

# Andrzej Kompa

---

## Gnesioi filoi: the Search for George Syncellus' and Theophanies the Confessor's Own Words, and the Authorship of their Oeuvre

---

Studia Ceranea : journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe 5, 155-230

---

2015

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Andrzej Kompa (Łódź)

## GNESIOI FILOI: THE SEARCH FOR GEORGE SYNCELLUS' AND THEOPHANES THE CONFESSOR'S OWN WORDS, AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THEIR OEUVRE\*

### 1. Introduction

The most distinctive trait of the *Chronographia* of Theophanes is the unique bond that connects it with *Ekloge chronographias* of George Syncellus which is paralleled by the close ties between the two authors. As a result, the two works form the grandest and the most comprehensive universal chronography in Byzantium. This factor makes the undertaking different from all of the Byzantine historical prose, which is through the centuries interwoven in a characteristic chain of narrative continuity – either fragile and disrupted or strong and polyphonic, but mostly consisting of completely independent works. The nature of the connection between the two works and two authors is, however, opaque. This raises the notorious problem of the authorship of the *Chronographia*. I will attempt to offer a new solution to this issue below.

Theophanes' role and the relevance of the term 'authorship' for the *Chronographia* has been discussed for a few decades<sup>1</sup>, and it seems unnecessary to

---

\* This is an unabridged, revised and updated version of the article *In search of Syncellus' and Theophanes' own words: the authorship of the Chronographia revisited*, TM 19, 2015 (= *Studies in Theophanes*, ed. M. JANKOWIAK, F. MONTINARO, Paris 2015), p. 73–92, with data valid for June 2013 (here updated to October 2015). The brevity of that text made it impossible to present the method which may be a paradigm for similar analyses in detail; this is supplemented here. The new data (i.a. three important updates in TLG) strengthen the charted line of argument.

<sup>1</sup> C. MANGO, *Who Wrote the Chronicle of Theophanes?*, ЗРВИ 18, 1978, p. 9–17; И.С. ЧИЧУРОВ, *Феофан Исповедник – публикатор, редактор, автор? (В связи со статьей К. Манго)*, ВВ 42, 1981, p. 78–87; P. SPECK, *Das geteilte Dossier. Beobachtungen zu den Nachrichten über die Regierung des Kaiser Herakleios und seine Söhne bei Theophanes und Nikephoros*, Bonn 1988, p. 499–519; I. ROCHOW, *Byzanz im 8. Jahrhundert in der Sicht des Theophanes. Quellenkritisch-historischer Kommentar zu den Jahren 715–813*, Berlin 1991, p. 40 sq; P. SPECK, *Der 'zweite' Theophanes. Eine These zur Chronographie des Theophanes*, [in:] *Poikila Byzantina*, vol. 13, *Varia V*, Bonn 1994, p. 431–483; I. ŠEVČENKO, *The Search for the Past in Byzantium around the Year 800*, DOP 46, 1992, p. 287–289; *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813*, trans. with introd. and comm. C. MANGO, R. SCOTT, with assist. of G. GREATREX, Oxford 1997 (cetera: *The Chronicle of Theophanes*), p. xliii–lxiii (esp. liii–lxiii); *Thesaurus Theophanis Confessoris*, ed. B. COULIE,

recapitulate the debate. The consensus now seems even more distant than before, as almost every element has been questioned. One tendency is to minimise or deny the contribution of Theophanes, or to consider the author of the *Chronicle* to be distinct from the Confessor known from several *vitae*, to question the existence of the man himself, relocate him in the past etc. The other extreme is the wholesale acceptance of the authorship of Theophanes, popular among those historians who survey certain problems of Byzantine or medieval history and only occasionally make use of the chronicle, as they often seem to shrug their shoulders at the debate, and often draw on the source as if it had been written by Theophanes only, as an independent and wholly original author.

Many (often contradictory) thoughts and opinions have been drawn in the recent years from the scanty biographical data lurking in the sources, and purely biographical approach to the problem is insufficient. There seems to be room for a different methodology. Juxtaposing and comparing the texts of George and Theophanes, namely their style, content, and narrative techniques, offers a promising avenue of research. A final, irrefutable solution will not be given here, but some conclusions presented below may bring us closer to it. A comparison between the *Ekloge chronographias* and the *Chronographia* is methodologically sound only insofar as it can be conducted on the basis of authorial comments, rather than passages copied from their sources, many of which have been identified; thus the research on the literary techniques of reworking source material was possible and has been conducted for more than the last *pentakontaetia*<sup>2</sup>.

---

P. YANNOPOULOS, Turnhout 1998, p. xxvii–lxi; A. KAZHDAN, *History of Byzantine literature (650–850)*, Athens 1999, p. 215–224; P. YANNOPOULOS, *Les vicissitudes historiques de la Chronique the Théophane*, B 70, 2000, p. 527–553 (esp. 527–531); L. BRUBAKER, J. HALDON, *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (c. 680–850): The Sources – an Annotated Survey*, Aldershot 2001, p. 168–170; A. KARPOZĒLOS, *Byzantinoi historikoi kai chronographoi*, vol. 2, 80s–100s ai., Athens 2002, p. 117–153; P. YANNOPOULOS, „Comme le dit Georges le Syncelle ou, je pense, Théophane”, B 74, 2004, p. 139–146; J.D. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *Witnesses to a World Crisis: Historians and Histories of the Middle East in the Seventh Century*, Oxford 2010, p. 272–274; P. YANNOPOULOS, *Théophane de Sigriani le Confesseur (759–818). Un héros orthodoxe du second iconoclisme*, Bruxelles 2013, p. 237–282 (esp. 269–273).

<sup>2</sup> Bibliography on the identified sources used by Theophanes, his literary techniques and methods of reworking the source material is abundant. Below is just a selection of the texts that influenced my own attitude towards the issue: N. PIGULEVSKAJA, *Theophanes' Chronographia and the Syrian Chronicles*, JÖBG 16, 1967, p. 55–60; И.С. ЧИЧУРОВ, *Феофан – компилятор Феофилакты Симокатты*, АДСВ 10, 1973, p. 203–206; A.S. PROUDFOOT, *The Sources of Theophanes for the Heraclian Dynasty*, B 44, 1974, p. 367–439; И.С. ЧИЧУРОВ, *Феофан Исповедник – компилятор Прокопия*, ВВ 37, 1976, p. 62–73; H. HUNGER, *Die Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vol. 1, München 1978, p. 337; J. FERBER, *Theophanes' Account of the Reign of Heraclius*, [in:] *Byzantine Papers: Proceedings of the First Australian Byzantine Studies Conference, Canberra, 17–19 May 1978*, ed. E. JEFFREYS, M. JEFFREYS, A. MOFFATT, Canberra 1981, p. 32–42; L.M. WHITBY, *The Great Chronographer and Theophanes*, ВМГС 8, 1982/1983, p. 1–20; I. ROSCHOW, *Malalas bei Theophanes*, K 65, 1983, p. 459–474 (esp. 472–474); L.M. WHITBY, *Theophanes' Chronicle Source for the Reigns of Justin II, Tiberius and Maurice (A.D. 565–602)*, B 53, 1983, p. 312–345 (esp. 314–316 and 319–337);

The idiosyncratic style of George Syncellus is easily identifiable in his chronicle<sup>3</sup>, in particular in his polemical commentaries on the sources, such as chronological works of his predecessors. His linguistic habits, his opinions and his own additions to the sources can, therefore, be straightforwardly defined: the abundance of text samples is obvious<sup>4</sup>. But how to find the true words of Theophanes, much of a 'scissors and paste' historian<sup>5</sup>, even if the label is an oversimplification? There is a certain type of phrases and parenthetical clauses necessitated by a work of such size, whenever the author tried to link parts of his narrative by a system of cross-references, such as 'as I have already mentioned', 'as has been said', 'as will be related in the proper place', 'as we have already demonstrated', etc. They occur inevitably both in chronicles and histories *sensu stricto*, and prove to be used even by the laziest of the ancient and Byzantine historians. Theophanes' chronicle is not deprived of expressions of this kind, and they constitute a rewarding object of comparison. The examples selected below are chosen as the most representative and telling, yet some of them may also be seen as potentially irrelevant – these are aimed to expose the limitations of the method.

For the reader's convenience, the below tables set forth quotations from Theophanes<sup>6</sup>, accompanied by citations from George and passages of Anastasius the Bibliothecarius' Latin equivalent<sup>7</sup>, when relevant, and by the source of the chronicler or parallel source(s) (the text translated by Anastasius is crucial in many fragments, as it proves that the fragments were present in the copies of the *Chronography* relatively close to the *floruit* of the author himself). Passages from the 1997 English translation<sup>8</sup>, which has fostered and encouraged the research on Theophanes in the

Я.Н. ЛЮБАРСКИЙ, Феофан Исповедник и источники его «Хронографии»: (К вопросу о методах их освоения), ВВ 45, 1984, p. 72–86; I. ROCHOW, *Byzanz im 8. Jahrhundert*, p. 44–51; D. OLSTER, *Syriac Sources, Greek Sources, and Theophanes Lost Year*, BF 19, 1993, p. 218–228; J. LJUBARSKIJ, *Concerning the Literary Technique of Theophanes the Confessor*, Bsl 61, 1995, p. 317–322; R. SCOTT, *Writing the Reign of Justinian: Malalas versus Theophanes*, [in:] *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning*, ed. P. ALLEN, E. JEFFREYS, Brisbane 1996, p. 21–34; *The Chronicle of Theophanes*, p. lxxiv–xcv (esp. xci–xcv); R. SCOTT, *From Propaganda to History to Literature: the Byzantine Stories of Theodosius' Apple and Marcian's Eagles*, [in:] *History as Literature in Byzantium*, ed. R. MACRIDES, Aldershot 2010, p. 122–127; J.D. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *op. cit.*, p. 272–313.

<sup>3</sup> *The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*, trans. with introd. and notes W. ADLER, P. TUFFIN, Oxford 2002 (cetera: *The Chronography of George Synkellos*), p. lx, lxxvii sq. See also I. ŠEVČENKO, *The Search for the Past...*, p. 281, 287, 293; A. KAZHDAN, *History of Byzantine literature (650–850)...*, p. 206–208, 218.

<sup>4</sup> Problems arise only occasionally, because of the ambivalent attitude of George to his Alexandrian sources – *The Chronography of George Synkellos*, p. lix.

<sup>5</sup> C. MANGO, *The Availability of Books in the Byzantine Empire, A.D. 750–850*, [in:] *Byzantine Books and Bookmen*, ed. C. MANGO, I. ŠEVČENKO, Washington 1975, p. 36; remark cited by I. ŠEVČENKO, *The Search for the Past...*, p. 287 and often repeated later by byzantinists.

<sup>6</sup> *Theophanis Chronographia*, rec. C.G. DE BOOR, vol. 1, Lipsiae 1883.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, vol. 2, Lipsiae 1885.

<sup>8</sup> *The Chronicle of Theophanes* (cited an. 1).

recent years so greatly follow later; George's *Ekloge chronographias* (A.A. Mosshammer's edition<sup>9</sup>) is accompanied by the W. Adler and P. Tuffin translation in the passages used<sup>10</sup>. The precise position of the passage from the *Chronographia* is always marked by four figures just below the *annus mundi* date (the last number shows the overall number of verses of the cited A.M. in de Boor's *editio ultima*; the second and the third, both bolded, are the first and the last verse in which the citation occurs). As the examples show, the position of the passage at the beginning, in the middle or in the end of the A.M. is not irrelevant in some instances.

## 2. Forms of πρόφημι as an indicator of the authorship of the *Chronographia*

The first example, potentially the most promising one, is the following set of expressions: **ὡς προέφην** / **καθὼς καὶ προέφην** / **ὡς προέφημεν** / **καθὼς προέφημεν**:

Table I

Theophanes, ed. C. DE BOOR, 1883, tr. C. MANGO / R. SCOTT 1997	Anastasius, ed. C. DE BOOR, 1885	Theophanes' source or parallel source
<b>ὡς προέφην</b>		
<p>AM 5796, p. 11, 19–22 (1) – <b>39</b> – <b>42</b> – (42)  τούτων οὖν ἐκ μέσου γενομένων, καὶ τοῦ χριστιανόφρονος Κωνσταντίου τελευτήσαντος, τὴν βασιλείαν, <b>ὡς προέφην</b>, κατέσχον Κωνσταντῖνος Σεβαστὸς καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς ὁ Γαλλέριος.  AD 303/304, p. 17  <i>So with them out of the way and with the death of the pro-Christian Constantius, the Empire, as I have said, fell to Constantine Augustus and Maximianus Galerius.</i></p>	<p>p. 78, 26–28  <i>Hic ergo de medio factis et quae christianitatis sunt sententiae Constantio defuncto, imperium, ut praedixi, optinuerunt Constantinus Augustus et Maximianus Galerius.</i></p>	–
<p>AM 5963, p. 117, 11–14 (1) – <b>10</b> – <b>13</b> – (13)  ὑποπτος γάρ, <b>ὡς προέφην</b>, γενόμενος τῷ βασιλεῖ ὁ Ἄσπαρ καὶ πολλὴν περικείμενος δύναμιν δόλω παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως φονεύεται μετὰ βραχὺ σὺν τοῖς αὐτοῦ παισίν,</p>	<p>p. 112  – (years between AM 5950 and 5964 omitted in translation)</p>	<p>PRISCUS PANITES, restored from Theoph. (fr. 53, 5 &amp; 61); cf. EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, II, 16, p. 66, 13–18 (eds. J. BIDEZ, L. PARMENTIER):  Ἄπερ ἀκριβέστατα Πρίσκω τῷ ῥήτορι πεπόνηται· ὅπως τε δόλω περιελθὼν ὁ Λέων μισθὸν</p>

<sup>9</sup> *Georgii Syncelli Eclogae chronographica*, ed. A.A. MOSSHAMMER, Leipzig 1984.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. an. 3.

