for deducing that the *Laterculus* was written by archbishop Theodore are mainly circumstantial. To begin with, this is a seventh-century text, written in Latin by a man whose education in the Greek patristic tradition is both wide and deep, and whose knowledge of Latin is relatively superficial. This is negatively supported by the fact that I have been quite unable to trace any influence from the thought of Augustine or Gregory in the *Laterculus*, which forms an absolute contrast with every other piece of seventh- or eighth-century Latin exegesis, Insular or continental, known to me. It is completely extraordinary to find a Western treatment of the life of Christ which stands independent of the Latin patristic tradition, and draws only on the Greek.

On the other hand, there are two Latin poets who have probably impressed the author of the *Laterculus*: Caelius Sedulius (whom he draws on at least ten times), and Proba. Vergil, *pace* Mommsen, is a more difficult influence to assess: Mommsen's parallels are superficial in the extreme, and if relevant at all, could assuredly have come through Proba. The *Cento* was very little read in the early middle ages, but it was known to Aldhelm, who was partly trained in the school of Canterbury. Furthermore, Caelius Sedulius was one of Aldhelm's favourite authors. I also found two passages which suggest that the author of the *Laterculus* read Gildas. Gildas was very well known to Aldhelm, but on the other hand, there is little or no indication that he was read at all outside the Celtic West and England. Another fact which can be deduced about the author of the *Laterculus* is that he was familiar with the city of Rome, because he refers to a great church dedicated to the Virgin, which had just been built on the Capitol. This must refer to S. Maria in Capitolio, the predecessor of S. Maria in Aracoeli, built on the Capitol some time in the second half of the seventh century.<sup>65</sup> The Roman reference is interesting, as the notorious Anglo-Saxon habit of going on pilgrimage to Rome took some time to get started. Only a very few Anglo-Saxons, notably Benedict Biscop, Wilfred, King

<sup>64</sup>What I intend to imply by describing the *Laterculus* and the Theodoran tradition of glosses as 'Antiochene' is that they rigorously eschew allegory and devote themselves to issues of literal and historical truth (the identification of Middle Eastern birds and beasts named in the Bible, for instance), while exhibiting a marked interest in Old Testament typology. It can hardly be too strongly stressed that in a seventh-century Western context, this avoidance of allegorical methods of exegesis hallowed by Augustine and Gregory was deviant to the point of being practically unique.

<sup>65</sup>Krautheimer, 1980, 285: 'to the North, perhaps using the ruins of the Temple of Juno, the monastery and church of S. Maria in Capitolio had been set up by the eighth century or earlier'. No remains of this church survive to clarify the question of its date, because it was rebuilt in the twelfth century, and rebuilt yet again in the thirteenth, each time in a larger and more impressive form, thus obliterating the original basilica (*ibid.*, 286-7).

Caedwalla, and possibly Aldhelm,<sup>66</sup> are said to have been visiting Rome in the period from 650 to 680.<sup>67</sup> Although the unique manuscript of the *Laterculus* is North Italian, and there was a plethora of Greek monks in later seventh-century Rome, there are several reasons for insisting that the *Laterculus* is Insular in origin. As mentioned earlier, there is one small but interesting pointer in the manuscript itself – the reading *suminantur* for *ruminantur*. The considerable similarity of *s* and *r* in Insular minuscule hands suggests that the exemplar from which this text was copied was of Insular origin; and since the manuscript is not very far removed in time from the original text, this original may have been written in the British Isles.<sup>68</sup> I have already referred to the significance of the author's possible use of Gildas. But a far stronger piece of evidence for an English origin is that the author goes out of his way, on two separate occasions, to be rude about the Irish, saying in his preface, 'iam ne nos fallant multiloquio suo Scottorum scolaces', and in §4, 'In sex milia autem annorum concordant omnes apparuisse Dominum; quamuis Scotti concordare nolunt, qui sapientia se existimant habere, et scientiam perdederunt'. The peevish tone of these comments is interestingly comparable with Aldhelm's gibes at Irish scholarship. The point here is that the *Laterculus* was written in the later seventh century, at which time nobody but the English were particularly bothered about the Irish. Certainly, we find some conspicuous Hibernophobia in Continental circles in the later eighth and ninth centuries,<sup>69</sup> but in the seventh there were not enough *peregrini*<sup>70</sup> about to have excited any particular reaction. And there is only one testimony of an expedition to Rome from seventh-century Ireland that I know of, Cumnian's dispatch of three monks to go to Rome and find out how they calculated Easter.

<sup>66</sup>*Aldhelmi Opera* (ed. Ehwald, 1919), 494; the letter of an anonymous student to Aldhelm includes the phrase 'quia tu Romae aduena fuisti', but there is no way of placing this statement relative to the chronology of Aldhelm's life.

<sup>67</sup>The Pilgrimage was a dramatic feature of Anglo-Papal relations in the eighth century, on the witness of both Bede and Boniface. See, for instance, Bede's comment on the year 725 in his *Chronica Maiora* (Mommsen, 1898, 223-333, 320): 'his temporibus multi Anglorum gentis, nobiles et ignobiles, uiri et feminae, duces et priuati, diuini amoris instinctu de Britannia Romam uenire consueuerant'; and also Levison, 1946, 34-44. But this flood of eager pilgrims seems very much a feature of the confident and consolidated church of the mid and late eighth century. Venturesome Anglo-Saxon Christians of the seventh century were more likely to cross the sea to Ireland, like Wihfrith and Heahfrith, or to the monasteries of Gaul, like the future abess Hild, than to go as far as Rome.

<sup>68</sup>'... by so doing "Continental" scribes courted another danger, the confusion of *r* with *s*; for Insular *s* falls below the line ... the confusion of these two letters usually points to an Insular minuscule exemplar' (Lindsay, 1922, 43).

<sup>69</sup>See, e.g., Bischoff, 1966a, 19-25 and also Theodulf's poem *Ad Carolum regem* (Dummler, 1881), which describes at some length (II. 214-34, pp. 488-9) an Irishman 'quae tamen ignorat, omnia nosse putat'.

<sup>70</sup>The Irish presence on the Continent began towards the end of the sixth century with the foundation of Annegray, Fontaines, Luxeuil and Bobbio by Columbanus, and Péronne by Fursa. In all these cases, a small core of Irish monks was balanced by much larger numbers of Continental recruits. Apart from the perennial battle over the date of Easter, on which Columbanus has left us two important epistles (*Epistolae* I and III, ed. Walker, 1957, 1-13, 22-5), there is no evidence that the eccentricities of Irish scholarship attracted the attention of their Continental neighbours at this time. It was the Carolingian era, when there was an influx of a larger number of Irish scholars than the market could easily bear, which saw the development of pronounced anti-Irish sentiments in some Frankish quarters.

To sum up, the author of the *Laterculus* was educated in the Greek tradition, familiar with Rome, disliked the Irish, and flourished in the later seventh century. This seems to point straight to Theodore of Tarsos, who was certainly educated in the Eastern Empire, was living at Rome in the 660's, and is pictured by Aldhelm in his letter to Heahfrith as locked in battle with Irish students, like an old boar surrounded by hounds, suggesting with some force that he was well aware of contemporary controversies between Irish and English scholars.<sup>71</sup> Furthermore, the Latin sources of the *Laterculus*, such as they are, were all known to Aldhelm, and the glosses known to originate in seventh-century Canterbury show a very considerable overlap with the *Laterculus* in the Greek authorities used. Whenever the *Laterculus* and the Theodoran glosses happen to coincide in their comments,<sup>72</sup> they are in agreement.

The first half of the *Laterculus* (§§2-11) follows Malalas' chronicle almost exactly, with one or two minor additions, and an introduction. This is what they contain. We begin with the annunciation, and a discussion of the various important events which have fallen on this date (March 25th), most of which is additional to Malalas. Then we return to straight translation for an account of the division of historical time; we are told that there were 3,000 years between Adam and Phalek, and 2,967 years from Phalek to the birth of Christ, which of course makes 6,000 years from the creation of Adam to the crucifixion, when Christ was thirty-three. Most of this is straight from Malalas – indeed, the dating of the crucifixion to *anno mundi* 6000 seems unique to Malalas and texts associable with him (cf. chapter 6, pp. 111-20); the only addition is a gratuitous, parenthetic remark about the stupidity of the Irish. The next event mentioned in the *Laterculus* is the visit of the Magi, first to Herod, and then to Christ at Bethlehem, followed by the flight into Egypt. Here again, the writer inserts additional material, which he claims to have derived from Epiphanius, the fourth-century iconoclast bishop of Constantia in Cyprus.<sup>73</sup> The author, following Malalas once more, then treats of the return of Jerusalem, Augustus' dream of an unknown Jewish divinity, the succession of Tiberius, the baptism of Christ, the death of John the Baptist, the crucifixion, and the resurrection. His account follows the chronology of the Biblical narrative in sequence. Each of these significant events is given its date, often very elaborately. Here is an example of the writer's technique:<sup>74</sup>

<sup>71</sup>Aldhelm, *Epistola ad Efridum* (ed. Ehwald, 1919), 493.

<sup>72</sup>For example, that all human beings will be resurrected at the age of thirty (§16), and that the Magi arrived two years after Christ's birth (§6).

<sup>73</sup>I argue at some length in a forthcoming book that Mommsen was wrong to attribute this passage, in direct contradiction to the text, to Epiphanius Scholastikos, the Latin translator of Theodore Lector's *Historia Tripartita*. The apocryphal episode in question is a *locus classicus* of the iconoclast position (unfortunately only a handful of quotations remain to us of Epiphanius' iconoclast works). Moreover there is considerable evidence that various works by Epiphanius were used at Canterbury; and, as Laistner (1983, 30) says, 'the *Historia Tripartita* does not appear to have been much consulted by continental authors of the eighth century, and in England it seems to have been unknown at that period'. So, despite the superficial attractiveness of preferring a Latin source for a Latin text, the *Historia* appears to be the less likely of the alternative sources for this episode.

<sup>74</sup>Interestingly, the *Canones Theodori*, 143, based on Archbishop Theodore's verbal *iudicia*, use a double date, giving both the Greek and the Roman month, in a similar way: 'Bis in uno



in the sixth month of the forty-first year of that Caesar, in the month of Distrus (*that is, according to the Latins, March*) on the twenty-fifth day of the month (*which is the eighth of the kalends of April, which is called Xanthicus according to the Greeks*) ... the archangel Gabriel was sent to bear witness to blessed Mary ...<sup>75</sup>

The second half of the *Laterculus*, which is original prose rather than translation or paraphrase, is rather different in its contents. §12 goes back to Christ's birth, and begins a recapitulation of the life of Christ treated typologically rather than historically, and displaying a marked Antiochene bias. The *Laterculus* in fact is written in the form of two parallel structures of historical fact and spiritual significance, with a final element consisting of a list of imperial reign lengths from Augustus to the ninth year of Justin II (cf. chapters 1, pp. 24-25 and 6, pp. 139-41). Although it is not very long, it is a work of considerable learning. The bipartite structure, odd though it may seem, can be paralleled quite easily in the Antiochene exegetical tradition, with its avoidance of undue dependence on allegory, and its concern with both literal and historical truth and typological significance. The most specific model for the plan of the work as a whole which I have found is Theodore of Mopsuestia's commentary on the minor epistles of St Paul, which similarly begins its discussion of each epistle by setting it in its political and temporal context.<sup>76</sup>

The only two sources mentioned by name in the *Laterculus*, apart from books of the Bible, are Eastern; Epiphanius of Cyprus is cited in §7, and Ephrem Syrus in §19. I have been able to find a parallel, though one cannot be sure that it is a source, for every single idea in the *Laterculus*. Theodore of Mopsuestia, the great Antiochene, proved particularly useful for this, as also was Epiphanius. The Syrian doctors, Ephrem, Narsai and Jacob of Sarug, who were trained in the Antiochene tradition, have also afforded several useful parallels. John Chrysostom and Irenaeus were other theologians I found particularly relevant, though Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Theophilus, Hippolytos and others were helpful on particular points. Every one of these writers was Eastern or of Eastern origin, and wrote either in Greek or in Syriac,<sup>77</sup> most of them were Antiochene in tendency. Outside of exegesis, the author of the *Laterculus* also drew on the historians Josephos and Eusebios, and the medical writers Galen and Oribasios.<sup>78</sup> In short, the content of his

anno concilia episcopi fiant id est quarta septimana post pentecosten. Secundo xii die mensis Hyperberethei id est iii idus viiibris iuxta Romanos' (Finsterwalder, 1929, 250).

<sup>75</sup>Cf. Malalas, IX §25, Bo 226; the phrases in italics are additions to the text of Malalas as it is preserved in Ba. They represent either additions made by Theodore himself or phrases which stood in his version of Malalas: they are not included in the sub-text to the 1986 translation, though parallels for this double dating reference exist elsewhere in the text (e.g. X §14, Bo 240).

<sup>76</sup>His commentary on *Ephesians* opens by collating the evidence of *Acts*, the traditions about John and the history of the imperial reigns of Nero and Trajan before moving on to an exegesis of its contents. See Swete, 1880, I, 112-96, at 112-18 and Greer, 1961, 104-5.

<sup>77</sup>The works of the great Syrian doctors were rapidly translated into Greek, and similarly much Greek literature, theological and otherwise, was translated into Syriac; see Brock, 1977, 1-17.

<sup>78</sup>The *Synopsis* and *Euporistes* of Oribasios were certainly in England by the end of the ninth century, because they were known to the compiler of 'Bald's leechbook' (c. 900): Cameron (M.L.), 1983, 147-8.

thought seems to be entirely formed by Greek writers of one kind or another.<sup>79</sup> Note further that there is considerable overlap between the sources for the ideas in the *Laterculus* and the authorities cited by the Canterbury glosses attributed to Theodore and Hadrian – John Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Josephos and many others. The important point here, which may not be readily apparent in a Byzantine context, but which cannot be too strongly stressed, is that the *Laterculus* is unique in the annals of post-patristic Latin exegesis in apparently owing nothing to the Fathers of the Western Church. Thus, the peculiarities of the *Laterculus* are both positive and negative. We find first the total absence of the expected frame of reference, and then the presence of a way of thinking about the New Testament which is not only internally consistent in its approach but also comparable in both outline and detail with Greek exegetical traditions, particularly as found in the work of Theodore of Mopsuestia. There is not a single idea or statement in the *Laterculus* for which I have failed to find a Greek or Syriac parallel, and this is combined with a total absence of any concepts or turns of phrase which can be shown to echo the words of one of the Latin Fathers. The author was not, however, entirely ignorant of Latin literature. I have already mentioned his acquaintance with the Christian Latin poets, Proba and Sedulius. Sedulius in particular is echoed, sometimes very closely, at least ten times. His phraseology was influenced by Latin Bible-texts, even though he sometimes seems to have been translating directly from the Septuagint. The only non-Biblical Latin prose writer to influence the expression of the *Laterculus* is Gildas, who seems to have contributed two phrases, though it should also be said that a phrase in §2 suggests that the writer knew Rufinus' Latin translation of Eusebios' *Ecclesiastical History* as well as (or instead of) the Greek original. The only point at which the actual content may be dependent on a Latin text is the author's reference to the legal ceremony of manumission in §20, but this could perfectly well be based on Sedulius, who made the same point, in the same context.

The Bible-text of the *Laterculus* is interesting and problematic. It appears to be separable into several layers. Some of its readings are pure Vulgate, as we now know it. Some are Vetus Latina, or possibly assignable to an early stage of the development of the Vulgate, and agree with readings found in such writers as Augustine and Cassiodorus. A few of the citations are quite startlingly anomalous, in ways that suggest that the writer was paraphrasing from memory. The Psalm-text is 'iuxta LXX' (i.e., Gallican), again as one might expect, since it was the text used at Rome.<sup>80</sup> This is demonstrable from, for example, the reference to 'sicut gigas in uiam', which is a near-quotation from *Psalm* 18. 6, which reads 'exsultauit ut gigas ad currendam uiam suam' in the 'iuxta LXX' version

<sup>79</sup>A considerable number of Greek texts were translated into Latin between the fourth and seventh centuries. Bede, a useful comparandum as our major early Anglo-Saxon exegete, knew some of Rufinus' translations of Origen and Gregory of Nazianzus, Eustathius' translation of Basil's *Hexaemeron*, and some of John Chrysostom's works. There were almost certainly more translations of Greek exegesis made than we are now aware of. But it would be extraordinarily perverse of a Latin scholar from some Hibernophobic milieu (i.e. England or Frankia) to reject the influence of the Latin Fathers and place his trust entirely in a battery of translations. This would require a degree of dependence on, and independence from, *auctoritas* unlikely in any period, but particularly implausible in the early middle ages.

<sup>80</sup>See Estin, 78-83, in Fontaine and Pietri, 1985.

and is quite different in the 'iuxta Hebraeos'. Of the several references to *Psalms* in this text, all are either common to the two versions, or where they vary, close to the Septuagint. The Vetus Latina was often closer to the Septuagint than the Vulgate and this normally obscures the question of whether the writer was actually translating from the Septuagint at times. There is, however, one instance where he was almost certainly translating from Greek; the *Laterculus* summarises *Exodus* 4. 21-6 in a way which demonstrates influence from Jewish exegesis of this difficult passage. Verses 24-5 of the Vulgate *Exodus* read 'occurrit ei Dominus et uolebat occidere eum. Tulit ilico Seffora acutissimam petram et circumcidit praeputium filii sui ... et dimisit eum postquam dixerat sponsus sanguinem ob circumcisionem'. The earliest Jewish exegesis of this passage was written in Palestine before 200 B.C. and established the following points: the object of the assault is Moses; the assailant is not Jahweh but an angel of the Lord; it is to the angel that Zipporah speaks in 4. 25; and Moses' life is saved because of the sacrificial atoning value of the blood that is shed (Vermes, 1957-8, 313). This ancient Jewish reading of the text affected the Septuagint, Vulgate and Peshitta (Robinson, 1986, 456). The *Laterculus* is very much in the Jewish exegetical tradition, as the writer gives the non-biblical *angelus* rather than *Dominus*; it is Moses whom the angel attempts to kill and the sacramental, redemptive power of the blood shed in circumcision is stressed, with its obvious typological value as a prefiguration both of the blood shed in the circumcision of Christ and the blood shed on the cross.

The Septuagint reading, which is unsupported by any known Hebrew text, refers, like the *Laterculus*, to the angel of the Lord rather than the Lord himself: 'Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐν τῷ καταλύματι συνήτησεν αὐτῷ ἄγγελος Κυρίου καὶ ἐζήτει αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνειν. This suggests quite strongly that the writer is thinking in terms of the Septuagint. The Vetus Latina reads 'et factum est in uia, ad refectorem obuiant ei angelus, et quaerebat eum occidere' (Sabatier, 1743, II, 97-8). Although this was clearly translated from the Septuagint, the vocabulary is so different from the *Laterculus* – note *occidere* rather than *interficere*, *obuiare* not *occurrere*, and that Zipporah seizes a *calculus* rather than a *lapis* – that it seems very unlikely that the *Laterculus* drew on the Vetus Latina.

All this greatly complicates any attempt to reconstruct the writer's Bible-text. But even when a writer is paraphrasing from memory, he is quite likely to retain words and structures from the version he knows most intimately, even if he elides or inverts parts of the original sentence. It may therefore be significant that non-Vulgate phrases, even in loose quotation or paraphrase, may be found to be shared with the Vetus Latina or early 'mixed' Bible-texts, though the sentence in the *Laterculus* has been so thoroughly recast that it resembles no one version in detail.

The sections of Malalas which are used in the *Laterculus* are translated so closely as to form what is practically a 'crib', to the extent of reproducing the Greek syntax. The genitive absolute 'sanctorum apostolorum uidentium' precisely matches τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ὁρώντων, and, similarly, *ex consolibus* rather than *exconsule* is a Latin calque on ἀπὸ ὑπάτων. Cf. §3: ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ ἕως τοῦ Φαλέκ, υἱοῦ Ἐβέρ ...: 'ab Adam usque a Phalech, fili Eber ...'; §3: καὶ ὑπέπεσε τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὁ ἄνθρωπος: 'et cecidit

sub peccato homo'; §4: κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἑξ ἡμερῶν τῆς πλάσεως τοῦ Ἀδάμ: 'secundum numerum sex dierum plasmationis Adae'. However, it must be noted that this absolutely literal translation is not followed as a consistent principle through the sections of the *Laterculus* taken from Malalas; some sentences are more Latinate than others, though it is fair to say that the translation is always close.

The translation techniques used in the *Laterculus* must be viewed in their appropriate context. There were many Greek monks in Rome, and furthermore, there was a fair amount of translation going on. The minutes of the Lateran council of 649, for example, were produced simultaneously in Greek and Latin. But the centre I want to focus specific attention on is not the Vatican secretariat, but the monastery of Tre Fontane, or St Anastasios, *Ad Aquas Salvias*, one of the three important Greek monasteries in seventh-century Rome (Ferrari, 1957, 33-48). This is of interest for a number of reasons. It housed a community of Cilicians under their abbot, George, who put their weight behind the Pope and against the emperor in the politico-theological battle known as the monothelite controversy. Theodore was, of course, from Tarsos in Cilicia, and it is not only possible, but probable, that Tre Fontane was his monastery.<sup>81</sup> The monks of Tre Fontane brought with them to Rome the head of their patron saint, Anastasios, who was martyred by the Persians in 628, and they quite quickly set about the delicate business of transferring the cult of this saint to Rome, a city which of course was absolutely crammed with home-grown saints of its own. An immediate result of this was, naturally enough, a flurry of literary activity. These Greek monks produced a translation of the Passion of Anastasios,<sup>82</sup> which was originally written (in Greek) in 630; and this is how it is described by Paul Meyvaert (1982, 380):

The Latin follows the Greek word order, line after line. The translation is replete with shortcomings: choice of the wrong word to render the Greek meaning, and an almost total neglect of Latin grammar, syntax and idiom, resulting here and there in statements that remain unintelligible to anyone who is unable to refer back to the original Greek.

Meyvaert further noted that this version of the *Passio* was in Northumbria by the beginning of the eighth century, because it was rewritten into more correct Latin by Bede, who described it trenchantly as 'librum uitae et passionis sancti Anastasii, male de greco translatum et peius a quodam inperito emendatum' (V. 24; Colgrave/Mynors, 1969, 568-70). This original version of the *Passio* at least shows that it was possible for a seventh-century Greek-speaker active in Rome to be satisfied with producing 'translations' from Greek to Latin which made only the most minimal concessions to the characteristics of the latter language. But the cult of Anastasios, supported by the important relic of his head, was successfully established in Rome. Meyvaert says, 'the veneration of this relic by pilgrims coming from all over the West must have prompted the desire to provide a

<sup>81</sup>There seems to have been a definite, and humanly comprehensible, tendency for monks from a particular region to form a separate community. For instance, as late as the pontificate of Donus (676-8), a Nestorian community was discovered living undisturbed 'in monasterio qui appellatur Boetiana', in Rome (*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, 1886, I, 348).

<sup>82</sup>Preserved in Turin, Biblioteca nazionale, MS F. III. 16, ff. 14-23, a former Bobbio manuscript of the tenth century.

Latin version which would tell the story of the Persian monk's conversion and death' (Meyvaert, 1982, 383-4). It seems to me interesting that the obviously inadequate Latin text of the *Passio*, for all the shudders it evoked in Bede's refined consciousness, seems to have been thoroughly successful in its avowed intention of putting St Anastasios and his monastery firmly on the pilgrim's map of important holy sites in Rome, since the monastery is mentioned in *De locis sanctis martyrum quae sunt foris ciuitatis Romae*, probably written between 635 and 645 (Geyer, 1965, 316, note 6).

I have suggested that the monastery of St Anastasios in Rome must be at the very least very close to the milieu in which Theodore of Tarsos lived and worked before he came to Canterbury. Meyvaert's discussion of the *Passio* shows that a contemporary monk at St Anastasios took the same approach to the translation of Greek that we find in the *Laterculus*. We can add to this a further insight into the culture of St Anastasios, a text called *Miracula S. Anastasii*, also written by a monk of St Anastasios, in 712, but an original composition in Latin (*Miracula*, 1892, 233-41). It is interesting to observe that its Latinity has the same un-classical characteristics as the *Laterculus*, though the style is considerably more flowery, with *dum* used for *cum* (§2), nominative absolutes (§2) and occasional errors of syntax<sup>83</sup> as well as a similar tendency to use markedly anomalous versions of Latin Bible-texts.<sup>84</sup>

When thinking about translation, we are used to accepting the dictum of Jerome, so often quoted, that one ought to translate sense by sense, not word by word; and of course many late antique and early medieval texts, from Jerome's Vulgate itself and Rufinus' translation of Eusebios' *Historia ecclesiastica* do just that. But there is an alternative trend in early medieval translation, though we tend not to think of it as such, which is glossing, i.e. writing word-by-word equivalents over the words of the original texts, as a tenth-century Northumbrian vandal called Aldred did, for instance, in the Lindisfarne Gospels (in c. 960).<sup>85</sup> This approach to the text seems more closely related to the translation-technique used in the *Passio* and, though less extremely, in the *Laterculus*. It is an indirect but powerful statement of the primacy of the original text over the independence of the version. The monastery of St Anastasios was by no means unique in taking this approach to the translation of Greek. For instance, the original Latin translation of the *Life* of Pelagia the Harlot (or Penitent) follows the Greek word by word (ed. Petitmengin, 1981).<sup>86</sup> In short, the evidence that I have seen so far suggests that the translation from Malalas in the *Laterculus* appears to be of a standard acceptable to the majority of the writer's contemporaries, however much it might wound the sensibilities

<sup>83</sup>E.g., 'et assumens filiam suam *habens* spiritum immundum ....'

<sup>84</sup>E.g., 'quaerite et inuenietis, petite *et accipietis*', (*Luke* 11. 9; §7) for 'petite et dabitur uobis, quaerite et inuenietis'; and '*non periet capillus* de capite uestro' (*Luke* 21. 18; §9) for 'et capillus de capite uestro non periebit'. This writer, like the author of the *Laterculus*, uses *Psalms* 'iuxta LXX'.

<sup>85</sup>Ross, 1969, 493 comments 'surely then what Bede was doing when he was translating was making a word-for-word gloss'. He notes also that the 'translation' was achieved, as the *Epistola* tells us, by dictating to a second party, who wrote down Bede's words.

<sup>86</sup>The original Latin translation is edited by Francois Dolbeau (Petitmengin, 1981, 161-249), and is a word-for-word rendering of the original. Dolbeau thinks it was made in the pre-Carolingian period, though he does not commit himself to greater precision.

of an accomplished Latinist, whether in the seventh century, or the twentieth.

There is also a useful indication in the works of Gregory of Tours that translation was sometimes a two-stage process. In his *De gloria martyrum*, he informs us that he was assisted by a Syrian called John in translating the Passion of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesos (whether from Greek or Syriac, he does not say): 'quod passio eorum, quam Siro quodam interpretante in Latino transtulimus, plenius prodit' (*De gloria martyrum* §94; Arndt/Krusch, 1884, 550-2). We have here a dual activity. First *interpretatio*: which probably means that John the Syrian turned the original text word-by-word into Latin, without bothering about the literary qualities of this 'crib', then *translatio*, performed by Gregory on this rough version, in which, having grasped the sense, he turned it into intelligible Latin (cf. Bordellès, 1985, 125). It is clear from the context of Greek activity at Rome, notably the *Passio S. Anastasii*, that *interpretatio*, or word-by-word translation, could and sometimes did stand on its own. But there is also the possibility, in such cases, that the *interpretatio* was intended to provide the basis for reworking by an accomplished Latinist such as this text ultimately received at the hands of Bede. All I would argue for in the case of the *Laterculus* is that there is reason to suggest that, in a classroom context, *interpretatio* might be held to be sufficient by a fundamentally Hellenophone scholar, forming as it did an adequate basis for analysis and discussion of the meaning of the text. The *Laterculus*, it seems to me, consists of a rough *interpretatio* of Malalas' useful summary of the position of Christ in history, expanded, in true Antiochene style, by a series of typological meditations on the events described.

What, then, is the status of the *Laterculus* as a witness to the text of Malalas himself? As, arguably, the work of a man who lived in the Greek-speaking East probably up to his forties, and subsequently seems to have lived in a Hellenophone community in Rome until his sixties, probably at St Anastasios, it is probable that his source-text was reasonably close to the original. Some points may be noticed. The orthography of proper names – e.g., names of consuls – is often very close to that of the eleventh- or twelfth-century Ba, suggesting that the corrupt forms in which they appear go back at least to the seventh century, if not to Malalas himself. The *Laterculus* supports the reading βωμός not πρόμος like the tenth-century Souda (Su I, 411) in the Sybilline verses (§8; cf. X §5, Bo 232). But the most important aspect of the *Laterculus*, from the point of studies on Malalas, is the evidence it offers for the date of composition of the chronicle. The final portion of the *Laterculus* is a list of emperors and their reign lengths (cf. p. 292). Is the last item, the entry for Justin II, merely a doublet of the entry for Justin I, or does it pinpoint a precise year? It is impossible to tell with any certainty. The treatment of Malalas' chronographic data in the *Laterculus* suggests that the author went through Books X-XVIII, jotting down the regnal lengths given, and then wrote them out in a list. This mechanical procedure would be equally compatible with the acceptance of dittography in the original (note, as a comparison, that Valerian appears twice in the *Laterculus*' list) or with an original which said 'it is now the seventh year ...'. The list as it stands suggests that Theodore was either uninterested in comparing Malalas' work

with that of other chronographers, or indeed, that he had no other book of contemporary history to hand – which may serve to strengthen the thesis that he was writing in Canterbury rather than Rome.

## 4: Malalas in Syriac

Witold Witakowski<sup>87</sup>

For a long time both Syriac and Byzantine historiography developed along parallel lines. Though the former originated in a different ethnic and linguistic milieu, both shared the same political ambience – the Roman/Byzantine empire – and the same Christian spirit. Due to the far richer tradition of Greek historiography, it was only natural that in the contacts between them Syriac historiography received stronger impulses from the Byzantine than vice versa. One of the results of this influence is that new historiographic genres developed in Syriac, the universal chronicle, for example, for which the *Chronicle* of Eusebios was the model. Another result is that Syriac chronicles contain much historiographic material of Greek provenance. For before the ways of the two historiographic traditions parted – after the Church divisions of the sixth century – many Greek works were translated into Syriac, either whole or in fragments. Even if not all of these translations have survived independently, extracts from them have become a part of the Syriac historiographic tradition. Obviously the Syriac extracts are even more valuable if the Greek originals are lost, totally, or partially.

This is, in fact, the case with the chronicle of John Malalas. In its original form, that is, a form more extensive than that preserved in Ba, Malalas' chronicle was a source for the Syrian John of Asia (known in Byzantine sources as John of Ephesos) for the second part of his *Ecclesiastical History*. This part is now practically lost, but before it disappeared it was used by several Syriac chroniclers. Among them, Pseudo-Dionysios of Tel-Mahrê (= PsD), the author of a universal chronicle, seems to be the major witness to John of Ephesos' and ultimately to Malalas' original text.

As early as 1892 the similarity of some fragments of the work of Malalas to those of John of Ephesos was recognized by E.W. Brooks (Brooks, 1892). He also noticed that John's *Ecclesiastical History* testifies to the original and longer Malalas. Brooks' Syriac text base was, however, limited to the excerpts published by P.N. Land (Land, 1868, 289-329: BL, Add. Mss. 14650, 385-391: Ms. Add. 14647) and translated by him and W.J. Van Douwen (Van Douwen/Land, 1889).

The first to perceive Malalas' material in Pseudo-Dionysios was the Russian scholar A. D'yakonov, who pointed it out in an article in 1903 and then later in his book on John of Ephesos (1908, 247-62). He compared the text of John of Ephesos, as preserved

<sup>87</sup>Research for this section has been made possible thanks to the financial support of the Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

by Pseudo-Dionysios, with Malalas' work as it was known from Ba (D'yakonov, 1908, 248-56), and found that, although the two often differ on the common material, it must be due to the fact that John of Ephesos had access to a more extensive version of Malalas than that in Ba. This makes Pseudo-Dionysios, according to D'yakonov, an important witness to the original text of Malalas, the more so because John of Ephesos was one of the first historians to use that chronicle. The text of John of Ephesos in Pseudo-Dionysios contains excerpts from Malalas' chronicle up to and including Book XVIII and this means that John of Ephesos had access to the text in its later edition, attributed by some scholars to an anonymous Constantinopolitan continuator (D'yakonov, 1908, 259; cf. chapters 1, p. 19 and this chapter, p. 249). D'yakonov compared John's text with other witnesses beside Ba – the Slavonic translation, the excerpts in the Escorial manuscript (*De insidiis* and *De virtutibus*), Evagrius' *Ecclesiastical History*, the *Chronicon Paschale*, Theophanes' *Chronicle* and the *Chronicle* of John of Nikiu – and found that the extracts from John of Ephesos in Pseudo-Dionysios came closer sometimes to one, sometimes to another of these and sometimes to Ba itself (*ibid.*, 248, 259).