<p>Ἄρδαβουρίῳ καὶ Πατρικίῳ, ὃν καίσαρα ὁ βασιλεὺς πεποίηκε πρότερον, ἵνα τὴν Ἄσπαρος εὐνοίαν ἔχη.</p> <p>AD 470/471, p. 182–183</p> <p><i>For Aspar, being suspected by the emperor, as I have mentioned, and being invested with great power, was treacherously murdered by the emperor shortly afterwards, along with his sons, Ardaburios and Patricius, whom the emperor had earlier appointed Caesar in order to keep Aspar's goodwill.</i></p>		<p>ὡσπερ ἀποδιδούς τῆς ἐς αὐτὸν προαγωγῆς ἀναρεῖ Ἄσπαρα τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτῷ περιθέντα, παιδὰς τε αὐτοῦ Ἀρταβούριον τε καὶ Πατρικίον, ὃν Καίσαρα πεποίητο πρότερον ἵνα τὴν Ἄσπαρος εὐνοίαν κτήσῃται.</p>
<p>AM 6026, p. 192, 3–8 (1) – 166 – 171 – (861)</p> <p>ὁ δὲ Γελίμερ τὸν ἀνεψιὸν Κιβαμοῦνδον ἐκέλευσεν ἅμα δισχιλίῳν κατὰ τὸ εὐώνυμον μέρος ἰέναι, ὅπως Ἀματᾶς μὲν ἐκ Καρχηδόνας, Γελίμερ δὲ ὀπισθεν, Κιβαμοῦνδος δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἀριστερᾶ χωρίων εἰς ταῦτὸ τὴν κύκλωσιν τῶν πολεμίων ποιήσονται. Βελισάριος δὲ τὸν μὲν Ἰωάννην, ὡς προέφη, προάγειν ἐκέλευσεν, Μασσαγέτας δὲ ἐν ἀριστερᾶ τῆς στρατιᾶς ἰέναι.</p> <p>AD 533/534, p. 290</p> <p><i>Gelimer ordered his nephew Kibamoundos to advance with 2000 men on the left side, so that with Amatas coming from Carthage, Gelimer from the rear, and Kibamoundos from the country on the left, they would encircle the enemy in one place. Belisarius for his part ordered John, as I have already mentioned, to go ahead and the Massagetai to advance on the left of the enemy.</i></p>	<p>p. 135</p> <p>– (fragment p. 191, 7 – 193, 25 is not included in Anastasius' translation)</p>	<p>PROCOPIUS, <i>De bellis</i>, III, 18, 1–3 (ed. H.B. DEWING, II, p. 154):</p> <p>Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ <u>Γελίμερ τὸν ἀνεψιὸν Πιβαμοῦνδον ἐκέλευεν ἅμα</u> Βανδίλων <u>δισχιλίους</u> φθάνοντα τὸ ἄλλο στράτευμα κατὰ τὸ εὐώνυμον <u>μέρος ἰέναι, ὅπως Ἀμμάτας μὲν ἐκ Καρχηδόνας, Γελίμερ δὲ αὐτὸς ὀπισθεν, Πιβαμοῦνδος δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐν ἀριστερᾶ χωρίων ἐς ταῦτὸ</u> ξυνιόντες ῥᾶον δὴ καὶ ἀπονώτερον <u>τὴν κύκλωσιν τῶν πολεμίων ποιήσονται.</u> ἐμοὶ δὲ τὰ τε θεῖα καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπεια ἐν τῷ πόνῳ τούτῳ ἐπῆλθε θαυμάσαι, ὅπως ὁ μὲν θεὸς, πόρρωθεν ὁρῶν τὰ ἐσόμενα, ὑπογράφει ὅπη ποτὲ αὐτῷ τὰ πράγματα δοκεῖ ἀποβήσεσθαι, οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἢ σφαλλόμενοι ἢ τὰ δέοντα βουλευόμενοι οὐκ ἴσασιν ὅτι ἔπταισάν τι, ἂν οὕτω τύχοι, ἢ ὀρθῶς ἔδρασαν, ἵνα γένηται τῇ τύχῃ τρίβος, φέρουσα πάντως ἐπὶ τὰ πρότερον δεδογμένα. εἰ μὴ γὰρ <u>Βελισάριος</u> οὕτω διωκῆσατο τὴν παράταξιν, <u>τοὺς μὲν ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην προτερῆσαι κελεύσας, τοὺς δὲ Μασσαγέτας ἐν ἀριστερᾶ τῆς στρατιᾶς ἰέναι,</u> οὐκ ἂν ποτε διαφυγεῖν τοὺς Βανδίλους ἰσχύσαμεν.</p>

Table I (cont.)

<p>AM 6124, p. 336, 14–16 (1) – 1 – 3 – (11)</p> <p>Τούτω τῷ ἔτει ἐπεμψεν Ἀβου- βάχαρος στρατηγούς τέσσαρας, οἱ καὶ ὀδηγηθέντες, ὡς <b>προ- έφη</b>ν, ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀράβων ἦλθον καὶ ἔλαβον τὴν Ἡραν καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν Γάζης.</p> <p>AD 631/632, p. 467</p> <p><i>In this year Aboubacharos sent four generals who were conduct- ed, as I said earlier, by the Arabs and so came and took Hera and the whole territory of Gaza.</i></p>	<p>p. 210, 29–32</p> <p><i>Mundi anno VIcxxxiii, divinae incarnationis anno dcxxxiii, anno imperii Heraclii vicesimo tertio cum misisset Abuba- charus praetores quattuor, qui ducti fuerant, ut praetuli, ab Arabibus, venerunt atque cepe- runt Ran et totam regionem Gazae.</i></p>	<p>cf. AGAPIUS, trans. R.G. HOY- LAND, 2011, p. 92</p> <p><i>He (Abu Bakr) sent the troops to the horizons with four men: one to the land of Persians and the other to Aleppo and Damascus.</i></p> <p><i>[Abu Bakr sent four generals with the armies, one to Pales- tine, another to Egypt, a third to the Persians, and a fourth to the Christian Arabs.</i></p> <p>cf. MICHAEL THE SYRIAN (XI, 4, éd. J.-B. CHABOT, vol. II, p. 413)</p> <p><i>Quand Muhammad fut mort, Abou Bekr lui succéda, et envoya quatre généraux: un en Palestine, un autre en Égypte, le troisième en Perse et le quatrième contre les Taiyaye chrétiens. Et tous revinrent victorieux.</i></p> <p>tr. R.G. HOYLAND, 2011, p. 92</p> <p><i>After Muhammad died, Abu Bakr succeeded him and he dis- patched four generals: one to Pal- estine, another to Egypt, the third to Persia and the fourth against the Christian Arabs; all returned victorious.</i></p> <p>cf. <i>Chronicle 1234</i>, tr. R.G. HOY- LAND, 2011, p. 92</p> <p><i>After Muhammad died, Abu Bakr became king and in the first year of his reign he dispatched troops of Arabs to the land of Syr- ia, to conquer it, some 30 000 soldiers. He appointed over them four generals (...)</i></p> <p><i>Of the four generals sent out by Abu Bakr one came, as we have said, to the land of Moab en route for Palestine, the second headed for Egypt and Alexandria, the third went to the Persians and the last to the Christian Arabs who were subject to the Romans.</i></p>
---	--	--

<p>AM 6239, p. 424, 9–10 (1) – 1 – 2 – (2)</p> <p>Τούτω τῷ ἔτει κτείνεται Γρηγόριος ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀρουριτῶν, καὶ ἐξενίκησε Μαρουάμ, ὁ τῶν Ἀράβων ἀρχηγός, <b>ὡς προέφην</b>.</p> <p>AD 746/747, p. 586</p> <p><i>In this year Gregory was killed by the Arourites [sc. Kharidjites] and Marouam, the Arab leader, was victorious as I have already said.</i></p>	<p>p. 277, 25–27</p> <p><i>Mundi anno VIccxxviii, divinae incarnationis anno dcccxxxviii, anno vero imperii Constantini septimo occiditur Gregorius ab Arirutensibus, et evicit Maruham, ut praetuli.</i></p>	<p>cf. AGAPIUS, trans. R.G. HOYLAND, 2011, p. 265</p> <p><i>The Harurites reassembled and handed over their command to a man called Shayban. He rallied an army and travelled to Nineveh. Marwan marched towards him and encamped near him. War was launched between them, proceeding slowly and lasting for two months. Then Marwan's men made an assault against the Harurites and defeated them, pursuing them as far as Azerbaijan. Marwan dispatched 'Amir ibn Dubara with many troops to hunt down the Harurites while he returned to Harran, seeking refuge and respite, and stayed there.</i></p> <p>(similar yet more informative passage in the <i>Chronicle</i> 1234, cf. ut supra)</p> <p>cf. MICHAEL THE SYRIAN, trans. R.G. HOYLAND, 2011, p. 265</p> <p><i>Marwan went down to Assyria, to the place called Niniveh.</i></p> <p>cf. p. 265, note 790:</p> <p>(...) <i>After this notice Theophanes diverges substantially from TC, both omitting material found in TC and adducing material not found in TC; Theophanes either has access to an additional source or is using a continuation of TC (or of the 'eastern source' ...) that adduces additional material.</i></p>
<b>καθὼς καὶ προέφην</b>		
<p>AM 6221, p. 409, 11–18 (1) – 64 – 71 – (74)</p> <p>τῇ δὲ κβ' τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰαννουαρίου μηνὸς χειροτονοῦσιν Ἀναστάσιον τὸν ψευδώνυμον μαθητὴν καὶ σύγκελλον τοῦ αὐτοῦ μακαρίου Γερμανοῦ συνθέμενον τῇ Λέοντος δυσσεβείᾳ, διὰ φιλαρχίαν κοσμικὴν προχειρισθεὶς Κων-</p>	<p>p. 265, 12–19</p> <p><i>Porro undecimo kalendas Februariarum creant falsi nominis Anastasium, discipulum et syncellum eiusdem beati Germani, consentientem Leonis impietati propter amorem principatus mundani, hunc in pseudepiscopum Constantinopoleos provehentes. sane</i></p>	<p>cf. NICEPHORUS, <i>Historia syntomos</i>, 62, 8–12 (ed. C. MANGO, p. 130):</p> <p>μετ' αὐτὸν δὲ προχειρίζονται ἀρχιερέα Ἀναστάσιον κληρικὸν τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας τυγχάνοντα. ἐξ ἐκείνου τοίνυν πολλοὶ τῶν εὐσεβούντων, ὅσοι τῷ βασιλεῖ οὐ συνετίθητο</p>



Table I (cont.)

<p>σταντινουπόλεως ψευδεπίσκοπος. Γρηγόριος δέ, ὁ ἱερός πρόεδρος Ῥώμης, <b>καθὼς καὶ προέφην</b>, Ἀναστάσιον ἅμα τοῖς λιβέλλοις ἀπεκήρυξεν ἐλέγξας τὸν Λέοντα δι' ἐπιστολῶν ὡς ἀσεβοῦντα, καὶ τὴν Ῥώμην σὺν πάσῃ τῇ Ἰταλία τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ ἀπέστησεν.</p> <p>AD 728/729, p. 565</p> <p><i>On the 22<sup>nd</sup> of the same month of January Anastasius, the spurious pupil and synkellos of the blessed Germanus, who had adopted Leo's impiety, was ordained and appointed false bishop of Constantinople on account of his worldly ambition. Gregory, however, the holy bishop of Rome, as I have said, repudiated Anastasios along with his libelli and reproved Leo by means of letters for the latter's impiety. He also severed Rome and all of Italy from Leo's dominion.</i></p>	<p><i>Gregorius, sacratissimus praesul Romanus, quemadmodum praedixi, Anastasium una cum libellis abiecit Leonem per epistolas tamquam impie agentem redarguens, et Romam cum tota Italia ab illius imperio recedere faciens.</i></p>	<p>δόγματι, τιμωρίας πλείστας καὶ αἰκισμοὺς ὑπέμενον.</p>
<p><b>ὡς προέφημεν</b></p>		
<p>AM 5942, p. 102, 13–18 (1) – 19 – 24 – (48)</p> <p>Τοῦ δὲ στόλου, <b>ὡς προέφημεν</b>, ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἐκδεχομένου τὴν τῶν πρεσβευτῶν Γιζερίχου ἄφιξιν καὶ τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως κέλευσιν, ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ Ἀττίλας, ὁ Μουνδίου παῖς, Σκυθῆς, γενόμενος ἀνδρείος καὶ ὑπερήφανος, ἀποβαλὼν Βδελλάν, τὸν πρεσβύτερον ἀδελφόν, καὶ μόνος ἄρχων τὸ τῶν Σκυθῶν βασιλεῖον, οὓς καὶ Οὔννους καλοῦσιν, κατατρέχει τὴν Θράκη.</p> <p>AD 449/450, p. 159</p> <p><i>While the fleet was waiting in Sicily, as we have mentioned, for the arrival of Gizerich's ambassadors and the emperor's commands, Attila, in the meantime, overrun Thrace. He was the son of Moundios, a Scythian, a brave</i></p>	<p>phrase omitted – p. 107, 24–28 <i>interea Attilas Scythia, vir fortis atque superbus, deposito Bdella seniori fratre solus Scytharum, quos et Hunnos vocant, principatus regno per Thracem discurrit et omnem civitatem et castra in servitutum redegit praeter Hadrianopolim et Heracliam, quae quondam Perinthu vocabatur.</i></p>	<p>PRISCUS PANITES, restored from Theoph. (fr. 9, 4); without relevant passage in Evagrius Scholasticus</p>

<p>and arrogant man who, after getting rid of his elder brother Bdel-las, became sole ruler of the empire of the Scythians whom they call Huns.</p>		
<p>AM 5943, p. 105, 1–4 (1) – 39 – 42 – (57) καὶ οὕτως ἀβλαβῆς ἀπολυθεὶς ὁ Μαρκιανὸς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον. χρόνου δὲ ὀλίγου διελθόντος, καὶ Θεοδοσίου τελευτήσαντος, βασιλεὺς ἀνεδείχθη, ὡς <b>προέφημεν</b>. ἐγένετο δὲ χρηστὸς περὶ πάντας τοὺς ὑπηκόους. AD 450/451, p. 161 <i>And so Marcian was set free unharmed and came to Byzantium. A little while later, on the death of Theodosius, he was proclaimed emperor, as we have already mentioned. His was a kind man to all his subjects.</i></p>	<p>p. 108 – (fragment p. 103, 30 – 105, 13 is not included in Anastasius' translation)</p>	<p>cf. PROCOPIUS, <i>De bellis</i>, III, 4, 10–11 (ed. H.B. DEWING, II, p. 136): οὕτω δὴ Μαρκιανὸς ἀφειμένως ἐς Βυζάντιον ἀφίκετο καὶ Θεοδοσίου χρόνῳ ὕστερον τελευτήσαντος ἐδέξατο τὴν βασιλείαν. καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ξύμπαντα βασιλεὺς ἐγεγόνει ἀγαθὸς, τὰ δὲ ἀμφὶ Λιβύην ἐν οὐδενὶ ἐποίησατο λόγῳ. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τῷ ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ ἐγένετο.</p>
<p>AM 6232, p. 412, 24 – 413, 4 (1) – 23 – 32 – (68) ἐβασίλευσεν οὖν Λέων ἀπὸ κε' τοῦ Μαρτίου μηνὸς τῆς ιε' ἰνδικτιῶνος ἕως μηνὸς Ἰουνίου ιη' τῆς θ' ἰνδικτιῶνος, βασιλεύσας ἔτη κδ', μῆνας β', ἡμέρας κε'. ὁμοίως καὶ Κωνσταντίνος, ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ καὶ βασιλείας διάδοχος, ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ιη' τοῦ Ἰουνίου μηνὸς τῆς θ' ἰνδικτιῶνος ἕως τῆς ιδ' τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου μηνὸς τῆς ιδ' ἰνδικτιῶνος, βασιλεύσας καὶ αὐτός, παραχωρήσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ, ἔτη λδ', μῆνας γ', ἡμέρας β'. οὕτως οὖν, ὡς <b>προέφημεν</b>, τῷ αὐτῷ ἔτει τῆς θ' ἰνδικτιῶνος μηνὶ Ἰουνίῳ ιη' τέθηκε Λέων σὺν τῷ ψυχικῷ καὶ τὸν σωματικὸν θάνατον, καὶ αὐτοκράτορεϊ Κωνσταντίνος, ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>p. 267, 30 – 268, 7 <i>regnavit ergo Leo ab octavo kalendarum Apriliarum quintae decimae indictionis usque ad quarto decimo kalendas Iulias nonae indictionis, cum regnasset annis viginti quattuor, mensibus duobus, diebus viginti quinque. similiter et Constantinus, filius eius, imperii et impietatis ipsius successor, ab eodem quarto decimo kalendas Iulias nonae indictionis usque ad octavo decimo kalendas Octobrias quartae decimae indictionis, cum regnasset et ipse annis triginta quattuor, mensibus tribus, diebus duobus.</i> <i>Taliter ergo, ut praediximus, eodem anno nonae indictionis mortuus est Leo una cum animae simul et corporis morte, et imperat Constantinus, filius eius.</i></p>	<p>– this fragment and the following passage, summarising the reign of Leo III and introducing a new tyrant, “his most impious and altogether wretched son”, have no equivalent in <i>Breviarium</i> of Nicephorus (previous section of the AM, a description of the earthquake of 26 October has a parallel passage in Niceph. 63, with some of the details identical, e.g. statue of Arcadius in Xerolophus) cf. NICEPHORUS, <i>Historia syntomos</i>, 64, 1–4 (ed. C. MANGO, p. 132): Λέων δὲ &lt;μετά&gt; τέσσαρα καὶ εἴκοσι ἔτη τῆς βασιλείας μεταλλάττει τὸν βίον ὑδέρῳ χαλεπῷ περιπεσών, διάδοχον δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς τὸν υἱὸν Κωνσταντίνον καταλιμπάνει. Ἀρτάβαζος δέ, ὃς γαμβρὸς Κωνσταντίνου...</p>

Table I (cont.)

<p>AD 739/740, p. 572–573</p> <p><i>Leo reigned from 25 March of the 15<sup>th</sup> indiction until 18 June of the 9<sup>th</sup> indiction, a reign of 24 years, 2 months, 25 days. So also his son Constantine, who succeeded to his impiety and his kingdom, reigned from the same 18 June of the 9<sup>th</sup> indiction until 14 September of the 14<sup>th</sup> indiction. He reigned, by God's dispensation, 34 years, 3 months, 2 days. So then, <b>as we have said</b>, in that same year of the 9<sup>th</sup> indiction, on 18 June, Leo died the death not only of his soul, but also of his body and his son Constantine became emperor.</i></p>		
<p>AM 6278, p. 461, 12–18 (1) – 4 – 10 – (24)</p> <p>Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει ἀποστείλαντες οἱ βασιλεῖς προσεκαλέσαντο πάντας τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτῶν ἐπισκόπους, καταλαβόντων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης πεμφθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ πάπα Ἀδριανοῦ γραμμάτων τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων, <b>ὡς προέφημεν</b>, καὶ τοῦ Ἀντιοχείας καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας. καὶ τῇ ζ' τοῦ Αὐγούστου μηνὸς τῆς θ' ἰνδικτιῶνος προκαθίσαντες ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ βασιλίδι πόλει ἤρξαντο τὰς ἁγίας γραφὰς ὑπαναγινώσκειν...</p> <p>AD 785/786, p. 635</p> <p><i>In the same year the emperors sent invitations to all the bishops subject to them, the letters and men who had been sent from Rome by pope Adrian having arrived, <b>as we have said</b>, as well as those of the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria. On 7 August of the 9<sup>th</sup> indiction they took their seats in the church of the Holy Apostles in the Imperial City and began reading out Holy Scriptures...</i></p>	<p>p. 306, 24–30</p> <p><i>Anno imperii sui sexto mittentes imperatores convocaverunt omnes, qui sub eorum erant potestate, antistites, pervenientibus quoque a Roma transmissis ab Hadriano papa litteris et hominibus, <b>ut praediximus</b>, et ab Antiochia et Alexandria. et septimo idus Augustas nonae indictionis praesidentes in templo sanctorum apostolorum apud regiam urbem coeperunt sanctas scripturas relegere...</i></p>	<p>–</p>

καθώς προέφημεν		
<p>prooimion, p. 3, 23 – 4, 2 (1) – 15 – 20 – (42)</p> <p>ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ τέλος τοῦ βίου τοῦτον κατέλαβε καὶ εἰς πέρας ἀγαγεῖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ σκοπὸν οὐκ ἴσχυσεν, ἀλλὰ, <b>καθὼς προέφημεν</b>, μέχρι Διοκλητιανοῦ συγγραψάμενος τὸν τῆδε βίον κατέλιπε καὶ πρὸς κύριον ἐξεδήμησεν ἐν ὀρθοδόξῳ πίστει, ἡμῖν, ὡς γνησίοις φίλοις, τήν τε βίβλον ἦν συνέταξε καταλέλοιπε καὶ ἀφορμὰς παρέσχε τὰ ἐλλείποντα ἀναπληρῶσαι.</p> <p>preface, p. 1</p> <p><i>Since, however, he was overtaken by the end of his life and was unable to bring his plan to completion, but, as I have said, had carried his composition down to Diocletian when he left his earthly life and migrated unto the Lord (being in the Orthodox faith), he both bequeathed to me, who was his close friend, the book he had written and provided materials with a view to completing what was missing.</i></p>	–	–

The above-mentioned expressions occur in the *Chronographia* in four slightly different forms, both singular and plural, eleven passages in total: prooimion<sup>pl</sup>, AM 5796 (303/304)<sup>s</sup>, AM 5942 (449/450)<sup>pl</sup>, AM 5943 (450/451)<sup>pl</sup>, AM 5963 (470/471)<sup>s</sup>, AM 6026 (533/534)<sup>s</sup>, AM 6124 (631/632)<sup>s</sup>, AM 6221 (728/729)<sup>s</sup>, AM 6232 (739/740)<sup>pl</sup>, AM 6239 (746/747)<sup>s</sup>, AM 6278 (785/786)<sup>pl</sup>. As may easily be noted, both grammatical numbers alternate throughout the chronicle, and the phrases are to be found both in the Roman-Byzantine and the Oriental parts (AM 6124, 6239).

Moreover, apart from the proemium, the first instance can be found at the very beginning of the *Chronicle* of Theophanes (AM 5796) and the last one in its final part, the remaining eight cases being evenly distributed in between. The words *καθὼς προέφημεν* in the proemium are especially important, as even the most critical historians have never denied that it was authored by Theophanes. Anas-tasius translates six of these instances (AM 5796, 6124, 6221, 6232, 6239, 6278), translated homogeneously as *ut/quemadmodum praedixi, ut praediximus*, and *ut praetuli*. This proves that these phrases were not added in a later redaction of the

text and, consequently, that they were present in the early manuscripts of the *Chronographia*. Concerning the five fragments where the adverbial clause has not been translated by Anastasius, they occur in passages summarised or altogether omitted by him (proemium, AM 5943, 5963, 6026)<sup>11</sup>, with the exception of AM 5942 where Anastasius deleted a repetition in Theophanes' entry. Two further remarks can be added. First, these clauses do not occur in sources used or paralleled by Theophanes; the apparent similarity between AM 6124 and the *Chronicle 1234* may be merely a coincidence or convergence – Theophanes comes back to the matter touched upon in the previous entry, and the Syriac chronicle seems to build its own narrative link independently. Second, the phrase occurs in the points of the narrative that suggest interventions of the author/compiler and not quotations copied verbatim from his sources, such as the opening or final parts of the *anni mundi*, passages in longer entries where a certain number of repetitions was unavoidable, places where the continuity of the narrative is broken by the chronistic structure of AM, recapitulations of facts or actions described several AM earlier and then mentioned again in the entries that do not follow the one-year rule in the internal structure, and résumés. These situations were likely to prompt some more activity of the author/editor than just rewriting the accounts he used. It is important to stress that, as may be easily found, all of the cross-references address matters or facts ideed described or mentioned by the chronicler<sup>12</sup>.

In the light of all this, it is of special significance that none of the four forms of πρόφημι can be found in the *Ekloge chronographias*, where cross-references are expressed in other ways<sup>13</sup>. In order to assess the full meaning of this divergence and to confirm or dismiss the thought that suggests itself immediately – namely, that the words discussed above come from Theophanes himself, which has consequences for the authorship of the *Chronicle* – one must take a broader perspective. This will elucidate whether the variation between the singular and the plural can be indicative of double authorship, with one author inclined to use the former and

<sup>11</sup> The last example (AM 6026) is especially interesting – the long entry of Theophanes' *Chronographia* is deliberately shortened by Anastasius in a few places and there is nothing extraordinary in the omission of the fragment of p. 191, 7 – 193, 25 (pages of de Boor's edition) in the translation. The methods of abbreviating may, however, be grasped here a bit more precisely. In the first sentence omitted (pp. 191, 9–10: Βελισάριος δὲ διακοσμῆσας τὸ στράτευμα ἐπὶ Καρχηδόνα ἐβάδιζεν), and the first then translated (pp. 193, 25–26: ἀπονητὶ δὲ Βελισάριος τῆς Καρχηδόνας κρατήσας παρήνει τοῖς στρατιώταις λέγων...) some striking similarities are noticeable at first glance. Did they furnish convenient points at which the text could be cut in order to make the narrative denser? Or did the translator or the scribe who prepared the manuscript possessed by Anastasius just skip this part for a different reason?

<sup>12</sup> Reference in AM 6239, the only apparently dubious case, is logically bound with victories of Marwan and with AM 6236–6237.

<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, apart from much more sophisticated expressions, George used ὡς φησιν (twice – p. 197, 21; 458, 11), and καθὼς φησιν (once p. 34, 14); nevertheless, such usage should be considered rare, and stemming from the frequently applied structure 'ὡς φησιν + source,' cf. below.

the other the latter. But in the first place the frequency of such expressions among other writers should be determined in order to evaluate to what extent προέφην / προέφημεν is an idiosyncratic feature in the context of the Byzantine literary language.