Moreover, D'yakonov perceived on the basis of Pseudo-Dionysios' chronicle that Malalas' text had a monophysite tendency and that Ba presents a version that has arguably been purged by an orthodox epitomizer (*ibid.*, 259-61). According to D'yakonov, John of Ephesos preserved Malalas' anti-Chalcedonian expressions in a stronger form than they are given in Ba. In Pseudo-Dionysios, for example, it is said of Stephen, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, that he was murdered by his clerics, as 'it was found that he was a Nestorian' (PsD I, 229. 25f. / 171)<sup>88</sup>; similarly concerning the exiled Kalandio, *ibid.* 230.44) whereas Ba (XV §6, Bo 381) has only the *beztsvetnoye* (i.e. 'colourless') phrase 'as a Nestorian' (for further points on the context of these statements, see chapter 1, pp. 15-16). Another of D'yakonov's arguments concerns John of Ephesos' account of the riot against the pro-monophysite emperor Anastasios in connection with a change in the *Trisagion* formula (PsD II, 6. 21 – 8. 23; cf. XVI §19, Bo 406-8). Malalas' authorship of this account, unfavourable to the rioters as it stands in Pseudo-Dionysios, is corroborated by the relevant fragment of John of Nikiu (JN 89, 54-68), who used Malalas but did not know John of Ephesos. Similarly, Pseudo-Dionysios' story of the death of Euphrasios, the patriarch of Antioch (PsD II, 50. 14 – 51. 21) testifies, according to D'yakonov, to the original monophysite tone of Malalas' work. It has been purged in Ba nearly to the point of complete removal of the mention of Euphrasios' death (XVII §22, Bo 423), but again it is also present in John of Nikiu (JN 90, 32), according to D'yakonov – with a monophysite bias.

Another Syriac source containing material from Malalas which was analysed by D'yakonov was the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian (= MS).<sup>89</sup> This includes some information from Malalas and John of Ephesos which Pseudo-Dionysios did not copy,

<sup>88</sup>References to Syriac texts are by page and line of the Syriac edition, followed (after /) by the page of the translation.

<sup>89</sup>Having analyzed three examples from the *Chronography* of Bar Hebraeus, D'yakonov found (1908, 302 f.) that it contained no information extra to that in Michael the Syrian; he concluded that Bar Hebraeus must have used John of Ephesos only indirectly, through Michael the Syrian.



but more often than not the two Syriac authors agree in their choice of passages from John of Ephesos. D'yakonov, however, suggested that Michael the Syrian may have used Malalas directly. It must be pointed out that the Russian scholar had no access to the actual text of Pseudo-Dionysios as it was not published at that time. He based his research on F. Nau's analysis of the chronicle and the fragments published together with it (Nau, 1897). Yet Nau in his turn did not use the unique medieval manuscript of Pseudo-Dionysios (Vatican, Syr. 162), but the unreliable copy made from it by Paulin Martin in 1867, which the latter deposited in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Par. Syr. 284, 285). In addition to this D'yakonov used the fragments of John's *Ecclesiastical History* published by Land, though he was under the impression that they were copied from Pseudo-Dionysios (an inference based on spelling faults and a dating method common to both Land's fragments and PsD; D'yakonov, 1908, 205 f.).

This valuable analysis remained, due to the language in which it was published, practically unknown in the West. Thus Felix Haase, who wrote in 1916 about the relationship between Pseudo-Dionysios and Malalas, did not know D'yakonov's work.<sup>90</sup> He too discovered that Pseudo-Dionysios must have copied the second part of John of Ephesos' *Ecclesiastical History* (Haase, 1916, 79). He then proceeded to compare the material from John of Ephesos in the chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysios with that in Michael the Syrian. As the two chronicles agreed with each other on this point, Haase went one step further in looking for source parallels. He compared the passage in Michael the Syrian (Chabot's translation: II, 149), 'Ces choses sont tirées du livre de Jean d'Antioche qui dit que depuis Adam jusqu'à la mort de Zenon il y a en tout 6458 ans', with Malalas XV §16, Bo 391, but the fact that the latter has the From Adam year of 5983,<sup>91</sup> together with other differences between the Syriac chronicles and Malalas, led him to suppose – against the solutions admitted by Brooks and D'yakonov – that the John of Antioch to whom Michael the Syrian refers was not Malalas (Haase, 1916, 88 f.). Haase also drew on other chronicles as comparative material: the *Chronicon Paschale*, Theophanes, Moses Khorenats'i and John of Nikiu as well as Evagrius, George Monachos and George Kedrenos, and this analysis led him to the conclusion that they all, Malalas included, used a common source (*ibid.*, 240-67). This was, according to him, John of Antioch, and Malalas' chronicle presents only a vulgarized form of the work of the former (*ibid.*, 268). Michael the Syrian, possibly used the Antiochene even without the intermediary of John of Ephesos (*ibid.*, 260).

A quarter of a century later the problems connected with the chronicles of Malalas, John of Ephesos and Pseudo-Dionysios were studied by Nina V. Pigulevskaya (1941, 15-

<sup>90</sup>Also Haase was only able to use the fragments of PsD published by Land and Nau. The risks involved in drawing conclusions from an unreliable text base can be seen in Haase's assertion (1916, 251) that PsD must have misunderstood his source since, against the testimony of Michael the Syrian (278b. 9f / II 192) and Malalas XVIII §6, Bo 427, PsD says that in 525 Justinian baptized the king and the army of the Heruls 'in the church of the Epiphany' instead of 'on the day of Epiphany'. Haase was misled by Martin/Nau's text; in fact Chabot's edition has 'the feast' ('ܕܝܢܐ ܕܥܕܢܝܐ'; PsD II, 53, 20).

<sup>91</sup>On the significance of this passage for elucidating both Malalas' From Adam year for Zeno and the chronological excursus at XVIII §8, Bo 428, see chapter 6, pp. 117-18.

28).<sup>92</sup> She too asserted that it was not the chronicle of Malalas that John of Ephesos excerpted, but the work of John of Antioch, to whom both Pseudo-Dionysios and Michael the Syrian, the heirs of John of Ephesos, refer. On the other hand John of Antioch was used, according to her, by Malalas and Evagrius; in other words she assumed that John of Antioch antedated Malalas (*ibid.*, 24). The latter took over the former's material, vulgarizing the language. Pigulevskaya also thought that the John the Rhetor quoted by Evagrius was John of Antioch and not Malalas.<sup>93</sup> Although she seems to have changed her mind on this point in a later article (Pigulevskaya, 1967), her way of describing connections between the historians involved does not dissipate doubts about her opinion on the dependence between them; she writes, for instance, 'Ioannes Antiochenus (= Malalas = Rhetor)' or 'Malalas (Ioannes Antiochenus)' (*ibid.*, 58, 59). In any case she regards Syriac chronicles which quoted John of Ephesos as important witnesses of the original, larger and 'monophysite' text of Malalas' chronicle.<sup>94</sup>

Without embarking on a meticulous discussion of the opinions expressed by the scholars just mentioned, it seems that all the problems concerning the transmission of Malalas' material into Syriac must be analysed anew, partly because these earlier discussions used an inadequate text, and partly because present discussions should start from another level as a number of relevant problems in Byzantine historiography have been resolved. For example, the relationship between Malalas and John of Antioch is now clear – the former was used by the latter.<sup>95</sup> Moreover two other Syriac chronicles besides those mentioned so far should be taken into consideration. The present paper, however, in anticipation of a thorough investigation, will review briefly only some of the problems concerning the way in which material from Malalas' chronicle entered the Syriac historiographic tradition and will show in which works it can be found. In addition one lemma, or entry, will be used to indicate what the Syriac witnesses can contribute to studies on Malalas.

So far as is known, no Syriac translation was ever made of Malalas' work though portions of it can indubitably be found in Syriac chronicles. Of these the earliest and the one which – it seems – contains more of Malalas' material than any other is the chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysios of Tel-Mahrë.<sup>96</sup> This was written in the second half of the eighth

<sup>92</sup>The book (Pigulevskaya, 1941, 109-47) also contains her Russian translation of fragments of the third part of John of Ephesos' *Ecclesiastical History*.

<sup>93</sup>Pigulevskaya, 1941, 24. So far as Russian Byzantinology is concerned, it was as early as 1890 that S. Shestakov, in the course of his polemic with C. Müller, L. Jeep and G. Sotiriadis, established that John the Rhetor, a source of Evagrius, and John Malalas are one and the same person (Shestakov, 1890, 97-132); see also chapter 11, pp. 329-30.

<sup>94</sup>Pigulevskaya, 1967, 59. Pigulevskaya's earlier analysis (1940, 17-28) gave evidence for a further link between Syriac and Byzantine historiography; she concluded there, repeating her views in 1967, that the chronicle of Joshua the Stylite, copied in its entirety by Pseudo-Dionysios, used 'a lost Greek chronicle of Candidus, an adherent of the Isaurian dynasty, which had later been adapted and altered by a historian hostile to the Isaurians, viz. Eustathios of Epiphaneia', who was himself used by John of Antioch-John Malalas (1967, 57 f.). This link between Malalas and Pseudo-Dionysios, being of quite a different character, will not be dealt with here.

<sup>95</sup>Hunger, 1978, I, 324; Patzig, 1901.

<sup>96</sup>J.S. Assemani, who found the unique acephalous manuscript of this text, attributed it to the

century and, more precisely, was finished in A.D. 775 (Witakowski, 1987, 90). Pseudo-Dionysios was a monophysite monk in the small Mesopotamian monastery of Zuqnin,<sup>97</sup> near Amida (today Diyarbakir in Turkey); it seems that he held the office of *so'uro* (literally: 'inspector'), a monk in charge of food supplies and other contacts with the outer world. Beyond this we know very little about his life.

The form of his universal chronicle is very simple. It imitates the structure of the so-called short chronicles,<sup>98</sup> which normally consist of short annalistic lemmata by date, of the type 'The year X; N did Y'. Very often, however, these lemmata are expanded whenever Pseudo-Dionysios has more material to hand. The date lemma system, kept throughout the chronicle, forces Pseudo-Dionysios to adjust all his source material to it, if the borrowed material does not itself use this system. This was the case with all his narrative sources and among them, which is of importance to us, those belonging to the genre of *historia* (e.g. *historia ecclesiastica*).

In the introduction to the *Chronicle*<sup>99</sup> Pseudo-Dionysios names some of his main sources, among them Sokrates Scholastikos and John of Ephesos. There is, however, no introductory remark either at the beginning or at the end of the material taken 'from holy John, the bishop of Asia' (PsD II, 146. 3). We can surmise, on the basis of the introduction, that the material taken over from John of Ephesos begins after that from Sokrates had come to an end (anno 747 Sel. which corresponds to A.D. 435/6<sup>100</sup>) and extends as far as the introduction, i.e. it is enclosed roughly within PsD I 213. 15 / 159 and II 145. 16.<sup>101</sup> The material that coincides with Malalas' chronicle apparently starts from PsD I 226. 20 / 168 (anno 766 = A.D. 454/5: the earthquake in Tripolis; cf. XIV §29, Bo 367) and ends perhaps in PsD II, 145. 11 with the death of Justinian and the

Syrian monophysite patriarch Dionysios of Tel-Mahrê (died 845). Later it was proved that the patriarch could not be the author of the chronicle, but since so far no positive attribution can be given the conventional name is still kept; see Witakowski, 1987, 30-38.

<sup>97</sup>This is why the work is sometimes called 'The Chronicle of Zuqnin'.

<sup>98</sup>Here it is not the length of the chronicle that is meant but the length of its lemmata. We know that short chronicles were Pseudo-Dionysios' sources, amongst them the classic of the genre, the chronicle of Eusebios of Caesarea.

<sup>99</sup>This is not placed at the beginning of the work but at the beginning of its last, i.e. original, part (PsD II, 145. 17 – 146. 8): 'This reckoning (of time), that is this book, starts with the beginning of the world and comes to the birth of Abraham and the rule of Ninos, who built Nineveh and ruled over it for 52 years; and in the 42nd year of Ninos Abraham the patriarch was born, as Eusebios witnesses, for from him we have taken the material of this book up to the years of Constantine the Believer; from there up to the years of Theodosius the Younger – from Sokrates who was of the Novatian confession; from Theodosius then to the emperor Justin, that is to the year 885 (*Seleucid era* = A.D. 573/4), from holy John the bishop of Asia; from there then up to this year which we have today, which is the 1086th year of Alexander (*Seleucid era* = A.D. 774/5) and the 158th of the Hagarites (Syr. Mahg'rāyê = Arabs; = A.D. 775/6) we have not found anything (written) as carefully as those previous (works) on the matters of this book'.

<sup>100</sup>Note that PsD uses the Seleucid era. This lemma is a composite one: the main event, the death of Maximianus, the patriarch of Constantinople, occurred in A.D. 434, but other events mentioned there took place between 423 – John's usurpation of the western part of the empire, and 438 – John Chrysostomos' body brought back to Constantinople.

<sup>101</sup>It does not mean that all of it comes from John of Ephesos; other sources too are detectable in this part. Some of them perhaps found their way into Pseudo-Dionysios' chronicle through John of Ephesos, others – like the chronicle of Joshua the Stylite – were used independently.

enthronement of Justin II (Theophanes 240 f. = Malalas [Jeffreys/Jeffreys/Scott, 1986], 306). This is *anno* 885 (of the Seleucid era), a date which corresponds to A.D. 573/4, whereas Justinian died in 565. This may look like interesting confirmation for the evidence in the *Laterculus Malalianus* that Malalas' chronicle may have extended to 573/4 (cf. chapter 1, p. 24 and this chapter, pp. 298-99 and note 99 above); Pseudo-Dionysios' chronology is, however, often erroneous since his source, not being a chronicle but an ecclesiastical history, did not provide him with all the dates he needed. The date lemma system called for supplementation of the missing dates, which Pseudo-Dionysios did with a very imperfect result.

This time-span from 766 Sel. to 885 Sel. coincides with what is supposedly material from John of Ephesos, and thus the question arises whether Pseudo-Dionysios had independent access to Malalas or only knew his work through John of Ephesos. Two arguments help solve the problem: firstly, Pseudo-Dionysios did not know Greek (Witakowski, 1987, 94) and thus he must have come across Malalas' material through the intermediary of some other Syriac chronicler or historian who could use Malalas directly. Secondly, Malalas' material can also be found in the chronicle of Michael the Syrian where, as was observed long ago, it also coincides with passages taken from John of Ephesos.

John of Ephesos (*circa* 507-586), a Syrian from the region of Amida,<sup>102</sup> was a figure of considerable significance in the ecclesiastical politics of the sixth century. From the 540s he lived mostly in Constantinople, where he became acquainted with the emperor Justinian who charged him with missionary work in the provinces of Asia Minor, at that time not entirely Christian. Later, however, after the death of Justinian, when the campaign against the monophysites began, he found himself among the persecuted. Jacob Baradeus, the founder of the second generation of the monophysite hierarchy, to whom the Syrian monophysite church perhaps owes its existence (and also its alternative name of the Jacobite church), ordained John the titular bishop of Ephesos. It does not seem, however, that he ever lived in his diocese. Fleeing from his Chalcedonian persecutors or being moved by them from one prison to another, he never had an opportunity to settle down in his see.<sup>103</sup>

He wrote two major works: the *Ecclesiastical History* and a collection of the lives of monophysite monks (Brooks, 1923-5). We know that the *Ecclesiastical History* was composed in three parts, although only the third has been preserved (almost) in full (Brooks, 1935-6; Payne Smith, 1860).<sup>104</sup> It covers the period 571-585, but as it does not contain material from Malalas it is of no concern to us here. The first part began with Julius Caesar and reached the fourth century; consequently it could not be anything but a compilation, which was based most probably on Eusebios' *Ecclesiastical History*

<sup>102</sup>He is for this reason also called John of Amida by some Syriac historians, including Michael the Syrian; see the index to Chabot's edition.

<sup>103</sup>John of Ephesos was the first Syriac historian to be the subject of a monograph (now out-of-date): Land, 1856. A second, still valuable study is D'yakonov, 1908; see also Brooks, 1923-5, PO 17.1, iv-vi; Pigulevskaya, 1941, 15-28; and Honigmann, 1951, 207-15.

<sup>104</sup>The division into parts and the extent of the first two are stated in part III; Brooks, 1935-6, 4. 5-14 / 2.

(Pigulevskaya, 1941, 21). This has been totally lost as it was supposedly of little interest to Syriac readers who already had at their disposal a translation of Eusebios' work covering roughly the same period. Pseudo-Dionysios does not know this section of John of Ephesos' work and certainly it must have been unknown to Michael the Syrian, who believed that the work began with the fourth century (MS 121a. 10f / I, 239; Pigulevskaya, 1941, 21).

The second part, which ended in the sixth year of Justin II, i.e. A.D. 571 (Brooks, 1935-6, 4. 13 / 2),<sup>105</sup> has not been preserved in its entirety, at least in the independent manuscript tradition. Long extracts were however copied by Pseudo-Dionysios, shorter ones by Michael the Syrian and still shorter portions by other chroniclers. It is also fragmentarily preserved in two manuscripts in the British Library, Ms. Add. 14650 and 14647, in which some of the text is expressly attributed to John of Ephesos (Land, 1868, 289; Van Douwen/Land, 1889, 217). According to D'yakonov (1908, 205 ff.) this is nothing but a copy of the relevant part of Pseudo-Dionysios. As we have already mentioned, there is no information in Pseudo-Dionysios' text introducing material from John of Ephesos, which makes it hardly likely that such a heading would appear on a copy. It is simpler to admit that there existed shorter or longer extracts of John's *Ecclesiastical History* made before Pseudo-Dionysios composed his work. Two such have been preserved in the British Library manuscripts and Pseudo-Dionysios probably had another – longer one – before him when writing his chronicle.<sup>106</sup>

Even if we now have at our disposal the two extracts and in addition the excerpts in the chronicles of Pseudo-Dionysios, Michael the Syrian and elsewhere, the exact text and the full extent of the second part of John of Ephesos' *Ecclesiastical History* cannot be established with certainty. Nevertheless it is certain that some fragments of it were copied by Pseudo-Dionysios literally and in full; this can be seen from the fact that sometimes even the personal statements by John of Ephesos in the first person were kept by Pseudo-Dionysios (e.g. PsD II, 78. 11 ff.).

John of Ephesos, as copied by Pseudo-Dionysios, says in one place that he took his information from John the Antiochene (Yōhannan 'Antyōkâyā, PsD II, 49. 13). Since the text fragment so signed agrees with the relevant portion of Ba (PsD II, 49. 1-23; On the burning of the great church of Antioch [which burnt] for seven days; cf. XVII §16, Bo 419), it seems safe to admit that it is in fact the text of Malalas, whom John of Ephesos knew under the name of John the Antiochene. Although John of Damascus (*circa* 675-749), himself a native of Syria, when quoting a fragment of the Byzantine chronicler calls him by both sobriquets ('the Antiochene' and 'Malalas')<sup>107</sup> the Syriac chroniclers never called him by the nickname 'Malalas' (Syr. *mal[l]ālā*), nor, for that matter, 'Rhetor' (Syr.

<sup>105</sup>This fact may have some bearing on establishing the end of Malalas' chronicle, as it is conceivable that John of Ephesos concluded the second part of his *Ecclesiastical History* where his main source – Malalas – came to an end. More likely, however, is that John chose this year as it was marked by the outbreak of savage persecution of Monophysites following the edict of Justin II (Payne Smith, 1860, 3).

<sup>106</sup>The British Library excerpts correspond to the material included in PsD II between 19. 21 and 141. 10.

<sup>107</sup>*De imaginibus oratio III* (PG 94, col. 1369): 'Εκ τῆς χρονογραφίας Ἰωάννου Ἀντιοχείας τοῦ καὶ Μαλάλα; D'yakonov, 1908, 247, note 244.

*rhetrā*, or *m<sup>e</sup>lilā*).<sup>108</sup> There is no need, however, to resort to postulating the existence of another chronicler of Antioch by the name of John the Antiochene, whose work would be practically identical with that of John Malalas (cf. Brooks, 1892, 299 ff.). Neither should he be identified with John of Antioch (Ἰωάννης ὁ Ἀντιοχεύς, died after 610) who availed himself of Malalas' chronicle.

Thus it seems that, in order to find material from Malalas in Syriac, one should search the chronicles of those who excerpted John of Ephesos' *Ecclesiastical History*. Three works avowedly contain such material, in addition to that of Pseudo-Dionysios. These are the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian, which has already been mentioned, the *Chronicle to the year 1234*, and the *Chronography* of Bar Hebraeus.<sup>109</sup>

The *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian, the Jacobite patriarch in the years 1166-99, is the largest work of Syriac historiography. It is a universal chronicle which covers the period up to 1195. It has quite a complicated structure, being written in three synoptically arranged parallel columns presenting *historia sacra* (from the Biblical patriarchs to monophysite church history), *historia profana* and *varia* (natural catastrophes, etc.). He used a number of sources, of which we shall mention only those which are pertinent to the period covered by John of Ephesos' and Malalas' material: Pseudo-Zachariah the Rhetor (6th c.; ecclesiastical history), Jacob of Edessa (died 708; chronicle), Cyrus of Batnae (end of 6th c.; chronicle, lost), Dionysios of Tel-Mahrē (died 845; ecclesiastical history, lost), John of Litarba (9th c.; chronicle, lost).<sup>110</sup>

<sup>108</sup>The form *mallala* is Classical Syriac (also preserved in Eastern Syriac), and is characterised by the double 'l' and the two long 'ā's. In the Western Syrian dialect, spoken *inter alia* in Antioch, the gemination has been lost, and the long 'ā' changed into 'o', i.e. the chronicler's nickname is pronounced there *malolo*. The question is, when did these changes take place? The shift 'ā' > 'o' must have been fulfilled before the end of the seventh century, as Jacob of Edessa (died 703), the inventor of the Western Syriac vowel signs, used the Greek *omicron* as a sign for what in Classical (and Eastern) Syriac was long 'ā'. F. Nau found a Greek witness to the Western Syriac pronunciation 'ā' at the end of the sixth century (Nau, 1911). In the Greek rendering of the Syriac *malālā* as Μαλάλας we have a contemporary attestation of the classical pronunciation of 'ā', but at the same time the first attestation of the simplification of the double consonants. We should perhaps also note that citations of Malalas' text in the tenth century (*De insidiis*, *De virtutibus*) and the twelfth (Tzetzes) refer to him as Μαλέλας.

*Mallālā* in Syriac means 'endowed with the power of speech, talkative, eloquent' etc., and such a word could in fact be used for the Greek ῥήτωρ. On the other hand there was already in Syriac a loan word *rhetrā* with exactly the meaning which could be expected. Also *m<sup>e</sup>lilā* (of the same ideomorpheme *ml* as *mallālā*), which means 'endowed with speech and reason, articulate, reasonable' and then 'eloquent; logician, dialectician, a rhetorician', came to be used for the Greek ῥήτωρ. This is in fact the term used for the historian Zachariah the Rhetor in Syriac, e.g. Brooks, 1919, I, 166. 3 f. It is possible, of course, that in sixth-century Syriac, beside *m<sup>e</sup>lilā* and *rhetrā*, another word for 'rhetor' – *mal(l)ālā* – was used, the semantic development of which was parallel to that of *m<sup>e</sup>lilā*, but, to our knowledge, there is no attestation of it.

<sup>109</sup>These four exhaust the number of the Syriac so-called 'developed' chronicles, i.e. chronicles which provided some space for narrative (as opposed to annalistic) historiographic material; Witakowski, 1987, 83. Although Syriac short chronicles may actually include material from Malalas/John of Ephesos, it would probably not be in the form of excerpts. For general information on the chronicles mentioned here, see Brock, 1979/80, 10-20 and Witakowski, 1987, 83-7.

<sup>110</sup>On the sources of Michael the Syrian, see J.B. Chabot's introduction to his edition of that

The anonymous *Chronicle to the year 1234* was written soon after that date supposedly by an Edessene cleric. It too is a universal chronicle, of a simpler structure than Michael the Syrian's. The early epochs up to Constantine are treated in one narrative but after that the work is divided into secular and ecclesiastical parts. Its sources are partly the same as those of Michael the Syrian, but the author used them independently and did not know Michael the Syrian's chronicle. At present the only source that can be identified for the period covered by Malalas, apart from John of Ephesos, is the *Ecclesiastical History* of Dionysios of Tel-Mahrê.<sup>111</sup>

The *Chronography* of Bar Hebraeus, the 'Maphrian of the East',<sup>112</sup> and the renowned Syriac polyhistor (1226-1286), is also a universal chronicle. It consists of two relatively independent parts, that is, they have been transmitted in separate manuscripts. These parts are the *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum* (Abbeloos/Lamy, 1872-7), and the *Chronicon Syriacum* containing *historia profana* (Budge, 1932). Among the sources that Bar Hebraeus himself lists we find again Zachariah the Rhetor, John of Ephesos, Dionysios of Tel-Mahrê and, of course, Michael the Syrian.<sup>113</sup>

As has been said already, only a thorough analysis of the relevant works can establish the actual extent in them of material from Malalas and John of Ephesos. Here, however, we would like only to show what assistance such an analysis can bring for establishing the original text of Malalas. For this purpose we have chosen as an example one lemma which occurs in all the Syriac witnesses. It concerns the short reign of Leo (II) the Younger (18th January, 474 – November, 474), the son of Zeno (crowned 9th February, 474, died 491). The 1986 translation of the Greek reads as follows:

The emperor Leo crowned Leo the Younger, his grandson, son of Zeno, in Constantinople making him co-emperor with himself. The Caesar Leo the Younger became consul in the month of January of the 12th indiction, in the year 522 according to the era of Antioch. On the following 3rd February the emperor Leo the Elder was stricken with illness and died of dysentery at the age of 73.

After the reign of Leo the Elder, Leo the Younger reigned for one year and 23 days. He was a small boy. He was under the influence of his mother, the most illustrious Ariadne. As Zeno the *magister militum*, the patrician, his father, made obeisance to him as emperor, he placed an imperial crown on his father's head on 9th Peritios of the 12th indiction, and they reigned jointly.

The emperor Zeno Kodisseos the Isaurian reigned with his son Leo for a short time. The most sacred Leo the Younger became consul in the year 522

text (1924, I, xxiv-xxxvii).

<sup>111</sup>See F.M. Fiey's introduction to the French translation of the *Chronicle to the year 1234*, ix-xii.

<sup>112</sup>The title of the high ecclesiastic in the Jacobite church, the head of its Eastern part, i.e. in the territory of the former Persian empire, second only to the patriarch.

<sup>113</sup>Bar Hebraeus' work was the first Syriac chronicle to be published in Europe – in 1789. It was frequently used by nineteenth-century students as the most important Syriac historical source. However, after the publication of the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian (Chabot, 1899-1924), it somehow fell out of the scope of Syrologists who preferred to make use of the latter, since it was believed that Bar Hebraeus depended totally on the work of his predecessor. Although that generally seems to be the case, the possibility cannot be excluded that Bar Hebraeus made some independent use of the sources he quotes; cf. below.

according to the era of Antioch of the 12th indiction. But in the 11th month of his consulship the most sacred Leo the Younger fell ill and died, in the month of November of the 13th indiction, in the year 523 according to the era of Antioch, at the age of seven, as was written by the most learned Nestorianos, whose chronicle ended with Leo the Younger. (XIV §46, Bo 375)

The Syriac counterparts of this passage in the respective chronicles read as follows:

| PsD I 228.20-229.6 / 170                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Michael the Syrian, 250a. 9-31 / II 143                                                                                                                                                                        | <i>Chronicle to the year 1234</i> , I 185.17-29 / 146                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Bar Hebraeus, 27va.22-27vb.2 / 69                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| The year 786 (A.D. 474/75): Leo the Elder made [Leo, son] of his daughter, Zeno's son, to rule together with himself in the imperial power.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Leo the Younger, that is, Leontinus, began to rule at the age of six years. He was put in imperial power by the order of Leo the Elder in the year 780 of the Greeks (A.D. 468/9).                             | The reign of Leo; according to what John of Asia wrote.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| The year 788 (A.D. 476/77): Leo the Elder died and Leo the Younger gained power as he was seven years old.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | When he had kept the power for one year and his father Zeno used to make obeisance to him,                                                                                                                     | The emperor Leo made the son of his daughter, a little boy, the son of Zeno, whose name was also Leo, he made him a caesar (Syr. <i>qesar</i> ) and he ruled with him during his life, and he was called Leo the Younger. One year later Leo the Elder died.                                                            | Leo proclaimed Leontinus, the son of his daughter, that is, the son of Zeno, a caesar (Syr. <i>qesar</i> ) while he was a child six years old. He reigned one year during the emperor's life. Then the emperor fell sick with an illness of the intestines and died.                         |
| The year 789 (A.D. 477/8): The mother of Leo the Younger deceived him as an infant and said, 'When your father together with the nobles will make obeisance to you, take the diadem which is on your head and put (it) [on his head]'.<br><br>He, Leo the Younger, who was an infant, seven years old, did so. He took his imperial crown, which was on his head and put it on the head of his father. | his mother deceived him as an infant and said, 'When your father will make obeisance to you, take the crown off your head and give [it] to him'.<br><br>And he did so, and put the crown on his father's head. | Then his daughter, the mother of Leo the Younger, because he was a boy seven years old deceived him and said, 'My son, when your father will come to make obeisance to you, take the crown of your imperial power from your head and put (it) on your father's head'.<br><br>And the boy did as his mother advised him, | After Leo this Leontinus ruled one year. Even Zeno his father used to make obeisance to him. (Treating him) as a child his mother deceived him (saying), 'When your father will make obeisance to you, take the crown which is on your head and put (it) on his head'.<br><br>When he did so |



|                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                                      |                                                |                                                                                                                      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Since then Zeno became the ruling emperor.<br>He, who was an Isaurian by origin, made Leo his son a consul (Syr. <i>hupatos</i> ). | Since then Zeno became the ruling emperor.<br>He was an Isaurian by origin.<br>He made Leo his son a consul by arranging a promotion. <sup>114</sup> | and Zeno, his father, became emperor.          | Zeno gained the imperial power.<br><br>He made Leontinus, his son, a consul by arranging a promotion. <sup>115</sup> |
|                                                                                                                                    | A few days after he crowned his father, Leo died. Many were scandalised and said various things.                                                     | Some days later the boy Leo fell ill and died. | A few days later the boy died. Many thought that his father and his mother had put him to death.                     |

The fragments just quoted show above all that the Syriac authors had more information on the way Zeno gained the imperial throne (and especially about his wife's help) than is given in *Malalas*, as preserved in Ba. On the other hand, it cannot be excluded *a priori* that John of Ephesos used another source in addition to *Malalas* (for instance, the Nestorians to whom *Malalas* refers, an otherwise unknown chronicler), or that the Syriac historian could himself develop the story which was only suggested by *Malalas*. As a matter of fact, the *Chronicon Paschale*, which is known to have used the original *Malalas*, does not have the extension preserved in the Syriac witnesses. Nevertheless, it seems more probable that it was the original and more extensive text of *Malalas* which was used by John of Ephesos. The problem cannot, however, be solved by means of a single example but must wait until further analysis corroborates one alternative or the other.

The passages quoted also indicate how the material from *Malalas* and John of Ephesos was taken over by the Syriac chroniclers. The reception was by no means uniform. It is true that all four chroniclers name John of Ephesos as one of their sources, but again, the possible presence of other Syriac intermediary sources (with the possible exception of the *Chronicle to the year 1234*, which indicates John of Ephesos as the source of the lemma in question) cannot be dismissed. Where, for instance, does the name Leontinus (*l'wntyn'*) come from? Could it be a garbled form of a diminutive, or of Λέων ὁ νέος either in the nominative or the accusative (Λέοντα τὸν νέον)?

From what is known generally about the source dependences among the Syriac chronicles, it would appear that Pseudo-Dionysios, Michael the Syrian and the author of the *Chronicle to the year 1234* used John of Ephesos' work directly, while Bar Hebraeus knew it through the intermediary of Michael the Syrian. Nevertheless, as the entry that was analysed demonstrates, even Bar Hebraeus can provide accurate additional details (e.g. on the cause of Leo I's death; cf. XIV §46, Bo 375).

<sup>114</sup>Both Michael the Syrian and Bar Hebraeus use here a Greek loan word *prwltyn'*, otherwise unknown in Syriac, which is treated as a substantive: *Le'on dēn b'reh 'bad da-prwltyn'* (vocalization unknown) *ne'bed 'ayk hwptsyws (= hupatos?)*; *Malalas* (XIV §47, Bo 376) has προῆλθεν ὑπατος.

<sup>115</sup>Syr.: *prwltyn'*; cf. the previous note.

The above example shows that analysis of all the relevant material in Syriac chronicles may yield yet further fragments of Malalas' chronicle in its original longer form. Irrespective of whether it will contribute to establishing the exact wording of Malalas or not, it will be worthwhile in itself in clarifying the source relationship between the Byzantine and Syriac historiographic traditions.

### The main stages of the transmission of Malalas' chronicle

|           |                                                                    |                              |                        |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 550       | JOHN MALALAS                                                       |                              |                        |
|           | Tusculan Fragments                                                 | Evagrius                     | John of Ephesos        |
| 600       | <i>Chronicon Paschale</i>                                          | John of Antioch              |                        |
| 650       |                                                                    | <i>Laterculus Malalianus</i> | John of Nikiu          |
| 700       |                                                                    |                              |                        |
| 750       |                                                                    |                              |                        |
| 800       | Theophanes                                                         |                              |                        |
| 850       |                                                                    |                              |                        |
|           | C (Par. Gr. 854)                                                   | George Monachos              | Dionysios of Tel-Mahre |
| 900       |                                                                    |                              |                        |
| 950       |                                                                    |                              |                        |
|           | <i>Excerpta de insidiis et de virtutibus</i>                       |                              | Pseudo-Symeon          |
| 1000      |                                                                    |                              |                        |
|           | A (Par. Gr. 1336)                                                  |                              | Slavonic translation   |
| 1050      |                                                                    |                              |                        |
| 1100      | Kedrenos                                                           |                              |                        |
|           | Isaac Porphyrogennetos                                             | John Tzetzes                 |                        |
| 1150      |                                                                    | BAROCCIANUS 182              |                        |
| 1200      |                                                                    |                              | Michael the Syrian     |
| 1691      | <i>Editio princeps</i> , Oxford (Chilmead/Hody), reprinted 1733    |                              |                        |
| 1831      | Bonn edition (Dindorf)                                             |                              |                        |
| 1897-1914 | Istrin's edition of the Slavonic translation                       |                              |                        |
| 1986      | English translation (Australian Association for Byzantine Studies) |                              |                        |



# THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CRITICAL TEXT

Brian Croke

## 1. *Introduction*

Prolonged work on the chronicle of Malalas has generated increasing puzzlement at how such a relatively important text could have been subjected to such scholarly neglect for so long. What we have been working with, and will continue to work with for the foreseeable future, is basically a 150-year old redaction of an inaccurate 350-year old transcript of a 900-year old manuscript. In explaining how this situation has arisen due weight must be given to two general factors and conditions prevailing in the history of scholarship. Firstly, the fact that Malalas was identified as a Byzantine text kept the chronicle trapped in the web of prejudice against Byzantine texts and literature; in this atmosphere the best textual scholars were never likely to devote special attention to it. Secondly, the long-standing classical depreciation of the sort of chronicles typified by that of Malalas meant that it would never be taken seriously as an historical document. In other words as long as there was no modern edition of Prokopios there was even less likelihood of there being an edition of Malalas.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, especially in Germany, both these barriers began to be broken down. Byzantine literature finally became the object of serious philological study and chronicles were increasingly acknowledged as important historical sources in their own right. At last it seemed that the study of Malalas would move forward and soon lead to the production of a modern critical text. Between 1880 and 1900 there appeared the bulk of the scholarly research that underpins any modern study of Malalas. The scale and depth of analysis produced chiefly by Patzig, Gleye and Bury have never really been matched since. Yet students of Malalas and his time are still frustrated by the lack of a standard critical text of the chronicle. Indeed a closer look at the history of the editing and publishing of the chronicle is dispiriting in that it discloses a series of mishaps, broken promises and feats of hasty workmanship by relatively young scholars.

## 2. *The Barocci Collection*

The chronicle of John Malalas is preserved essentially in a single acephalous manuscript copied in the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries (cf. chapter 9, pp. 245-47) and now housed in the Bodleian library, Oxford, where it is catalogued as Codex Baroccianus 182, an indication that it once formed part of the Barocci collection of manuscripts originally gathered in Crete but acquired by the Bodleian in the seventeenth century. The manuscript lacks the preface and first book of the chronicle, and contains a

lacuna towards the end in the reign of Justinian before it breaks off at the year A.D. 563. In addition it contains a considerable lacuna in the period of the middle Roman empire which had obviously appeared in the exemplar of the manuscript. Precisely when and how the Malalas manuscript came to Crete from Constantinople (where it was probably written) is unknown although it may have been yet another of the spoils of the crusaders who captured the imperial capital in 1204.

The Venetian noble family of the Barocci, or Barozzi, had a long and intimate association with Crete, particularly as patrons of Cretan scribes (Geanakoplos, 1962, 50). The best known member of the family was Francesco Barocci (1537-1604). Born in Candia (Herakleion) but educated at Padua, Francesco established a reputation for mathematical and cosmographical learning but in 1587 fell under suspicion of heresy. Most of his life was spent in Crete and it was there that he began to assemble a collection of Greek manuscripts, mainly of the patristic authors (Spiazzi, 1964, 495-9; Rose, 1977, 119-178). On his death the collection passed to his nephew Giacomo (or Iacopo) Barocci (1562-1615/6), a scholar of similar interests (Bottari, 1964, 508-9). Giacomo continued to augment the collection and after his death a catalogue was produced – ‘Indice de’ libri greci antichissimi scritti a penna, che si trovano nella Libreria che fu del q. illustriss. Sig. Giacomo Barocci, nobile veneto’ (1617).

In that catalogue the manuscript we now know as Baroccianus 182 was described as ‘chronologia a creatione mundi in memb. mutila’ (Tomasini, 1650, 80). Precisely what befell the collection of manuscripts after the death of Giacomo Barocci is not clear except that a decade later (1629) it was up for sale in London. The earliest indication of the collection’s arrival in London is contained in a letter of the renowned scholar and chronographer Archbishop Ussher (1581-1656) who appreciated the paramount value of the collection and recommended that the king (Charles I) purchase it. So he wrote from Dublin on 22 January 1629:

That famous library of Giacomo Barocci, a Gentleman of Venice, consisting of 242 Greek manuscript volumes, is now brought into England by Mr Fetherstone, the Stationer. Great pity it were, that such a treasure should be dissipated, and the Books dispersed into private hands. If by your Lordship’s mediation, the King’s majesty might be induced to take them in to his own hand ... (Letter CXXXIII: Parr, 1686, 400).

Not long after, in February 1629, the whole collection was bought for £700 and donated to the Bodleian library by the then Chancellor of the University of Oxford, William Herbert (1580-1630), Earl of Pembroke (Macray, 1890, 68ff), whose statue still adorns the entrance to the library. Together with the manuscripts shipped to London was a Venetian catalogue dated 1618 in which the acephalous chronicle is described as ‘chronologia imperfetta dalla creatione del mondo. bergamina’ (Oxford, Seld. supra 80, 54v, No. 100). Before the end of March the Barocci manuscripts were catalogued by the King’s librarian Dr Augustine Lindsell and Mr Patrick Young (Hunt, 1953, xvi). In this catalogue Baroccianus 182, then known as folio 100, is described simply as ‘chronologia’ with the general contents of each complete book listed (Barocc. 243, 9r).

The importance of the collection to a scholar like Ussher was already evident when Sir H. Bourghier wrote to him on 13 April 1629 to say that he had been told by Lindsell

'that there are a great number of excellent tracts of the Greek fathers, never yet published; besides divers ancient Historians and Geographers, and particularly, that there is as much of Chrysostom as will make a volume equal to any of those published by Sir H. Savil' (Letter CXXXVIII: Parr, 1686, 406). By the end of May the manuscripts were ready to be forwarded to Oxford with the following covering letter to Dr Frewin (1588-1664), the Vice-Chancellor (Macray, 1890, 68):

Good Mr. Vice-Chancellor,  
 Understanding of an excellent collection of Greke manuscripts brought from Venice, and thincking that they would bee of more use to the Church in being kept united in some publick Librarye then scattered in particular hands; remembring the obligation I had to my mother the Universitie, first for breeding mee, after for the honor they did mee in making mee their Chancellor, I was glad of this occasion to repay some part of that great debt I owe her. And therefore I sent you downe the collection entire, which I pray present with my beste love to the Convocation house. And I shall unfaynedly remaine,

Your most assured friend,

PEMBROKE

Two days later the collection was sent on its way by Archbishop Laud (1573-1645) who wrote to Frewin, enclosing Pembroke's letter, with the following advice (Macray, 1890, 69):

Worthye Sir

I haue bye thiss carryer sent you downe those manuscripts which you haue longe expected; and hear inclosed you shall find a leter of my lord Steward's, written with his owne hand to accompanye his gift; of whom I shall say noe more but that he hath shewed himself your most Honourable Chauncclor.

These books ar made up in three chests and one lesser trunke. They ar marked all with W. upon them, and directed to you. The catalogue of them (veye carefullye and exactlye taken bye the great paines of Dr Lindsell and Mr Patrick Younge) is with your Librarye Keeper allreadye, which I am veyre glad of, because mye beinge at Court when they left London made it allmost forgotten.

Laud goes on to point out that only one of the chests is locked, while the other two are nailed up. The trunk contains the manuscripts in need of binding which no one had been prepared to risk having done in London. 'I maye not omit to inform you to,' Laud continues, 'that some of these bookes ar much worne with aige, and the leters in some places growne dimme, and if in some reasonable tyme they be not transcribed they will be lost to anye use'. These he recommends should be copied as soon as possible. Finally, he reports that Pembroke has also included a solitary Javanese manuscript which no-one in London could read, together with the collection of (predominantly Greek) manuscripts donated by Sir Thomas Roe (1581-1644), formerly ambassador to the Ottoman Porte (Macray, 1890, 69-71).

Not long after their arrival in Oxford permission was given by Pembroke for the learned mathematician Peter Turner (1586-1652) of Merton College to borrow the manuscripts from both the Barocci and Roe collections for the purpose of making another catalogue. In Turner's catalogue Baroccianus 182 is entitled 'chronicon anonymi

cuius' (Barocc. 243, 37r) and in what appears to be the same hand the marginal observation is made that 'congruit variis in locis cum chronico Alexandrino', that is to say Turner noticed the correspondences between the information in Ba with what we now know as the *Chronicon Paschale*.

Within twelve months of his gift arriving in Oxford, however, Pembroke died and was in fact succeeded as Chancellor by Laud. Obviously, interested scholars such as Lindsell were setting to work on the manuscripts themselves. Indeed it was possibly Lindsell who put the learned young John Gregory (1607-1646) on to Baroccianus 182. Gregory, described by Wood as 'the miracle of his age for critical and curious learning', wrote treatises on law and scripture, astronomy and chronology as well as assisting Lindsell with an edition of the Pauline commentaries of Theophylakt of Ochrid. Wood goes on to describe how Gregory 'attained to a learned elegance in English, Latin, and Greek, and to an exact skill in Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, Arabic, Ethiopic &c. He was also well vers'd in philosophy, had a curious faculty in astronomy, geometry and arithmetic, and a familiar acquaintance with the Jewish rabbines, antient fathers, modern critics, commentators and what not' (Wood, 1691, 205).

Gregory's role in the study of Malalas is pivotal precisely because it was he who identified Baroccianus 182 as being the chronicle of Malalas. As indicated by the various catalogue entries, to that point the acephalous manuscript had never been ascribed to any particular author. What Gregory noticed, and set out in his 'Observationes in loca quaedam excerpta ex Joh. Malalae Chronographia' (Oxford, Rawlinson D 1083) which must have been written in 1631/2 when Gregory was 24 years of age, was that the passage describing a statue depicting Christ's healing of the haemorrhaging woman who touched his garment (X §12, Bo 237-8) corresponded to that in Oration 3 of John of Damascus. In his anti-iconoclastic oration John attributes the passage to the chronicle of John Malalas of Antioch, an identification Gregory found confirmed in John Tzetzes. Besides this fundamental discovery Gregory discussed a few key passages in the chronology of the chronicle but otherwise declined to discuss the author except to defer to a higher authority in determining where the chronicle might have ended – 'an ulterius progressus est [i.e. beyond 563] Deus novit' (f. 2).

Laud, meanwhile, as Chancellor had succeeded in carrying through a proposal to set up a Greek press in London and Oxford for the printing of the manuscripts in the Bodleian. A delegacy was appointed to arrange for the printing of the manuscripts and it was decided for no apparent reason to choose as a trial run Codex Baroccianus 182. In effect it had been resolved that the first book to be published by Oxford University Press was the recently identified chronicle of Malalas (Carter, 1975, 1, 30ff; Sutcliffe, 1978, xvii; Johnson/Gibson, 1946, 12).

### 3. *The Elusive Editio Princeps*

When the decision was taken on 1st April 1633 to undertake the printing of Malalas or 'John of Antioch' as he was then called, it is evident that the work was under the general supervision of John Gregory. On 18th October 1634 a contract was agreed upon between the Vice-Chancellor and the University Printer, William Turner. Sealed on 5th



November in the presence of Gregory, it was agreed (Johnson/Gibson, 1946, 13):

Imprimis that the said William Turner shall print one booke intituled *Johannis Antiocheni etc Chronographia* at his owne coste & charges in follio and in & uppon good sufficient paper with the greate Primer Greeke letter, with some notes and hee shall sell them at as cheape rates as he cann afford them, and the saide rates to bee att the discretion of the Vicechauncellour for the time being And for his helpe hee is to have as much of the Universitie Greeke letter as hee shall have use of, and he to bee att the charges to provide new letter to supply that which is worne deficient or dull that will not print hansomly as yt should doe, And alsoe the said William is to provide as much Arabicke [=Hebrew? Syriac?] letter as shall bee needfull for the notes of that booke. Item the said William Turner shall give unto the Editioner of the said bookes in Consideration of his paynes one hundred Coppyes of the said bookes ... Item the said William Turner Immediatly after the Printing of the said Greeke Author shall deliver backe to the Universitie as many of the same or the like Greecke letter in number forme metell and waight as he receved from the said Universitie ...

From Turner's point of view the benefits to be gained from the printing of Malalas were very attractive. In the first place he was able to use the Greek type donated to the university by Sir Henry Saville (1549-1622) who had acquired his reputation by having the works of John Chrysostom printed at Eton. In addition he was granted the potentially lucrative privilege of printing three almanacs a year for seven years.

As it turned out Turner was keen to extract the advantages for himself while escaping the obligation to print the text of Malalas. The Delegates became less patient as the delays dragged on. In October 1636, two years after the agreement to print Malalas had been made, Laud directed that the Vice-Chancellor, Dr Baylie, the Senior Proctor and John Gregory confer with the tardy Turner. Baylie reported that this meeting was unsatisfactory and he followed it up with a series of private meetings which again produced nothing. So he then referred it to the Heads of Colleges. They too could not obtain a satisfactory explanation from Turner and finally it was left to the Master of University College, Thomas Walker, and the Warden of All Souls, Gilbert Sheldon, to resolve the impasse. Meanwhile, Turner continued to print his almanacs. Baylie suggested to Laud that it was impossible to be too harsh on Turner for if the agreement were revoked 'as his extraordinarie peevishnes or extreme sottishnes (harde to say which) hath deserved, hee and his were utterlie undone' (Simpson, 1935, 171-2). The Malalas edition therefore lapsed and in 1639, to judge from a letter of Laud (Lambeth, 18 October 1639: Laud, 1700, II, 174), attempts were still being made in order to extract from Turner the Greek type loaned to him to print Malalas. The type was eventually returned, albeit 'unwillingly' (Morrison, 1967, 15 note 6).

Although it is not clear what Turner was supposed to be printing the text from, it is unlikely to have been directly from the manuscript itself. He is more likely to have operated from a legible transcription. In that event it will presumably have been the transcription of Edmund Chilmead (1610-54) which is still preserved (together with his Latin translation) in the Bodleian library (Auct. T. infra 2.5, ff. 1r-503v) and it must have been prepared in 1632/3. In addition, to accommodate the absence of the first book of the chronicle, Chilmead substituted something related to the lost book – namely the relevant

folios from another Barocci manuscript (Barocc. 194) containing the ninth-century chronicle of George Monachos who had utilised Malalas in his own chronicle. He also prepared a set of very extensive notes in which he demonstrated an impressive command of Greek vocabulary and usage, a bold scepticism about certain statements and a useful assessment of the value of specific passages.

Then in his early twenties, as Gregory had been when he made his important discovery a few years previously, Chilmead was a close friend and colleague of Gregory. Since taking out his M.A. in 1632 Chilmead had been mainly involved in copying out music books for Magdalen college choir as well as working on the Malalas manuscript. Furthermore, he had a close knowledge of the Barocci manuscripts since he was also involved in the preparation of a catalogue of Greek manuscripts in the Bodleian library which appeared in 1636 (Barocc. 244). Five years later in 1641 all the Barocci manuscripts were relocated at the Selden end of the library and were renumbered by Gerald Langbaine (1609-1658) whereupon the Malalas manuscript acquired the numeration it still possesses – Baroccianus 182. In addition Langbaine was responsible at this time for putting the numbers in the earlier catalogue of Peter Turner and for noting in the margin alongside Baroccianus 182 'John Gregory has identified as John of Antioch known as Malalas' (Barocc. 243, 37r).

In the wake of the disastrous experience with the printer William Turner since 1633, nobody seems to have been keen to resurrect the Malalas publication, not even the loyal Royalist Chilmead, at least before 1648 when he was banished from Oxford in the wake of the parliamentary capture of the town and took up a mainly musical occupation in London. After his death in 1654 the Malalas material, obviously still in his possession, passed to Sir Edward Bysshe (1615-1679), a renowned patron of learning and expert on heraldry who had specially encouraged the work of both Gregory and Chilmead. A year after the death of Chilmead Bysshe confesses that he has the Malalas and it lacks only a typographer, and it was probably at Bysshe's instigation that the publication was moving again in 1660, this time under the supervision of the new *architypographus* Samuel Clarke. Convocation confirmed £40 for the printing and the requisite paper was purchased from a certain Richard Davis. Once again, however, for reasons unrecorded, no progress was made and the project was officially abandoned once more in 1669 after Clarke froze to death in the Bodleian (Carter, 1975, 43).

Fortunately Clarke was succeeded by the energetic and scholarly John Fell (1625-1686) who had just completed his term as a reforming vice-chancellor of the university. Fell, famous for his edition of Cyprian, was not one to ignore the need to bring the Malalas edition to fruition. Accordingly, he commissioned one of his favourite Christ Church pupils, Humphrey Prideaux (1648-1724), then in his early twenties, to complete it. Precisely what Prideaux was expected to provide is not clear – presumably an introduction and notes. At any rate he advised his friend John Ellis on 30th August 1674 that the Oxford press is 'upon a designe of printing Johannes Antiochenus Malela, a booke of great antiquity and very usefull for cronologers; the copy whereof is noe where extant but in our publick library'. He explains how the work was originally prepared for publication by Chilmead but shelved 'till of late it being made use of by severall of our

cronologers and antiquarys, we are continually pestered with letters from forrain parts to set it forth, out of a conceit that rare things ly hid therein, whereas more than halfe the booke is stuffed with ridiculous and incredible lys; and, although there be something of good use contained therein, yet they are not of such number or value as to make any recompense for the rest of his booke which is intolerable'. Prideaux then explains to Ellis that Malalas wrote 'about 400 years after Christ', which would appear to indicate that he had not yet looked too closely at the work or, more likely, that he had not yet worked his way through to the end. 'The copy is very much moth eaten', he continues, 'and extremely difficult to be made perfect. Some on must be forced to cast away his time in the unprofitable worke of repaireing it' (Thompson, 1875, 16).

Prideaux's distaste for the task in hand was only heightened when he began serious work on the chronicle. He wrote again to Ellis not long after (27th September 1674) to say that 'Whatever I wrot to you of him formerly, I now sufficiently know him to be a horrid musty foolish booke, and many degrees below the worst of authors that I have ever yet met with. I wish I were rid of him; and, if my opinion were to be harkned to, instead of goeing to the presse, he should be condemned back again to the rubbish from whence he was taken, and there ly till moths and rats have rid the world of such horrid and insufferable nonsense'. The brighter side of it, Prideaux confides to Ellis, is that it would make a good fire but the chronicle also promises great mirth and amusement 'for I assure you that he is a pleasant rogue and tells his lys not after an ordinary manner' (Thompson, 1875, 22). Before long, however, Prideaux's abhorrence at the sight of Malalas turned to reluctance and he preferred to spend his time on the Arundel marbles. So yet again Malalas lapsed; and it could not be revived before 1686 when Prideaux left Oxford for the see of Norwich.

The continual delays and setbacks had not diminished demand for the Malalas text. Considerable interest in chronography on the part of scholars such as Henry Dodwell (1641-1711), Camden Professor at Oxford, Selden (1584-1654) and Bishop William Lloyd (1627-1717), as well as continued interest on the part of Bishop Ussher, ensured the need for an edition. Ussher, for example, in 1648 speculated on the nature of the Macedonian month names in use in Antioch as well as, later in a posthumous publication, on possible dates from creation for the patriarch Phalek (Ussher, 1680, 98) while Dodwell's consultation of Malalas seems to have arisen out of his work on Cyprian (1682, 62); Selden cites with approval Malalas (IV §6, Bo 70-71) on Kekrops' imposition of monogamy (1640, V, 6). Nor had Fell given up hope either. When he died in the year of Prideaux's departure from Oxford (1686) the job was left to his protégé John Mill (1645-1707), principal of St Edmund's Hall and renowned for his controversial edition of the New Testament. At last Malalas had found a resolute patron and after the typesetting had finally begun in 1690 Mill entrusted the still necessary task of an introduction and notes to the Dean of Wadham, Humphrey Hody (1659-1707) who was destined ten years later to become Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford. Hody diligently set about his study of the chronicle and his deliberations were embodied in his seventy page introduction which discussed at considerable depth and with impressive learning the basic problems of authorship and sources. It had been Chilmead's intention, and the original intention of

Mill too, that Gregory's *Animadversiones* would form the preface of the edition. However Mill had decided against printing Gregory's treatise and turned instead to Hody who differentiated well between Malalas and the various other Antiochene Johns, a question which had generated (as it still does) great confusion. Yet he erred in insisting that Malalas was writing in the ninth century. In addition to the introduction Hody provided a considerable list of emendations to Chilmead's transcript, plus supplementary notes on the text, which took advantage of the light cast on the text by the recent edition of the *Chronicon Paschale* (1688) by the father of Byzantine studies, Du Cange (1610-1688).

So fifty-seven years after it was first commissioned the *editio princeps* of Malalas was ready to be printed. Even so, its remarkable path to publication was still not complete. When the proofs were finally ready Mill, who was still supervising the production, was out walking one day with Richard Bentley (1662-1742) when the young scholar expressed a wish to inspect the proofs. Mill agreed, assuming that Bentley could have some useful suggestions and corrections to make at the last minute. Bentley's response, the *Epistola ad Millium*, was probably more than Mill had bargained for but it could obviously not be ignored. What Bentley had provided was nothing less than one of the most astonishingly learned treatises scholarship has ever known although it is not always appreciated how hurriedly it had to be put together. The letter to Mill sufficed to establish for Bentley an enduring reputation. What Bentley did was offer remarks on specific statements contained in the chronicle, remarks which comprised detailed elucidation and a good deal of ingenious emendation of all sorts of relevant texts. His discussion of the lost plays of Euripides, to which Malalas frequently refers (see chapter 6, pp. 179-80), is particularly illuminating. The range of learning and skills concentrated on making sense of Malalas is impressive by any reckoning. In concluding the *Letter to Mill* Bentley sought to demonstrate that the correct spelling of the chronicler's name had to be 'Malalas' not 'Malela' as Hody had supposed.

In deciding actually to publish Bentley's letter as part of the Malalas edition, Mill was encouraged by Bishop Lloyd. Dodwell too saw the letter and Bentley's friend Edward Bernard (1638-1696), Savilian Professor of Astronomy, was invited to comment on it. His critique was answered effectively by Bentley. Hody, however, probably did not share the enthusiasm for Bentley's letter. He took exception to Bentley's championing of 'Malalas' as the proper form of the name and added an ultimately unconvincing prefatory note in an attempt to vindicate his insistence on the form 'Malela'. Bentley won the day, however (Jebb, 1889, 8-18). Eventually the book received the vice-chancellor's imprimatur on 16th June 1691.

With the printing done at the press in the Sheldonian theatre, the *editio princeps* of Malalas finally appeared in 1691 under the title 'Johannis Antiocheni cognomento Malalae Historia Chronica ... E MS Cod. Bibliothecae Bodleianae nunc primum edita. Cum interpret. et notis Edm. Chilmeadi'. It consisted of Hody's prefatory note on the author's name and his introduction to the work (both written in 1690) plus the Greek text (i.e. Barocc. 194 for Book I [= Anon. Mal.] and Barocc. 182 for the remainder), Latin translation and notes by Edmund Chilmead – completed nearly sixty years before – and,

finally, the extensive supplementary notes of Hody and the letter of Bentley. In the published version the chronicle was divided into two sections, each numbered sequentially; the second section began with Constantine and was entitled 'pars altera de imperatoribus', then set off each reign with an emperor as heading. The edition was well received on its appearance with special attention focussed on Bentley's *Letter to Mill*. Leading scholars of the day, such as Ezechiel Spanheim (1629-1710) and John Graevius (1632-1703), concurred in greeting Bentley as 'the rising star of philological scholarship'. Indeed Bentley's contribution seems to have overshadowed the significance of the very work being published – the chronicle of Malalas. Nevertheless it was the chronicle itself in Chilmead's edition, without Bentley's letter, that was translated into Modern Greek in Bucharest by a certain Gregorios Phytianos; the manuscript is dated 1727.<sup>1</sup> What is striking about the *editio princeps* was firstly the fact that it did eventually appear despite a lengthy series of mishaps and broken promises; and secondly that it was made up of a collection of feats of hasty workmanship by relatively young scholars. Gregory was 24 when he made his discoveries about the text, Chilmead was 22 when he prepared the text with its Latin translation and comprehensive notes, Hody was 30 when he wrote his introduction; while the author who astounded the scholarly world with his letter to Mill was 28 at the time.

#### 4. *Subsequent Editorial Endeavours*

The chronicle gained wider circulation when it was reprinted in 1733 in the Venetian corpus of Byzantine texts but the Venetian edition was merely a reprint of the Oxford edition. The first, and still the only, subsequent edition of the chronicle of Malalas appeared in the Bonn corpus in 1831. It had been edited by Ludwig Dindorf (1805-1871), son of a professor of Hebrew at Leipzig and younger brother of the prodigious editor of classical Greek texts, Wilhelm Dindorf (1802-1883). While at Berlin in 1827/8 Wilhelm became involved with Barthold Niebuhr (1776-1831) in the planning and prosecution of the *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* and himself prepared editions of George Synkellos and Nikephoros patriarch of Constantinople, as well as Prokopios (wrongly attributed to Ludwig in Croke, 1985, 277). The Bonn Corpus proved to be a valuable and durable collection but its individual volumes were generally of inferior quality. Indeed Bury once described the corpus as 'the most lamentably feeble production ever given to the world by German scholars of great reputation' (1897c, xlix). In general the texts produced even by the most respected editors of the day were little more than reprints of the Paris or Venice editions; rarely were manuscripts examined afresh.

<sup>1</sup>The surviving manuscript (cf. chapter 2, p. 53) preserves the second part of the translation only, from Malalas Book X and the incarnation onwards (note that Chilmead divided his edition at Book XIII with Constantine, the first Christian emperor). Puzzlingly, Phytianos treats the chronicle as a work in nineteen books and Malalas' Book X is numbered XI by him, and so on. This corresponds to no other surviving witness in the tradition. The only explanation that springs to mind is that Chilmead divided the material taken from George Monachos, to replace Book I missing in Ba, into Books I and II, and then introduced Ba's Book II as a clearly distinct though unnumbered section with Ba's Book III appearing as III; Phytianos may have been correcting what he perceived as Chilmead's inaccurate numbering.

Presumably it was Wilhelm Dindorf who arranged for his younger brother Ludwig to be commissioned by the Bonn Corpus and who explained to him that the usual requirement was simply to reprint the best or only available edition. In approaching Malalas, therefore, the 25-year old Ludwig did not bother to inspect the Oxford manuscript for himself. Instead he merely reprinted the original edition with a few conjectural emendations, some of which turned out to be the actual readings of the manuscript wrongly transcribed by Chilmead or Hody. Dindorf's edition also included Chilmead's Latin translation, all Chilmead's and Hody's notes, plus a short preface of his own but he abandoned the imperial headings and the separate section for the Christian emperors which had been used in the 1691 edition. His edition of the *Chronicon Paschale* which appeared in the following year (1832) was executed in much the same fashion.

Wilhelm Dindorf edited an enormous number of other Greek texts including Xenophon, Hesiod, Euripides and Thucydides while his brother covered much of the remainder of Greek literature and together they produced Stephen of Byzantium's Thesaurus. Since the reclusive editor of Malalas was hardly ever seen in public people came to believe that he did not exist; instead he was thought to be an invention of Wilhelm in order to explain away the extraordinary number of editions bearing the name of Dindorf. He was, however, very real and went on to edit Diodoros, Dio Cassius, Polybios, Zonaras and Pausanias and the fragmentary Greek historians of late antiquity, but he never returned his attention to Malalas.

The next important episode in the development of a critical edition of Malalas' chronicle was begun in 1872 by the great German historian and philologist Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903) who published and commented on some fragments of John of Antioch and Malalas contained in an Escorial manuscript of the *De Insidiis* of Constantine Porphyrogennetos. In concluding his contribution Mommsen pointed out the great benefit that would accrue from having a new edition of Malalas and that such an edition would need to be based not only on a thorough examination of the Oxford manuscript but also on the Constantinian excerpts and on those subsequent sources which had employed Malalas in some way (1872, 383). It was not a new suggestion for he had been pointing to the scholarly inadequacy of the texts of the Byzantine chroniclers such as Malalas as long ago as 1857 (Mommsen, 1857, 754). In addition he hoped for 'some young scholar' to disentangle from the confused textual tradition the genuine seventh-century John of Antioch (cf. 1871, 91). It was Sotiriadis who deliberately took up this suggestion in 1888 but in the final analysis he only succeeded in making the problem even more complicated (see chapter 11, p. 331).

Mommsen's challenge was not taken up immediately although it was kept in the forefront of scholars' minds throughout the 1880s and 1890s as a series of major discoveries emerged with serious implications for recovering and editing the text of Malalas. There had already appeared in 1839 an edition by J.A. Cramer (1793-1848) of three Paris manuscripts (A, B and C) of later chronicles which had clearly made extensive use of Malalas. In addition to those reflections of the original chronicle it now became clearer that significant amounts of the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes were copied and adapted originally from Malalas (Jeep, 1881, 351-61; Freund, 1882); then there was

the discovery of the Slavonic translation of Malalas which included the preface to the work and the first book missing from the Oxford manuscript (Haupt, 1880, 230-5; chapter 9, p. 277). Following soon after came the realisation that embedded in the Syriac *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesos there were also parts of Malalas (Brooks, 1892, 291-301; chapter 9, p. 279), and next came the identification of the palimpsest fragments of a chronicle published by Cardinal Angelo Mai (1782-1854) in 1839 as being genuine Malalas (the Tusculan Fragments; Patzig, 1890/1). Finally the missing first book of the chronicle was found in another Paris manuscript (Suppl. Gr. 682) and published in 1894 (Wirth, 1894, 3-10; Richard, 1955). All these discoveries generated feverish interest in the chronicle and associated problems, especially the relationship between Malalas and John of Antioch which Mommsen thought Carl de Boor (1848-1923), the editor of Theophanes and George Monachos, was ideally equipped to tackle (Croke, 1985, 281). At the same time these discussions created new interest in the Oxford manuscript for by now it was obvious that versions other than Baroccianus 182 were better witnesses to the original chronicle. So the manuscript was studied anew by Bury (1897, 219-30) who thereby demonstrated the unreliability of the Dindorf edition.

When Mommsen proposed a new edition of Malalas in 1872 what was required was the collation of a few Greek texts. Twenty years later an edition would have to take account not only of new Greek material but also versions of the chronicle in Slavonic and Syriac. Before long there was also a Latin version, for in the course of his extensive research in preparation for the edition of the late Latin chroniclers (MGH, *Auctores Antiquissimi* 9 [1892], 11 [1894] and 13 [1898]) Mommsen discovered that the basic source of an eighth-century Latin chronographical manuscript was the chronicle of Malalas (Mommsen, 1895, 487-88). It has subsequently come to be known by the name he gave it – the *Laterculus Malalianus* (see chapter 9, p. 287). By now too the number of potential editors had obviously shrunk considerably but at least Gleye (1894, 587) announced his determination to produce a critical text based on the Greek and the Slavonic versions. Gleye's projected edition failed to materialise but the painstaking philological work of an eminent student of Old Russian, Vasilii Istrin (1865-1937), at Odessa produced a serviceable edition of the Slavonic. The foremost student of Byzantine literature, Karl Krumbacher (1856-1909), still thought it premature to expect an edition while there were so many textual questions unresolved (1897, 330). In the absence of a text, analysis of the literary and historical context of the chronicle and its transmission became bogged down and eventually scholars lost interest in it altogether, not least because in 1901 the editor of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, Krumbacher, was forced to call a halt to discussion of the question (Krumbacher, 1901, 53). Consequently in the earlier part of the present century there seems to have been little impetus for the preparation of a new text of Malalas, despite the identification of yet more sections of Malalas preserved in the Syriac chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysios (D'yakonov, 1903 and 1908).