The first step is, therefore, the search for ὡς προέφην / καθὼς καὶ προέφην / ὡς προέφημεν / καθὼς προέφημεν and similar clauses of the same stylistic function in the preserved corpus of classical and Byzantine Greek literature. I have taken advantage of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG<sup>14</sup>) as the most appropriate tool for this task, in spite of all the difficulties and drawbacks that this method may bring. It is, one may judiciously observe, a comparison of what is incomparable – the legacy of some *literati* counting hundreds of pages of the standardised Teubner/Loeb/CFHB/SC editions is juxtaposed with the poor dozens of pages that survived from some others' output or were the only pages written by them throughout their whole lives; some works are of disputed authorship; completely different genres with their different wording and style are treated equally – no matter if 'high' or 'vernacular' – without further distinctions, and somewhat mechanically; TLG has not yet covered all of the existent texts; the interface has some limitations. All these reservations are quite justified, yet no better method can be currently proposed. Besides, four or five years ago I would not have said that TLG might be treated as representative for this kind of survey – now, even despite the drawbacks or incompleteness, the bulk of the most important Byzantine writings is included, the database is being constantly – and impressively – enhanced, and the question may be evaluated positively.

I have spared no effort to make the results as plausible and accurate as possible. Wherever it was feasible (more than 75% of the works cited) I have verified the TLG citations with the printed originals and where newer editions were accessible to me, this has been acknowledged in the respective note. In a few instances, more precise references were provided instead of inappropriate or renumbered addresses in TLG. A few works not included in the base were consulted in their printed or on-line editions to supplement the table and minimise the risk of omission<sup>15</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature*, University of California (<http://www.tlg.uci.edu>). Full list of the ancient and Byzantine authors and works available throughout TLG: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/tlgauthors/cd.authors.php> and [http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/tlgauthors/post\\_tlg\\_e.php](http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/tlgauthors/post_tlg_e.php) (or in *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Canon of Greek Authors and Works*, ed. L. BERKOWITZ and K.A. SQUITIER, Oxford 1990 with its updated on-line version, edited by Maria PANTELIA).

<sup>15</sup> The exceptionally helpful Dumbarton Oaks Hagiography Database made it possible to browse many vitae (e.g. *Vita Georgii Amastriotae*, *Vita Eliae spelaiotae*, *Vita Andreae in krisei*, *Vita Germani Cosinitense*, Nicetas' *Vita Ignatii*, Saba's and Peter's *Vitae Ioannicii*, *Vita Ioannis Gothense*, *Vita Ioannis Psychaitae*, Theophanes' *Vita Iosephi Hymnographae*, *Vita Lucae Steiritae*, *Vita Macarii higumeni Pellectensis*, *Vita Methodii*, Theophanes' *Vita Michaeli Maleinae*, *Vita Naumi Ohridense*, *Vita Nicephori Sebazense*, Theosterictus' *Vita Nicetae medic.*, *Vita Nicolai Studitae*, *Vita Niconis Metanoetes*, *Vita Pauli Caiumaei*, Eustathius' *Vita Philothei*, Theodore the Studite's oration on Plato of Saccidium,

## Table II

Arius Didymus	1 s	<i>Liber de philosophorum sectis (epitome ap. Stobaeum)</i> , [in:] <i>Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum</i> , rec. F.W.A. MULLACH, vol. II, Parisiis 1867, p. 97, 6–7r	(ὡς προσέφην)
Nicomachus	1 pl	<i>Introductio arithmetica</i> , rec. R. HOCHÉ, Leipzig 1866, II, 2, 5	(ὡς προσέφαιεν)
<i>Corp. Hermeticum</i>	+1 pl	<i>Harmonicum enchiridion</i> , 12, [in:] <i>Musici scriptores graeci</i> , rec. K. VON JAN, Leipzig 1895, p. 262, 11–12 fr. 26, 25; ed. A.-J. FESTUGÈRE & A.D. NOCK, vol. III, Paris 1954	(περὶ οὐ κατ' προσέφαιεν)
Galen	1 s	<i>De compositione medicamentorum per genera</i> , I, 17, [in:] <i>Claudii Galeni opera omnia</i> , rec. C.G. Kühn, vol. XIII, Lipsiae 1827, p. 442	(ὡς προσέφην ἔμπροσθεν)
<b>Justin Martyr</b>	13 s	<i>Apologia secunda</i> , 8(3), 6, [in:] <i>Apologie pour les chrétiens</i> , ed. Ch. MUNIER, SC 507, Paris 2006	(ὡς προσέφην)
	+1 s	<i>Dialogus cum Tryphone</i> , 19, 2; 21, 1; 41, 2; 51, 2; 53, 4; 56, 10; 63, 2; 88, 8; 92, 3; 92, 6; 94, 2; 102, 2; ed. Ph. BOVICHON, Fribourg 2003	(ὡς προσέφην πωλλάκις)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , 113, 1	(ὡς προσέφην ἐν πολλοῖς)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , 130, 3	(ὡς προσέφην γάρ)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , 134, 2	(<ὡς> προσέφην)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , 138, 2	(ὡς προσέφαιεν)
	15 pl	<i>Apologia</i> , 12, 5; 21, 6; 22, 2; 32, 11; 45, 6; 54, 5; 54, 7; 56, 2; 58, 1; 63, 4; 67, 5 ed. ut supra	
		<i>Apologia secunda</i> , 5(6), 5; 7(8), 1; 9, 1	
		<i>Dialogus cum Tryphone</i> , 83, 4	
<b>Irenaeus of Lyons</b>	3 pl	<i>Adversus haereses</i> , I, 1, 5 (= MASSUET & SC 264, ed. A. RUSSEAU, L. DOUTRELEAU, Paris 1979, I, 3, 1); I, 3 (= I, 10, 2); V, 17, 4 (cf. ed. L. DOUTRELEAU, B.C. MERCIER, A. ROUSSEAU, SC 153, Paris 1969: V.1. cit. and fr. gr. 16), ed. W. WIGAN HARVEY, Cambridge 1857, vol. I–II	(ὡς προσέφαιεν)
	+3 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , I, 4 (= I, 10, 3); I, 12 (= I, 19, 1); III, 19, 6 (= III, 18, 7; cf. SC 211, ed. L. DOUTRELEAU, A. ROUSSEAU, Paris 1974, I. cit. + fr. gr. 26)	(καθὼς προσέφαιεν)
	[+1 pl]	<i>ibidem</i> , V, 24, 3 [and fr. gr. 17], ed. ut supra, SC 153	(ὡς προσέφαιεν)]
<i>Clementina</i>	1 s	<i>Die Pseudoklementinen II. Rekognitionen</i> , IX, 25, ed. F. PASCHKE & B. REHM, Berlin 1965	(ὡς προσέφην)
<i>Hist. Alexandri (ε)</i>	2 s	<i>Anonymi Byzantini vita Alexandri regis Macedoniae</i> , 34, 2; 40, 2, ed. J. TRUMPF, Stuttgart 1974	(ὡς προσέφην)
Basil of Caesarea	1 pl	<i>Recensio byzantina poetica</i> , [in:] <i>Das byzantinische Alexandergedicht nach dem codex Marcianus 408</i> , ed. S. REICHMANN, p. 645, 7	(ὡς προσέφαιεν)
	1 s	<i>Constitutiones asceticae [sp.]</i> , I, 3, [in:] PG 31, col. 1332	(καθὼς προσέφην)
<b>Ps.-Ephrem of Chers.</b>	3 pl	<i>De miraculo Clementis Romani</i> , 6; 15; 18, [in:] PG 2, col. 637; 641; 645	(ὡς προσέφαιεν)

<b>Gregory of Nyssa</b>	1 s	<i>Ad Ablabium quod non sint tres dei</i> , [in:] <i>Gregorii Nysseni opera</i> , vol. III.1, ed. F. MUELLER, Leiden 1958, p. 38, 19	(καθὰ προέφρην)
	+1 s	<i>Contra Eunomium</i> , 27, 396, ed. W. JAEGER, trans. R. WINLING, SC 524, Paris 2010	(καθὼς προέφρην)
	1 pl	<i>Adversus Arium et Sabellium de patre et filio</i> , [in:] <i>Gregorii Nysseni Opera</i> , vol. III.1, ed. F. MUELLER, Leiden 1958, p. 79, 18	(ὡς προέφρημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , p. 73, 28	(ὥσπερ προέφρημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , p. 84, 2	(καθάρτερ προέφρημεν)
Evagrius Ponticus	1 pl	<i>De oratione (sub nomine Nili Ancyrami)</i> , [in:] PG 79, col. 1184	(καθὼς προέφραμεν)
Ps.-Athanasius	1 pl	<i>Die pseudoathanasianische IVte Rede gegen die Arianer</i> , 19, 6, ed. A. STEGMANN, Rottenburg 1917	(ὡς προέφρημεν)
John Chrysostom	2 s	<i>Fragmenta in Jeremiam (in catenis)</i> , 45, [in:] PG 64, col. 1017	(ὡς προέφρην)
		<i>In psalmum 118</i> , I, 1, [in:] PG 55, col. 676	
John Chrysostom, sp.	1 pl	<i>Visio Danielis</i> , [in:] <i>Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina</i> , rec. A. VASSILIEV, pars I, Mosquae 1893, p. 35, 9	(ὡς γὰρ πρεπόντως προέφρημε(ν))
<b>Ps.-Macarius</b>	2 pl	<i>Sermones (collectio B)</i> , hom. 2, 3, 7; hom. 59, 2, 5, [in:] <i>Makariorum/Symeon Reden und Briefe</i> , ed. H. BERTHOLD, vol. I-II, Berlin 1973	(ὡς προέφρημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , hom. 40, 1, 10	
	+1 pl	<i>Homiliae spirituales</i> , XXI, 4, 46, [in:] <i>Die 50 geistl. Homilien des Makarios</i> , ed. H. DÖRRIES, E. KLOSTERMANN, M. KROEGER, Berlin 1964	(ὡς γὰρ προέφρημεν)
John Stobaeus	1 s	<i>Ioannis Stobaei anthologium</i> , II, 7, 22, rec. C. WACHSMUTH, vol. II, Berolini 1884, p. 143	(ὡς προέφρην)
	1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , I, 49, 69, vol. I, p. 471	(ὡς προέφραμεν)
Palladius	1 s	<i>Palladii Dialogus de vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi</i> , XX, 615, ed. A.-M. Malingrey, Ph. Leclercq, SC 341, Paris 1988	(ὡς προέφρην)
<b>Philostorgius</b>	1 s	<i>Kirchengeschichte</i> , III, 2a (= <i>Artemii passio</i> , 17), ed. J. Bidez, F. Winkelmann, Berlin 1981	(ὡς προέφρην)
	1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , VII, 8a (p. 86 in notes)	(ὡς προέφρημεν)
Eutyches	1 s	letter to the emperors, read during the council of Chalcedon, 834, [in:] <i>ACO II</i> , 1, 1, ed. E. Schwartz, Berolini-Lipsiae 1933, p. 177, 36	(ὡς προέφρην)
<i>Vita Alexandri</i>	1 pl	53, ed. E. de Stoop, PO 6, Turnhout 1911 [repr. 1981], p. 700, 17	(ὅπερ προέφρημεν)
Diadochus of Photice	1 s	<i>Sermo de ascensione</i> , [in:] <i>Diadoche de Photice. Oeuvres spirituelles</i> , ed. É. Des Places, SC 5bis, Paris 1955, p. 167, 4	(ὡς προέφρην)



Table II (cont.)

<b>Gennadius I</b>	1 s	<i>Fragmenta in Epistulam ad Romanos (in catenis)</i> , [in:] <i>Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen</i> , vol. XV, <i>Pauluskommmentare aus der griechischen Kirche</i> , ed. K. STAAB, Münster 1933, p. 369, 11 – repeated in <i>catenae (Catena in epistulam ad Romanos (typ Vat.) (e cod. Oxon. Bodl. Auct. E.2.20 [= Misc. 48])</i> , ed. J.A. CRAMER, vol. I, Oxford 1840, p. 80)	(καθὼς ἦδη προέφην)
<b>Proclus</b>	1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , p. 384, 29 (repeated in <i>catenae</i> as above, p. 152)	(ὡς προέφραμεν)
anon. papyr. mag.	1 s	<i>Tomus ad Armentos</i> , 9, [in:] ACO IV, 2, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, <i>Berolimi-Lipsiae</i> 1914, p. 189, 5	(καθὰ προέφην)
	+1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , 21, p. 192, 13	(καθὰ προέφραμεν)
	1 s	16, [in:] <i>Papyri Graecae magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri</i> , vol. II, ed. K. PREISENDANZ & A. HENRICHs, <sup>2</sup> Stuttgartiae 1974, p. 225	(ὡς προέφην)
[Pseudo-Gelasius	1 s	<i>Anonyme Kirchengeschichte (Gelasius Cyzicenus, CPG 6034)</i> , III, 13, 8, ed. G.Ch. HANSEN, Berlin-New York 2002 (in editor's view <i>Zusatz des Compilators zum Text seiner Vorlage</i> )	(ὡς ἦδη προέφην)]
<b>Ps.-Caesarius</b>	2 s	<i>Die Erotapokriseis</i> , 108, 108; 179, 5, ed. R. RÜEDINGER, Berlin 1989	(ὡς προέφην)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , 121, 9	(καὶ γὰρ ἦδη προέφην)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , 146, 72	(καθὼς προέφην)
<b>John the Lydian</b>	4 pl	<i>De magistratibus populi Romani</i> , II, 13, 4; II, 24, 3; III, 53, 2, ed. J. SCHAMP, vol. II, Paris 2006	(ὡς προέφραμεν)
<b>John Scholasticus</b>	2 pl	<i>Prologus et scholia in Dionysii Areopagitae librum De divinis nominibus</i> , 4, 2305b; 11, 2396b ed. B.R. SUCHLA, Berlin 2011	(ὡς προέφραμεν)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , proem. 216c	(καθὰ προέφην)
	+3 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , 1, 2193b; 5, 2317c; 5, 2324a	(καθὰ προέφραμεν)
Abraham of Ephesus	1 pl	<i>Homilia de annuntiatione</i> , [in:] <i>Homélies mariales byzantines</i> , ed. M. JUGIE, Turnhout 1922, p. 446 [= PO 16]	(μὴδ' ὡς προέφραμεν)
Fl. Phoebammon	1 s	<i>Testamentum Flavii Phoebammonis</i> [Nov. 15, 570], <a href="http://webu2.upmf-grenoble.fr/Haiti/Cours/Ak/Negotia/Cair32_DDBDFgr.html">http://webu2.upmf-grenoble.fr/Haiti/Cours/Ak/Negotia/Cair32_DDBDFgr.html</a>	(ὡς προέφην)
<i>Chron. paschale</i>	1 s	rec. L. DINDORF, <i>Bonnae</i> 1832, p. 435, 4	(ὡς οὖν προέφην)
John Climacus	1 pl	<i>Scala paradisi</i> , 8, 10, [in:] PG 88, col. 832	(ὡς προέφραμεν)
<b>Maximus Conf.</b>	2 s	<i>Quaestiones ad Thalassium</i> , proem., 303; 65, 809, ed. C. LAGA & C. STEEL, vol. I–II, CC.SC 7 & 22, Turnhout 1980–1990	(ὡς προέφην)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , 63, 377	(καθὼς προέφην)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , 50, 205	(Προέφην γὰρ...)
<i>Vita Alypii Stylitae</i> <sub>1</sub>	1 pl	<i>Vita prior</i> , 4, [in:] H. DELEHAYE, <i>Les saints stylites</i> , Bruxelles-Paris 1923, p. 150, 11	(ὡς καὶ προέφραμεν)