By 1930, however, the hope was being expressed that the Brussels corpus might produce a new edition (Schehl, 1932, 125), although there is no indication of any prospective editor. Meanwhile a young German scholar Alexander Graf Schenk von

Stauffenberg (1905-1964) produced for his dissertation a critical edition of Books IX to XII covering the Roman empire to the Tetrarchy. Again, as pointed out by Schehl (1938, 158) in reviewing this work, it highlighted the need for a critical edition which would cover the whole chronicle and take full account of all the various witnesses to the original. This cry was echoed by the Slavist Matthew Spinka and the Byzantinist Glanville Downey (b. 1908) in 1940 when they published an English translation of Books VIII-XVIII of the Slavonic translation (Spinka/Downey, 1940, 10).

It was only after 1966, it would seem, when plans were being drawn up for the multi-national *Corpus Fontium* series that a concerted effort was made to locate and commission a suitable person to produce the long-awaited critical edition of Malalas. Even now, however, the unfortunate saga has not ended. It seems that in response to the study on Malalas' language published in 1963 by Kristen Weierholt (1902-1973) demand was again generated for an edition. The Berlin publishing house of Walter de Gruyter and Co. were planning to reprint Dindorf's edition as part of their series *Monumenta Byzantina et Metabyzantina* (intended to be a revamped version of the Bonn Corpus) when they apparently approached Weierholt to undertake a new edition. By 1965 he had prepared a useful introductory paper on the witnesses to the chronicle, at least in Greek, (Weierholt, 1965) but had still not inspected any of the manuscripts at first hand and had not come to grips with the Slavonic and other versions. With the advent of the *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, under the auspices of the International Association for Byzantine Studies (formed in 1955), there was an obvious home for this projected new edition of Malalas. Weierholt continued to work on his edition until his death in 1973. Again, progress towards a critical edition was halted. Subsequently the task of continuing Weierholt's work has fallen to the experienced I. Thurn, in Würzburg, who is currently engaged in preparing the edition for the *Corpus Fontium*. In the meantime a photographically reproduced reprint of Dindorf's Bonn text has been published in Athens (by Spanos, c. 1970).

There is now reason to feel confident that a modern critical edition of the chronicle of Malalas will eventually be completed. Why it has taken so long is not so difficult to explain when one stops to consider the complexity of the task. To begin with there are abnormal linguistic requirements since the tradition of the chronicle involves Slavonic, Ethiopic and Syriac in addition to Greek and Latin; then there are the most complicated literary and textual problems involved in determining how much of a later author such as Theophanes or John of Ephesos may be identified as being dependent on Malalas, and how close the various fragments such as those at Grottaferrata (the Tusculan Fragments) and those contained in the works of Constantine Porphyrogenetos are to the original. Since the decision was first taken in 1633 to publish the newly discovered chronicle of Malalas the path to producing a scholarly edition of the work has been a rocky one. It is littered all along the way over the past three and a half centuries with failed intentions, quick solutions and rushed work generally by immature scholars. In all it makes an interesting and instructive story.



# MODERN STUDY OF MALALAS

Brian Croke

Even though the text of Malalas continues to defeat scholars a great deal of critical labour has been devoted over the years to the chronicle itself, that is, to identifying the author and his era and to how the chronicle may be used as a source of historical information for the vast period it covers. Considerable use has been made of this scholarship in the previous chapters. Yet this very scholarship has itself been shaped by the state of the text, so that vital questions have been overlooked and the answers to others distorted or invalidated by deficient understanding of the text and its tradition. It is therefore important and helpful to explain how modern study of the chronicle has developed, for such explication provides not only a critical guide through the labyrinthine study of Malalas but also indicates some of the likely ways ahead.

In modern times the chronicle of Malalas first became known to the learned public in 1634 when Henri de Valois, otherwise known as Henricus Valesius (1603-1676), published the collection of excerpts compiled for Constantine Porphyrogennetos in which John of Antioch was distinguished from John Malalas. A few years before, however, John Gregory at Oxford had demonstrated that the chronicle contained in Ba was the chronicle of John Malalas which had been used by John of Damascus and Tzetzes (Oxford, Rawlinson D 1083; see chapter 10, p. 316). Gregory and Edmund Chilmead assumed as self-evident that Malalas had written not long after the apparent end of the chronicle, that is, some time after the death of Justinian. While the Oxford edition suffered its protracted delays in publication, the chronicle was not widely known and therefore not widely discussed and analysed, although read and quoted from selectively by a small group of Oxford scholars, including Dodwell, as mentioned earlier (see chapter 10, p. 319). So when the French Jesuit Antoine Pagi (1624-1699) came to produce the first volume of his *Critica Historico-chronologica* (1689), a correction of errors in the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Cardinal Baronius (1538-1607), he published the opinion that he had originally received from the learned student of Biblical chronology Bishop William Lloyd (1627-1717), that Malalas was writing in the time of Justinian. Just before the Oxford edition was finally prepared for the press and Humphrey Hody compiled his introduction, William Cave (1637-1713), sometime chaplain to Charles II and a formidable patristic scholar, published the first part of his *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria* (1688) in which he dated Malalas to the turn of the seventh century (p. 568).

Hody brought to his introduction (1691) an extensive knowledge of classical and Byzantine literature, both Christian and pagan. His command of this literature enabled him to provide the first detailed analysis of the issues involved. Unfortunately, however,

his classicism had conditioned him into considering that a work of such stylistic inferiority as the chronicle of Malalas could not have been written in the sixth century (Hody, 1691; = Bo lv-lvii). He was therefore able to persuade himself that the various dating and other discrepancies and apparent omissions for the reign of Justinian must mean that Malalas was writing much later (Bo xl-xlvi). Consequently he was then obliged to explain the correspondences with the seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale* by presuming that this work was used by Malalas (Bo lxiii-lxiv). Hody also emphasised that 'Malalas' was simply the Syrian for 'rhetor' or 'scholastikos' (Bo xiv) although he did not consider the implications of this fact for the education and literary culture of the author.

Hody's preface was a significant piece of scholarship even if it was overshadowed by Bentley's letter to Mill. His arguments for a late date for Malalas convinced some but not everyone. The sixth-century date to be found in Pagi and Cave was preferred in what came to be the most scholarly and respected handbook of Greek (and especially Byzantine) literature in the seventeenth century, the *Bibliotheca Graeca* of J.A. Fabricius (1668-1736). Yet Fabricius said little about Malalas himself, except to claim that he was a church official ('scholastikos') at Antioch (*BG* V, 446). No other scholar of the early or mid-eighteenth century paid close attention to the chronicle except the ecclesiastical historian and critic John Jortin (1698-1770) who argued against Hody in favour of a date of composition just after Justinian; Jortin used the epithets *θειότατος* and *εὐσεβεστάτη* applied to Justinian and Theodora in Book XVIII to 'shew that Malalas lived in those times, and much earlier than some Critics have imagined' (*Animadversiones* IV, 383). So when Edward Gibbon came to write his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* in the 1770s and 1780s, based on his command of the great antiquarian works such as those of Pagi, Cave and Fabricius, he was able to cast his critical eye over Hody's case and declare his preference for Jortin (Gibbon, in Bury, 1898, 209, note 11). Gibbon was really the first scholar to make serious use of Malalas as an historical source, even though he considered 'the authority of that ignorant Greek is very slight' (Gibbon, in Bury, 1897c, 338, note 72).

Another decisive contribution to the dating of Malalas was provided by the Leipzig Orientalist J.J. Reiske (1716-1774) in his edition and commentary of the *De Caerimoniis* of Constantine Porphyrogenetos 'without doubt one of the greatest events in the history of Byzantine studies' (Ostrogorsky, 1968, 5) although it remained unpublished for over half a century. Reiske pointed out that Malalas' use of the comparative *μειζότερος* for *μείζων* was not a later usage but was common in the sixth century. More significantly, he noted that the presence of the very name Malalas as a Syrian word denotes an era when Syriac was in use, which was not the case after its virtual displacement by Arabic in the seventh century (1830, 855). When Dindorf executed his edition of Malalas' chronicle for the Bonn Corpus in 1831 (preface dated October, 1830), he therefore had little to offer about the chronicler and his times except what could be gleaned from Hody, Gibbon and the newly published work of Reiske. In the final analysis all that he added was the observation, in support of Reiske, that there is no trace in the chronicle of the Arabic

influence one would expect to find if it were written after the seventh century (Dindorf, 1831; = Bo vii).

In the years after Dindorf it was clear that there were other witnesses to the text of Malalas than Ba and the Constantinian excerpts, although no one attempted to locate and study them systematically. In the course of his searching and printing of Paris manuscripts, J.A. Cramer (1793-1848), then principal of New Inn Hall in Oxford and later to become an undistinguished Regius Professor of Modern History, unearthed various later chronological works which had evidently used Malalas. One of these (B) he only partially published in 1839, leaving the remainder of the manuscript precisely because he regarded it as being genuine Malalas; he was only interested in publishing what he could be confident was from the seventh-century John of Antioch. When Karl Müller subsequently included John of Antioch in his monumental collection of the fragmentary Greek historians he printed all the material in B including the part Cramer attributed to Malalas. Müller, however, had to tackle the vexed question of identifying and dating John of Antioch. Three Antiochene Johns resulted: a sixth century John the Rhetor cited by Evagrius; John of Antioch in the time of Heraclius and a c.700 John Malalas who drew heavily on John of Antioch (FHG IV, 536). In his edition Müller included the Constantinian *De insidiis* fragments of John of Antioch contained in Par. Gr. 1666 but he noted (FHG IV, 535) there were other such extracts in existence: two, frags. 217 and 218, originally printed by Nicolai Alemannus from a Vatican manuscript and others in an Escorial manuscript (1.Ω.11). Unfortunately he could not locate the former and could not obtain access to the latter, except afterwards. So he printed them as an appendix in FHG V (at 23-38) but even then he was only aware of the last of the Malalas excerpts contained in the Escorial manuscript (*ibid.*, 38-39). None of Müller's discoveries advanced the study of Malalas but they did give rise to the first critical analysis of the problems surrounding John of Antioch, and this inescapably entangled one in the study of Malalas too.

It was, consequently, only in the early 1870s that modern critical study of Malalas was inaugurated and it occurred somewhat accidentally. In 1871 Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903), the doyen of Roman historians but who had long been casting his keen eye over Byzantine chronicles, published a substantial article in which he showed that fragments of an earlier historian quoted in the Byzantine tradition and attributed to Cassius Dio (3rd c.) were derived in fact from the seventh-century John of Antioch and he proposed John of Antioch as a worthy subject for young scholars (Mommsen, 1871, 91). This study created considerable interest and Mommsen was soon informed by different scholars about other neglected or unpublished manuscripts and extracts from John of Antioch: first of all the extracts published by Alemannus which had eluded Müller were located as Vat. Pal. 96 (14th c.) but Mommsen (1872) soon showed them to be from Agathias, not John; and then he arranged for his friend Eduard Geppert (1811-1881) to undertake the collation of the Escorial manuscript in Madrid when he was there for other purposes. In addition to the fragments of John of Antioch that Müller published, the Escorial manuscript which had been curiously neglected for so long (cf. de Boor, 1905, v-x), turned out to contain many more extracts on revolts taken from the chronicle of

Malalas, including sections which were not to be found in Dindorf's edition. Mommsen then immediately published an edition (1872, 323-83) of that part of the manuscript which covered the later sections of John of Antioch and hitherto unknown fragments of John Malalas. So the search for John of Antioch had unexpectedly brought to light more of Malalas.

As Mommsen indicated in his commentary, publication of the Escorial manuscript enabled some important conclusions to be drawn about Malalas. In the first place the manuscript's statement after the last fragment – 'here ends the chronicle of John Malalas' (published by Müller without comment) – finally confirmed what had originally been suspected by Gregory and Jortin and what Reiske had virtually established as certain, namely that the chronicle ended with Justinian, and was probably written therefore in the reign of Justin II. More importantly, comparison of the Escorial version with that of the published edition (Bo) showed that Ba was itself, at least in parts of the final books, only a summary of the original text which had been more detailed. Mommsen concluded that now for the first time the nature of the text was clear. Accordingly he proposed a new edition. It would require the study not only of the Oxford manuscript (Ba) but also the Constantinian fragments and the later chroniclers who had clearly used Malalas. Such a work, Mommsen concluded, would considerably advance our knowledge of a wonderful but neglected period of history. Furthermore, it too would be a great opportunity for some young philologist (Mommsen, 1872, 383).

Nobody was ready to take up Mommsen's challenge immediately. In 1880, however, the study of Malalas finally gathered momentum. In the first place the scholarly world was apprised by H. Haupt of the Slavonic translation of the chronicle (Haupt, 1880, 230-5). The translation included Book I which was missing from Ba, together with the author's preface in which Malalas claimed to draw on living memory from the time of Zeno; Mommsen was soon trying to have the Moscow manuscript of the Slavonic translation conveyed to Berlin but in vain (Jagic, 1880, 235). This Slavonic version which concluded early in Justinian's reign appeared to reinforce the dating of the chronicle to the sixth century. At the same time Carl Neumann (1857-1917) published his analysis of Ba. Neumann was then a young scholar who had prepared an edition of Julian's anti-Christian writings before moving to Tübingen where he came under the influence of one of the masters of late antique chronicles, Alfred von Gutschmid (1831-1887). Gutschmid had already in 1863 declared his support for Malalas' writing in the time of Justin II (1894, 414) and it was his influence which led Neumann to his only excursion into the chronicle of Malalas. Since the 1690s Ba had not been examined at first hand, not even by Dindorf. Gutschmid was able to have the manuscript forwarded from Oxford to Germany since such arrangements were still possible, and Neumann set to work on it. What his investigation demonstrated was precisely how much of the chronicle was missing from Ba, especially in Book XVIII: there are two folios missing between f. 317b and 318a which are balanced by two corresponding folios at the very end (see chapter 9, pp. 246). He was therefore led to conclude that the chronicle continued for a maximum of 70 lines beyond the end of Ba, just enough to reach the end of Justinian's reign

(Neumann, 1880, 360). It was becoming increasingly likely that the chronicle ceased in 565 and was written in the reign of Justin II, as Gutschmid had long thought.

By this stage scholars had begun to grasp a further implication of the Escorial manuscript specified by Mommsen, that is, that portions of later Byzantine writers who used Malalas as a source could in fact preserve verbatim or paraphrased parts of the original chronicle. This issue then attracted the attention of another of Mommsen's younger collaborators, Ludwig Jeep (1846-1911), who had been engaged for many years in editing Claudian. He showed by comparing Ba, the Escorial fragments and the ninth-century chronicle of Theophanes that parts of Theophanes could safely be attributed to the original text of Malalas and especially that the sources and style of Theophanes' text helped to identify the termination of Malalas' chronicle with the reign of Justinian (Jeep, 1881). The following year (1882) Albin Freund took Mommsen's proposal a step further and pointed to parts of the *Chronicon Paschale* which could be taken as original Malalas (1882, 29 ff.). Freund was a pupil of another leading student of ancient and Byzantine chronography, Heinrich Gelzer (1847-1906), at Jena. Gelzer's own mentor had been Gutschmid, under whose influence Gelzer opened up the lines of research which led to his fundamental work on the *Chronographia* of Julius Africanus (1885). In his thesis on the Antiochene and Constantinopolitan city chronicles Freund proposed a strict distinction between that part of Malalas which preceded XVIII and XVIII itself, based on his perception that the former was constructed from the work of a monophysite source (Theophilos), the latter of an orthodox (Freund, 1882, 22-8). This doctrinal distinction was a refinement of the views of Gutschmid, who claimed to detect monophysite elements in Malalas, and Gelzer, who attributed such elements not to Theophilos but to what was then considered another source, John the Rhetor (cf. Gleye, 1896, 445-6). Not long after, Gelzer took this conclusion for granted and sought to extend it by postulating that the Antiochene chronicle terminated at a point just before the Nika riot and was later continued at Constantinople by someone else (Gelzer, 1885, II, 130). This interpretation was destined to spark a long and sometimes acrimonious dispute.

Outside the new German empire it seems that little attention was paid to Malalas at this time. In 1886 a young Fellow of Trinity College Dublin, John Bagnell Bury (1861-1927) published his first article in Byzantine history, the field he was to make his own: it consisted in justifying the historicity of a passage of Malalas dealing with the emperor Olybrius. Bury, however, at this stage followed Hody in thinking that Malalas wrote in the ninth century (Bury, 1886, 507), and in his *Later Roman Empire* three years later he had lowered the date to the early eighth century (Bury, 1889, II, 410, note 4). He had obviously not yet given the chronicle the close attention which was later to produce such significant results.

It was only in 1888 that Mommsen's challenge of 1872 was taken up in a serious way by Georgios Sotiriadis but unfortunately he set the study of Malalas off on a deviant course which ultimately proved unproductive. Sotiriadis reverted to the simplistic arguments originally proposed by Hody, and reinforced by generations of prevalent classicism, which tended to equate style with literary quality and scholarly ability. Writing in ignorance of the discovery of the Slavonic translation of the preface in 1880,

Sotiriadis argued that the chronicle, even in the Escorial fragments, reflected a poor and low degenerate Byzantine style which could not be envisioned before the seventh century (Sotiriadis, 1888, 73-76). Malalas, therefore, must have written in the early seventh century, the date traditionally ascribed to John of Antioch. So what has been taken as John of Antioch really belonged to another Antiochene John – Malalas. Conversely certain fragments ascribed to John of Antioch are in a fairly refined style, closer to that of Prokopios than John Malalas (i.e. to the 520s and not the 620s). So these fragments mean that John of Antioch wrote a chronicle to Justin I while it was John Malalas who wrote to the time of Heraclius (Sotiriadis, 1888, 76-83). Although favourably received by Bury (1888, 208-9) who was evidently persuaded that Malalas wrote in the seventh century or later and that John of Antioch was identical with 'John the Rhetor', it was not long before Sotiriadis' bold hypothesis was attacked by Edwin Patzig (1846-1929), then teaching at the Thomasschule in Leipzig. In a very important article Patzig discussed the place of the so-called Tusculan fragments in the context of the recent discoveries about the text of Malalas (Patzig, 1890/1).

The four palimpsest fragments had originally been discovered in a manuscript in the Basilian monastery at Grottaferrata, and published by Cardinal Angelo Mai (1782-1854) in the 1820s (although their authorship was not identified; Mai, 1839), but scholars subsequently ignored them. Even Mommsen overlooked them in the 1870s. Patzig's crucial contribution was to identify these fragments as being from the chronicle of Malalas and to show how they too confirmed the complete state of the original text. In responding to Sotiriadis Patzig pointed out how cavalier and unwarranted Sotiriadis' basic assumptions on style and so on had been, and went on to argue that the John the Rhetor mentioned by Evagrius (and others) whose work cut out in the 520s was indeed John Malalas and not John of Antioch. Furthermore, Evagrius used an original edition which concluded at the end of Justin I's reign (I-XVII). Subsequently, according to Patzig, Malalas added a further book (XVIII) to bring his work down to the close of Justinian's reign. Patzig regarded the chronological discussion (XVIII §8, Bo 428-429), rather than 531, as indicating a new book as well as the use of more detailed attention to dating. Here, for the first time, was the proposition that there was more than one edition by the same author.

Patzig, who described himself as a 'homo novus auf dem Gebiete der byzantinischen Chronographie' (1890/1, 1), came to Malalas from an unlikely direction. Evidently he had been working simultaneously on the question of Malalas' relation to the Greek original of Diktys and on the mythographer Nonnos. Commentaries on Nonnos are preserved together with the works of the fourth-century theologian Gregory of Nazianzus and were made known by Cardinal Mai, who published them in vol. 2 of his *Spicilegium Romanum* (1839). It was because of Nonnos that Patzig was led to this volume just at the time he was working on Malalas. That is how he was able to identify some extracts from a sixth-century chronicler, published in *Spicilegium Romanum* vol. 2 as being from the chronicle of Malalas. What had happened in effect, as Patzig himself pointed out, was that the Gregory of Nazianzus material had come to be incorporated in volumes 35 and 36 of the Abbé Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* so scholars consulted it there, never bothering

to return to Mai's original edition. Hence the other material in Mai's edition, such as the Tusculan fragments, remained unnoticed.

Mai had concluded that the chronicle fragments in the Grottaferrata palimpsest were from some sixth-century chronicler who had obviously been a source for Malalas, that is, assuming (as Mai did, on the basis of Hody's views) that Malalas wrote in the ninth century. Patzig observed, however, that fragment 4, the latest in time, refers to the emperor Justinian as ἡμῶν δεσπότης etc. In other words, this chronicle uses consistently what he regarded as the epithet for a living emperor (εὐσεβής / εὐσεβέστατος) so it must have been written in the time of Justinian. In considering likely attributions for these fragments Mai had not considered Malalas but Patzig realised immediately, the text of Malalas fresh in his mind, that these fragments were obviously from Malalas' chronicle since they filled out the material abbreviated in Ba and published in Dindorf's edition (Bo). Further, the author's use of εὐσεβής obviously meant, at least according to Patzig (1890/1, 23), that he was writing while Justinian was still alive although this was later disproved (Gleye, 1896, 424; Gleye, 1899, 318; Haury, 1900, 340).

Identification of these new Tusculan fragments of Malalas which firmly dated him to Justinian's era led the self-confessed 'new man' into the mainstream of Byzantine chronographical research. To begin with it was clear to Patzig that by itself the evidence of the Tusculan fragments overturned the thesis of Sotiriadis – that Malalas wrote in the ninth century and that what we know as Malalas was the work of John of Antioch. At the same time the Tusculan fragments complemented the recent discovery of both the Escorial manuscript, in which the excerpts from Malalas conclude with the reign of Justinian, and the Slavonic version, which contains the preface in which Malalas dates his access to living witnesses from the time of Zeno, and which also concludes at the beginning of Justinian's reign. It also confirmed the arguments of both Neumann (1880) and Jeep (1881) which pointed to the death of Justinian as the terminus of Malalas' chronicle.

Sotiriadis' chief proposition had been essentially that of Hody, that is, that the style of Malalas (as preserved in Ba) could not be envisaged in the sixth century so he must have written later. As Patzig pointed out, the style of Malalas as preserved in the Tusculan fragments must be original and sixth-century because the palimpsest manuscript itself cannot be dated much later. Moreover the style is not at all unlike that of other sixth-century writers such as Cyril of Scythopolis (Patzig, 1890/1, 4). The majority of Patzig's study was devoted, however, to locating the Tusculan fragments in the published text of Malalas and illustrating in detail the process of abbreviation and supplementation of the original (at least in XIII-XVII) that took place in the *De insidiis* extracts and in later writers, such as *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes, who clearly depended on Malalas (Patzig, 1890/1, 5-17). Then he turned to the implications of his research for the larger issues surrounding the chronicle, first of all by suggesting that Malalas was the very source referred to by Evagrius as 'John the Rhetor'. It was observed that this source was only cited by Evagrius for Antiochene events (1890/1, 17) and that Malalas lived earlier than Evagrius, as the Slavonic preface had demonstrated (1890/1, 18-9). Moreover,

because 'Malala' was none other than the Syriac for 'rhetor' (1890/1, 20), the identification was natural. Since, however, Evagrius tells us that John the Rhetor concluded his work with the earthquake of 526 it must mean that Malalas originally concluded his chronicle at the end of Book XVII, or rather just into Book XVIII, where the chronological summary (XVIII §8, Bo 428-429) indicates the commencement of a new book (Patzig, 1890/1, 21). At the same time Patzig took the opportunity to respond to the thesis previously advanced by Gelzer (1885, II, 219) to the effect that the majority of XVIII (XVIII §71 ff., Bo 472/3 ff.) was not the work of Malalas but of an anonymus Constantinopolitan continuator. Patzig pointed out (1890/1, 25-6) that this is an unnecessary hypothesis because it ignores the extensive record of Constantinopolitan events before XVIII and would mean that, although Malalas claims to be writing of his own lifetime, he ignored precisely the period on which he would be best informed. In any event it is quite possible to attribute the Constantinopolitan bias in XVIII to Malalas himself on the easy assumption that in the 530s after the threat to Antioch he moved to the greater safety of Constantinople. He concluded by suggesting that the issue could probably be resolved by research on the style of XVIII. Patzig's article represented a solid step forward and became the starting point for later progress.

Meanwhile in England attention was being brought to the chronicle at Cambridge by the young Byzantine historian E.W. Brooks (1863-1955), who at that time was working on John of Ephesos. Independently of Patzig, Brooks concluded that John Malalas was to be identified with the John the Rhetor of Evagrius but for a very different reason. Brooks observed the close correspondence between John Malalas' and John of Ephesos' accounts of the earthquake in Antioch in 526, with John of Ephesos attributing the information to John of Antioch. He noted further that, since John of Ephesos' *Ecclesiastical History* was written before 581, then Malalas was probably writing soon after 565 and he found confirmation of this in the fact that the works of Theophanes, John of Nikiu and the *Chronicon Paschale* have scarcely anything in Malalas' style after 565 (Brooks, 1892, 292-3). Like Patzig he commented that a prior edition ended in 528. At the same time a Russian scholar Shestakov (1890, with Gleye, 1894a, 625-30) had come to the same conclusion on the basis of a comparison of Evagrius and John Malalas in light of the Slavonic translation. Moreover, it seems that another Russian scholar, V.G. Vasilievsky, had (as Brooks did) identified the 'John of Antioch' of John of Ephesos with John Malalas (but cf. Gleye, 1896).

At the same time (1891/2) Patzig published a further study, this time concentrating on what was becoming the immensely complicated and controversial question of the relationship between John Malalas and John of Antioch. What had prompted Patzig to pursue his research on Malalas was the publication of the Ethiopian version of John of Nikiu (Zotenberg, 1883). He was able to show that John of Nikiu (writing in the late seventh century) had used Malalas and that, contrary to Sotiriadis, John of Antioch must have written in the 630s and was perhaps the Antiochene patriarch of that name. Having set out his case, Patzig turned to consider the review of his previous contribution by Gelzer (1892) who had not been dissuaded from his view that Book XVIII was a later addition and not from the hand of Malalas. Instead Gelzer sought to bolster his view by



insisting that, in terms of theological character, XVIII (orthodox) was quite different from XV-XVII (monophysite). Patzig was not persuaded and pointed out that Malalas' account of the fifth-century patriarchs of Antioch is really nothing more than a report and that what Malalas reports is an accusation not a fact. In addition, that the monophysite John of Nikiu should call him a 'heretic' suggests that Malalas was certainly not monophysite. Patzig concluded that Malalas came to Constantinople after 540 and wrote XVIII there (Patzig, 1891/2, 28-31).

Patzig's contributions were reviewed in 1893 by another pupil of Gutschmid, Carl Erich Gleye, who had been working on the Slavonic version of the chronicle. He began his review by berating Patzig for not realising that the 'complete/full' Malalas was itself only an abbreviation of a larger work, in fact, merely the Graeco-Syrian vulgarisation of a work of far higher standing and the author of that work was the so-called 'John of Antioch' (1893, 160). In other words, Gleye saw John of Antioch as the original chronicler whose work was utilised by Malalas although the text of Malalas preserved in Ba is actually only an abbreviation of the original text of Malalas, who becomes 'merely a literary-historical concept' (1893, 161). Further, Malalas was a rhetor and so (as previously claimed by Hody, 1691, and Sotiriadis, 1888) could never have written in the poor style of the work contained in Ba.

In the following number of *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, as an appendix to a study of the Odyssey scholia, Patzig (1893, 431-40) targeted the weak spot in Gleye's argument: the compulsion to date Malalas after John of Antioch who wrote in the time of Heraclius. Decisive contrary evidence could be found in the second part of John of Ephesos' *Ecclesiastical History*, recently published (Van Douwen/Land, 1889), which showed that as early as 581 the full eighteen-book edition of Malalas was in circulation and that the previous edition was known to Evagrius in the 590s and before 629 by the *Chronicon Paschale*. Further, there is a difficulty in reconciling the terminal dates stated or implied by Gleye and the stubborn fact that John of Antioch can be shown to have used Peter the Patrician and is therefore later than the mid-sixth century. Moreover, he obviously differed from Malalas in emphasis, for example in the attention he gave to the late Roman republic. Yet Peter illustrated by his very style that a work like that of Malalas could have been written in the sixth century. In reviewing Shestakov in the following year (1894a) Gleye confessed that he had originally tried to reconcile the identity of John the Rhetor as Malalas with the thesis of Sotiriadis but now he had to admit that the evidence did in fact point to John the Rhetor as John Malalas.

In 1895 attention was drawn by Mommsen to another of the anonymous works contained in Mai's *Spicilegium*, this time an eighth-century Vatican manuscript (Cod. Pal. 277). As with the Grottaferrata palimpsest (the Tusculan Fragments), Mai failed to notice an obvious connection between this manuscript and the chronicle of Malalas. Mommsen, however, demonstrated briefly that parts of the manuscript represented a direct translation of Malalas. Furthermore this Latin version, the *Laterculus Malalianus* (discussed further in chapter 9, pp. 287-99) provided an important new witness to the text in that it included an imperial list which covered the period of the lacuna in Book XII, and it cast new light on where the chronicle ended. Ba breaks off in 563 and the analysis of

Neumann (1880), followed by the studies of Jeep (1881) and others, pointed convincingly to the chronicle finishing at the death of Justinian in 565. This Latin version, so Mommsen concluded, suggested that the chronicle in fact continued to the ninth year of Justin II in 574 because its list of imperial reigns based on Malalas includes nine years of Justin (Mommsen, 1895, 487-8). This would mean that Malalas completed his work after 574. Mommsen had also asked one of his collaborators on the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, the eminent palaeographer Ludwig Traube (1861-1907), to investigate the manuscript more closely. Traube (1895) concluded that the translator or compiler of the *Laterculus*, very likely a Greek unfamiliar with Latin, was probably writing in Rome in reaction to Bede's computistical arguments on the ages of the world; Bede's mature discussion, *De temporum ratione*, was completed around 725. The *Laterculus*, Traube implied, was written not long after.

Gleye expanded his previous analysis with a major contribution (1896) in which he concentrated on three topics – Malalas' religious opinions, Evagrius' use of John the Rhetor and the relationship between the works of John Malalas and John of Antioch. For Gleye Malalas was not a real and definable author. He claimed that XVIII was a distinct work added to XVII after the death of Justinian and that then the whole work was edited. According to Gleye, Ba represents in XVIII an abbreviated version of the original while I-XVII represents an abbreviation of an abbreviation of the work of John the Rhetor. Gleye apparently could not conceive of the possibility of Ba being the reflection of an abbreviation of the original Malalas done by a later scribe, or indeed a copy in a tradition originating after the sixth century. He claims that Evagrius is unlikely to have used a work such as that in Ba and in any event a sixth-century rhetor could not have written in such a way. As for Malalas' religious views, Gleye traces the development of the thesis that the author of I-XVII was monophysite and concludes that, since Malalas himself cannot be known (because we do not have his original work), then we cannot know whether or not he was monophysite. The most that can be said is that in Ba there are traces of monophysitism but these may have been left by the subsequent redactor. Finally, Gleye argues, Malalas was a source for John of Antioch or at least they both used a common source.

At the same time there appeared the revised version of Krumbacher's history of Byzantine literature (1897), in which he devoted some space to Malalas. He was apparently cautious about Gleye's hypothesis and stated that the chronicle as it stands was not merely the simplification of some previous work, although he was inclined to think that XVIII was the work of someone else. He was cautious too about the extension to 574 proposed by Mommsen. Finally he suggested that the slippery discussion of Malalas' religious views was not clear and perhaps never would be (Krumbacher, 1897, 332). Bury (1897b) wrote an important review of Krumbacher, treating at length the chronicle of Malalas in which he had now become especially interested. 'It is indeed', he claimed, 'a remarkable example of a puzzle being gradually solved, not by the ingenuity of a single man but by the labours of a great many independent workers approaching the question from different points of view' (1897b, 209). He went on to claim as settled the facts: 1. that Malalas is to be identified with John Rhetor; 2. that he wrote between 530

and 540; 3. that he preceded John of Antioch; 4. that Ba is an abridgement of Malalas; 5. that the first edition contained I-XVII and the early part of XVIII (to Bo 429.9); 6. that the second edition continued to the death of Justinian. The rest, such as Malalas' religious views and the authorship of the later edition, was a matter for speculation and he was inclined to reject the notion that the chronicle in fact extended to 574 (cf. 1897, 221, note 1; 1898, 518), to accept that *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes used a full version of the chronicle and that Gleye's abridgement thesis (1896) was unlikely. Not long after, Bury evidently felt more confident in thinking that the extension of the chronicle to 565 was not the work of Malalas (1897a, 95; 1898, 519).

Another piece of the puzzle was virtually solved soon after when Patzig (1898) took up once again the issue of Malalas' monophysite views. Although he was wrong to construe Malalas' notice of Nestorios (XIV §25, Bo 365) as being pro-Nestorian and therefore anti-monophysite, he was correct to draw attention to the question of sixth-century usage. This makes clear that Malalas is using contemporary terminology to denote monophysites as orthodox and that his account of the Antiochene patriarchate is not decidedly monophysite (see chapters 1, p. 15 and 9, p. 300), nor is his account of the victory over Vitalian (XVI §16, Bo 402-4) and the death of Anastasios (XVI §20, Bo 408-9). Further, Malalas is called a 'heretic' by the definitely monophysite John of Nikiu. Irritated by Patzig's article Gleye responded (1899) by reiterating his previously stated view that Malalas was not himself monophysite but that there are traces of such a viewpoint in the extant version of the chronicle. Because Gleye did not believe that Evagrius had used John the Rhetor directly, and that the chronicle could no longer be recovered under the layers of subsequent abbreviation and interpretation, he insisted that it was simply meaningless to ask about Malalas' religious views.