Pamphilus of Jerusalem	1 pl	<i>Encomium sancti Soteridis</i> , [in:] <i>Diversorum postchalconensium auctorum collectanea I</i> , ed. J.H. DECLERCK, P. ALLEN, CC-SG 19, Turnhout 1989, p. 292, 32	(ὄν ὡς προσέφημεν)
<b>Tarasius I</b>	1 s	words noted 787 below the letter of Germanus I to Constantine of Nacoleia (ep. 3, 44) [in:] <i>PG</i> 98, col. 164	(ὡς καὶ προσέφην)
George Syncellus	0	Ταράσιος ὁ ἀγιώτατος πατριάρχης ἔπεν· ὡς καὶ προσέφην, τίμιοι ἀδελφοί, ἡ εἰσαγωγή τῆς ἐπιστάκτου καινοτομίας ταύτης γέγονεν ἐκ τοῦ προεπιρημένου ἀνδρός ἐπισκόπου Νακωλείας, Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ θεοφιλίστατος διάκονος καὶ νοτάριος ἀνέγνω.	
<b>Theophanes</b>	6 s 5 pl		
George Choeroboscus	1 pl	<i>Prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones</i> , [in:] <i>Grammatici Graeci</i> , ed. A. HILGARD, vol. IV.2, Lipsiae 1894, p. 38	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<b>Michael Syncellus</b>	1 pl	cf. <i>Epimerismi Homericī</i> , 52f	(καθὼς προσέφημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>Peri tes tou logou syntaxeos</i> , 56, [in:] <i>Le traité de la construction de la phrase de Michel le Syncelle</i> , ed. D. DONNET, Bruxelles 1982	(καθάρτερ προσέφημεν)
<i>Vita Nicephori med.</i>	1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , 115	(καθὰ προσέφημεν)
<b>Methodius I</b>	1 pl	9, 1, [in:] E. HALKIN, <i>La Vie de s. Nicéphore, fondateur de Médiokion en Bithynie (d. 813)</i> , AB 78, 1960, p. 412	(ὡς ἀνωτέρω προσέφημεν)
<i>Vita Andreae in trib.</i>	1 s	<i>Vita Euthymii Sardiani</i> , 15, 301, ed. J. GOUILLARD, TM 10, 1987: (ὁ ἀδελφός καὶ συναρχιερέυς τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ...)	(...ὄν προσέφημεν)
	1 s	<i>Martyrium sancti et gloriosis... Andreae</i> , 5, [in:] <i>Acta Sanctorum Octobris</i> , vol. VIII, (Oct. 27–30), Parisii-Romae 1866, p. 137	(ὡς προσέφην)
<b>Saba</b>	1 s	<i>Vita Ioannicii</i> , 6, 22(c), [in:] <i>Acta Sanctorum Novembris</i> , vol. II.1, (Nov. 3–4), Bruxellis 1894, p. 353	(ὡς προσέφην)
<b>Saba</b>	1 s	<i>Vita Petri Atroatae / La Vie merveilleuse de saint Pierre d'Atroa</i> , 67, ed. V. LAURENT, Bruxelles 1956	(ὡς προσέφην)
<i>Vita Athanasiae</i>	1 pl	L. CARRAS, <i>The Life of St Athanasia of Aegina: A Critical Edition with Introduction</i> , 21, 38, [in:] <i>Maistor. Classical, Byzantine nad Renaissance Studies</i> for Robert Browning, ed. A. MOFFATT, Canberra 1984	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<b>George the Monk</b>	1 pl	<i>Chronicon</i> , X, rec. C. DE BOOR, vol. II, Stuegardiae 1904, p. 416, 20	(καθὼς προσέφημεν)
?Paul of Nicaea	1 s	<i>Manuale medico</i> , 92, 19, ed. A.M. IERACI Bro, Napoli 1996	(ὡς προσέφην)
<b>Photius I</b>	1 pl	<i>Bibliotheca</i> , cod. 192a, p. 154b–155a; ed. R. HENRY, vol. III, Paris 1962	(Ἄλλ' ὁ καὶ προσέφημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>Contra Manichaeos / Récit de la réapparition des manichéens</i> , 54, ed. W. WOLSKA-CONUS, TM 4, 1970, p. 139, 13–14	(ὡς καὶ προσέφημεν)

Table II (cont.)

Nicholas Mysticus	+1 pl	<i>Fragmenta in epistulam II ad Corinthios (in catenis)</i> , [in:] <i>Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen</i> , vol. XV, <i>Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche</i> , ed. K. STAAB, Münster 1933, p. 587, 16	(καθώς και προσέφημεν)
	1 s	[in:] <i>Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople, Letters</i> , ed. R.J.H. JENKINS & L.G. WESTERINK, Washington 1973	(τούτο δι' ὃ προσέφην)
	+1 pl	ep. 2, 14	(ὃ προσέφημεν)
	+1 pl	ep. 6, 74	(ὡς οὖν προσέφημεν)
	+1 pl	ep. 135, 21–22	(...ὡς προσέφημεν)
	+1 pl	ep. 101a, 10	(ἐν οἷς προσέφημεν)
Basil	1 pl	<i>Vita Euthymii iunioris</i> , 36, ed. L. PETIT, ROC 8, 1903, p. 202, 8	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
Constantine VII	2 pl	<i>De administrando imperio</i> , 29, 84–85, ed. G. MORAVCSIK & R.J.H. JENKINS, <sup>2</sup> Washington 1967	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
Pseudo-Heron	1 pl	<i>De cerimonis aulae Byzantinae</i> , I, 10, ed. A. VOGT, vol. I, Paris 1935, p. 71, 6–7	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
Nicephorus	2 pl	<i>Vita sancti Andreae Sali</i> , 21; 36, ed. L. RYDÉN, Uppsala 1995	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<i>Vita Pauli iun.</i>	1 pl	37, ed. H. DELEHAYE, [in:] <i>Milet. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen</i> , ed. Th. WIEGAND, vol. III.1, Berlin 1913, p. 127	(ἦ προσέφημεν)
<i>De velitatione bell.</i>	1 pl	4, 4, [in:] <i>Le traité sur la guérilla (De velitatione) de l'empereur Nicéphore Phocas</i> , ed. G. DAGRON, H. MIHAESCU, Paris 1986, p. 45	(καθάρτερ προσέφημεν)
<i>Digenis Acritas</i>	1 s	IV, 583, ed. E. JEFFREYS, Cambridge 1998, p. 100	(καθώστερ και προσέφην σου)
John of Sicily	1 s	<i>Commentarius in Hermogenis librum Peri ideon</i> , IV, 47, [in:] <i>Rhetores Graeci</i> , vol 6, rec. C. WÄLZ, Stuttgartiae et al. 1834, p. 184, 29–30	(ὡς προσέφην)
	+1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , IV, 42, p. 181, 10	(ώσπερ προσέφην)
Michael I Cerularius, sp.	1 pl	<i>Panoplia</i> , IIIa, c. 19, [in:] A. MICHEL, <i>Humbert und Kerullarios: Quellen und Studien zum Schisma des XI Jh.</i> , Paderborn 1930, p. 234	(καθώς προσέφημεν άνωθεν)
Michael Attaleiates	2 pl	<i>Historia</i> , ed. I. BEKKER, Bonn 1853, p. 84, 8, 99, 2–3	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<i>Vita Cosmae &amp; Joannis</i>	+1 pl?	<i>Ponema nomikon etoi synopsis pragmatike</i> , 4, 3, [in:] <i>Jus graecoromanum</i> , ed. J. ZEPOS, Athenae 1931	(οἷς προσέφημεν)
		<i>Vita Cosmae Melodi et Joannis Damasceni</i> , 15, [in:] <i>Analekta Ierosolymitikes stachylogias</i> , ed. A. PAPAΔOPOY- LOS-KERAMEUS, vol. IV, Petroupolei 1897, p. 283, 2–3	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<i>Vita Niconis</i>	2 pl	12; 57; ed. D. SULLIVAN, Brookline Mass. 1987	(ὡς ἔφθημεν εἰπόντες)

<b>Christodulus</b>	4 pl	<i>Testamentum et codicillus Christoduli (a. 1093)</i> , in test.: p. 82, [28]; p. 82, [31]; p. 82, [20]; in cod.: p. 89, [12]; ex <i>Acta monasterii Patmi</i> , [in:] <i>Acta et Diplomata Graeca Medii Aevi sacra et profana</i> , ed. F. MIKLOSICH & J. MÜLLER, vol. VI, Vindobonae 1890	(ώς προσέφημεν)
<i>Vita Phantini iun.</i>	1 s	<i>La vita di san Fantino il Giovane</i> , 32, 2, ed. E. FOLLIERI, Bruxelles 1993	(καὶ ἦν προσέφην)
<i>Translatio Nicolai</i>	1 pl	20, [in:] <i>Der Heilige Nikolaos in der griechischen Kirche. Texte und Untersuchungen</i> , ed. G. ANRICH, vol. I, Leipzig-Berlin 1913	(ώς προσέφημεν)
<b>John Tzetzes</b>	2 s	<i>Exegesis in Homeri Illiadem</i> , v. 226, sch. 41; v. 459, sch. 3, [in:] <i>Der unbekannte Teil der Ilias-Exegesis des Ioannes Tzetzes (A 97-609)</i> , ed. A.C. LOLOS, Königstein 1981	(προέφην)
	+ 1 s	<i>Chiliades</i> , II, 48, 710, [in:] <i>Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae</i> , ed. P.L.M. LEONE, Napoli 1968	(ώς ἦδη σοι προσέφην)
	1 pl	<i>Exegesis in Homeri Illiadem</i> , v. 423, sch. 81	(ώς καὶ προσέφημεν)
	+ 1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , v. 413, sch. 66	(δὲ ἄπὲρ προσέφημεν)
	+ 1 pl	ep. 28, 9-10, rec. P.A.M. LEONE, Leipzig 1972, p. 44	([ἄσπερ προσέφημεν])
Eustathius of Thess.	1 pl	<i>Commentarii ad Homeri Illiadem</i> , ed. M. VAN DER VALK, vol. I, Leiden 1971, p. 265	(ώς καὶ προσέφημεν)
<b>Neophytus the Recluse</b>	5 s	<i>Deka logoi peri tou Christou entolon</i> , hom. 4, 17, ed. I.E. STEPHANES, [in:] <i>Hagiou Neophytou tou Egkleistou Syggrammata</i> , ed. I. KARABIDOPOULOS, C. OIKONOMOU, D.G. TSAMES, N. ZACHAROPOULOS, vol. I, Paphos 1996	(ώς προσέφην)
		<i>Testamentum sive Typike dithethe</i> , 24, ed. I.E. STEPHANES, [in:] <i>ibidem</i> , vol. II, Paphos 1998	
		<i>Biblos ton katecheseon</i> , ed. P. SOTIROUDIS, [in:] <i>ibidem</i> , vol. 2	
		<i>Panegyrike A'</i> , 8, 207; 21, 438, ed. Th. GIAGKOU & N. PAPATRIANTAFYLLOU-THEODORIDI, [in:] <i>ibidem</i> , vol. III, Paphos 1999	(προέφην σοι ὄτι )
	+ 1 s	<i>Liber quinquaginta capitulorum</i> , 39, 13, ed. P. SOTIROUDIS, [in:] <i>ibidem</i> , vol. I	(ώς προσέφημεν)
	8 pl	<i>Deka logoi peri tou Christou entolon</i> , hom. 4, 4; hom. 4, 12	
		<i>Biblos ton katecheseon</i> , II, 37; II, 49	
		<i>Panegyrike A'</i> , 8, 346; 19, 415; 26, 33	
		<i>To asma asmaton</i> , 3, 113-114, ed. B.S. PSEUTOGKAS, [in:] <i>ibidem</i> , vol. II	
	+ 1 pl	<i>Panegyrike A'</i> , 29, 265-266	(καθ' ὄν προσέφημεν τρόπον)
<b>Nicholas of Otranto</b>	1 s	<i>Disputatio contra Iudaeos</i> , [in:] <i>Nektariou, hegoumenou mones Kasoulou, Nikolaou, hegoumenou mones Hydrountinou Dialexis kata Ioudaion</i> , ed. M. CHRONZ, Athens 2009, p. 77, 14	(ώς προσέφην)
	+ 1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , p. 114, 3	(...σοὶ καὶ προσέφην ὄτι...)
	+ 1 s	<i>ibidem</i> , p. 125, 8	(ώς καὶ προσέφην)
	6 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , p. 20, 19; 86, 6; 128, 10; 180, 3; 210, 20; 227, 12	(ώς προσέφημεν)

Table II (cont.)

	+4 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , p. 18, 21; 80, 20; 113, 17; 223, 1	(ὡς και προσέφημεν)
Manuel Holobolus	1 s	<i>Oratio 3 in imp. Michaelem Palaeologum</i> , [in:] <i>Manuelis Holoboli orationes</i> , ed. M. TREU, pars 2, Potsdam 1907, p. 87, 2	(ὡς προσέφην)
Andrew Libadenus	1 s	<i>Descriptio itineris</i> , [in:] <i>Andreu Libadenou bios kai erga</i> , vol. I, ed. O. LAMPSIDES, Athenais 1975, p. 40, 14	(ὡς προσέφην)
<b>George Acropolites</b>	1 s	<i>Laudatio Petri et Pauli</i> , 16, [in:] <i>Georgii Acropolitae opera</i> , vol. II, rec. A. HEISENBERG, Studgardiae 1978, p. 96, 34	(εἰ γὰρ και προσέφην)
	1 pl	<i>Annales</i> , 80, [in:] <i>ibidem</i> , vol. I, p. 165, 14	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<b>Const. Meliteniotes</b>	2 s	<i>Orationes antirrhethicae adversus tomum Gregorii II Cyprii</i> , ed. M. ORPHANOS, Athēna 1986, p. 187, 277.	(ὡς προσέφην)
Maximus Planudes	1 pl	<i>Macrobius Commentariorum in Somnium Scipionis</i> , II, 10, 10, ed. A. MEGAS, Thessaloniki 1995.	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<b>George Metochites</b>	1 s	<i>Historia dogmatica</i> , I, 5 [in:] <i>Nova Patrum Bibliotheca</i> , rec. J. Cozza, vol. VIII.2, Roma 1871, p. 6	(ὡς προσέφην)
	2 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , I, 96, p. 133; III, 9, [in:] <i>NPB</i> , rec. J. Cozza-Luzi, vol. X.1, Roma 1905	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<i>Actum Isaaci protii</i>	1 pl	(a. 1316), [in:] <i>Actes d'Esphigmenou</i> , éd. J. LEFORT, Paris 1973, p. 91, 80–81 = <i>Diploma Isaaci protii de cambitate agrorum</i> (a. 1316), 80–81, [in:] <i>Actes de Vatopédi I, Des origines à 1329</i> , ed. J. BOMPAIRE, C. GIROS, V. KRAVARI & J. LEFORT, Paris 2001, p. 271	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<b>Gregory Palamas</b>	1 s	<i>Contra Nicephorum Gregoram</i> , or. II, 67, [in:] <i>Grēgoriou tou Palama syggrammata</i> , ed. P.K. CHRESTOU, vol. 4, Thessalonike 1988	(καθ'αυτην και προσέφην)
	1 pl	<i>De processione Spiritus Sancti</i> , or. II, 78, 11, [in:] <i>ibidem</i> , vol. I, Thessalonike 1962	(καθ'α προσέφημεν)
Gregory Acindynus	1 pl	<i>Antirrheticus maior</i> , IV, 6, 35, [in:] <i>Gregorii Acindyni Refutationes duae...</i> , ed. J. NADAL CANELLAS, CC.SG 31, Turnhout 1995	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<b>David Dishypatus</b>	3 pl	<i>Logos kata Barlaam kai Akindynou pros Nikolaon Kabasilan</i> , p. 53, 1; 64, 2; 74, 17; ed. D.G. TSAMES, Thessalonike 1976	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<i>Prochiron Auctum</i>	1 pl	XXVII, 284, rec. P. ZEPOS (post C.E. ZACHARIÄ VON LINGENTHAL), Athenae 1931	(οἶων προσέφημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , XXXI, 39 (citation from Attaleiates' <i>Ponema nomikon</i> , cf. above)	(οἷς προσέφημεν)
<i>Exegesis in Hesiodi</i>	1 pl	ad 270, <i>Glossen und Scholien zur hesiodischen Theogonie</i> , ed. H. FLACH, Leipzig 1876, p. 389, 9	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<i>Schol. coll. Marc.</i>	1 pl	<i>Peri prosodion</i> , [in:] <i>Scholta [Commentaria] in Dionysii Thracis Artis grammaticam</i> , rec. A. HILGARD, Lipsiae 1901, p. 293, 11	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>Peri technes</i> , [in:] <i>ibidem</i> , p. 298, 17	(καθ'α προσέφημεν)
Thomas Magister	2 pl	<i>Thomae Magistri sive Theoduli monachi Ecloga vocum Atticarum</i> , ed. F. RITSCHL, Halis Saxonum 1832, p. 352, 14–15 and 371, 6	(ὡς προσέφημεν)

<b>Nicephorus Gregoras</b>	1 s	<i>Explicatio in librum Synesii De insomniis</i> , 138c, 157, 16, ed. P. PIETROSANTI, Bari 1999.	(ὡς προσέφη)
	1 pl	<i>Liber dogmaticus</i> V, 15 ( <i>Historiae byzantinae libri postremi</i> , XXXIV, 56), rec. I. BEKKER ( <i>Nic. Greg.</i> vol. III), Bonnæ 1855, p. 469, 17–18	(ὡς ἀνωτέρω προσέφημεν)
Philotheus Coccinus	1 s	<i>Laudatio Sancti Demetrii</i> , 17, 13, [in:] <i>Philotheou K-poleos tou Kokkiniou hagiologika erga</i> , vol. II, ed. D.G. TSAMES, Thessalonike 1985	(ὡς προσέφη)
John Cyparissiotēs, sp.	1 pl	<i>Theologica varia inedita saeculi XIV</i> , ed. J. POLEMIS, Turnhout 2012, p. 266, 35	(καθὼς προσέφημεν)
<b>Theod. Meliteniotes</b>	5 pl	<i>De astronomia libri III</i> , I, 3, 14; I, 18, 7; II, 4, 38–39; II, 5, 317; II, 8, 9, ed. R. LEURQUIN, vol. 1, Amsterdam 1990, vol. II, Amsterdam 1993	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
	+ 1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , II, 22, 103	(ἄς προσέφημεν)
<b>Callistus Angelicudes</b>	1 pl	<i>Refutatio Thomae Aquinæ</i> , 396, ed. S.G. PAPADOPOULOS, Athens 1970	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
editor of Pachymeres	+ 1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , 186	(Προέφημεν γάρ...)
	1 pl	<i>Historia brevis</i> , VI, 24, [in:] <i>Le version brève des Relations Historiques de Georges Pachymérés</i> , ed. A. FAILLER, vol. I, Paris 2001	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<b>Symeon of Thess.</b>	2 s	<i>Apologia de abitu ad Constantinopolim</i> , 5, 24–25, [in:] <i>Politico-Historical Works of Symeon Archbishop of Thessalonica (1416/17 to 1429)</i> , ed. D. BALFOUR, Wien 1979, p. 72	(ὡς προσέφη)
		ep. 5, 357, [in:] <i>Hagiou Symeon Thessalonikes 1416/1417–1429, erga theologika</i> , ed. D. BALFOUR, Thessalonike 1981	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
Manuel II	2 pl	ep. 2, 571; 6, 220	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
	1 s	<i>Dialogi cum mahometano</i> , 8 [in:] <i>Manuel II. Palaiologos. Dialoge mit einem "Perser"</i> , ed. E. TRAPP, Wien 1966, p. 100, 30	(ὡς δὴ προσέφη)
John Cananus	1 pl	<i>De Constantinopoli oppugnata</i> , v. 53, / <i>L'assedio di Costantinopoli</i> , ed. E. PINTO, Messina 1977	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
Ducas	2 pl	<i>Historia Turco-Byzantina</i> , 22, 11; 44, 3 [in:] ed. V. GRECU, București 1958	(καθὼς προσέφημεν)
<i>Actum Bessarionis</i>	1 pl	(a. 1500), 25 [in:] <i>Actes d'Iviron</i> , vol. IV, <i>De 1328 au début du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle</i> , ed. J. LEFORT et al., Paris 1995, p. 180	(ὄν ἀνωθεν προσέφημεν)
<i>Actum Joachim I</i>	1 pl	(a. 1501), 23, [in:] <i>Actes de Kattiumus</i> , ed. P. LEMERLE, Paris 1988, p. 163	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<i>Ekthesis chronica</i>	1 pl	48, 1, [in:] <i>Emperors, Patriarchs and Sultans of Constantinople, 1373–1513. An Anonymous Greek Chronicle of the Sixteenth Century</i> , ed. M. PHILIPPIDES, Brookline Mass. 1990	(ὡς προσέφημεν)
<b>Macarius Melissenus</b>	1 s	<i>Chronicon sive maius</i> , IV, 13 [in:] GEORGIOS SPHRANTZES, <i>Memorii, 1401–1477</i> , ed. V. GRECU, București 1966, p. 324, 18–19	(ὡς προσέφημεν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις βιβλίοις)

Table II (cont.)

anon.	2 pl 1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , I, 5; I, 11; ed. ut supra, p. 172, 5; 188, 21 <i>Actum falsum Isaaci et concilii Caryanum</i> , 24, [in:] <i>Actes de Docheiariou</i> , ed. N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, Paris 1984, p. 336 (cf. <i>ibidem</i> , 17)	(ὡς προσέφημεν) (ὡς προσέφημεν[εἰ])
<b>in total</b>	<b>88 s</b> <b>158 pl</b>		

Some of the passages from Irenaeus were repeated in catenae (f.ex. *Catena in epistulam Petri I / catena Andreae*, [in:] *Catena Graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. VIII, rec. J.A. CRAMER, Oxford 1840, p. 56, 9), by EPIPHANIUS OF SALAMIS in his *Panarion* (ed. K. HOLL, vol. I, Leipzig 1915, p. 406, 432, 434; vol. II, Leipzig 1922, p. 32) and by Theodoret of Cyrillus (*Erasmios*). There may have been 4 other plural instances of ὡς/καθὼς/προσέφημεν in *Adversus haereses* of IRENAEUS – the relevant parts survived, alas, only in a Latin translation (III, 12, 9; IV, 12, 1; IV, 34, 2; IV, 58, 5, ed. W. WIGAN HARVEY, vol. II, Cambridge 1857). In one of the sources cited by Epiphanius in *Panarion* the forms ὡς προσέφημεν and ὡς προσέφημεν occur divided by a few verses only (EPIPHANIUS, *Ancoratus und Panarion*, ed. K. HOLL, vol. III, Leipzig 1933, p. 270, 17 and 20).

JOHN OF DAMASCUS used the above-listed forms only twice, citing Philostorgius' *Historia ecclesiastica* in his *Passio magni martyris Artemii* – once in the singular (17, ὡς προσέφημεν), and once in the plural form (51, ὡς προσέφημεν) – ed. P.B. KOTTER, vol. V, Berlin–New York 1988 (cf. P. BATTIFOL, RQChA 3, 1889, p. 268, 274 – in this oldest reconstruction ὡς προσέφημεν is omitted on p. 268). It is interesting that no other source – witness of Philostorgius *HE* shows any quotations in which both forms would be attested; moreover, the above-mentioned two instances, differing in number, do not occur in any other work by John. One may well presume here the activity of a copyist or an editor of *Passio Artemii*. GEORGE CEDRENIUS used ὡς προσέφημεν (rec. I. BEKKER, vol. I, Bonnæ 1838, p. 604, 6), but in a quotation from Theophanes (AM 5943, p. 105, 3–4) and καθὼς προσέφημεν (p. 409, 2) in a quotation from George the Monk (*ut supra*).