At the same time Jacob Haury was engaged in his study of Prokopios when he produced his original and influential paper on Malalas (1900). In it he sought to identify the chronicler with John Scholastikos, the patriarch of Constantinople in the time of Justin II. Certainly there is a degree of similarity: both may have been lawyers, to judge by the fact that they were known by much the same title ('scholastikos' / 'rhetor'), both were Antiochene and later moved to Constantinople. Yet there were two fundamental flaws in Haury's reconstruction. He accepted as proven the hypotheses: 1. that the chronicle extended to 574 and was therefore the source for the insanity of Justin II; and 2. that Malalas was known only indirectly to Evagrius and John of Ephesos, which explains why they themselves did not make the simple identification. Haury also avoided the difficulty of reconciling the style of the chronicle with the extant works of John Scholastikos by resorting to Gleye's hypothesis (1896) that Ba is beyond comparison because it does not represent Malalas' work so much as a later corrupted version of it. Further, on the uncertain question of Malalas' monophysitism, Haury found him to be orthodox and so the monophysite traces (alleged by Gleye) were a later Antiochene addition. Finally, he claimed that Malalas wrote his chronicle as a young man in Antioch and (following Hody, at Bo xli) suggested that he must have done so well after 529 for which year he cites the local archives (XVIII §29, Bo 443). The weaknesses in Haury's thesis, stemming from his dependence on the spurious conclusions of Gleye (1896), seem

to have been overlooked and the identification of Malalas with John Scholastikos has proved influential to the present day (cf. Hunger, 1978, I, 320), despite the case long ago mounted by Stein (1920, 86 ff.).

In 1898 it was only the question of Malalas' religious views which Patzig had sought to tackle and which had elicited such a vigorous response from Gleye. Now, however, surprised by the influence of Gleye's arguments, Patzig resolved to attack head-on Gleye's fundamental claim that John the Rhetor, writing earlier in the sixth century, was John of Antioch and that Malalas was a later compiler. He had not bothered to do so previously, he says, because he did not expect Gleye's outrageous construction to have much impact and anyway he had better things to do (Patzig, 1901, 42). Now, however, he proceeded to show, by comparing with Diktys/Septimius those sections of Malalas and John of Antioch which covered the period of the Trojan War, that John of Antioch abbreviated and supplemented Malalas and not vice-versa. In other words, Malalas must have preceded John. So Patzig felt confident in dismissing Gleye's opposite contention as a 'Phantasiegebilde' (1901, 53). At this point the editor of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, Krumbacher, called a halt. In a footnote to Patzig's article, he declared that there was no point in pursuing the debate given the current inadequate state of the texts of both authors (Krumbacher, 1901, 53). Since such an authoritative intervention could not be ignored, there was no attempt to reopen discussion on the issues involved. Indeed, there has not really been any substantial investigation of these issues until now and even then we still do not have a better critical text of either Malalas or John of Antioch (except for the Constantinian excerpts) than existed in 1901.

The Armenian scholar and controversial rationalist F.C. Conybeare (1856-1924) approached Malalas from the Armenian angle. He argued that apparent correspondences between Moses Khorenats'i and both Malalas and the *Chronicon Paschale* were to be attributed to their use of a common source (Conybeare, 1902). Conybeare, however, appeared oblivious to all the scholarship that had been going on around him in recent years; in particular, his argument was vitiated by his entire dependence on Ba and the neglect of the other witnesses which supplement Ba. In the final analysis the Armenian tradition which Moses encountered in the ninth century may have absorbed something from Malalas, but the connections are not close (cf. chapter 9, p. 267).

By this time, however, the study of Malalas' chronicle had made considerable progress. In the first place, the significant textual discoveries (the Tusculan Fragments, the Slavonic translation, the Syriac material, and the *Laterculus Malalianus*) had increased the difficulty and complexity of preparing a critical edition. At the same time these different witnesses to the original text had enabled the question of Malalas' date to be settled. He could no longer be dated after the sixth century. Beyond that, however, there was no certainty. In the succeeding period scholars desisted from venturing into broader questions. Instead they tended to focus attention on a detailed analysis of Malalas' language and style (Merz, 1910/11; Wolf, 1911; Psaltes, 1913) or specific episodes, especially the Trojan war (Fleschenberg, 1908; Patzig, 1928), or the sources used in the chronicle (Bourier, 1899). The single exception to this pattern was the article of Wolf in Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie*, in which he was able to provide a critical summary of

research to 1901, there being nothing substantial since except for the studies concentrating on Malalas' style which themselves strongly suggested that the whole extant chronicle was the work of a single author (PW 9, cols. 1795-9). In general, scholarship on Malalas was stationary at this stage, still under the influence of Krumbacher's 1901 edict. The unfortunate effect of this situation was evidenced by the somewhat elementary and derivative study of Chernousov, who more or less reiterated Gleye's 1896 argument in favour of Malalas' monophysitism (1926, 65-72).

There was, however, a single isolated burst of activity at Halle in the late 1920s, first by Germany's leading Roman historian of the inter-war period, Wilhelm Weber (1882-1948), and then by Weber's aristocratic pupil, Alexander Graf Schenk von Stauffenberg (1905-1964). Weber was a meticulous scholar who excelled at detailed source-analysis and whose historical vision tended to concentrate on the great men of history, thereby incurring so much opprobrium from the youthful Ronald Syme (1903-1989). It was as part of his larger work on the political and religious background to Augustus that Weber produced in 1927 his studies on Malalas (Christ, 1982, 210-224). These researches were immediately reinforced and extended by the young von Stauffenberg, who had for some years been part of the famous intellectual circle which developed around Stefan George and which influenced von Stauffenberg so profoundly. In his own researches on Malalas von Stauffenberg produced in 1928 (published in 1931) a new text of part of the chronicle (Books IX-XII) and a set of associated studies, mainly concerned with Malalas' information on Antioch and its likely sources. Yet both Weber and von Stauffenberg testify to the hiatus in the study of Malalas since (as noted in reviews by Ensslin, 1933 and Schehl, 1938) they appear to lack a full appreciation of the earlier research into the chronicle as a whole, and the predilections of its author. If the understanding of Malalas was to progress once more a new beginning was required, but never again did Weber or von Stauffenberg, or indeed Schehl, give detailed attention to the chronicle.

At this point a new direction in studies on Malalas opened up during the Princeton expedition to Syria, which from 1931 involved systematic exploration of the remains of Antioch and the study of them in the light of extant literary texts. One of the young participants in the project, Glanville Downey (b. 1908), attempted to answer questions concerning Malalas' testimony to the monuments and topography of Antioch. He was able to demonstrate that the use of inscriptions was mainly second-hand (1935) and his evidence for imperial buildings consistently distorted (1938a). The foundation studies for his *History of Antioch* (1961) were very valuable. They illustrated once more the importance of the other witnesses, especially the Slavonic, so there appeared the annotated translation of the Slavonic provided by Spinka and Downey in 1940. As he continued to utilise Malalas throughout the 1940s in pursuing his Antiochene research, Downey demonstrated the importance of Malalas as a contemporary source, especially for the history of Antioch, but he does not appear to have brought together the disparate witnesses to the original chronicle. In the period since World War II, still without a critical text, studies on Malalas have continued to concentrate on aspects of style and language (Weierholt, 1963; Sofroniou, 1965; Helms, 1971/2; Festugière, 1978 and 1979) and to devote particular attention to specific episodes (Bikerman, 1951; Chrysos, 1966;

Fitton, 1974; Fishman-Duker, 1977), while the early books have received special treatment (Wyatt, 1976; Reinert, 1981); there have been few general studies (e.g. Udal'tsova, 1965 and 1971; cf. Jeffreys, 1979). Yet it is arguable that in all these narrowly focussed studies the totality of the chronicle and the associated milieu of its author have become obscured. Indeed until the present enterprise there has been no real investigation of the basic textual problems so vigorously discussed a century ago, no comprehensive study of the chronicle and its author, and no attempt to reconstruct and understand Malalas' chronological framework – only the useful surveys of Moravcsik, 1958 and Hunger, 1978.

The Australian Malalas project therefore provides not only a significant contribution to the study of Malalas and his times but also a solid critical foundation for further research. While, as always, it is difficult to predict the nature and direction of such research, there will certainly be profit in detailed textual study, especially in the preparation of a critical edition. It is quite possible that new sections of Malalas are waiting to be disinterred from published and unpublished Syriac works while study of the Slavonic compendia could enhance our understanding of both the Slavonic translation (cf. Franklin, 1987) and the original chronicle. Adequate modern editions of some other vital works, such as the *Chronicon Paschale*, will improve understanding of Malalas' place in the Byzantine tradition of chronographical writing. The availability of a proper text will enable a reconsideration of the vexed and unsolved problem of John of Antioch and will provide the necessary basis for assessing Malalas' style within the stylistic range employed by his contemporaries. More attention to the chronicle as discourse and what that suggests about the author's techniques and the expectations of his audience should also be fruitful. In general, it can be anticipated that more detailed comparative analysis will refine our understanding of Malalas, especially of his intellectual and religious world, and therefore enable more illuminating use to be made of the chronicle as a source of information both for the Byzantine realm of the fifth and sixth centuries and for Byzantium's reflection on its classical and Christian heritage.

## CONCLUSION

Traditionally the chronicle of Malalas has been treated as a quarry of historical facts, mainly for the fifth and sixth centuries. However, building on other recent work in a range of disciplines as well as on conventional philological approaches, the studies presented here have attempted to investigate the chronicle more as a historiographical and cultural artefact of sixth-century Roman Syria, that is, as a text produced by a particular writer for a particular reason in a particular historical context and subsequently received and interpreted in a variety of ways. Despite the shift in focus from Antioch to Constantinople in the course of Book XVIII, it has been argued (in chapters 1, 7 and 8) that the balance of evidence – linguistic and otherwise – suggests that the same man was responsible for the composition of all eighteen books of the chronicle. The original chronicle, ending probably at XVIII §76, Bo 478, was completed shortly after the conclusion of the Endless Peace with Persia in 532. One of the motivating forces behind the original writing of the chronicle was the need to argue against a fearful expectation of the ending of the sixth millennium either in 490/1, by the conventional Byzantine reckoning (cf. XV §16, Bo 391), or in 528/9 (cf. XVIII §8, Bo 428) by some other reckoning for which Malalas' statements are the only surviving evidence (as is argued in chapter 6). Some thirty or more years later, with the millennial fears apparently long receded, Malalas – now advanced in years – added a further section to his chronicle, most likely to 565, and thus created a second edition. Both editions of the chronicle, and probably some incomplete versions too, continued to circulate: for example, Evagrius (in the late sixth century), the *Chronicon Paschale* (early seventh century), John of Nikiu (late seventh century) and the Slavonic translation (tenth century) all seem to have used forms or manuscripts of the chronicle that ended at different points, just as Ba breaks off in 563. Today we know the text of Malalas principally from one eleventh- (or twelfth-) century Greek manuscript whose deficiencies as a witness to the original have to be supplemented from extracts and translations of varying length and accuracy that survive in Syriac, Latin, Slavonic and Ethiopic as well as in the Greek historiographical tradition. The complexity of this textual transmission (discussed in chapters 9 and 10) has so far thwarted all attempts to complete a modern critical edition. This situation has perhaps been aggravated by two other factors. One of these would be the status of the chronicle as the first major witness to a form of the Greek vernacular (see chapter 8); this may have been a disincentive in the past to scholars who were trained to prefer writers who used classicising Greek. Another would be the scholarly literature's persistent confusion of Malalas with other writers in the sixth century who were also named John and came from Antioch (as is shown in chapter 11).

Behind the chronicle that he wrote one can discern sufficient of the figure of Malalas himself to make some reasonable conjectures about his place in sixth-century society. He was well acquainted with Greek literary culture, as his name might indicate: the Syriac root 'ml' that lies behind the word 'Malalas' has connotations of eloquence and educated speech. The breadth of his literary references indicate that he moved in this area of Greek culture with casual familiarity, even if many of the literary and historical points are taken at second-hand and cited loosely (as demonstrated in chapter 7) and their accuracy was not verified. Malalas would not have been alone in this looseness. He had read the historians of Antioch thoroughly, especially Domninos, but was also aware of contemporary writers. The extent of his debt to Eustathios of Epiphaneia (who died at some time after 502/3) cannot now be estimated but he certainly knew that historian's work. His religious interests were not those of a dedicated theologian but he was open to religious speculation of the widest sort, on the edges of orthodox Christian belief. He was familiar with recent collections of material in the areas that were of interest to him, like the collection of pagan foreshadowings of Christian doctrines preserved in the Tübingen Theosophy which he may have known through the intermediary of Timotheos, another contemporary albeit a rather shadowy one. His focus on the passing of the millennium, a concern which seems to have been especially strong in Syrian Christian circles, reflects both his concern for otherworldly matters and the influence of his Syrian environment (see chapters 3, 5 and 6).

Malalas demonstrates an interest in administrative matters – in the creation of provinces, for example, troop movements in the Eastern frontier region, the proclamation of laws, technical legal procedures and the outward symbols of Graeco-Roman civic life. This, combined with the possibility that figures like the praetorian prefect Marinus and the *magister officiorum* Hermogenes may be identified as oral informants for events in his own lifetime, create the likelihood that he could have served in some capacity in one of the *scrinia* in Antioch. The type of information he provides makes it plausible that he was connected with the *comes Orientis*. The reorganization of this office in 535 would mark a suggestive context for Malalas' removal from Antioch to Constantinople.

We should be wary of assuming that because Malalas' chronicle was written outside the norms of classicising historians – both linguistically and conceptually – it was therefore an aberration, written by an ignorant man for uncritical readers (see chapter 2). On the contrary, the links between Malalas' conception of his world and that demonstrated by his contemporaries at all levels of Byzantine society are many (as is shown in chapter 4). Equally, the extent to which his chronicle was quarried by later writers shows that it answered questions of continuing concern. The conclusion to this collection of studies, then, is perhaps that we should not turn to Malalas for an accurate and authentic record of historical events, except in the later books, especially XVI to XVIII; we can, however, look to find in his chronicle a reflection of attitudes, beliefs and historical perspectives that were widespread throughout the sixth-century Byzantine world.



## PASSAGES CITED FROM MALALAS\*

- I §1, P 5: 32, 112  
 I §1, P 6: 6, 31, 61, 63, 112, 182  
 I §2, P 7: 21, 112, 173, 182, 187  
 I §3, P 7-8: 58, 188, 189, 190, 192, 194, 195, 214  
 I §4, P 9-10: 112, 113, 180, 182, 184, 189  
 I §5, P 10-11: 113, 124, 184  
 I §6, P 11: 180  
 I §7, P 12: 61, 65  
 I §8, P 12-13: 62, 132, 202  
 I §§8-10, P 12-15: 171  
 I §§8-15, P 12-19: 199  
 I §9, P 13-14: 58, 61, 62, 65, 134  
 I §§9-10, P 13-15: 61  
 I §10, P 14: 96, 132, 134  
 I §10, P 15: 183  
 I §11, P 15: 65  
 I §12, P 16: 96, 98, 186  
 I §13, P 16-17: 13, 63, 64, 88, 177  
 I §§13-14, P 16-18: 171  
 I §14, P 18: 134, 177, 183, 194  
 I §15, P 19: 63, 64, 131
- II §1, Bo 23: 131  
 II §2, Bo 24: 21, 61, 183, 188, 214  
 II §3, Bo 24-5: 28, 131, 172, 186, 193, 195  
 II §4, Bo 26: 183  
 II §5, Bo 26-7: 172, 176, 182, 195  
 II §6, Bo 27: 131  
 II §7, Bo 28-9: 4, 21, 58, 59, 64, 124, 194, 215, 222  
 II §8, Bo 30-1: 5, 21, 61, 62, 126, 179, 205, 221, 223, 228  
 II §9, Bo 32-3: 99, 188, 222  
 II §§9-10, Bo 32-4: 60  
 II §10, Bo 34: 196  
 II §§10-43, Bo 33-54: 260  
 II §11, Bo 34: 175  
 II §12, Bo 34: 113, 124, 187  
 II §13, Bo 34-5: 62, 174, 179, 214, 223  
 II §14, Bo 35-6: 64, 221  
 II §17, Bo 36: 6, 62, 104  
 II §18, Bo 37: 62, 105, 107  
 II §19, Bo 37: 132, 173, 285  
 II §20, Bo 38: 63, 65, 132, 188  
 II §22, Bo 39: 126
- II §23, Bo 40-1: 65, 172, 185, 193, 195  
 II §24, Bo 41-2: 62, 63, 188  
 II §25, Bo 42: 126  
 II §26, Bo 43: 179  
 II §28, Bo 44-5: 61, 170, 176, 185, 189  
 II §29, Bo 45-6: 124, 126  
 II §§31-34, Bo 46-49: 58  
 II §§33-35, Bo 48 f.: 104  
 II §34, Bo 49: 126, 214  
 II §35, Bo 49: 179, 185  
 II §36, Bo 49: 126  
 II §36, Bo 50: 7  
 II §37, Bo 50: 226  
 II §39, Bo 52: 61, 126  
 II §40, Bo 52: 126  
 II §41, Bo 53: 124  
 II §42, Bo 53: 126, 172, 179, 188, 214  
 II §43-III §1, Bo 53-57: 87  
 II §43, Bo 53-4: 61, 180, 192  
 II §§43-45, Bo 53-56: 64  
 II §44, Bo 54: 177  
 II §45, Bo 55-6: 61, 63, 190, 191, 221
- III §1, Bo 57: 64, 99, 180  
 III §2, Bo 58: 113, 176, 184  
 III §3, Bo 58: 14-15, 113  
 III §6, Bo 59-61: 28, 182, 186, 194, 219  
 III §7, Bo 61: 63, 64, 174  
 III §8, Bo 61: 114, 124  
 III §9, Bo 62: 127, 172  
 III §10, Bo 62-3: 61, 188  
 III §11, Bo 63: 63, 131  
 III §12, Bo 64-5: 182, 219, 221  
 III §13, Bo 65-6: 172, 195  
 III §14, Bo 67: 187
- V §1, Bo 68: 124, 125, 129, 171, 173, 177  
 IV §3, Bo 68-9: 124, 125  
 IV §4, Bo 70: 180, 222  
 IV §6, Bo 71: 61, 62, 319  
 IV §§6-7, Bo 71-2: 127  
 IV §7, Bo 72: 172, 179  
 IV §8, Bo 73: 188  
 IV §§8-10, Bo 72-6: 172, 188  
 IV §9, Bo 74: 188

\*While this list attempts to cover all references to Malalas' text contained in this volume, certain categories are excluded: e.g. the list of portrait vocabulary in chapter 8 (pp. 232-40) and the lists in chapter 9 of the paragraphs in the subtext to the 1986 translation in which each witness in the transmission of the chronicle is cited; and regrettably the electronic indexing system we have used cannot collect material from the footnotes.

- IV §10, Bo 75: 188, 219  
 IV §11, Bo 76-7: 58, 65, 186, 187, 214  
 IV §12, Bo 76-8: 89, 172, 194, 195  
 IV §13, Bo 78-9: 89, 173, 216  
 IV §15, Bo 79-81: 130, 176  
 IV §16, Bo 81: 75, 130, 175  
 IV §17, Bo 81-3: 13, 62, 63, 128, 182, 188, 214  
 IV §§18, Bo 83-4: 130, 179  
 IV §18-19, 21, Bo 83-5: 128  
 IV §19, Bo 84-5: 75  
 IV §20, Bo 85: 64, 194  
 IV §21, Bo 85-6: 179, 190, 223  
 IV §22, Bo 86: 13, 64, 130  
 IV §24, Bo 88-90: 90, 126, 178, 179, 185, 214  
 IV §25, Bo 90: 62, 129, 172, 246
- V §1, Bo 91: 130  
 V §5, Bo 94-5: 61, 62, 221  
 V §7, Bo 97: 65  
 V §8, Bo 98: 88  
 V §11, Bo 101-2: 61, 221, 223  
 V §12, Bo 103: 10-11, 246  
 V §§13-21, cf. §§22-40, Bo 103-7: 231  
 V §§13-40, Bo 103-7: 231  
 V §22, Bo 103: 61  
 V §40, Bo 107: 176  
 V §41, Bo 107-8: 222, 242  
 V §42, Bo 108: 130, 223  
 V §43, Bo 108-9: 64, 222, 223  
 V §46, Bo 114: 223  
 V §49, Bo 117: 21, 179, 183, 189, 192, 214  
 V §49, §50, Bo 117, 120: 214  
 V §50, Bo 117-21: 13, 21, 64, 88, 176, 183, 189, 192, 215  
 V §51, Bo 122: 176, 264  
 V §57, Bo 130: 222  
 V §59, Bo 132-3: 176, 183, 192, 196, 215, 285  
 V §61, Bo 135: 176  
 V §63, Bo 137: 179  
 V §65, Bo 139: 5, 61, 62, 223  
 V §§65-67, Bo 139-142: 58  
 V §67, Bo 141-2: 56, 58, 178, 183, 222  
 V §68, Bo 143: 174, 194  
 V §69, Bo 143-4: 8, 15, 91, 114, 216  
 V §§70-72, Bo 144-149: 65, 172, 203  
 V §72, Bo 149: 115  
 V §73, Bo 149: 104, 115, 133, 222
- VI §1, Bo 150: 91, 133, 180  
 VI §2, Bo 151: 130  
 VI §3, Bo 151: 63, 91  
 VI §4, Bo 152: 64  
 VI §5, Bo 153: 130
- VI §7, Bo 153: 133  
 VI §10, Bo 157: 170, 183, 184, 191, 193, 194  
 VI §11, Bo 158: 194  
 VI §12, Bo 158: 172, 191  
 VI §13, Bo 159: 191, 195  
 VI §14, Bo 160: 179, 182  
 VI §15, Bo 160: 91  
 VI §16, Bo 161: 52, 65, 102, 134, 135, 171, 211, 216, 222  
 VI §§16-18, Bo 161-2: 171, 199  
 VI §17, Bo 162: 115, 133, 134  
 VI §19, Bo 162-3: 192, 223  
 VI §20, Bo 165: 185  
 VI §22, Bo 166: 176  
 VI §24, Bo 168: 89, 134  
 VI §25, Bo 168: 134  
 VI §27, Bo 169: 52, 65  
 VI §28, Bo 169: 133, 281  
 VI §29, Bo 169: 134
- VII §1, Bo 171: 134  
 VII §2, Bo 172: 7, 60, 102, 221  
 VII §3, Bo 172-3: 7, 89  
 VII §§3-6, Bo 173-8: 74  
 VII §4, Bo 173-7: 88, 98, 175, 184, 222  
 VII §§4-5, Bo 173-7: 60  
 VII §5, Bo 175-6: 60, 61  
 VII §6, Bo 175-8: 61, 185, 190, 196, 223, 229  
 VII §7, Bo 179-80: 7, 61, 185  
 VII §8, Bo 180-1: 134, 285  
 VII §9, Bo 181-3: 7, 60, 185, 192, 223  
 VII §10, Bo 183: 223  
 VII §11, Bo 184-5: 221, 222, 223, 229  
 VII §12, Bo 186-7: 5, 7, 60, 175, 214, 228  
 VII §14, Bo 188: 134, 143, 190  
 VII §15, Bo 188: 64, 176, 195  
 VII §16, Bo 188-9: 64  
 VII §17, Bo 189-91: 62, 131, 132, 133, 134, 179  
 VII §18, Bo 190: 155  
 VII §19, Bo 190: 135, 178, 180
- VIII §1, Bo 192-3: 90, 94, 106, 133, 135, 174  
 VIII §2, Bo 193-4: 115, 133, 135  
 VIII §4, Bo 195: 115, 194  
 VIII §5, Bo 196: 135  
 VIII §§6-8, Bo 196-7: 136  
 VIII §9, Bo 197: 180, 188  
 VIII §10, Bo 197: 58  
 VIII §11, Bo 198: 136  
 VIII §12, Bo 199: 62  
 VIII §13, Bo 200: 62, 105, 174  
 VIII §§13-17, Bo 199-202: 104

- VIII §§13-19, Bo 199-203: 90  
 VIII §14, Bo 201: 107  
 VIII §15, Bo 202: 58  
 VIII §16, Bo 202: 154  
 VIII §17, Bo 202: 57  
 VIII §19, Bo 203-4: 188, 215  
 VIII §20, Bo 204: 90, 99  
 VIII §22, Bo 205: 57, 90  
 VIII §23, Bo 206-7: 62, 91, 223  
 VIII §24, Bo 207: 62, 90, 91, 180  
 VIII §25, Bo 208: 155, 178, 188  
 VIII §28, Bo 209: 181, 188, 192, 199  
 VIII §29, Bo 209-11: 181, 185, 223  
 VIII §31, Bo 212: 62, 103  
 VIII §32, Bo 212: 204, 281  
 VIII §33, Bo 212: 192  
 VIII §34, Bo 213: 137, 154
- IX §1, Bo 214: 143  
 IX §2, Bo 214-5: 61, 180, 185, 223  
 IX §5, Bo 216-7: 55, 90, 92, 100, 102, 149, 151, 200, 204, 219  
 IX §7, Bo 217: 143, 151  
 IX §9, Bo 218: 223  
 IX §10, Bo 219-21: 13, 21, 64, 194, 196, 215  
 IX §11, Bo 221: 223  
 IX §12, Bo 221: 221  
 IX §13, Bo 221-2: 62, 106, 205  
 IX §14, Bo 222: 55  
 IX §15, Bo 223: 100, 219  
 IX §16, Bo 223: 205  
 IX §17, Bo 223: 56, 91  
 IX §19, Bo 224: 143, 185  
 IX §20, Bo 224: 59  
 IX §21, Bo 225: 137, 223  
 IX §22, Bo 225: 139  
 IX §23, Bo 225: 89  
 IX §24, Bo 226: 143, 221  
 IX §25, Bo 226: 12, 63, 120, 144
- X §1, Bo 227: 12, 63, 120, 144  
 X §2, Bo 227-8: 12, 65, 115, 116, 136, 151, 175, 180, 182, 187, 194, 195, 215, 246, 255, 285  
 X §3, Bo 229: 155  
 X §4, Bo 229-31: 13, 63, 64, 144, 175, 182  
 X §5, Bo 231-2: 172, 193, 195  
 X §6, Bo 232: 13, 64, 139  
 X §7, Bo 232: 139, 144, 223  
 X §8, Bo 232: 55, 56, 100, 221  
 X §9, Bo 234: 137, 226  
 X §10, Bo 234-5: 58, 62, 94, 104, 105, 138, 151, 178  
 X §11, Bo 236: 12, 144, 182  
 X §§11-12, Bo 236-7: 254
- X §12, Bo 237-9: 5, 102, 174, 200, 214, 316  
 X §13, Bo 239-40: 175, 223  
 X §14, Bo 240-2: 12, 29, 118, 121, 122, 144, 151, 190  
 X §15, Bo 242: 12, 122, 162, 175, 193  
 X §16, Bo 243: 139  
 X §17, Bo 243: 139, 145  
 X §18, Bo 243: 56, 151, 155, 222  
 X §§18-19, Bo 243: 56  
 X §20, Bo 244-5: 221, 222  
 X §21, Bo 245: 139  
 X §22, Bo 246: 139, 145  
 X §23, Bo 246: 56, 155, 222  
 X §24, Bo 246-7: 15, 122, 162  
 X §26, Bo 247: 122, 184  
 X §27, Bo 248-9: 59, 151, 188  
 X §28, Bo 250: 139, 155, 176, 215, 222  
 X §29, Bo 250: 145  
 X §30, Bo 250-1: 12, 64  
 X §31, Bo 252: 221  
 X §32, Bo 252: 162, 194  
 X §§32-4, Bo 252-5: 63  
 X §33, Bo 254: 242  
 X §34, Bo 255: 90  
 X §35, Bo 256: 145, 162, 180  
 X §35, §37, Bo 256, 257: 231  
 X §36, Bo 256: 12  
 X §37, Bo 257: 12, 145  
 X §38, Bo 257: 222  
 X §39, Bo 257: 62, 205  
 X §40, Bo 258: 139, 145  
 X §§40-1, Bo 258: 228  
 X §41, Bo 258: 139  
 X §42, Bo 258-9: 139, 162  
 X §43, Bo 259: 123, 139  
 X §44, Bo 259-60: 139, 145  
 X §§44-5, Bo 259: 281  
 X §45, Bo 260-1: 56, 91, 100, 101, 123, 145, 180, 184, 223  
 X §46, Bo 261-2: 139, 227  
 X §47, Bo 262: 139  
 X §48, Bo 262: 12, 139, 174  
 X §48, §52, Bo 262, 267: 65  
 X §50, Bo 263: 103  
 X §51, Bo 263-6: 57, 59, 64, 107, 178  
 X §52, Bo 267: 139  
 X §53, Bo 267-8: 107, 139, 155  
 X §54, Bo 268: 12, 13, 139
- XI §1, Bo 269: 139, 172  
 XI §2, Bo 269: 12, 162, 179  
 XI §4, Bo 271-3: 56, 60, 65, 178  
 XI §6, Bo 274: 173  
 XI §7, Bo 274: 227  
 XI §8, Bo 275: 151, 155, 156

XI §9, Bo 275: 102, 106  
 XI §10, Bo 276-7: 15, 102, 162, 254  
 XI §12, Bo 277: 139  
 XI §13, Bo 277: 139, 145  
 XI §14, Bo 278: 56, 103  
 XI §16, Bo 279: 6, 56, 100, 156  
 XI §19, Bo 279-80: 13, 175  
 XI §20, Bo 280: 139  
 XI §21, Bo 280: 139  
 XI §22, Bo 280: 56, 92  
 XI §23, Bo 280: 223  
 XI §26, Bo 281: 90  
 XI §27, Bo 281: 139  
 XI §28, Bo 281: 65, 139  
 XI §30, Bo 282: 14, 103  
 XI §31, Bo 282: 139  
 XI §32, Bo 282: 139  
 XI §33, Bo 283: 139  
  
 XII §1, Bo 283: 62, 139  
 XII §2, Bo 285: 60  
 XII §3, Bo 284-5: 59, 171, 196  
 XII §§3-10, Bo 284-8: 8, 59  
 XII §5, §6 and §12, Bo 286, 290: 99  
 XII §6, Bo 286: 152, 223  
 XII §7, Bo 286: 222  
 XII §7, Bo 287: 92, 102  
 XII §§7-8, Bo 286: 109  
 XII §8, Bo 287: 222  
 XII §9, Bo 287: 178  
 XII §11, Bo 289: 56, 156  
 XII §13, Bo 290: 139  
 XII §14, Bo 290: 139  
 XII §15, Bo 290: 139  
 XII §17, Bo 291: 139  
 XII §18, Bo 291: 139, 145  
 XII §20, Bo 291-2: 64, 94  
 XII §21, Bo 293-4: 222, 223  
 XII §22, Bo 295: 139  
 XII §23, Bo 295: 139  
 XII §24, Bo 295: 139  
 XII §25, Bo 295: 139, 231, 246, 262  
 XII §26, Bo 295-7: 7, 21, 140, 152, 178, 190, 215  
 XII §27, Bo 298: 140  
 XII §28, Bo 298: 140, 156  
 XII §29, Bo 299: 140  
 XII §30, Bo 299: 90, 140  
 XII §31, Bo 301: 13, 140  
 XII §33, Bo 301: 140  
 XII §33, Bo 302: 103, 140  
 XII §34, Bo 302: 140  
 XII §34, Bo 302-3: 62, 146  
 XII §35, Bo 303: 17, 140, 163  
 XII §36, Bo 304: 17, 140  
 XII §37, Bo 306: 140, 146

XII §38, Bo 307: 62, 222  
 XII §40, Bo 308: 100  
 XII §41, Bo 309: 153, 221, 223  
 XII §42, Bo 309-10: 13  
 XII §44, Bo 310: 140, 178, 222  
 XII §44, Bo 310-11: 59  
 XII §45, Bo 311: 140, 229  
 XII §46, Bo 311-12: 59  
 XII §46, Bo 312: 140  
 XII §47, Bo 312: 14, 64, 140  
 XII §48, Bo 313: 140, 156  
 XII §49, Bo 314: 140  
 XII §50, Bo 314-5: 17  
  