\* \* \*

Cf. THEMISTUS, *In Aristotelis physica paraphrasis*, rec. H. SCHENKL, Berlin 1900, p. 140, 18–20; *Catena in Matthaeum* (e cod. Paris. Coislin. gr. 23), [in:] *Catenae...*, vol. I, rec. J.A. CRAMER, Oxford 1840, p. 171 with καθὼς/προσέφημεν omitted in one of the MS (*ibidem*, p. 489, 16) || JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *In Matthaeum*, hom. 68 [in:] PG 58, col. 634, 4–7; IDEM, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, [in:] PG 55, col. 190, 25; THEOCTISTUS THE STUDITE, *Canones in Athanasium*, II, 5; 3, 8, ed. E. APENTIOULIDOU-LEITGEB, Vienna 2008; THEODORET OF CYRRHUS, *Commentaria in Isaiam*, 8, 185, ed. J.-N. GUINOT; THEODORE THE STUDITE, poem 7 (ed. J.B. PITRA, Paris 1876); SYMEON THE NEW THEOLOGIAN, hymn 30, 283 (ed. A. KAMBYLIS, Berlin–New York 1976); EUSTATHIUS OF THESSALONICA, *Commentarii ad Homeri Illiadem* (ed. M. VAN DER VALK, vol. I, Leiden 1971, p. 633, 6), *Comm. ad Homeri Odysseam* (rec. G. STALLBAUM, vol. II, Lipsiae 1826, p. 253, 36), *Oratio* 4, 174 (ed. S. SCHÖNAUER, Frankfurt am Main 2006); GENNADIUS II, *Epitome primae partis Summae theologiae Thomae Aquinae*, III, 44, 20, eds. M. JÜGIE, L. PETIT & X.A. SIDERIDES, vol. V, Paris 1931; THEODORE AGALLIANUS, *Sermo duo apologeticus*, 261; 1213, [in:] Ch.G. PATRINELES, *O Theodoros Agallianos...* Athenai 1966; JOHN MAUROPOUS, 4, 9, *Canones in s. Nicolaum*, [in:] A.D. PANAGIOTOU, *Ho Ioannēs Mauropous hymnografos tou Hagiou Nikolaou*, Athēna 2008; IDEM, *Canones paraclētics*, I, 1, [in:] *Giovanni Mauropode, metropolita di Eucaita. Otto canoni paraclētics*, a cura di E. FOLLIERI, Roma 1967; BESSARION, *In calumniatorem Platonis*, I, 5; 2; IV, 2, 6, ed. L. MOHLER, vol. II, Paderborn 1927.

A few isolated instances have been omitted, e.g. 1 pl *Scholia recentiora in Aeschylum*, v. 225; 1 pl *Commentarium in librum Peri heurescos*, [in:] WALZ, *Rhet. gr.*, vol. VII, p. 839; 1 pl *Anonymous questions and answers on the interval signs*, VII, 298, ed. B. SCHARTAR, Vienna 1998, or *Epimerismi Homericis, pars prior*, 52f, ed. A.R. DYCK, Berlin 1983.

Pages are added in the bibliographical notes mainly if there is no other more precise identification of the loci, if the division of the source does not provide a quick reference to the passage, or if the identification in TLG is imprecise.

(valid for 18 October 2015, with 2420 authors included in TLG)

Thus the results, even if not entirely definitive, should not therefore change substantially in the future, and may serve as a basis for some valid conclusions. The extensive selection of the writings analysed below is meant to eliminate the danger of too narrow a sampling, which would make the figures in the *Chronographia* seem inflated. The authors have been arranged in a roughly chronological order, with different forms of clauses counted separately (first the singular, then the plural); the most notable examples are bolded. Note that the plural variant προέφημεν is also included.

\* \* \*

The forms that interest us here are attested in the works of ca. 100 authors from the classical (Hellenist) era up to the 16<sup>th</sup> cent., and although this number is in every respect relative (particularly because of the fragmentary state of preservation of the ancient and medieval Greek literature), observations relying on this list are not misleading. The phrase is present in every language register, from theological writings and hagiography through scientific treatises and historical narratives to magical spells (as exemplified by the curious Christian incantation from the 4<sup>th</sup> cent., written in scribbled cursive with Copticisms, devised in hope that God would stop supporting a certain Theodosius, ὅτι τηρανηκὸν ἔχει τὸν τρόπον Θεοδόσις)<sup>16</sup>. Whether used in a more metaphysical meaning or solely to refer to things mentioned earlier in the text, altogether it was not employed often – ca. 245 occurrences and, as above, ca. 100 authors out of ca. 2420 consulted. The plural and singular forms occur in the style of writers who originated from various parts of the Greek-speaking world and flourished in Constantinople, Egypt, Asia Minor or Italy.

Thus, the expressions with πρόφημι should be treated as rare, linked to the linguistic preferences of the respective authors (although they do not characterise the style itself in most cases, as only single occurrences may be found). However, since their first appearance at the turn of the eras, προέφην and προέφημεν remained intelligible in this function throughout the Byzantine times; even the plural form seemed much more natural than some archaising phrases with identical meaning. Thus e.g. the phrase ἦν ὃς δὴ καὶ πάλαι in the history of George Pachymeres<sup>17</sup> was changed to ὡς προέφημεν in a later, shorter and more comprehensible redaction

---

*Vita Stephani Sugdaitae*, Leontius of Damascus' *Vita Stephani Sabaitae*, Gregory's *Vita Theodoraе Thess.*, *Vita Theodoraе Theophili imp. uxoris*, Pseudo-Basil's *Vita Theodori Edessense*, *Vitae Theodori Studitae*, *Vita Theophanae*), but the survey included also some papyri available online, as well as the acts of *Concilium Quinisextum* (ed. H. OHME, Turnhout 2006), and writings of ANDREW OF CRETE (PG 97, col. 789–1444) etc.

<sup>16</sup> N° 16, in *Papyri Graecae magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, vol. 2, ed. K. PREISENDANZ & A. HENRICH, <sup>2</sup>Stuttgart 1974, p. 225.

<sup>17</sup> GEORGES PACHYMERES, *Relations Historiques*, VI, 24, ed. A. FAILLER, trans. V. LAURENT, vol. 1, Paris 1984, p. 613, 17.



of his account<sup>18</sup>. Despite its vernacular status, both in the early and in the late Byzantine period the plural form outnumbers the singular one.

It goes without saying that the vast majority of the Byzantine *literati* did not have *ὡς προέφην / προέφημεν* etc. in their active written vocabulary. One does not find a single occurrence in Neilus of Ancyra, Julian, Gregory Nazianzen, Procopius, Arethas, John Zonaras, Gemistus Pletho and many others, in all of John Chrysostom's works there are only two occurrences, and one more in *spuria*; two instances are to be found in Palamas, three in Photius. Among the authorities listed above, there are only very few historians, even in the broadest sense of the word (including authors who only occasionally wrote historical/semihistorical works throughout their lives or who shared historical interests): Palladius (1 s), John the Lydian (4 pl), the unknown author of the *Chronicon paschale* (1 s), George the Monk (1 pl), Photius (3 pl), Constantine VII (2 pl), Michael Attaleiates (3 pl), John Tzetzes (3 s, 3 pl), George Acropolites (1 s, 1 pl), Nicephorus Gregoras (1 s, 1 pl), the editor of Pachymeres (1 pl), John Cananus (1 pl), Ducas (2 pl), Macarius Melissenus (1 s, 2 pl), and the author of the *Ekthesis chronica* (1 pl). But four of them lived earlier than Theophanes, and none used the expression more frequently; indeed, single instances are predominant.

In the extant corpus of the ancient and medieval Greek literature there is a total of three notable exceptions that outnumber the 11 instances in the *Chronographia*: Justin Martyr (32 inst. – 17 s and 15 pl) – the early Christian apologist from the 2<sup>nd</sup> cent.; Neophytus the Recluse or Encleistus (15 inst. – 6 s and 9 pl) – the monastic authority from 12<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup> cent. Cyprus (died after 1214); and Nicholas of Otranto (13 inst. – 3 s and 10 pl) – Neophytus' contemporary and an abbot, under the name of Nectarius, of St Nicholas in Casole, Italy (died 1235). The frequency of occurrences in the works of the runners-up – Irenaeus (7 pl), John Scholasticus (1 s, 5 pl), John Tzetzes (as above), Theodore Meliteniotes (6 pl) – is substantially smaller. The distance in space and time between Justin, Theophanes, Neophytus and Nicholas needs no further stressing, and *προέφην / προέφημεν* stand out as characteristic of the style of the *Chronographia*; the relatively considerable frequency of the expressions (almost 4,5% of all occurrences in TLG) is an important argument for seeing an individual feature here. One may assume that if it was not for the character of the chronicle and the methods of its composition, the number of occurrences would be even higher.

Although it may sound tempting to investigate the stylistic inspirations of Theophanes, especially with regard to Justin, I shall refrain from such digressions here – let us make do with the assumption that they were probably rooted more in religious/theological literature than in historiography. However, the

<sup>18</sup> *Le version brève des Relations Historiques de Georges Pachymérés*, VI, 24, ed. A. FAILLER, vol. 1, Paris 2001.

cases of *Dialogus cum Tryphone* and both apologies<sup>19</sup> as well as the other above-mentioned works are helpful in highlighting another aspect of the specificity in Theophanes' usage of the phrases, namely the high degree of syntactic variety (different adverb, καί as a separator between the adverb and the verb), enriched by the variation between singular and plural. In the above list, some authors opened phrases of this kind with both ὡς and καθὼς, or with yet other adverbs/conjunctions (Irenaeus, Gregory of Nyssa, Pseudo-Caesarius, Maximus Confessor, Photius, Nicholas Mysticus, John of Sicily, Tzetzes, Neophytus the Recluse, cf. also Pseudo-Macarius); there are also some who in all probability were accustomed to both singular and plural forms (Justin, Gregory of Nyssa, Proclus, John Scholasticus, Nicholas Mysticus, Tzetzes, Neophytus, Nicholas of Otranto, George Acropolitae, George Metochites, Symeon of Thessalonica). If we combine both criteria, diversity is to be seen among all authors, even in the choice between the two most popular, basic phrases (ὡς προέφηρ and ὡς προέφημεν / -αμεν – many ancient and Byzantine *literati* chose but one of these), but Theophanes is the only writer who used the four combinations (ὡς προέφηρ, καθὼς καὶ προέφηρ, ὡς προέφημεν, καθὼς προέφημεν).

The history of the clauses and of the verb πρόφημι, the frequency of the phrases throughout the centuries, or the phraseological and syntactical connections are not to be analysed here. However, one cannot forget that the phrases surveyed here were at all times rare variants of much more abundant ones, built directly on the verb φημί. The reference to the clauses as ὡς ἔφηρ and ὡς ἔφημεν / -αμεν is of much more importance in the context of Theophanes' writings than, say, the genealogy of πρόφημι and the potential links with the noun προφήτης. It should be stressed, first of all, that although such clauses were highly frequent and relevant<sup>20</sup>, neither George Syncellus nor Theophanes used the forms ὡς ἔφηρ, ὡς ἔφημεν / -αμεν; they did not fit the eloquence of the former and the style of the latter (in the *Chronographia* προέφηρ and προέφημεν appear even in the recollections of the facts described relatively close in the scheme of *anni mundi*).

The absence of ὡς ἔφηρ and ὡς ἔφημεν / -αμεν gains more meaning when compared to the universality of their usage in ancient and Byzantine Greek. This is shown in the simplest form of presentation in the table below. It is meant only as a background for a more precise enumeration of ὡς προέφηρ, ὡς προέφημεν, etc., and it is less reliable; occurrences in TLG have been counted more mechanically and thoroughly cross-checked only in a few cases (Theon of Alexandria with

<sup>19</sup> JUSTIN is notable for the exceptional density of the parenthetical clauses that interest us here; sometimes they are found close to one another in the same passage or sentence (cf. ὡς προέφημεν and ὡς προεμηνύσαμεν in *Apology*, I, 54, 5).

<sup>20</sup> The close proximity of the forms is proved by their occasional exchange at the hands of the copyists of the MSS, sometimes in the early stage of the stemma (cf. *Passio magni martyris Artemii*, 51, [in:] *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 5, ed. P.B. KOTTER, Berlin–New York 1988, with swap from ὡς προέφημεν to ὡσπερ ἔφημεν, p. 231 in app.).

regard to Ptolemy, Scylitzes and Cedrenus, Andronicus Callistus and Michael Apostolius, or Cyril of Alexandria's abundant usage, etc.). Hence, there may be some doublet quotations. Phrases are included if they bear a parenthetical function, but there may also occur examples in which they are separate subordinate clauses, adverbial ones, conjunction phrases, discourse markers etc. On the other hand, only the most suitable variants have been selected, using more rigorous criteria; some forms similar to those that marginally occur in table II, as e.g.  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \xi\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu / -\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$ <sup>21</sup>, are omitted in order not to hinder the proper estimates.

Thus, while the previous table lists all the occurrences of  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\phi\eta\nu$  and  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu / -\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  in that type of clauses, the table below presents only  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta\nu$  (2663 occurrences) and  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu / -\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  (1389:  $\xi\phi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  x 818 and  $\xi\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$  x 571),  $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta\nu$  (only 37) and  $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu / -\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  (42:  $\xi\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$  x 22 and  $\xi\phi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  x 20), and, as only one example of a much broader group of related expressions,  $\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\ \xi\phi\eta\nu$  (237) and  $\acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\ \xi\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu / -\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  (132:  $\xi\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$  x 87 and  $\xi\phi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  x 45); direct speech and verbatim quotations are included. From the total number of 4500 instances<sup>22</sup>, ca. 95 singular instances and 200 plural ones are omitted: these are catenae, centons, anonymous scholiae, some identified cross-checked quotations and small fragments of spurious authorship. Occurrences are aggregated for the respective authors in the parentheses next to their names. The personages present in table II (so those who used also  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\phi\eta\nu / \pi\rho\acute{o}\epsilon\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ ) are underlined, and cases of special interest, i.e. mainly with numerous or idiosyncratic instances, are bolded. A dozen examples, mainly from the 9<sup>th</sup>–10<sup>th</sup> cent. and therefore the closest to the lifespan of George and Theophanes, are listed in detail below the table. To provide a transparent way of comparison, the results from tables II and III are juxtaposed in table IV, which summarises all results for the authors listed in table II.