 XIII §1, Bo 316: 140, 146  
 XIII §2, Bo 316: 17, 223  
 XIII §3, Bo 317-8: 17, 101, 227  
 XIII §4, Bo 319: 56, 146, 160, 221, 223  
 XIII §5, Bo 319: 17, 91  
 XIII §6, Bo 321: 98  
 XIII §7, Bo 319-20: 6, 94, 98, 103, 106, 146  
 XIII §§7-8, Bo 321-2: 94  
 XIII §8, Bo 321-2: 6, 107, 152, 250  
 XIII §11, Bo 323: 14, 164  
 XIII §12, Bo 323: 156, 205  
 XIII §14, Bo 324: 140, 142, 187  
 XIII §15, Bo 324: 140, 146  
 XIII §16, Bo 325: 140  
 XIII §17, Bo 325-6: 14, 140, 223  
 XIII §18, Bo 326: 140, 146, 221  
 XIII §19, Bo 327-8: 17, 62, 222  
 XIII §21, Bo 329: 186, 221, 223  
 XIII §§21-23, Bo 328-332: 186  
 XIII §22, Bo 332: 181  
 XIII §23, Bo 332-3: 152, 186, 215, 223  
 XIII §24, Bo 333: 140  
 XIII §25, Bo 334: 21, 181  
 XIII §26, Bo 334: 141, 146  
 XIII §27, Bo 336-7: 141, 223  
 XIII §28, Bo 337: 141  
 XIII §29, Bo 338: 149, 221  
 XIII §30, Bo 338-40: 56, 100, 221  
 XIII §31, Bo 340: 223  
 XIII §32, Bo 341: 141, 223  
 XIII §33, Bo 341-2: 141, 223  
 XIII §34, Bo 342: 14, 152  
 XIII §35, Bo 342-3: 141, 149, 156, 223, 227  
 XIII §36, Bo 343-4: 14, 64, 141, 146, 183  
 XIII §37, Bo 344: 14, 92, 141, 227  
 XIII §39, Bo 345-6: 6, 92, 146  
 XIII §40, Bo 346: 14, 164, 229  
 XIII §42, Bo 347: 227  
 XIII §44, Bo 348: 227  
 XIII §45, Bo 348: 8, 141, 223  
 XIII §46, Bo 348-9: 141, 246, 251  
 XIII §47, Bo 349: 141

XIII §48, Bo 349: 90, 92, 141  
XIII §50, Bo 350: 141

XIV §1, Bo 351: 141, 147  
XIV §2, Bo 352: 223  
XIV §3, Bo 352: 211  
XIV §§3-9, Bo 352-8: 56  
XIV §4, Bo 353-5: 65, 232, 253  
XIV §6, Bo 356: 223  
XIV §7, Bo 356: 141  
XIV §8, Bo 356-7: 8, 91  
XIV §10, Bo 358-9: 21, 191, 215, 221, 281  
XIV §12, Bo 359: 65, 156, 179  
XIV §13, Bo 360: 8, 56, 178, 284  
XIV §15, Bo 361: 191, 223, 228  
XIV §16, Bo 361: 65, 95, 108, 191, 257  
XIV §17, Bo 362: 59  
XIV §20, Bo 363: 156  
XIV §21, Bo 363: 147  
XIV §22, Bo 363: 20 156  
XIV §23, Bo 364: 223  
XIV §24, Bo 364-365: 206, 227  
XIV §25, Bo 365: 14, 164, 335  
XIV §26, Bo 366: 90, 101, 223  
XIV §27, Bo 367: 141  
XIV §28, Bo 367: 141, 149, 152  
XIV §29, Bo 367: 5, 103, 157  
XIV §30, Bo 367: 14, 164  
XIV §34, Bo 368: 141  
XIV §35, Bo 369: 141  
XIV §36, Bo 369: 8, 147, 152, 157, 204, 209, 250, 251  
XIV §37, Bo 369: 10, 17, 204  
XIV §38, Bo 369-70: 10, 65, 99, 204, 221  
XIV §40, Bo 371: 284  
XIV §41, Bo 372: 14  
XIV §43, Bo 372: 95, 149  
XIV §44, Bo 373: 223  
XIV §45, Bo 373: 90, 147  
XIV §46, Bo 375-6: 10, 141, 147, 149, 223, 309  
XIV §46, §47, Bo 376: 149  
XIV §47, Bo 376: 141, 142, 149, 152, 187

XV §1, Bo 377: 141, 163, 241  
XV §§1-7, Bo 377-82: 211, 212  
XV §§2-6, Bo 377-81: 10  
XV §3, Bo 378: 10, 141, 147  
XV §4, Bo 378: 9, 157, 209, 212  
XV §5, Bo 379: 149, 164, 223  
XV §§5-6, Bo 379-80: 163  
XV §6, Bo 380-1: 15, 141, 163, 215, 250  
XV §7, Bo 381: 223  
XV §8, Bo 382-3: 9, 92, 208, 223  
XV §§9-10, Bo 383-6: 212  
XV §10, Bo 385: 14

XV §11, Bo 385-6: 8, 10, 56, 157, 204, 246, 250, 284, 285  
XV §12, Bo 386: 147, 223  
XV §13, Bo 387-9: 11, 200, 208, 221, 231, 281, 284  
XV §14, Bo 389: 223  
XV §15, Bo 389-90: 8, 160, 204, 209, 212  
XV §16, Bo 390-1: 12, 13, 64, 65, 117, 138, 141, 149, 152, 153, 246, 259, 266, 301

XVI §1, Bo 392: 141, 147  
XVI §2, Bo 392-3: 8, 152, 160, 204, 212, 213  
XVI §3, Bo 393-4: 9, 212, 213  
XVI §4, Bo 394-5: 10, 94, 223  
XVI §5, Bo 395: 8, 108, 204, 264  
XVI §6, Bo 395-8: 8, 92, 104, 147, 149, 160, 204, 209, 223  
XVI §8, Bo 398: 8, 204, 212  
XVI §9, Bo 398-9: 10, 169, 180, 211, 213, 216  
XVI §10, Bo 399: 9, 100, 209  
XVI §11, Bo 400: 15, 152, 162, 163, 212, 221  
XVI §12, Bo 400: 213, 223  
XVI §13, Bo 400-1: 101, 212  
XVI §15, Bo 401: 150, 153, 223  
XVI §16, Bo 402-6: 65, 106, 209, 212, 216, 223, 335  
XVI §18, Bo 406: 157, 209, 212  
XVI §19, Bo 406-8: 108, 209, 281, 300  
XVI §20, Bo 408-9: 223, 335  
XVI §20, §22, Bo 408-9: 253  
XVI §22, Bo 409: 141

XVII §1, Bo 410: 141, 147, 150, 153, 284  
XVII §2, Bo 410-1: 212  
XVII §3, Bo 411: 147  
XVII §4, Bo 411: 9, 204, 213  
XVII §5, Bo 411: 223  
XVII §6, Bo 411: 15, 163, 213, 249  
XVII §7, Bo 412: 8, 204, 223, 285  
XVII §§7-9, Bo 412-5: 208  
XVII §8, Bo 412: 147, 212, 223  
XVII §9, Bo 412-5: 9, 109, 213, 222, 223  
XVII §10, Bo 414-5: 200  
XVII §11, Bo 415: 15, 163  
XVII §11, Bo 416: 15, 16, 163  
XVII §12, Bo 416-7: 8, 160, 204, 209, 212, 221, 223  
XVII §13, Bo 417: 59, 150, 153  
XVII §14, Bo 417: 9, 103, 160, 204, 209, 223  
XVII §15, Bo 417-9: 9, 157, 158, 209, 212  
XVII §16, Bo 419-21: 8, 20, 88, 158, 203, 212, 250, 286, 305

- XVII §§16-18, Bo 419-22: 285  
 XVII §§16-22, Bo 419-424: 209  
 XVII §17, Bo 422: 200, 212  
 XVII §18, Bo 422: 10, 148  
 XVII §19, Bo 423: 8, 9  
 XVII §21, Bo 423: 13  
 XVII §22, Bo 423-4: 160, 163, 212, 213, 223  
 XVII §23, Bo 424: 141, 150  
  
 XVIII §1, Bo 425: 23, 25, 141, 148, 150, 153, 285, 286  
 XVIII §2, Bo 425-6: 150, 160, 209, 212, 213, 216  
 XVIII §3, Bo 426-7: 149, 150, 169  
 XVIII §4, Bo 427: 213, 220, 221, 228  
 XVIII §5, Bo 427: 209, 212  
 XVIII §6, Bo 427: 222  
 XVIII §7, Bo 428: 23  
 XVIII §8, Bo 428-9: 14, 18, 21, 65, 73, 115, 118, 138, 148, 150, 153, 154, 175, 180, 194, 195, 215, 246, 250, 259, 286  
 XVIII §10, Bo 429-30: 213, 223  
 XVIII §11, Bo 430: 213  
 XVIII §12, Bo 430: 220, 246  
 XVIII §13, Bo 430-1: 222, 223, 284  
 XVIII §14, Bo 431: 211, 216  
 XVIII §§14-15, Bo 431: 249  
 XVIII §15, Bo 433-4: 213, 257  
 XVIII §16, Bo 435: 150, 223  
 XVIII §17, Bo 435: 95  
 XVIII §18, Bo 436: 221  
 XVIII §19, Bo 436-7: 209, 212, 158  
 XVIII §21, Bo 438: 222, 223  
 XVIII §22, Bo 438-9: 212, 222, 223, 225  
 XVIII §23, Bo 439-40: 211, 223  
 XVIII §24, Bo 440: 221  
 XVIII §25, Bo 441: 150  
 XVIII §26, Bo 441: 223  
 XVIII §27, Bo 442-3: 9, 16, 158, 212, 286  
 XVIII §27, §59, Bo 443, 460: 163  
 XVIII §§27-9, Bo 442-44: 286  
 XVIII §28, Bo 443: 158, 209  
 XVIII §29, Bo 443-4: 204, 208, 223, 335  
 XVIII §30, Bo 444: 13, 63, 65, 169, 195, 211, 222, 223  
 XVIII §31, Bo 444: 209, 223, 229  
 XVIII §34, Bo 445: 210, 223, 229  
 XVIII §35, Bo 445-7: 150, 208, 212, 254  
 XVIII §37, Bo 448: 158, 209  
 XVIII §38, Bo 448: 227  
 XVIII §39, Bo 448: 23, 206, 209  
 XVIII §40, Bo 448: 158, 209  
 XVIII §41, Bo 449: 209  
 XVIII §42, Bo 449: 221, 253  
 XVIII §43, Bo 449: 223  
  
 XVIII §44, Bo 449-50: 200, 223  
 XVIII §45, Bo 450: 108, 204, 228  
 XVIII §46, Bo 450: 148, 228  
 XVIII §47, Bo 451: 202, 263  
 XVIII §48, Bo 452: 204, 221  
 XVIII §50, Bo 452-3: 148, 223  
 XVIII §51, Bo 453: 79, 222, 258, 264  
 XVIII §52, Bo 454: 228  
 XVIII §53, Bo 454-5: 200  
 XVIII §54, Bo 455-6: 208, 216  
 XVIII §54, Bo 456: 208  
 XVIII §55, Bo 456: 158  
 XVIII §56, Bo 457-60: 109, 200, 257  
 XVIII §57, Bo 459: 229  
 XVIII §§57-70, Bo 459-72: 268  
 XVIII §59, Bo 460: 16, 164  
 XVIII §60, Bo 464-5: 200, 219, 222  
 XVIII §61, Bo 465-6: 200, 223  
 XVIII §62, Bo 467: 204, 209  
 XVIII §63, Bo 467: 229  
 XVIII §64, Bo 468: 209, 222  
 XVIII §66, Bo 469: 223  
 XVIII §67, Bo 471: 202  
 XVIII §§68-9, Bo 471-2: 200  
 XVIII §69, Bo 472: 14, 63  
 XVIII §70, Bo 472: 200, 208  
 XVIII §71, Bo 473-7: 9, 84, 94, 95, 150, 169, 208, 221, 222, 223, 253, 271  
 XVIII §72, Bo 477: 169  
 XVIII §76, Bo 478: 19, 20, 88, 169, 210, 211, 216  
 XVIII §77, Bo 478: 22, 158  
 XVIII §78, Bo 478: 23  
 XVIII §79, Bo 478: 19, 158  
 XVIII §80, Bo 478: 22, 148  
 XVIII §81, Bo 479: 21, 150  
 XVIII §82, Bo 479: 22  
 XVIII §83, Bo 479: 23, 148, 162, 221  
 XVIII §84, Bo 479: 14, 22, 23, 148  
 XVIII §85, Bo 479: 22  
 XVIII §§85-86, Bo 479: 95  
 XVIII §86, Bo 479: 22  
 XVIII §87, Bo 479-80: 19, 88, 150, 221  
 XVIII §88, Bo 480: 21  
 XVIII §89, Bo 480: 22, 221  
 XVIII §90, Bo 481: 22, 150  
 XVIII §92, Bo 482: 22, 23  
 XVIII §93, Bo 482: 22, 150, 158  
 XVIII §94, Bo 482: 22, 101  
 XVIII §95, Bo 482: 22  
 XVIII §96, Bo 482-3: 22  
 XVIII §97, Bo 483: 21, 23, 150, 221  
 XVIII §98, Bo 483: 23, 162  
 XVIII §99, Bo 483: 22  
 XVIII §100, Bo 483: 23  
 XVIII §102, Bo 483: 22  
 XVIII §103, Bo 483-4: 22, 150

XVIII §104, Bo 484: 22, 150  
XVIII §105, Bo 484: 22, 51  
XVIII §§105-112, Bo 484-5: 251, 258  
XVIII §106, Bo 484: 22, 150, 251  
XVIII §107, Bo 484: 23  
XVIII §108, Bo 484: 22  
XVIII §109, Bo 484: 150, 214, 230  
XVIII §110, Bo 484-5: 21, 223  
XVIII §111, Bo 485: 23, 150  
XVIII §112, Bo 485: 9, 22, 23, 150, 159,  
203  
XVIII §113, Bo 486: 22, 150  
XVIII §114, Bo 486: 22  
XVIII §115, Bo 486: 23, 150  
XVIII §116, Bo 486: 21  
XVIII §117, Bo 486: 22, 150  
XVIII §118, Bo 486-7: 22, 94, 100, 150,  
159  
XVIII §119, Bo 487-8: 23, 150, 223  
XVIII §120, Bo 488: 22, 150  
XVIII §121, Bo 488: 22, 150  
XVIII §122, Bo 488: 22, 150  
XVIII §123, Bo 488: 22, 150, 159  
XVIII §124, Bo 488-9: 22, 94, 100, 150,  
159  
XVIII §125, Bo 489: 22  
XVIII §127, Bo 489: 22, 150  
XVIII §§127-143, Bo 489-95: 24  
XVIII §128, Bo 489-90: 95, 221, 223  
XVIII §129, Bo 489-90: 150, 258  
XVIII §134, Bo 490: 22, 221  
XVIII §135, Bo 490-1: 22  
XVIII §136, Bo 491: 23, 102, 150  
XVIII §137, Bo 492: 22, 150, 222  
XVIII §138, Bo 492: 22, 150  
XVIII §139, Bo 492: 22, 162  
XVIII §140, Bo 492: 21  
XVIII §141, Bo 493-4: 23, 150, 169, 222,  
223, 230  
XVIII §142, Bo 495: 23  
XVIII §142, §143, Bo 495: 253  
XVIII §143, Bo 495: 22, 95, 150, 162, 221,  
223  
XVIII §144, Bo 495: 22, 150  
XVIII §145, Bo 496: 246, 258  
XVIII §150, Bo 496: 23  
XVIII §151, Bo 496: 23, 24





# INDEX\*

- A (= Paris, Gr. 1336) 43-44, 259-262, 322  
 Aaron 111, 114, 127  
 Abas 128  
 Abgersaton 269  
 Ablakkon 108  
 Abraham 31, 39, 64, 99, 111, 113, 114, 131, 180  
 Abthartios 161  
 Academy (Athens) 78  
 Achaia 128  
 Achaos 131  
 Achilles 61, 231  
*acta* 213, 214  
*acta diurna* 203  
*Acta Petri* 12  
*Acta Pilati* 12  
*acta urbis* 8, 203, 204, 213, 214  
     contents of 204; see also 'city archives'  
 Adam 1, 3, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 40, 41, 44, 46, 47, 48, 51, 63, 69, 87, 111, 159, 197, 243, 246, 252, 259, 286; see also 'years From Adam' and 'Malalas, chronicle, years From Adam'  
 Addous 1  
 Adonis 58, 65  
 Adrastos 124  
*advocati* 11  
*advocati fisci* 11  
 Aeetes 70  
 Aemilianus, emperor 140  
 Aeneas 1, 47, 48, 51, 68, 71, 73, 260; see also 'Aineias'  
 Africa 19, 84  
 Africanus, Julius 1, 12, 27, 30, 31, 63, 113, 114, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 136, 154, 165, 170, 171, 172, 173, 179, 184, 186, 190, 191, 196, 252, 268, 329  
 Agamemnon 71, 88, 128, 231  
 Agapetos 82, 83  
 Agapetus of Rome 162  
 Agathias 38, 68, 71, 80, 81, 84, 89, 90, 327  
 Agave 105  
 Agenor 5, 61, 126, 128  
 Agnellus 92, 99  
 Agrippa 7  
 Aiaia 88  
 Aias Telamonios 231  
 Aides 61  
 Aigialeus 125  
 Aigisthos 128  
 Aimathe 105  
 Aineias 134; see also 'Aeneas'  
 Aischylos 127  
*Akathistos Hymnos* 77  
     attitude to classical Greece 77  
 Akrisios II 128  
 Akropolis  
     Constantine 48  
     George 48, 49  
*akta* 271, 272; see also 'acta'  
 Al-Mundhir 200, 269  
 Alaric 90  
 Albas 133, 134  
 Albinus 289  
 Aldhelm 289, 290, 291, 292  
 Aldred 297  
 Alemannus, N. 327  
 Aletes 129  
 Alexander (of Macedon) 1, 52, 62, 68, 87, 90, 94, 106, 112, 115, 133, 135, 165, 174, 197, 240, 260  
 Alexander Mamaea 140  
 Alexander Severus 47  
 Alexandria 3, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 56, 80, 90, 93, 106, 162, 212, 215, 247  
     bath 90  
     lighthouse 88  
     temple of Serapis 90, 92  
*Alexiad* 43  
 Alexios I, emperor 43, 48, 265  
 Alkamenes 129  
 Alkmaion 127  
 alytarch 99, 108  
 Amandra 62  
 Amanos 58

\*This index is intended to cover proper names referred to in this volume, together with certain topics which may help orient the reader through an otherwise unhelpful string of numbers (the name 'Malalas', for example, appears on nearly every page). Some lists, however, have not been fully indexed, e.g. of consuls (pp. 143-48), earthquakes (pp. 155-59), vocabulary (pp. 221-23) and portraits (pp. 232-40). Authors of secondary literature appear here only if the scholar's name has been specifically mentioned in the text. Please note that the foot-notes have not been indexed, though references have been included to those pages on which important discussions appear in the notes.

- Amaseia 158, 209  
 Amazons 70  
 Amida 108, 303  
 Ammianus 181, 186  
 Amos 52  
 Amphion 58, 104, 126, 178  
*amphithales* 109, 178  
 Amyke 58  
 anachronisms 61  
 Anasarthon 209  
 Anastasios, emperor 1, 4, 12, 15, 16, 24, 33, 42, 44, 45, 61, 73, 92, 95, 96, 100, 101, 104, 105, 106, 108, 118, 119, 141, 168, 209, 210, 211, 216, 240, 241, 243, 253, 255, 300, 335  
 Anastasios, patriarch of Antioch 256  
 Anastasios, quaestor 82  
 Anastasios, St 296, 297; see also '*Laterculus Malalianus*'  
 Anastasioupolis 100  
 Anatolios, *comes Orientis* 160  
 Anatolios of Laodikeia 34  
 Anazarbos 9, 10, 107, 157, 159, 209  
 Anchises 71  
 Andreas 79  
 Andronikos II, emperor 48, 49  
 angels 112, 187  
 Anglo-Saxon England 288, 289, 290  
 Anicia Juliana 82  
 Ankyra 106  
 Anna Komnene 43, 248  
 Annas, high priest 122  
 Annianos 32, 33, 34, 35, 114, 127, 132, 154, 180, 197, 268  
 annunciation 120  
 Anon. Mal. (= Oxford, Baroccianus 194) 318, 320  
 Antaios 64  
 Anthimius, emperor 90, 141  
 Anthios 173  
 Anthousa, *tyche* 57, 98, 106  
 Antichrist 84  
 Antigone, *tyche* 104, 105  
 Antigoneia 104, 107  
 Antigonos Poliorketes 57, 104  
 Antioch 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23, 29, 30, 39, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 64, 66, 79, 80, 84, 87, 90, 91, 93, 94, 99, 103, 104, 105, 108, 111, 124, 155, 157, 158, 162, 167, 178, 197, 200, 203, 208, 209, 212, 216, 228, 243, 247, 250, 266, 269, 285, 319, 337  
     and Antiochos IV Epiphanes 90  
     and Malalas 13  
     archives 8, 9, 208  
         contents of 205  
     archives of *comes Orientis* 208  
         contents 208  
         natural disasters 209  
         patterns of reports 209  
     basilicas 56  
     basilica of Anatolios 8, 56  
     basilica of Rufinus 8, 56, 101  
     baths 103  
     benefactors 56  
     Bouleuterion 90, 93, 94  
     Charonion 57, 108  
     city archives 204  
     city chronicle 204  
     Epiphaneia 90  
     festivals  
         Kynegia 93  
         Maioumas 59, 93  
     foundation legends 97  
     founded by Seleukos Nikator 90  
     imperial building 7, 56  
     imperial visits 7, 55  
     Kolonisios 104  
     language mix 7  
     Mouseion 103  
     Nymphaion 62, 103  
     Olympias spring 94  
     Olympic games 8  
     patriarchs 15, 23  
     public buildings 94  
         Roman period 94  
     rituals  
         anti-mosquito 59  
         door-knocking 59  
         drum-beating 60  
     Roman customs 59  
     Romanesion Gate 104  
     synagogue 90  
     talismans 107  
     temple of Ares 91  
     temples 90  
     *tyche* 58, 104  
         erected by Seleukos 104  
     urban development 93  
 Antiochos I 106  
 Antiochos Chouzon 59  
 Antiochos IV 108  
 Antiope 58, 104  
 Antipatros 9  
 Antoninus Pius, emperor 7, 56, 89, 92, 93, 105, 139  
 Apamea 10, 90, 106  
 Aphrodite 59, 62, 63, 65, 92, 94  
 Apollianus; see Claudius Apollianus  
 Apollinaris of Alexandria 162  
 Apollo 90  
 Apollodoros, of Athens 28, 29, 37, 265  
 Apollonios Rhodios 170, 173, 196

- Apollonios, of Tyana 57, 64, 107, 178  
     talismans in Constantinople and Antioch 107  
 Appian 47  
 Apsyrtos 5  
 Aqua Antoniniana 90  
 Aquila 170, 173, 196  
 Arabia 10, 15  
 Ararat 189  
 Arcadius, emperor 61, 101, 108, 141  
 Archangel Michael 89, 173, 216  
 Archilochos 170, 173, 196  
 Archive Compendium (Slavonic) 278  
 archives 9, 11, 208; see also '*acta urbis*', '*Antioch*, archives'  
 Ardysos 130  
 Areopagos 89  
 Ares 61, 63, 91, 96, 98, 107  
 Arethas 274  
 Argives 59  
 Argo 70  
 Argonauts 70, 89, 173, 260, 261  
 Argos 1, 28  
     ruler list 124  
     From Adam date 124  
     synchronization 124  
 Ariadne 61  
 Arian 42  
 Arianism 14  
 Aristainetos 79  
 Aristotle 79  
 Armenia 88  
 Arrian 27, 47, 170, 173, 196  
 Arsine 106  
 Artabanes 99  
 Artaxerxes 91, 133  
 Artaxerxes Mnemon 133  
 Artemis 6, 71, 88, 92, 94  
 ascension  
     date of 122  
     dates from 165  
     dates from, in *Chronicon Paschale* 123  
     dates from, in Malalas 122  
 Asia 6, 155  
 Asios 64  
 Askanios 134  
 Assyria 65, 73, 87, 203  
     From Adam date 133  
     ruler list 132  
     synchronization 133  
 Assyrians 91, 98  
 Astynome 240  
 Asytages 133  
 Atargatis 106  
 Athalaric 14  
 Athanasios, patron of Cosmas 82  
 Athanasios, St 261  
 Athena 103, 104  
 Athenae, village 71  
 Athene 89, 90, 91  
 Athenians 73  
 Athens 1, 12, 65, 78, 105  
 Athos, Mt 53, 247  
 Atreus 71, 128  
 Attaleiates, Michael 43  
 Attica  
     ruler list 126  
     From Adam date 127  
     synchronization 127, 128  
 Attila 180, 191, 215  
 Attis 89  
 audience for chronicles in 6th century 70  
 Augustine 290, 294  
 Augustus, emperor 1, 7, 13, 48, 55, 57, 59, 64, 74, 89, 116, 120, 138, 139, 197, 292, 293  
 Auleas 170, 174, 196  
 Aulis 88  
 Aurelian, emperor 90, 140, 240  
 Auson 74  
 Ausonia 74  
 Autolykus 30; see also 'Theophilus'  
 Automenes 129  
 Axoum 269, 271, 273, 274, 276  
     embassy: account on loose leaf? 274  
     embassy misdated by Malalas 273  
 Axoumitai 109, 200, 274  
  
 B (= Paris, Gr. 1630) 39, 251, 252, 322, 327  
 Ba (= Oxford, Baroccianus 182) 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 21, 24, 56, 96, 161, 200, 229, 231, 241, 245, 246, 248-249, 251, 253, 255, 259, 262, 265, 268, 269, 271, 272, 273, 274, 276, 283, 298, 299, 300, 313, 314, 315, 316, 323, 327, 328, 329, 331, 333, 334, 335, 336  
     annotations and re-inking 246  
     base text of 1986 translation 248  
     book divisions 247  
     lacunas 246, 247  
     necessary emendation 116, 117  
 Baalbek Oracle 119  
 Babel 111, 113, 114, 124, 126, 133  
 Babylas 17, 163  
 Babylon 115  
 Babylonian 78  
 Babylonian captivity 1  
 Balbinus, emperor 140  
 Baldwin, B. 244  
 Balshazzar 133  
 Bar Hebraeus 306, 307, 309  
     sources 307  
*Barbarus Scaligeri* 33; see also '*Excerpta Barbari*'

- Barocci 313, 314, 315, 318  
     Francesco 314  
     Giacomo 314  
 Baroccianus 182; see 'Ba'  
 Baronius, Cardinal 325  
 Barozzi; see 'Barocci'  
 Basil I, emperor 42  
 Basileios 160  
 basilica; see 'Antioch', 'Constantinople'  
 Basiliskos (Basiliscus), emperor 15, 141,  
 163, 212, 215  
 Bassus 5, 170, 174, 196, 200, 214  
 baths; see 'Antioch', 'Constantinople'  
 Baylie, Dr. 317  
 Bede 255, 288, 289, 290, 296, 298  
 Bederiana 241  
 Beirut 3, 14  
 Bel 98  
 Belisarios 69, 83  
 Bellerophon 5  
 Bellerophon and Pegasus 103  
 Belos 132  
 Belshazzar 91  
 Benedict Biscop 289, 291  
 Benevento 5  
 Bentley, R. 320, 321, 326  
     *Epistola ad Millium* 320  
 Bernard, E. 320  
 Bessoï 63  
 Bidez, J. 170  
 Bischoff, B. 289  
 Blachernai 95  
 Black Sea 89  
 Bodleian Library 313, 316, 318  
 Boiotia  
     ruler list 126  
     From Adam date 126  
 Bonn Corpus 321, 322, 324  
 Book of Enoch 63  
 Book of Jubilees 63  
 Bosporos 95  
 Bostra 10  
 Bottios, Bouttios 27, 170, 174, 196, 214  
 Boukephalos 90  
 Bouleuterion; see 'Antioch'  
 Boundos 13  
 Bourghier, Sir H. 314  
 Bouriier, P.H. 169, 336; see chapter 7, *passim*  
*Breviarius de Hierosolyma* 80  
 Britannia 105  
 Brooks, E.W. 250, 286, 299, 332  
 Browning, R. 40, 43, 218  
 Brumalia 7, 60, 61, 185; see also 'festivals'  
 Brunichius 5, 170, 175, 196, 214  
 Brutus 134  
 buildings 69, 71, 88, 93  
     Antiochene focus 93  
     classical 103  
     destruction and restoration 91  
     element in imperial biography 92  
     Hellenistic period 90-911  
     imperial patronage 93  
     Jerusalem 91  
     legendary period 88-90  
         Rome 89  
         temples and tombs in Greek myth 88  
 Bulgaria 276, 282  
 Bury, J.B. 45, 272, 313, 321, 323, 329,  
 330, 334, 335  
 Busiris 74  
 Byblos 58  
 Bysshe, Sir E. 318  
 Byzantion 52, 74, 101, 106, 158, 159  
 Byzas 52, 94, 95, 96  
  
 C (= Paris, Gr. 854) 44, 50, 260-1, 322  
     9th or 6th centuries? 44  
 Caedwalla 291  
 Caesar 47, 48, 61, 74, 204; see also 'Julius  
 Caesar'  
 Caesarea 9, 10, 31, 56, 80, 106  
 Caesarea Maritima 87, 91, 106  
 Caesarea Philippi 5, 102  
 Caiaphas 122  
 Caledonian boar 5  
 Caligula, emperor 48, 139  
 Cameron, A.M. 55, 69, 71, 80  
 Cameron, A.D.E. 272  
 Camillus 4  
 Campus Martius 7, 89  
 Canterbury 255, 287, 289, 290, 292, 294,  
 297, 299  
     and teaching of Greek 290  
 Capito(n) 39, 181  
 Caracalla, emperor 7, 139, 240  
 Caria 62  
 Carinus, emperor 140, 240  
 Carrhae 62  
 Carthage 47, 269  
 Carus, emperor 62, 140  
 Cassiodorus 175, 294  
 Cassius Longinus 121  
 Cassius Dio, see 'Dio Cassius'  
 Caucasian potentates 9  
 Cave, W. 325, 326  
*Cave of Treasures* 66  
 Chalcedonian(s) 16, 63, 75  
 Chaldaean Oracles 14  
 Chaldaeans 31  
 Chalkedon 14  
 Chalkis 58, 186  
 Chalkokondyles, Laonikos 49  
 Charalambakis, C. 241  
 Charax 27, 44, 75, 170, 175, 184, 196

- Charonion; see 'Antioch'
- Cheiron 65
- Chernousov, E. 337
- Cherubim and Seraphim 91, 101
- chiliasm 113, 120; see also 'millennialism'
- Chilmead, E. 45, 54, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 325
- Chosroes 14, 71, 200, 210, 269, 270, 274, 275
- Christ 1, 12, 36, 64, 116, 200, 214, 256, 289, 292
- born in 5500 116, 117, 119
  - crucified in 6000 116, 117, 119
  - lifetime 12, 117, 120
    - annunciation 120
    - ascension 122
    - burial 121
    - crucifixion 121
    - dates of 120-122
    - incarnation 68
    - length of ministry 121
    - resurrection 66, 121
    - resurrection on 26th March 118
    - resurrection in 6000 12, 65
- Christian(s) 5, 37, 55, 58, 63, 102, 240
- Christian Roman empire 68
- Christianity 29, 68, 75
- Chronicle of 846* 118, 119
- Chronicle to the year 1234* 306, 307, 309
- chronicles 35, 37; see also 'chronography'
- and histories 51
  - audience 37, 50, 51
  - Christian 30
  - contents of 22, 37, 51
  - manuscripts of 50
  - monks as authors 51
  - origins of 27
  - purpose 11, 37
  - Roman 29
  - translations of 50
- Chronicon Paschale* 17, 18, 20, 21, 38, 47, 123, 138, 154, 164, 165, 213, 219, 220, 229, 231, 246, 248, 252-253, 254, 256, 257, 267, 268, 272, 275, 300, 301, 309, 316, 320, 322, 326, 329, 331, 332, 333, 335, 336, 338
- chronological systems 39
  - purpose of 39
  - used early version of Malalas 253
- Chronographikon syntomon* 46; see also 'Nikephoros, patriarch'
- chronography 27; see also 'chronicles'
- 4th and 5th centuries 35
  - Christian 35
  - Hellenistic 28, 29
- chronological structures 1, 27, 63, 111-66
- chronology
- Christian 34, 36, 37
  - Roman 28
- Chrysaphios 180
- church history 37
- Cilicia 10, 15, 62, 205, 296
- Cilician woman 8
- city archives 203
- city chronicle(s) 8, 21, 88, 151, 166, 169, 204, 213, 216, 243, 248, 253, 256, 257, 329; see also 'Antioch'
- contents of 204
- city prefect 24
- Clarke, S. 318
- classical learning 78
- 6th-century hostility to 78
- classicising writers 69
- Claudius, emperor 7, 56, 59, 122, 139, 215
- Claudius Apollianus, emperor 140, 240
- Clement (of Alexandria) 27, 30, 36, 112, 117, 118, 164, 170, 175, 193, 196, 215
- Cleopatra 13, 52, 64, 215
- Collatinus 134
- Colossus (of Rhodes) 88, 104
- comes Orientis* 6, 9, 10, 11, 19, 22, 59, 111, 166, 200, 201, 205, 209, 210, 212, 213
- establishment of 161
  - reorganization of 161
  - sequence of 160-162
- comets 204
- Commodus, emperor 56, 59, 99, 100, 123, 139
- Consilia (= Consualia) 7; see also 'festivals'
- Constans I, emperor 140, 241
- Constans II, emperor 254
- Constantine I, emperor 2, 6, 7, 17, 45, 49, 56, 57, 73, 74, 89, 94, 95, 96, 98, 100, 101, 103, 106, 138, 140, 142, 173, 197, 205, 216, 243, 321
- Constantine II, emperor 241
- Constantine Manasses 266
- Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos, emperor 39, 42, 219, 262, 264, 322, 324, 325, 326
- Constantinian excerptor 22
- Constantinian excerpts; see '*Excerpta* (Constantinian)', '*De insidiis*', '*De virtutibus*'
- Constantinople 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, 23, 41, 49, 51, 52, 55, 58, 60, 64, 84, 87, 88, 90, 93, 95, 96, 99, 106, 107, 109, 138, 156, 157, 159, 162, 164, 169, 177, 182, 184, 208, 210, 212, 213, 247, 249, 250, 251, 286, 304, 314, 321, 329, 332
- Acropolis 6, 92, 94
  - anniversary celebrations 106, 107
  - Augousteion 100
  - Baths of Dagistheos 95
  - Baths of Zeuxippos 94, 99, 103, 125

- Constantinople (cont.)  
 building by Constantine 94  
 building by Justinian 95  
 building by Theodosius II 95  
 Chalke Gate 22, 95, 97  
 churches 95  
 columns of Theodosius 108  
 Forum Tauri 101, 108  
 foundation legends 97  
 Hagia Sophia 83, 92, 95, 99, 255  
 Holy Apostles 83, 95  
 Kynegion 94  
*patria* 96  
 Prosphorion harbour 94  
 public buildings 95  
 Regia 94, 100  
 Rhegion Gate 95  
 Senaton 95, 100  
 St Diomedes in Jerusalem 95  
 St Eirene 83  
 St Eirene at Justinianai 95  
 St George of Mangana 99  
 St Konon 95  
 St Laurence 95  
 St Mamas 95  
 St Sergius and St Bacchus 83  
 St Sergius in Hormisdas 95  
 St Stratonikos 95  
 St Thekla 95  
 Strategion 94  
 talismans 107  
 temples 6, 94  
 temples on Acropolis 92  
 Tetrastoon 94, 95  
*tyche* 98  
 urban embellishments 103  
 walls 94  
 Zeuxippon 64
- Constantius I, emperor 14, 140, 160, 240  
 Constantius II, emperor 140, 241  
 Consualia 60; see also 'festivals'  
 consul(s) (not listed individually; see chapter 6, section 5) 28, 39, 73, 143-149, 166, 298  
 consulships 252  
*conventus* 60  
 Conybeare, F.C. 336  
 Coptic 80  
 Corinth 28, 47, 79, 157  
   ruler list 129  
   synchronization 130  
 Corippus 80, 81, 82, 175  
*Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 324  
 Cosmas Indicopleustes 71, 78, 79, 80  
   despises classical learning 79  
   on marvels 78  
   on succession of kingdoms 78  
   patrons 82
- Costanza, S. 170  
 councils, church 14, 164  
 Cramer, J.A. 44, 322, 327  
 creation of provinces 227  
 Crete 88, 155, 156, 313  
 crucifixion 112, 190, 255, 292; see also 'Christ, lifetime'  
   date of 121  
*cubicularii* 61  
 Cummian 291  
*cuspos* 60, 73  
 customs, see also 'Antioch; festivals, rituals', 'festivals'  
   Roman 7, 59  
 Cyprian 318, 319  
 Cyprus 10, 54, 58  
 Cyrenius 120  
 Cyril of Alexandria 170, 171, 176, 182, 190, 195, 196, 293  
 Cyril of Scythopolis 75, 81, 82, 331  
   expressing official policies 75  
 Cyrus of Batnae 306
- D'yakonov 299, 301, 305, 323; see also chapter 9, part 4, *passim*  
 Daidalos 5, 103  
 Damascus 5, 10  
 Danae 62  
 Daniel, prophet 79, 133  
 Daphne 8, 56, 62, 87, 90, 91, 93, 99, 100, 103  
   aqueduct and Shrine of Nymphs 103  
   synagogue 92  
   theatre 91  
 Dara 9, 100, 209, 210  
 Dardanos 128, 130  
 Dareios 94, 134  
 Dareios Kambyzes 133  
 Dareios the Mede 133  
 Dares 231, 244, 248  
 Daristhenoi 13  
 Darmarios, Andreas 46, 50  
 David, king 53, 111, 114, 266  
 Davis, R. 318  
 de Boor, C. 273, 323  
 de Gruyter, publishing house 324  
*De insidiis* 3, 11, 21, 24, 27, 39, 230, 248, 251, 258, 262, 269, 284, 300, 322, 327, 331; see also '*Excerpta* (Constantinian)'  
*De Magistratibus*; see 'Lydus'  
*De Mensibus*; see 'Lydus'  
*De Ostentis*; see 'Lydus'  
*De virtutibus et vitiis* 3, 27, 39, 251, 262, 300; see also '*Excerpta* (Constantinian)'  
 Debborios 57, 64, 107  
 Decius, emperor 140

- decorative arts: costume, silver 108  
 Deinarchos 170, 176, 185, 189, 196, 201  
 Delphi 170, 189  
 Demetrios, Jewish scholar 28  
 Demetrios, St 106  
 Demokritos 64, 194, 260  
 Demosthenes 52, 77  
 Dexippos 36  
 Diadumenianus, emperor 140  
 Didius Julianus, emperor 139  
 Didymos 27, 170, 176, 196, 201  
*Digest* 83  
 Diktys 44, 77, 88, 89, 130, 170, 172, 175, 176, 179, 192, 196, 199, 214, 215, 242, 260, 265, 266, 330, 336  
 Dindorf  
   Ludwig 45, 247, 259, 268, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326, 328, 331  
   Wilhelm 321, 322  
 Dindymos, Mt 87  
 Dio Cassius 47, 252, 322, 327  
 Diocletian, emperor 7, 8, 13, 44, 46, 59, 100, 140, 259, 263  
 Diodoros (of Sicily; Diodorus Siculus) 27, 29, 31, 39, 124, 125, 170, 171, 177, 192, 196, 201, 322  
 Diogenianos, lexicographer 73  
 Diokaisareia 155  
 Diomeda 240  
 Diomedes 74, 231  
 Dionysios of Halikarnassos 29, 31, 170, 178, 196  
 Dionysios of Tel-Mahre 269, 306, 307; see also 'Pseudo-Dionysios'  
 Dionysios the Areopagite 71  
 Dionysius Exiguus 154  
 Dionysos 59, 62, 63, 104, 170  
 Dioscorides 82  
 Dioscorus of Aphroditos 66, 80  
 Diospolis 155  
 Dirke 185  
 Dodwell, H. 319, 320, 325  
 Domitian, emperor 7, 65, 89, 139  
 Domitios 17  
 Domninos 1, 7, 8, 27, 33, 59, 60, 104, 126, 138, 153, 159, 164, 167, 170, 172, 176, 177, 178, 179, 185, 187, 189, 190, 195, 196, 199, 200, 201, 204, 208, 215, 216, 243, 244, 268  
   major source for Malalas 178, 197  
 Domnus 163  
 Dorotheos of Monemvasia 52-53, 267  
   Russian translation 54  
 Doukas 49  
 Downey, G. 22, 94, 161, 324, 337  
 Drakon 127  
 Drijvers, H. 13  
 Du Çange 320  
*dux* 60  
 Dyrrachium 157  
 earthquake(s) 8, 9, 10, 17, 23, 56, 79, 88, 111, 118, 138, 155-159, 166, 203, 204, 209, 228, 250, 256  
   formulaic vocabulary on 159  
   official lists of 159  
   sources of information on 159  
 Easter 34, 39, 66, 118, 120, 123  
 ecclesiastical historians: polemical narratives 76  
*Ecclesiastical History, Selections from* 255-256, 258, 268, 271  
 Edessa 9, 10, 13, 158, 209  
 Egypt 28, 63, 68, 241, 253, 254, 292  
   synchronization 131  
 Egyptians 1, 28, 31, 52  
 Eirenaïos 27, 132, 170, 172, 179, 196; see also 'Irenaeus'  
 Eirenaïos Pentadiastes 160  
 'Εκλογή τῶν Χρονικῶν; see 'A'  
 'Εκλογή 'Ιστοριῶν; see 'C'  
*ekphraseis* 98  
 Elagabalus, emperor 140  
 Elesboas 274  
 Eleutherios 161  
 Eliakim 112, 115  
 Ellis, J. 318, 319  
 Elpius 243  
 embassies 9  
 Emesa 80  
 emperor, debate on role of 56, 60, 68, 82  
 emperors, Roman: see chapter 6, section 4 138-143  
   reign lengths 138, 165  
 Endeblechos 132  
 Endless Peace 14, 19, 20, 83, 88, 169, 211, 286  
 Endymion 63, 64, 174  
 Enoch 112, 173  
 Enyalios 75  
 Ephesos 12, 14, 93, 107, 130  
 Ephraim, chronicler 48  
 Ephraimios, patriarch 160, 163  
 Ephrem Syrus 293  
 Epiphanius 289, 292, 293, 294  
*Epitome* 46, 50, 263, 264  
 era 34  
   Alexandrian 34, 117, 119  
   Antiochene 33, 151-153, 166  
   alteration to 151  
   Byzantine 34  
   Eusebian 119  
   of Anatolios 34

- era (cont.)  
 of Annianos 34, 35  
 of Diocletian 117, 153, 166  
 of Panodoros 34, 35  
 proto-Byzantine 34, 35  
 Seleucid 154, 166  
 Eratosthenes 28  
 Erechtheus 132  
 Eryxias 127  
 Escorial manuscript; see '*Excerpta*  
 (Constantinian)'  
 Esdra 115  
 Esquiline treasure 105  
 Eteokles 126  
 Ethiopia 78, 109  
 etymologies 62  
 Euchaita 15  
 Eudokia 8, 56, 65, 75, 79, 91, 232, 250  
 Eugenius 141  
 euhemerization 37-8, 52-3, 59, 58, 62-3, 67,  
 75, 79, 132, 173, 188, 192, 214  
 Eulalios 211  
 Eunapius of Sardis 36, 39  
 Euodios, patriarch 15, 122, 162  
 Euphemios, patriarch 15  
 Euphraimios 16, 23  
 Euphrasios, patriarch 15, 16, 163, 300  
 Eupolemos 28  
 Euripides 52, 65, 74, 77, 126, 170, 171,  
 172, 179, 185, 196, 214, 320, 322  
 Europe 5  
 Eurystheus 129  
 Eusebios (Pamphilou) 1, 5, 27, 29, 31, 32,  
 33, 34, 36, 41, 47, 61, 88, 102, 112, 114,  
 117, 118, 130, 154, 170, 171, 174, 180,  
 184, 188, 189, 190, 193, 196, 215, 260,  
 261, 268, 293, 294, 297, 299  
 chronicle 31, 32  
 Eustathios (of Epiphaneia) 27, 33, 35, 36,  
 45, 169, 170, 180, 191, 196, 197, 199, 209,  
 211, 216, 243, 268  
 Eutropius 27, 39, 167, 170, 181, 186, 192,  
 196, 199, 215  
 Eutychianos, historian 27, 170, 181, 186,  
 196, 199, 215  
 Eutychianos, Agathias' patron 81  
 Eutychides 58, 105  
 Eutychios, patriarch 162  
 Evagrius 2, 3, 8, 9, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 38,  
 45, 56, 76, 180, 191, 246, 248, 249-251,  
 286, 300, 301, 302, 327, 330, 331, 332,  
 333, 334, 335  
 Evander 89  
 exarch 10  
*Excerpta* (Constantinian) 27, 219, 229, 262,  
 263, 322, 327, 328  
 Escorial manuscript 300, 322, 327, 328,  
 329, 330, 331  
*Excerpta Barbari* 31, 33, 35, 125, 126, 127,  
 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136,  
 138, 142, 143, 149, 164, 165, 171, 173,  
 177, 183, 185, 186, 191, 198, 202, 203,  
 207, 252, 259  
 Exodus 127  
 date of 127  
 Fabricius, J.A. 326  
 faction riots 8  
*factionarius* 60  
*Fasti Hydatiani* 213, 214  
*Fasti Vindobonenses (Priores et Posteriores)*  
 118, 143, 148, 149; see also chapter 6,  
 section 5, *passim*  
 Faunus Hermes 134  
 Faustina the Younger 106  
 Februalia 7; see also 'festivals'  
 Februarius 4, 214  
 Felicianus 160  
 Fell, J. 318, 319  
 festivals; see 'Antioch; Kynegia, Maioumas',  
 'Brumalia', 'Consualia', 'Februalia', 'Graste'  
 fire-worship 65  
 fires 8, 204, 209  
 First Crusade 48  
 Flavian 15, 16, 163  
 Flora, *tyche* 106  
 Florianus, emperor 140  
 Florus 34, 170, 171, 181, 185, 196  
 Fortunus 6, 27, 170, 182, 196  
 Freund, A. 329  
 Frewin, Dr. 315  
 From Adam years; see 'years From Adam'  
 Fürst, J. 241  
 Gabala 9, 157, 209  
 Gabriel, prefect 81  
 Gaius, emperor 25, 56, 100, 107  
 Galatia 57, 106  
 Galba, emperor 139  
 Galen 293  
 Galerius, emperor 7, 100, 140  
 Galicia 281  
 Gallienus, emperor 7, 140, 240  
 Gallus, emperor 140  
 Garizim, Mt 92  
 Gaza 93  
 Geiseric 90, 101  
 Gelasinos 17  
 Gelimer 269  
 Gelzer, H. 329, 332  
 Genesis 47, 51



- George Monachos 45, 47, 50, 247, 248, 259, 261, 269, 278, 279, 282, 284, 301, 318, 323  
     anti-iconoclast 45  
     Georgian translation 51  
     Slavonic translation 47, 50  
     sources 46  
 Geppert, E. 327  
 Geta, emperor 139  
 giants 58, 187, 191  
 Gibbon, E. 326  
 Gildas 290, 291, 294  
 Gleye, C.E. 282, 313, 323, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337  
 Glykas 48, 52  
 gnosticism 11, 13, 14, 63, 195, 201, 211, 216  
 Golden Fleece 70  
 Goliath 216  
 Gordian I, emperor 140  
 Gordian III, emperor 140  
 Gorgon 6, 104  
 Gortyn 57  
 Graevius, J. 321  
 Graste 59; see also 'festivals'  
 Gratian, emperor 141, 183  
 Great Chronographer 40, 151, 256, 257, 258  
 Greece 28, 52, 74, 76  
*Greek Anthology* 72  
 Greek fire 6  
 Greek(s) 1, 29, 31, 39, 67, 217  
 Greens and Blues 271  
 Grégoire, H. 40  
 Gregoras, Nikephoros 49  
 Gregoria, *tyche* 106  
 Gregory, J. 316, 317, 318, 320, 321, 325, 328  
 Gregory of Nazianzus 289, 330  
 Gregory of Tours 298  
 Grottaferrata 251, 324, 330, 331, 333  
 Gutschmid, A. von 328, 329, 333  
  
 Haase, F. 301  
 Hadrian, emperor 6, 56, 88, 93, 100, 101, 103, 109, 139, 181, 289, 294  
 Hagia Glykeria 47  
 Hagia Sophia; see 'Constantinople'  
 hagiography 75  
 Harnack, A. 288  
 Haupt, H. 328  
 Haury, J. 335  
 Head, C. 244  
 Heahfrith 292  
 Hebrew history 1  
 Hebrew scriptures 170, 182  
 Hebrews 28  
 Helen, of Troy 61, 240, 243  
 Helena, mother of Constantine 17, 100  
 Helenoupolis 157  
 HelenouPontos 205  
 Helikonios 33, 36  
 Heliogabalus, emperor 231  
 Helioupolis 56, 88  
     temple of Zeus 92  
 Helios 6, 74, 92, 94, 104, 131  
 Helladikoi 125, 128  
 Hellas 59  
     ruler list 128  
     synchronization 128  
 Hellen 61, 62, 63  
 Hellenes 59, 77, 102  
 'Hellenic and Roman chronicler' 19, 20, 279, 284  
 Hellenic mythology 58, 64, 263, 266  
     aetiological role 58  
 Hellenistic historiography 29  
 Hellenistic kingdoms 1  
 Hephaistos 61, 63, 64, 98, 131, 183  
 Hera 63  
 Heraclius, emperor 39, 252, 327, 330, 333  
 Herakleis 90  
 Herakleitos 52, 65  
 Herakles 13, 64, 74, 8, 102, 109, 115, 134, 207, 211, 216  
 Hermes 63, 131  
 Hermes Trismegistos 14, 64, 170, 182, 183  
 Hermetic Corpus 14  
 Hermogenes, *magister officiorum* 11, 19, 151, 200, 209, 210, 229  
 Herod II 5, 102, 200  
 Herod the Great 56, 91, 292  
 Herodotos 47, 52, 65, 68, 170, 183, 191, 193, 196, 218  
 Hesiod 322  
 Hesychios 8, 33, 35, 36, 45-69, 80, 96, 116, 255  
     histories 96  
     *Patria* 97-8  
     similarities to Malalas 69, 96, 97  
 Hezekiah 111, 114, 115  
 Hierapolis 10, 15  
 Hippasios 65  
 Hippocephalum 57  
 Hippodameia 75  
 hippodrome 61, 74, 88, 89, 98  
     ceremonial 60  
     symbolism 60, 74, 89, 175, 184, 252, 261  
 Hippokrates 64  
 Hippolytos 243  
 Hippolytos, chronicler 31, 34, 259, 293  
*Historia Augusta* 167  
*Historia Tripartita* 255

- Hody, H. 3, 247, 319, 320, 321, 322, 325, 326, 329, 331, 333  
 Holder-Egger, O. 204  
 Holy Land 52, 80, 91  
 Homer 30, 62, 76, 77, 170, 183, 196, 214, 265  
 Homeritai 274  
 Honorias 206  
 Honorius, emperor 61, 90, 92, 141  
 Hormisdas 270  
 Horus 131  
 Hunger, H. 338  
 Huns 94, 180  
 Hypatia 65, 183  
 Hypatian Chronicle 279
- Iamblichos 14, 64  
 Iannes and Iambres 124, 131  
 Iconium (Ikonion) 6, 62, 104, 105  
 Idomoneus 260  
 Ignatios, of Antioch 15, 102, 162, 250  
 Ikaros 5, 103  
*Iliad* 265  
 Ilion 130  
 Ilios 130  
 Illus 10  
 imperial busts 60  
 imperial donations 56  
 imperial regnal years 252  
 Inachos 124, 126  
 incarnation 83, 112, 116, 255  
     date of 121  
 Indarazar 211  
 indictions 39, 149-151, 166, 252  
 inscriptions 7, 9, 58, 200-1, 207  
*Institutes* 83  
 Insular minuscule 289  
 Io 58, 59, 64, 126, 215  
 Iocaste 61  
 Iopolis 58  
 Iopolitai 58  
 Ioulios Polydeukes 46, 50  
 Iphigeneia 5, 58, 61, 88, 177  
*Iphigeneia in Tauris* 179  
 Irenaeus 12, 293; see also 'Eirenaïos'  
 Irish, the 288, 291, 292  
 Isaac Porphyrogennetos 231, 247, 265  
 Isauria 9, 10, 15  
 Isaurians 212  
 Isidore, of Seville 288  
 Isokasios 10, 65  
 Isokrates 52, 65  
 Israel 68, 73  
 Israelites 79  
 Istrin, V. 247, 277, 281, 282, 323  
 Italy 28, 63, 74, 84, 115, 177
- ruler list 134  
 synchronization 134
- Jacob Baradeus 304  
 Jacob of Edessa 306  
 Jacob of Sarug 293  
 James, apostle 12, 13  
 Jarrow 288, 289  
 Jason 70  
 Jeep, L. 329, 331, 334  
 Jenkins, R.H.J. 42, 92  
 Jerome 32, 33, 37, 297  
 Jerusalem 5, 12, 17, 56, 87, 101, 102, 123, 162, 182, 247, 292  
     Church of the Holy Sepulchre 91  
     sacked by Titus 91  
     Temple 91  
         destructions of 91  
 Jesus 64, 242  
 Jew(s) 5, 28, 29, 40, 52, 115  
 Joakim 112, 115, 133  
 Joel 48, 50  
 John, apostle 12  
 John, unknown bishop 184  
 John Chrysostom 8, 251, 289, 293, 294, 317  
 John Isthmeos 8  
 John Lydus, John the Lydian; see 'Lydus'  
 John Moschos 253  
 John of Antioch 3, 38, 39, 46, 51, 112, 181, 191, 251, 252, 253, 254, 263, 265, 266, 267, 284, 285, 301, 302, 306, 316, 318, 322, 323, 325, 327, 328, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 338  
     confused with Malalas 39  
     Constantinian fragments 251  
     ms B 251  
     Pigulevskaya's views 302  
     Salmasian fragments 251  
     sources 39  
 John of Asia; see 'John of Ephesos'  
 John of Damascus 3, 27, 174, 254, 316, 325  
 John of Ephesos 2, 3, 8, 17, 21, 22, 38, 76, 154, 248, 249, 253, 266, 269, 275, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 306, 307, 309, 323, 324, 332, 333, 335  
     cites Malalas as John the Antiochene 305  
     D'yakonov's views 300  
     second part of EcclHist preserved by PsD 305  
     works 304  
 John of Gaza 80  
 John of Litarba 307  
 John of Nikiu 254, 269, 300, 301, 332, 335  
 John, patriarch of Antioch 251  
 John Rufus 66  
 John Scholastikos 17, 251, 335

- John the Baptist 12, 292  
 John the Paphlagonian 101  
 John the Rhetor 3, 250, 286, 302, 327, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336  
 John the Syrian 298  
 John Troglita 82  
 John Tzetzes; see "Tzetzes"  
 John Tzimiskes, emperor 43  
 Jordanes 33, 34, 82, 191  
 Jortin, J. 326  
 Josephos 27, 29, 30, 31, 35, 47, 91, 126, 170, 184, 189, 196, 201, 281, 289, 293, 294  
 Joshua, son of Nun 63, 124, 127  
 Joshua the Stylite 66  
 Josias 52  
 Jovian, emperor 141, 181, 240, 241  
 Judaea 102  
 Judas Maccabaeus 91  
 Judith 133, 179  
 Julian, emperor 5, 24, 100, 140, 186, 189, 197, 199, 215, 240, 241, 328  
 Julian, ambassador 274, 275  
 Julian the Chaldaean 14  
 Julius Caesar 44, 46, 55, 61, 68, 87, 88, 94, 100, 102, 151, 259, 263  
 Justin I, emperor 1, 13, 24, 25, 42, 96, 141, 143, 169, 200, 211, 241, 250, 258, 275, 298, 330  
 Justin II, emperor 24, 83, 90, 141, 143, 244, 259, 274, 293, 298, 304, 305, 328, 334, 335  
 Justin Martyr 30, 90  
 Justinian I, emperor 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 37, 38, 45, 49, 69, 72, 75, 78, 82, 83, 87, 88, 90, 93, 95, 96, 100, 108, 112, 141, 161, 169, 200, 204, 206, 208, 216, 225, 240, 241, 243, 245, 251, 258, 270, 271, 273, 274, 276, 285, 286, 304, 314, 325, 326, 330, 331, 335  
     optimism in early years 83  
     pessimism of later years 84  
 Justinian II, emperor 40  
  
 Kadmeia 61  
 Kadmos 126, 128  
 Kaisareion 100  
 Kalandio 15, 163, 300  
 Kallimachos 170, 184, 196  
 Kallinikon 269  
 Kalliope, *tyche* 105  
 Kalliopios 160  
 Kallistos 56  
 Kalopodios 270, 271, 272  
 Kantakouzenos, John, emperor 49  
 Kasios 58  
 Kasiotis 58  
 Kassandros 135, 178  
 Kastor, of Rhodes 29, 31, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 132, 165, 170, 177, 184, 191, 193, 196  
*kathisma* 6  
 Kedrenos 47, 50, 52, 114, 213, 248, 261, 264, 269, 301  
 Kekrops 61, 127, 128, 319  
 Kepara, *tyche* 107  
 Kephalion 170, 176, 185, 189, 196, 201, 214  
 Kerateon 91, 102  
 Kerdon 13  
 Keroe, *tyche* 106  
 Kiev 281  
 Kigalas 53, 54  
 Kilix 62  
 Kinnamos 248  
 Kinyras 58  
 Kirke 13, 62, 64, 74, 88, 215  
 Koades 200, 210, 269, 270, 274  
 Kodonatos 15, 16  
 Koine Greek 217  
 Komnenoi 48, 49  
 Konya 6  
 Kosmas and Damian, SS 17  
 Kosmosotira monastery 265  
 Kranaos (Kranos) 52, 127, 135  
 Kratylos 62  
 Kritoboulos 50  
 Kroisos 130, 133  
 Kronos 63, 132, 134, 261  
 Krumbacher, K. 217, 323, 334, 336, 337  
 Kybele 89, 106  
 Kyros, of Persia 52, 133  
 Kyros, of Panopolis 65, 95, 180  
 Kyzikos 6, 48, 88, 89, 100, 156, 158, 260, 261  
     temple of Hadrian 88  
  
 Lakedaimonia  
     ruler list 129  
     From Adam date 129  
     synchronization 129  
 Lakon 62, 128, 131  
 Lakonia 62, 128  
     ruler list 128  
 Land, J.P.N. 299, 301  
 Langbaine, G. 318  
 language mixture in 6th-century Byzantion 80  
 Laodikeia 23, 56, 87, 90, 100, 105, 158, 186, 209  
 Laomedon 130  
 Lapathos 128, 131

- Lapidge, M. 289  
*Laterculus Malalianus* 12, 24, 25, 116, 119, 121, 138, 142, 231, 248, 254, 255, 267, 276, 287-99, 304, 323, 333, 336  
 and ending of Malalas 298  
 and Malalas 292  
 anti-Irish 291  
 bipartite structure 293  
 cultural context 296  
 date of ms 288  
 knowledge of Rome 290  
 Latin style  
   see Anastasios, St 297  
 links with Antiochene theology 293, 298  
 literal translation 295, 297  
   see Anastasios, St 296  
 Mommsen's views 288  
 on imperial reigns 298  
 original ms in Insular hand 291  
 reflection of Latin literary authors 290  
 sources 293  
   in Eastern exegetical tradition 293  
   not in Western exegetical tradition 294  
 status as witness to Malalas 298  
 translation as *interpretatio* 298  
 wide knowledge of Greek patristics 290  
 written by Theodore of Tarsos 290, 292  
 last entry 24-5, 143, 298  
 Latin 60, 73, 80, 222-3  
 Laud, W. 315, 316, 317  
 laws, legislation 9, 10, 201  
*Laws* 83  
 Laz 109  
 Leios 108  
 Leo Grammatikos 46, 50, 248, 264  
 Leo I, emperor 4, 14, 92, 99, 141, 197, 207, 256, 309  
 Leo II, emperor 2, 141, 142, 149, 168, 208, 209, 243, 307  
 Leo IV, emperor 41, 256  
 Leo V, emperor 40, 44, 45, 259, 263  
 Leo the Deacon 43, 263  
 Leontinus 309  
 Leontios, usurper 8, 10, 15, 65, 208  
 Leontios, presbyter 78  
 Libanios 58, 59, 93, 97  
*Liber Generationis* 31, 259  
*Liber Pontificalis* 92  
 Licinius 256  
 Licinius (Macer) 27, 185, 196, 170  
 Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. 7  
*Life of Basil* 92  
*limes* 10, 60, 61  
 Lindisfarne Gospels 297  
 Lindsay, Dr. A. 314, 315, 316  
 Linos 162  
 Livy 170, 171, 185, 190, 196  
 Lloyd, Bishop W. 319, 320, 325  
 Logothete chronicle 46, 264, 278, 284  
 Longinus 120  
 Lucan 170, 171, 185, 196  
 Lucian 170, 186, 196, 214  
 Lucius Verus, emperor 139  
 Lydia 28  
   ruler list 130  
   synchronization 130  
 Lydians 1  
 Lydus, John 4, 14, 71, 72, 74, 80, 83, 84, 131, 171, 174, 175, 182, 185, 196  
   and statues 74  
   dates of writing 73  
   *De Magistratibus* 72, 73, 81  
   *De Mensibus* 72, 74, 81  
   *De Ostentis* 72, 73, 81  
   interest in antiquity 72  
   on Roman Republic 73  
   on thunder 73  
   patrons 81  
   Roman history 74  
   use of archives 72  
   use of mythology 74  
   works 72  
 Lykaon 62, 205  
 Lykaonia 62, 205  
 Lykophron 266  
 Lykos 124  
 Lykourgos 61  
 Lynkeus 124, 173  
 Maccabees 91  
 Macedonia 28, 42, 67, 78, 106  
   ruler list 135  
   From Adam date 135  
   synchronization 135  
 Macedonian dynasty 42, 52, 67  
 Macrinus, emperor 140  
 Madaba 106  
 Magi 292  
*magister* 60  
*magister militum per Armeniam* 213  
*magister militum per Orientem* 6, 208  
*magister militum praesentalis* 10  
*magistri militum* 10  
 Magnus, of Carrhae 27, 170, 181, 186, 215, 268  
*magoi* 13, 63, 64  
 Mai, Cardinal 251, 323, 330, 331, 333  
 Makedonios, patriarch 15, 162  
 Malalas 32, 82, 136, 142, 155, 166, 171, 200, 211, 214  
   a monophysite? 15, 16, 300, 335  
   a self-conscious writer 81

## Malalas (cont.)

- anachronistic view of the past 60, 61
- and Antioch 4, 6, 55
- and *comes Orientis* 11, 200, 205, 208
- and Cosmas Indicopleustes
  - on succession of kingdoms 78
  - similarities to 79
  - sites visible 'to the present' 79
- and imperial government 225
- and inscriptions 58
- and John Scholastikos 335
- and John the Rhetor 334, 336
- and Nestorianism 15
- and Persia 13, 65
- and Rome 59
- and statues 56
- and Syriac Christianity 13
- and theology 14
- and *tychai* 58
- audience for 38
- Christian interpretation of history 68
- chronicle
  - and Africanus 30, 124, 125, 126, 129, 131, 133, 134
  - and Annianos 32, 127
  - and Antiochene city chronicle 204
  - and Domninos 33, 126
  - and Eusebios 32
  - and Eustathios 33
  - and *Excerpta Barbari* 33, 125, 127, 129, 130, 132, 133, 134, 135
  - and Hesychios 36, 69, 96
  - and Kastor 124, 126, 127, 129
  - and *Laterculus* 142
  - and Lydus 72
    - interest in reign lengths 73
    - interest in technical terms 74
    - lack of similarities 73
    - on hippodrome 74
    - role of great men in history 74
    - similarities to 72, 73
    - use of myth 74
  - and Nestorians 33
  - and Palaiphatos 128
  - and *patria* 96
  - and Prokopios 38
    - attitude to mythology 70
    - different genres 70
    - similarities 70, 71
  - Antiochene era 166
  - author's personality 20
  - authorities cited 199
    - directly 196
      - from Malalas' source 171
    - in clusters 170
    - indirectly 196
    - Latin 171
      - some accurately 172
      - time span 170
  - back references 20, 21, 199, 211
  - Book XVIII
    - different 169
    - language 212
    - subject-matter 211, 214
  - buildings, contexts for 87
  - Constantinopolitan city chronicle 213
  - change at end of XIV 168
  - chronological excursus at death of Zeno 118
  - chronological structures 111-166
  - comites Orientis* 160
  - consuls 143-149, 166
    - sources 149
  - cross-references 215
  - dates of composition 83
    - debates on 327
    - 6th-century context 84
  - dates for Christ's life 120, 122
  - dates from the ascension 122-123, 165
  - dating by Antiochene era 151-153
  - dating by consul 148
  - dating by imperial reigns 138-142
  - dating by indiction 149-151, 166
  - decorative arts 108
  - discovery of fragments 327
  - earthquakes 155-9, 160, 166
  - editions 17, 211
    - first edition 18, 21
    - second edition 19, 21
    - same author? 21-22
  - editio princeps* 320
    - modern editions 321
  - endings 18, 20, 23, 24
  - era of Diocletian 153
  - illustrated? 33
  - language
    - clause structures 220
    - earthquake notices 228
    - on creation of provinces 226-228
    - prepositions 220
    - reflects the vernacular 217
    - repetitious phrases 224, 225-226, 228
      - anachronistic usages 229
      - genuinely part of Malalas' style 229-230
  - verb forms 219
  - vocabulary
    - Latin-based forms 223
    - new usages 221-2
    - portraits 224
- Modern Greek translation 54, 321

- Malalas, chronicle (cont.)  
   notices of imperial reigns 141, 165  
   Olympiads 154  
   oral informants 11, 168, 169, 209, 211  
     Hermogenes 209-210  
     Marinus 209  
     Timothy 211  
   patriarchs 162, 166  
   portraits  
     antecedents 241-242  
     vocabulary 232, 240  
   preface 2, 3, 24, 27, 81, 168, 172, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 182, 187, 188, 194  
   printing history 316-321  
   purpose 1, 11, 27, 76  
   Roman calendar 154  
   ruler lists 124-138, 165  
   sample of Syriac witnesses 307-9  
   scope of 1, 87  
   Seleucid era 154  
   shifts in focus 88  
   significance of years from Adam 119  
   Slavonic translation 276-287  
   source criticism 21, 215  
   source ending in mid-5th century 201, 206  
   sources 167-216  
     Bourier's views 167  
     von Stauffenberg's views 167  
   structured by imperial reigns 141  
   title 27  
   'to the present' phrases 206  
   use of *patria* 97, 98  
   year 6000 11, 18, 35, 65, 164, 195  
   years From Adam 111-119, 164, 253, 266  
   classical past 68  
   Greek history 67  
   idiosyncratic interpretations 75  
   in Constantinople 6, 22  
   interest in legislation 201  
   interest in marvels 79  
   lack of patron 81, 82  
   left Antioch 4, 5, 22  
   lifetime 3, 8  
   name 2  
     Syriac root 3, 306, 326  
   neglect of classical Greece 76, 77, 78  
   not John Scholastikos 17  
   *Novels'* prefaces, similarities 75  
   on creation of provinces 205  
   orthodox 16  
   predecessors 38  
   punning etymologies 62  
   religious views 12, 23, 63, 68  
   rhetor 3, 10, 11  
   Roman history 68  
   Syrian influences 12, 66  
   touristic information 80  
   traditional view of past 67, 68  
   uninterested in theology 17  
   use of apocrypha 11, 12, 63  
   use of documents 5, 10  
   use of Latin 60  
     etymologies 60  
     technical phrases 60  
   use of official reports 76  
 Mammianos 8, 56, 250  
 Manasses, Constantine 48, 266  
 Manasses, of Israel 111, 115  
 Manetho 28, 30, 131, 132, 170, 186, 193, 196  
 Mango, C. 41  
 Mani 13, 14  
 Manichaeism 13  
 Manichaeans(s), Manichees 11, 13, 65, 195, 211, 269  
 Manichaeism 13  
 Manlius Capitolinus 4  
 Marcellinus, comes 16, 19, 76, 82, 101, 213  
 Marcian, emperor 4, 5, 141  
 Marcion 13  
 Marcus, emperor 140  
 Marcus Aurelius, emperor 65, 101, 139  
 Marinus the Syrian 6, 11, 16, 108, 151, 164, 169, 209  
 Markopoulos, A. 263  
 Mars 89  
 Marsyas 58, 65, 186, 187  
 Martin, P. 301  
 Martyrios 15  
 Martyropolis 209, 269  
 Maurianos 13, 64  
 Maurice, emperor 41, 81, 256  
 Mavrokordatos, A. 53  
 Maxentius, emperor 240  
 Maximianoupolis 156  
 Maximianus, emperor 7, 59, 99, 140  
 Maximinus, emperor 140  
 Maximus Licinianus, emperor 140  
 Mede, Median 65, 78  
 Medeia 70, 103  
 Medusa 64  
 Megara 52  
 Mehmet II 50  
 Melchisedek 176, 184  
 Meleager 58  
 Meleagros 135  
 Membronios of Babylon 170, 186, 196  
 Memnonios 56  
 Menander Protector 81  
 Menas, patriarch 162  
 Menelaos 231

- Mesopotamia 10, 13, 14, 15, 55  
 Mestram 131  
 metempsychosis 64  
 metropoleis 10, 61  
 Meyvaert, P. 296  
 Michael Attaleiates 43  
 Michael I Rangabe, emperor 44, 46, 259  
 Michael II, emperor 40, 45  
 Michael the Syrian 12, 102, 117, 248, 259, 266, 269, 300, 301, 302, 304, 305, 306, 307, 309  
     preserves significant date 301  
     sources 306  
 Michael VIII Palaiologos, emperor 48, 266  
 Midas 52  
 Miletos 80  
 Mill, J. 319, 320, 321, 326  
 millennialism 36; see also 'chiliasm'  
 millennium, sixth 18, 30, 34, 35, 36, 65, 66, 153, 168, 254, 259  
     passing of 117, 118, 119  
     passing of in 491 118  
     passing of in 528/9 118  
     Syrian fears 118, 119  
 millennium, seventh 117, 255  
 Mithridates 88  
 Moldavia 53  
 Mommsen, Th. 287, 288, 290, 322, 323, 327, 328, 329, 330, 333, 334  
 monarchy 68  
*Mönchschronik* 51  
*monogenes* 75  
 monophysite(s) 6, 15, 16, 18, 21, 23, 35, 63, 66, 76, 83, 84, 109, 300, 302, 303, 304, 329, 334, 335  
 Moravcsik, G. 338  
 Moschianos 95  
 Moscow 281, 282  
 Moses 28, 30, 31, 32, 63, 75, 79, 111, 114, 124, 127, 132, 170, 182, 187, 295  
 Moses Khorenats'i 267, 301, 336  
 Müller, C.O. 327, 328  
 Muses 99  
 Myra 158, 209  
 Myrina 80  
 mystic knowledge, powers 13, 63, 68  
 mythology; see also 'euherization'  
     dehellenization 67  
     gnostic element 64  
     Hellenic 62  
     in Malalas 70  
     in Prokopios 70  
     rationalization 62  
 Nag-Hammadi codices 63  
 Naiads 103  
 Naracho 128, 131  
 Narsai 293  
 natural disasters 22, 37, 84, 256  
 Nau, F. 301  
 Near East 28  
 Nebuchadnezzar 91, 130, 133, 279  
 Nehemiah 91  
 Nektanebo 131, 132, 134  
 Nektarios of Jerusalem 54  
 Neoplatonism 78  
 Nepos, Cornelius 29  
 Nero, emperor 64, 100, 139, 242  
 Nerva, emperor 2, 47, 100, 139  
 Nestor 231  
 Nestorian(s) 15, 16, 300  
 Nestorians 27, 33, 123, 142, 149, 153, 165, 167, 170, 174, 178, 187, 196, 197, 199, 204, 208, 209, 216, 243, 268, 309  
     major source for Malalas 197  
 Nestorios 15, 335  
 Neumann, J. 328, 331, 334  
 Niebuhr, B. 321  
 Nigidius Figulus 72  
 Nika riot 9, 18, 76, 83, 84, 88, 95, 169, 208, 253, 256, 257, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 276, 329  
 Nikaia 14, 156, 164  
 Nikephoros, patriarch 40, 41, 46, 51, 321  
     *Breviarium* 40, 41, 46  
     Bulgarian translation 51  
     *Chronographikon syntomon* 40  
 Nikephoros Bryennios 43  
 Nikephoros II Phokas, emperor 43  
 Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos 213  
 Niketas Choniates 52  
 Nikolaou, Haralambos 54  
 Nikomedeia 56, 87, 156, 157, 159  
 Nimrod 61, 66, 195  
 Ninos 170, 187, 196, 214, 261  
 Niobe 102  
 Noah 1, 111, 112  
 Nonnos 330  
 Northumbria 289  
*Notitia Dignitatum* 102  
*Novels*, prefaces 75  
 Novgorod 281  
 Numerianus, emperor 140  
 Nyssa 5, 58, 62  
 Ochos 133  
 Octavian 121  
 Odysseus 64, 74, 189, 192, 231  
 Odyssey scholia 333  
 Ogyges 127, 128  
 Oidipous 61, 126, 188  
 Oinomaos 75, 89, 129, 175  
 Old Testament 27, 28, 51, 77, 87, 91, 96, 187, 203

- Olympiad(s) 28, 31, 39, 252  
 Olympian gods 63, 67, 77  
 Olympias 62, 94  
 Olympic Games 44, 59, 93, 99, 108  
 Omphalos 108  
 Orestes 56, 58, 61, 89, 125, 129, 177, 178, 183  
 Oribasios 293  
 Origen 30, 31, 190  
 Orontes 58, 207  
 Orosius 34, 79  
 Orpheus 14, 170, 183, 187, 188  
 Orphic texts 172, 195, 199, 216  
 Orthodox 16, 18, 21, 75  
 Osiris 131  
 Osrhoene 10  
 Otho, emperor 139  
 Ottoman 49, 53, 54  
 Ovid 170, 171, 188, 192, 196, 214  
 Oxford University Press 316  
 Ozias 44, 260
- P (Paris, Suppl. Gr. 682) 2, 246, 247, 281, 286  
 Pachymeres 49  
 pagan oracles 14, 64  
 Pagi, A. 325, 326  
 Pagrae 58, 191  
 Paianios 39  
 Palaeologan period 43  
 Palaiphatos 27, 126, 128, 170, 181, 183, 188, 196, 214  
 Palamedes 61, 231, 265  
 Palestine 5, 10, 15, 41, 61, 159, 208, 295  
*Paleya* 279  
 palladion 6, 58, 61, 64, 98, 104, 177, 184  
     at Constantinople 98  
 Palladius 163  
 Pallantion 89  
 Pallas Athene 89, 98  
 Palmyra 209, 216  
 Pamphilos 82  
 Panaretos 49  
 Paneas 4, 5, 102, 174, 200, 214, 254  
 Panodoros 32, 33, 34, 35, 114, 132, 154, 179, 197, 252, 268  
*Parastaseis* 64, 98  
 Parian marble 28, 37  
 Parthenope, *tyche* 105  
 Parthia 60  
 Pasiphae 197  
*Passio S. Anastasii* 298  
 Patmos 12  
*patria* 69, 91, 96, 97, 98, 107, 168, 181  
     history of genre 97  
 patriarchs 111, 162, 166, 213  
     of Antioch 15  
         sequence of 162-164  
     of Constantinople 15, 162  
 Patrikios 160  
 Patroklos 231  
 patrons in 6th century 81, 82  
 Patzig, E. 167, 187, 286, 313, 330, 332, 333, 335, 336  
 Paul, apostle 12, 13, 240, 243  
 Paul, patriarch 15, 16, 163  
 Paul the Silentiary 82  
 Paulinos 91, 211  
 Pausanias 27, 59, 132, 170, 178, 188, 196, 198, 204, 215, 322  
 Pegasos 5  
 Peisander 170, 189, 196  
 Pelagia the Harlot 297  
 Peloponnesians 128  
 Peloponnesos 75  
 Pelops 75, 128, 175  
 Pembroke, Earl of 314, 315, 316  
 Pentheus 126  
 Pergamos 170, 189, 196, 207  
 Perikles 65  
 Perithous 61  
 Persephone 124  
 Perseus 6, 62, 64, 65, 104, 105, 109, 126, 132, 173, 176, 187, 188, 261  
 Perseus of Epirus 135, 181  
 Persia 8, 10, 11, 14, 19, 40, 52, 55, 56, 65, 68, 78, 87, 88, 93, 203; see also Assyria  
     ruler list 133  
         From Adam date 133  
         identifications 133  
         synchronization 133
- Persian priests 63  
 Persians 1, 31  
 Persis, *tyche* 105  
 Pertinax, emperor 139  
 Peter, apostle 12, 13, 122, 162, 240, 243  
 Peter, patriarch 162  
 Peter the Fuller 15, 163  
 Peter the Patrician 47, 72, 333  
 Petissonios 131, 132  
 Petrus Alexandrinus 118, 119  
 Phaethon 188, 246  
 Phaidra 126, 197, 243  
 Phalek 69, 111, 112, 113, 116, 124, 126, 134, 165, 187, 292, 319  
     at mid-point of time 113, 116  
 Phaleris 74  
 Phanariots 53  
 Pheidaios of Corinth 62, 170, 183, 189, 196, 261  
 Pheidias 88  
 Phidaleia 94  
 Philadelphia 80



- Philip (the Arab), emperor 140  
 Philip (of Macedon) 52, 68, 115, 135  
 Philochoros 170, 176, 185, 189, 196, 201  
 Philoponos 82, 182, 190  
 philosopher(s) 64, 65  
     Malalas' definition 64  
 Philostorgios 79  
 Philostratos 170, 190, 196, 215  
 Philoxenos 15, 16  
 Phlegon of Tralles 29, 37, 170, 190  
 Phoenicia 9, 10, 15, 62, 205  
 Phoenix 5  
 Phoinix 205  
 Phokas, emperor 256  
 Phoroneus 124, 127  
 Photios, patriarch 69, 82, 96, 262  
 Phrygia 28  
     ruler list 130  
 Phrygians 52  
 Phytianos, G. 53, 321  
 Picus Zeus 13, 61, 62, 63, 64, 115, 124, 126, 132, 134, 165, 177, 183, 199, 202  
 Pigulevskaya, N. 301  
 Pindar 189  
 Pisaians 59  
 plague 23, 84  
 planet names 63  
 Plato 28, 30, 31, 46, 64, 77, 78, 79, 170, 190, 196, 260  
 Pliny 170, 171, 185, 190, 196, 203  
 Ploutarchos 101  
 Plutarch of Chaironeia 39, 47, 170, 190, 192, 196, 214  
 Polemo 62, 205, 242  
 Polybios 170, 191, 193, 196, 242, 322  
 Polyneikes 124  
 Polyxene 240  
 Pompeiopolis 158, 209  
 Pompey 47, 88, 93, 180, 204  
 Pontius Pilate 12, 122, 242  
 Pontous 56  
 Pontus Polemoniacus 62, 205  
 Porphyry (Porphyrios) 37, 170, 191, 197  
 portraits 231, 248, 260, 265, 266  
     apostles 243  
     continuing tradition 244  
     emperors 243  
     Greek and Trojan heroes 242  
     hiatus in imperial series 241  
     iconistic 241, 243  
     imperial 141  
     Malalas' contribution 244  
     physiognomic 242  
     textual problems 231, 242  
     vocabulary 232-240  
         categories 240  
         first occurrences 241  
 Poseidon 62, 75, 101, 126  
 praetor 22  
 Praetorian Prefect 6, 10  
 Praetorian Prefect of the East 6  
*Pratum Spirituale* 253  
 Priam 130  
 Prideaux, H. 318, 319  
 Primary Chronicle 279  
 Priskos 39, 170, 180, 191, 196, 199  
 Proba 288, 290, 294  
 Probus, emperor 140, 225, 240  
*procurator ab actis urbis* 203, 204  
 Proitos 128  
 Proklos 65, 209  
 Prokopios 5, 6, 38, 55, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 80, 83, 84, 88, 93, 100, 107, 160, 180, 191, 210, 218, 221, 270, 321, 330, 335  
     Christian interpretation of history 71  
     genres 70  
     marvels 79  
     myth and history 70  
     patron 81  
     *Secret History* 69, 71, 76, 84  
     similarities with Malalas 70  
     touristic information 80  
     *Wars* 69, 70, 71  
 Prokopios of Gaza 80, 113, 116, 119, 187  
 Protesilaos 231  
 provinces, creation of 10, 61, 205  
 Psellos 43, 248, 263  
     *Chronographia* 43  
 [Pseudo-]Aristotle 242  
 Pseudo-Clementine Romance 66  
 Pseudo-Dionysios, of Tel-Mahre 8, 24, 154, 249, 266, 299, 300, 301, 302, 304, 305, 306, 309, 323  
     and John of Ephesos 303  
     D'yakonov's views 299  
     dates 302  
     did not use Malalas directly 304  
     extent of Malalas-derived material 303  
     Haase's views 301  
     nature of chronicle 303  
     preserves John of Ephesos 300  
     sources 303  
 Pseudo-Dionysios the Areopagite 78  
 Pseudo-Symeon 40, 46, 47, 177, 263-264  
 Pseudo-Zachariah the Rhetor 306  
*psogos* 70  
 Ptolemies 39, 40, 135, 165, 188, 203, 266  
     identifications 136  
     ruler list 135  
     From Adam date 136  
     synchronizations 136  
 Pupienus, emperor 140  
 Pyrrhos of Epirus 135  
 Pythagoras 52, 65, 77, 170, 191, 197

- Pythia Therma 89  
 quadriga 75  
*quaestor* 22  
 Quintillus, emperor 140  
 Quirinius 121  
 Rakoustis 106  
 Ravenna 92, 99  
 Reiske, J.J. 326, 328  
 Remus 68, 89, 102, 134  
 reports, official 10  
     used by Marcellinus, Malalas 76  
 resurrection 292  
     date of 122  
 Rhea 89, 106  
 Rheginos 170, 192, 197  
 rhetor, rhetores 3, 10, 11, 14, 17, 66, 306, 326, 332, 333, 335  
 Rhodes 88, 155, 157, 159, 209  
 Robert of Clari 108  
 Rochow, I. 271, 273  
 Roe, Sir T. 315  
 Roma 105, 106  
 Roman emperors 31, 68, 138-143  
 Roman Republic 68, 73, 75, 197, 333  
 Romanos Melodos 71, 77, 80, 83, 84  
     attitude to classical Greece 77  
     Syriac speaker 80  
     use of rhetoric 77  
 Romanos II, emperor 43, 46, 263  
 Romanos Lekapenos, emperor 279  
 Romans 31, 52, 77  
 Rome 1, 12, 19, 31, 44, 52, 58, 60, 73, 75, 76, 83, 89, 98, 102, 103, 138, 162, 184, 247, 251, 255, 261, 287, 288, 292, 296, 299  
     aqueduct 89  
     foundation legends 98  
     hippodrome 89  
     legendary period 89  
     Pallantion 89  
     temples 89  
     walls 90  
 Romulus 44, 68, 74, 89, 98, 102  
 Romus 61, 68, 134  
 Rufinus, translator of Eusebios 294, 297  
 Rufinus, envoy to Persia 11, 210, 274  
 Rufus 123  
 Rüger, A. 212  
 ruler lists 28, 124-138, 165  
     Argos 124  
     Assyria 132  
     Attica 127  
     Boiotia 126  
     Corinth 129  
     Egypt 131  
     Hellas 128  
     Italy 134  
     Lakedaimonia 129  
     Lakonia 128  
     Lydia 130  
     Macedonia 135  
     Persia 133  
     Phrygia 130  
     Ptolemies 136  
     Seleucids 136  
     Sikyon 125  
     synchronizations 138  
     Tyre 126  
 Russia 277, 281  
 Russian historical writing  
     chronicles 277  
     compendia 278-280  
         as evidence for Slavonic translation 278  
 S. Maria in Capitolio 290  
 Sabir Huns 269  
 Sacred Scriptures 182  
 Salamias 156  
 Salaminos 58  
 Salamis 10  
 Sallianus 56  
 Sallust 170, 171, 192, 197  
 Samaritan(s) 92, 208  
     Samaritan revolt 23, 254  
 Sampson 13, 63, 128  
 San Vitale 99  
 Sardanapalos 132  
 Saumaise, C. 252  
 Saville Sir H. 315, 317  
 scape-goat 60  
 Schehl, F. 324, 337  
 scholastikos, scholastikoi 14, 326, 335  
 Scott, R. 270  
*scrinia*, *scrinium* 59, 99, 200, 205  
*Scriptor incertus de Leone* 40, 244  
 Scythopolis 5, 10, 58  
 Second Coming 36, 76, 82, 83  
 Sedulius 290, 294  
 Selden, J. 319  
 Selene 102  
 Seleucid(s) 87, 88, 90, 94, 96, 135, 165, 203  
     ruler list 136  
         identifications 137  
         sources 138  
 Seleukeia 10  
 Seleukos 57, 105  
 Seleukos I Nikator 90, 104  
 senator(s) 10, 61  
*senior magister militum praesentalis* 10

- Sennacherib 65, 203  
 Septimius, translator of Diktys 172, 177, 192, 242, 260, 265, 336  
 Septimius Severus, emperor 74, 94, 95, 96, 97, 139  
 Septuagint 31, 73, 172, 294, 295  
 Serapis, temple of 90  
 Sergius, patriarch 81, 252  
 Seriphos 79  
 Seruch 61, 64, 261  
 Servius 170, 171, 192, 197  
 Seth 61, 63, 112, 182  
 Severus, patriarch 3, 12, 13, 15, 16, 163  
 Severus Alexander, emperor 140  
 Sheldon, G. 317  
 Shem 62  
 Shestakov, S.P. 284, 286, 332, 333  
 short chronicles 49  
 Sikyon 28, 58  
     ruler list 125  
     From Adam date 125  
     synchronization 125  
 Silpios, Mt 58, 104, 108, 174  
 Silvanus 121  
 Simeon the Stylite 10, 17  
 Simon Magus 12, 63, 90, 242  
 Sisypheos of Kos 170, 172, 175, 177, 179, 183, 192, 196, 199, 242, 260  
 Sittas, *magister militum in Armenia* 200  
 sixth-century self-confidence 71, 72, 73  
 Skoutariotes 48, 52, 142, 231, 248, 266  
     sources 48  
 Skylitzes 47, 50, 264  
 Slavonic translation of Malalas 2, 8, 11, 19, 20, 21, 50, 142, 153, 231, 241, 247, 248, 262, 265, 269, 300, 323, 324, 328, 329, 331, 332, 336, 337, 338  
     absence of Book XVIII 285  
     book divisions 285  
     date 277, 282  
     extent of witness 280-281  
     frequently sole witness to Ba 283  
     guide to original Malalas 283  
     Hellenic and Roman chronicler 284  
     history of 281  
     Istrin's edition 277, 281  
     nature of 277, 282  
     original extent 284  
     Spinka's version 277  
     supplements Ba 285  
     translator's method 282  
     Tvorogov's re-edition 277  
     used early edition of Malalas? 286-7  
 Sokrates (Scholastikos) 39, 250, 255, 303  
 Sokrates, philosopher 52, 65,  
 Solomon 91, 111, 114  
 Solon 127  
 Sophia Compendium 279  
 Sophokles 52, 64, 65, 170, 192, 193, 197  
 Sosibios 59  
 Sosthenion 89, 173, 216  
 Sostris 131  
 Sotates 170, 193, 197  
 Sotiriadis, G. 3, 322, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333  
 Souda, the 40, 97, 181, 188, 189, 195, 251, 261, 262, 298  
 Sozomen 250, 255  
 Sozopolis 3  
 Spanheim, E. 321  
 Sparta 28  
 Sphrantzes 49, 50  
 Spinka, M. 276, 282, 283, 324, 337  
 Stanos, Johannes 54  
 statues 87, 99-103  
     and development of idolatry 99  
 Antioch  
     apotropaic 57  
     Charonion 57  
     erected by Seleukos 104  
     horse's head 57  
     Orestes 104  
     Romulus and Remus 102  
     Runaway 56  
     symbolizing Roman power 102  
     Zethos and Amphion 58  
 Artabanes 99  
 as talismans 64, 107-8  
 as *tychai* 105  
 Byzantion, apotropaic 57  
 Cherubim, reuse of 101  
 Christian context  
     women martyrs 102-3  
     woman with the issue of blood 102  
 Constantinople  
     destruction of statues 101  
     in Zeuxippon 64  
 Iconium 6  
 interpretations of 98, 104-5  
 of citizens 99  
 of emperors 99-101  
     literary and artistic evidence 100  
     literary background 99  
     prominent locations 100  
     recording patronage 100  
     symbolic elements 100-1, 102  
 of Jacob Psychristos 99  
 Paneas 5  
 punning etymologies 104  
 Rome, destruction of statues 101  
 Tripolis 5  
 symbolism 87, 98-99  
     *tychai* 104  
 Stephen, patriarch 15, 163, 250, 300

- Stephen of Byzantium 322  
 Stevenson, J. 255  
 Strategios 210  
 succession of kingdoms 78  
 Suetonius (Tranquillus) 92, 170, 171, 196, 197, 242  
 Suidas; see 'Souda'  
 Sulla, consul 121  
 Sulpicius 121  
 Susa 209  
 Sutton Hoo treasure 105  
 Sykai 95  
 Symeon of Bulgaria 282  
 Symeon the Magister 46, 50, 263, 264  
 synchronization; see 'ruler lists' *passim*  
 Synkellos 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 112, 113, 114, 125, 126, 127, 130, 131, 132, 138, 154, 170, 176, 180, 190, 193, 252, 257, 259, 260, 263, 321  
     and Theophanes 41  
*Synopsis Sathas* 48; see also 'Skoutariotes'  
 Syria 2, 7, 10, 15, 23, 62, 65, 66, 84, 88, 93, 197, 205, 212, 253  
 Syriac 55, 66, 249, 338  
 Syros 62, 176  
  
*tabulae pontificum* 203  
*tabularia* 204  
*tabularium Caesaris* 208  
 Tacitus, emperor 140  
 Tages 73  
 talisman(s) 64, 107  
     archaeological evidence 107  
     in Constantinople and Antioch 107  
     set up by Justinian? 107  
     set up by Tiberius 108  
 Tarquinius Superbus 134  
 Tarsos 62, 105, 107, 296  
 Tatian 27, 30, 170, 193, 197  
 Tauros 5, 57  
 Teiresias 65, 185, 193  
 Telephos 134  
 Temple Mount 91  
 Tetrarchy 2, 324  
 Teukros 177, 192, 260  
 Thales 64, 127  
 Thallos 170, 184, 191, 193, 197  
 Tharras 64, 98, 99, 132  
 Thebes 1; see also 'Boiotia'  
 Theoderic 212  
 Theodora 8, 326  
 Theodora, Holy Martyr 95  
 Theodore II Laskaris, emperor 48, 266  
 Theodore Lector (Anagnostes) 42, 151, 256  
     see '*Ecclesiastical History, Selections from*'  
 Theodore of Alexandria 256  
 Theodore of Canterbury 287  
 Theodore of Mopsuestia 293, 294  
 Theodore of Tarsos 255, 289, 292, 294, 297  
     and Tre Fontane 296  
 Theodoret 47, 250, 255, 293  
 Theodorias 23, 206, 209  
 Theodosios of Melitene 46, 50  
 Theodosios the decurion 81  
 Theodosius I, emperor 2, 6, 7, 14, 30, 49, 90, 91, 92, 101, 141, 149  
 Theodosius II, emperor 2, 7, 33, 56, 94, 141, 180, 201, 206  
 Theodotos 160  
 Theon 14, 64, 183  
 Theophanes 11, 12, 17, 24, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 80, 100, 117, 138, 141, 151, 153, 161, 210, 248, 251, 256, 257-259, 261, 262, 263, 267, 268, 269, 270, 300, 301, 322, 323, 324, 329, 331, 332, 335  
     and ending of Malalas 258, 276  
     and Malalas 42  
     chronological structure 41  
     continued Synkellos 41  
     inaccurate Persian chronologies 270  
     on embassy to Axoum 273-275  
     on Nika riot 271-273  
         used lacunose text of Malalas 272  
     redates entries 257  
     sources, use of 41-42  
     suppressed personality? 80  
     Syriac sources 41  
     used a lacunose version of Malalas? 268, 275  
     used to fill lacunas 258  
 Theophanes Continuatus 42-43, 45, 92  
 Theophilos 1, 27, 30, 36, 46, 112, 115, 117, 118, 131, 135, 163, 164, 170, 171, 175, 191, 193, 194, 197, 204, 215, 293, 329  
     dates from Adam 115  
 Theophilos (of Alexandria?) 289  
 Theophilus, emperor 45  
 Theophylakt Simokatta 43, 79, 81, 256, 258, 270, 275  
 Theotokos 89, 92  
 Thessalonike 4, 5, 6, 106, 175, 178, 214  
 Thestia 128  
 theurgic displays 63, 64  
 Thoukydides 37, 65, 68, 218, 322  
 Thoulis 131  
 Thrace 52  
 Thurn, I. 324  
 Thyestes 128  
 Tiber Island 90  
 Tiberius, emperor 2, 7, 55, 56, 94, 100, 102, 104, 105, 108, 121, 139, 178, 244, 292

- Tigranes 88  
 Tikhonravov Compendium 279  
 Timaios 190  
 Timotheos 14, 35, 36, 45, 112, 117, 118, 164, 165, 167, 169, 170, 172, 175, 176, 183, 188, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 199, 201, 207, 215, 216  
     major source for Malalas 195, 197  
 Timotheos (Timothy, the Persian 'carrier') 13, 14, 65, 170, 195, 196  
 Titus, emperor 7, 91, 101, 123, 139  
 'to the present' phrases 5, 6, 21, 58, 79, 165, 201, 206  
     status of 207  
 Tobias of Rochester 289  
 Tourkokratia 54  
 Trajan, emperor 2, 7, 40, 46, 47, 56, 57, 60, 74, 93, 101, 102, 139, 174, 254, 259  
 Tranquillus; see 'Suetonius'  
 translation  
     as *interpretatio* 298  
     as *translatio* 298  
     types of 297  
 Traube, L. 288, 334  
 Tre Fontane 296  
     cult of St Anastasios 296  
 Trebizond 49  
 Trebonianus 140  
 Trinity 14, 64, 68  
 Triopas 124  
 Tripolis 5, 157  
     baths 103  
 Trisagion 16, 164, 300  
 Trisagion riot 209  
 Trojan war 1, 28, 44, 51, 59, 77, 130, 183, 189, 193, 224, 242, 252, 260, 261, 266, 336  
 Trojans 52  
 Tros 130  
 Troy 33, 58, 61, 88, 98, 104, 130, 177, 184, 265  
 Trypho 242  
 Tübingen Theosophy 14, 35, 68, 119, 170, 172, 173, 176, 180, 182, 193, 195, 201, 207  
 Turks 52  
 Turner  
     Peter 315, 318  
     William 316, 317, 318  
 Tusculan Fragments 8, 21, 219, 229, 246, 251, 253, 258, 323, 324, 330, 331, 333, 336  
 Tvorogov, O.V. 281  
*tyche*, *tychai* 6, 57, 71, 90, 98, 102, 104, 208  
     Antioch 105  
     archaeological evidence 106-7  
     as good fortune 106  
     Athens 105  
     Constantinople 105, 106  
     list of 57  
     names 105  
     purpose of 58  
     role assumed by saints 106  
     Rome 105  
     sacrificed virgins 105  
 Typhon 58  
 Tyre 5, 10, 28, 61, 62  
     ruler list 125  
     From Adam date 126  
 Tyro 62  
 Tzetzes, John 3, 177, 231, 248, 265, 266, 316, 325  
 urban riots 204  
 Ussher, Bishop 314, 319  
     Latin translation of Book X 247  
 V (Vatopedi 290) 247  
 Valens, emperor 7, 14, 42, 91, 93, 95, 141, 240  
 Valentinian, emperor 56, 100, 141  
 Valerian, emperor 7, 140, 141, 215, 298  
 Valesius, H. 325  
 Van Douwen, W.J. 299  
 Vararanes 270  
 Varius 56  
 Vasilievsky, A. 332  
*Vat. Gr.* 163 50, 263  
*Vat. Pal. Lat.* 277 24, 287, 288  
 Vergil 170, 172, 185, 190, 192, 196, 197, 288, 290  
 Verina 200  
 Veronica 5, 102, 174, 200  
 Vespasian, emperor 7, 56, 100, 123, 139  
 Vetus Latina 294, 295  
 Victor of Tunnuna 76  
 Vigilius, pope 23, 162  
 Vilna Compendium 278  
*vindex* 9, 213  
 Virgin (Theotokos) 77, 95, 287, 290  
 Vitalian, emperor 6, 8, 16, 42, 106, 209, 212, 216, 335  
 Vitellius, emperor 120, 139  
 Volusianus, emperor 140  
 von Stauffenberg, A. Schenk 8, 167, 199, 323, 337  
 Vulgate 294, 297  
 Walker, T. 317  
 Weber, W. 337  
 Weierholt, K. 324  
 Whitby, M. 256

- Wilfred 291  
 Witakowski, W. 249  
 Wolf, K. 336  
 wonder-workers 63, 64  
 Wood, A. 316
- Xenophon 47, 218, 322  
 Xiphilinos 47
- year 6000 11, 12, 18, 35, 36, 65, 164, 195  
 years From Abraham 31  
 years From Adam 30, 65, 69, 111-20, 164, 194, 211, 216, 245, 255, 261, 301; see also 'ruler lists'  
     of Annianos 32  
     of Malalas 111-19, 164, 253, 266  
     of Panodoros 32  
 Young, P. 314, 315
- Zachariah of Mytilene (Scholastikos and Rhetor) 3, 14, 76, 307  
 Zames 132  
 Zeno, emperor 1, 2, 4, 10, 12, 15, 16, 24, 61, 64, 67, 89, 92, 112, 117, 118, 141, 142, 161, 163, 165, 168, 180, 205, 209, 211, 216, 241, 243, 256, 286, 307, 309, 328  
 Zethos 58, 126  
 Zeus 62, 63, 88, 89, 91, 92, 102, 103, 109  
     Zeus Ammon 62  
     Asterios 62; Bottios 62, 90, 174  
     Capitoline 62  
     Kasios 62  
     Keraunios 62, 103  
     Olympian 62  
 Zilgibi 200  
 Zipporah 295  
 Zoilos 56  
 Zonaras 47-48, 50, 51, 322  
     Slavonic translation 51  
     sources 47  
 Zoroaster 14, 65, 66, 195, 261  
 Zosimos 39, 186  
 Zotikos 81  
 Ztathios 109