Table III

(a / b)	( $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta\nu$ with $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta\nu / \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta(\alpha)\mu\epsilon\nu$ with $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta(\alpha)\mu\epsilon\nu$ )
(a+b / c+d)	( $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta\nu$ with $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta\nu + \acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\ \xi\phi\eta\nu / \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta(\alpha)\mu\epsilon\nu$ with $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \xi\phi\eta(\alpha)\mu\epsilon\nu + \acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\ \xi\phi\eta(\alpha)\mu\epsilon\nu$ )
~ 5 <sup>th</sup> – 1 <sup>st</sup> BC	
Empedocles of Acragas (1 / 0), Antiphron (0 / 1), Hippocrates + corp. (3 / 0), Plato (0 / 8), Aristotle + corp. (1 / 4+3), Diocles (4 / 0), Asclepiades (1 / 1), Heraclides Ponticus (1 / 0), Theophrastus (2 / 1), Euclid (0 / 2), Philochorus of Athens (0 / 1), Erasistratus (1 / 0), Archimedes (0 / 1), Chrysiptus (8 / 0), Aristophanes of Byzantium (0 / 0+1), Attalus of Rhodes (1 / 0), Hipparchus of Nicaea (1 / 1), Agatharchides of Cnidus (0 / 1), Artemidorus (1 / 0), Posidonius of Apamea (2+1 / 0+2), <i>Peri homoion kai diaphoron lexeon</i> (1 / 0), Philodemus (1 / 0), Nicholas of Damascus (1 / 0), Diodorus Siculus (0 / 0+1), Dionysius of Halicarnas ( <u>2+45 / 2</u> ), Strabo ( <u>8+1 / 3+3</u> ), Anubion (0+1 / 0)	
<b>total: (40+48 / 26+10)   88 s / 36 pl</b>	

<sup>21</sup> And, consistently, more elaborate versions like e.g.  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \mu\iota\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\ \pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\ \xi\phi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$  ANDREW OF CRETE'S *In exaltationem venerandae crucis* [= or. XI], PG 97, col. 1037a.

<sup>22</sup> Mainly from TLG, supplemented with works mentioned in n. 14.

~ 1<sup>st</sup> – 3<sup>rd</sup> AD

Philo of Alexandria (44+4 / 0), Demetrius Rhetor (1 / 0), Rufus of Ephesus (0 / 2), Aelius Theon (0 / 2), Nicomachus of Gerasa (1 / 1), Cornutus (1 / 0), *Vita Adam et Evae* (1 / 0), Soranus (2 / 0), Flavius Joseph (13+2 / 7), Sextus Empiricus (14 / 0), Theon of Smyrna (0 / 3), Plutarch (5+3 / 0), Gaius Suetonius (0 / 1), Dio Chrysostom (8 / 0), Aspasia (1 / 4+1), Elius Aristides (8+12 / 0), Archigenes (0 / 1), Justin the Martyr (2 / 1), Ps.-Justin (2+1 / 0), Phlegon of Tralles (0 / 0+1), Rufus of Perinthus (0 / 0+1), Claudius Ptolemy (3 / 58), Albinus of Smyrna (0 / 1), Antigonos of Nicaea (1 / 0), Athenagoras of Athens (1 / 0), *Epistula ad Diognetum* (1 / 0), *Epistulae Themistoclis* (0+2 / 0), Hierocles (2 / 0), Achilles Tatius (4 / 0), Oenomaus (1 / 0), Papias (1 / 0), Apolonius Dyscolus (3 / 36), *Phalaridis epistulae* (1 / 0), Timaeus the Sophist (0 / 1), Lucian (12+6 / 0), Irenaeus of Lyons (0 / 1), Galen (ca. 370+10 / 15), Pseudo-Galen (7+2 / 3), Aelius Herodianus (0 / 3), Marcus Aurelius (1 / 0), Hermogenes of Tarsus (9+4 / 6), Clement of Alexandria (1+1 / 3), Ps.-Longinus (9 / 0), Athenaeus (4 / 0), Cassius Dio (4 / 2), Origen (2 / 1), Alexander of Aphrodisias (12 / 23), Sextus Empiricus (14 / 1), Philostratus (6 / 0), Heliodorus (1 / 0), Gaius the Roman (1 / 0), Porphyrius of Tyre (2 / 10+1), Gregory the Wonderworker (2 / 0), Clementina (25 / 2), *Corpus Hermeticum* (3 / 0), Aristides Quintilianus (7 / 0), *Martyrium Carpi, Papyli et Agathonicae* (1 / 0), Hippolytus of Rome (12 / 0), Achilles Tatius (1 / 0), Herodianus (2 / 0), Eutecnius (0+1 / 1), Dionysius Cassius Longinus (1 / 0), Diophantus (0 / 1), Plotinus (0 / 1), Methodius of Olympus (16 / 0), Cassius the Iatrosophist (0 / 10)

**total: (646+48 / 201+4) | 694 s / 205 pl**

4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> AD

Ulpian of Antioch (2 / 0), Menander the Rhetor (1+1 / 4+1), Jamblichus (0 / 4), Sopater (4 / 4), Eustathius of Antioch (2 / 0), Julian Arianus (2 / 0), Historia Alexandri (ε) – rec. byz. poetica (2+1 / 0), Eusebius of Caesarea (44+4 / 2), Libanius (7 / 0), Julian the Apostate (4 / 0), Basil of Ancyra (0+2 / 0), Themistius (4+15 / 5+2), Athanasius of Alexandria (8 / 0), Basil of Caesarea (6+1 / 4+2), Ephrem the Syrian (6 / 0), Gregory of Nyssa (1 / 7), Gregory Nazianzen (3+1 / 0+1), Severian of Gabala (2 / 0), Oribasius (12+1 / 1), Nemesius of Emesa (0 / 3), Marcellus of Ancyra (4 / 1), Eutropius (1 / 0), Hephaestion of Thebes (7 / 2), Ammon (1 / 0), Cyril of Jerusalem (2 / 0), Diodorus of Tarsus (0 / 1), Didymus the Blind (1 / 7), Pappus of Alexandria (1 / 2), Theon of Alexandria (2 / 188), Epiphanius of Salamis (90 / 7), John Chrysostom (19+12 / 0), Eunapius of Sardis (0 / 1+1), Macarius Magnes (3 / 0), John Stobaeus (2+1 / 2), Theodore of Mopsuestia (10 / 0), Syrianus (0 / 15), Pseudo-Martyrius (0+1 / 0), Theodosius of Alexandria (0 / 1+1), Isidorus of Pelusium (2 / 0), Concilium Ephesenum (112+2 / 10), Cyril of Alexandria (652[662]+7 / 9), Socrates Scholasticus (26+1 / 2+1), Basil of Seleucia (3 / 0), Theodoret of Cyrrhus (47 / 2), Concilium Chalcedonense (6 / 4), Vita Alexandri hegumeni (1 / 0), Lachares (0 / 1), Hierocles (1 / 3), Diadochus of Photice (12 / 0), Genadius I (1 / 0), Proclus of Athens (15+9 / 7+3), Marinus (3+1 / 0), Ammonius (0 / 3), John of Caesarea (3 / 0), Damascius (0 / 1), Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite (6 / 0), Aetius of Amida (3 / 0), Sergius' *Vita Marciani Oeconomi* (0 / 1), Olympiodorus the Deacon (6 / 5+1), Procopius of Gaza (0 / 2), Pseudo-Gelasius (0 / 0+1), Pseudo-Caesarius (1 / 0), Anthemius of Tralles (1 / 0), Choricus of Gaza (1+1 / 0), Cosmas Indicopleustes (1 / 0), Leontius of Jerusalem (1 / 0), John Scholasticus (5 / 6), John the Lydian (19+1 / 3), *Vita Marcelli Acoemetae* (0 / 1), Evagrius Scholasticus (1+2 / 2), Simplicius (2 / 8), \*Justinian I (6 / 0), Olympiodorus of Alexandria (2 / 2), David the Philosopher (0 / 4), John Philoponus (3 / 10), Pamphilus the Theologian (perhaps identical with Pamphilus of Jerusalem, cf. above, 1 / 0), Alexander of Tralles (0 / 1), Eustratius (1 / 0), John Moschus (2 / 0), Pseudo-Hermippus (0 / 7), *Vita Symeonis Stylitae iun.* (0 / 1)

**total: (1199+64 / 356+14) | 1263 s / 370 pl**

Table III (cont.)

7<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup> AD

Stephen of Alexandria (3+1 / 1+1), Antiochus Pandectes (0 / 1), Paul of Aegina (5 / 2), John I of Thessalonica (3 / 0), Sophronius of Jerusalem (5 / 6), *Concilium 649* (3 / 1), *Chronicon paschale* (3 / 1), Theodore of Raithou (0 / 2+1), Maximus the Confessor (45 / 1), Trichas (0 / 17), *Concilium Constantinopolitanum III* (1 / 1+1), *Doctrina Patrum* (6 / 0), *Vitae Alypii Stylitae* (0 / 2+1), *Miracula sancti Demetrii* (0 / 3), *Miracula sancti Artemii* (0 / 1), Gregory of Acragas (0 / 1), Pseudo-David / Pseudo-Elias (0 / 1), ?Leontius Mechanicus (0 / 3), Germanus I (0 / 1+2), Andrew of Crete (2+1 / 3), John of Damascus (15 / 9), Theophilus of Edessa [*De rebus praesertim bellicis*] (0 / 1), Stephen the Deacon (1 / 1), Nicephorus I (2 / 1), George Choeroboscus (0 / 1 [in quotation]), Theognostus (0 / 1), Leontius of Damascus (1 / 0+1), Theodore the Studite (1 / 0), Ignace the Deacon (2 / 0), Michael Syncellus (0 / 1), Methodius of Constantinople (5 / 9+5), Euodius (1 / 0), John of Sardis (3 / 2), *Hippiatrica* (1 / 2), *Vita Theophylacti Nicomediensis* (1 / 0), Saba, *Vita Ioannicii* (5 / 0), Saba, *Vita Petri Atroatae* (3 / 1), *Vita et miracula Petri Atroatae* (3 / 1), *Theophanes Continuatus* (0 / 2), *Passio sancti Georgii* (Ath. 343, Vat. Pal. 205) (1 / 0), *Vita Athanasiae Aeginetae* (0 / 1), *Vita Michaelis Syncelli* (0 / 2), Michael The Monk, *Vita Theodori Studitae* (1 / 0), *Vita Eliae spelaioatae* (1 / 0), *Vita Theodoraе imperatricis* (0 / 1), Sophronius I of Alexandria (1 / 3), George the Monk (15 / 0), ?Paul of Nicaea (0 / 1), Photius (18+3 / 34+18), Peter of Sicily (1 / 0), John Syncellus / *De sacris imaginibus contra Constantinum Cabalinum* (1 / 0), *Scripta anonyma adversus judaeos* (4 / 13), Nicetas the Teacher (2 / 3+1), Nicetas David Paphlagon (0 / 3), Peter of Argos (1 / 0), *Basilica & Ecloga Basilicarum* + scholia (3 / 5), Leo VI the Wise (3 [Nov. 94 + 2x in hom.] + 8 [Nov. 5, 23, 25, 40, 60, 97 + 2x in hom.] / 2 [Nov. 29, 33] + 3 [Nov. 19, 93, 95]), Leo Choerosphactes (1 / 0), Nicholas I Mysticus (1+2 / 2+3), Euthymius I of Constantinople (2 / 6), Arethas of Caesarea (0 / 5+1), Theodore Daphnopates (1 / 3), John Cameniates (1 / 1), Theodore of Nicaea (1 / 0), Professor Anonymus (0 / 1), Constantine VII (2 / 7+2), Leo of the *Vita Theodori Cytherii* (0 / 2), *Vita Pauli iunioris* (0 / 0+3) *Sylloge tacticorum* (9 / 21+2), Symeon Eulabes or the Studite (0 / 1), *De velitatione bellica* (2 / 9), Symeon Metaphrastes (0+1 / 1+2), Leo the Deacon (2 / 0), *Digenis Acritas* (2 / 0), *Martyrium Sebastianae* (1 / 0), *Vita Lazari* (1+1 / 0), *Passio anonyma XLII martyrum Amoriensum* (2+1 / 0+2), *Laudatio seu passio s. Jacobi Zebedaei* (0 / 0+1), John of Sicily (10+1 / 1), Philetus of Tarsus (1 / 0), John Doxopatres (0 / 3 [at least 2 in quot.]), Symeon the New Theologian (3 / 8), Michael Psellus (4 / 3), Nicetas Stethatus (1 / 1), John Scylitzes + *Scyl. Cont.* (0 / 5), Christopher of Mytilene (1 / 1), Michael Cerularius, sp. (0 / 2), Symeon Seth (0 / 2), Michael of Ephesus (0 / 3), John Mauropous (0 / 1), Michael Attaleiates (0 / 1)

**total: (221+19 / 241+50) | 240 s / 291 pl**

12<sup>th</sup> – 16<sup>th</sup> AD

Isaac Comnenus (1 / 1), Eustratius of Nicaea (0 / 2), Theophylact of Ohrid (3 / 1), Anna Comnena (4 / 3+1), Nicephorus Bryennius (1 / 0), Theodore Prodromus (3 / 3), Nicetas Seides (4 / 1), John Cedrenus (8 / 3 – mostly rewritten from his sources), Michael Glycas (0 / 22), Nicetas of Maroneia (0 / 4), Theorianus (3 / 0), Philagathus Cerameus (3 / 0), *Timarion* (1 / 0), Anacharsis/Ananias (0 / 1), Gregory Pardus (1 / 1), John Zonaras (0 / 1), Nicetas Eugenianus (1 / 0), Nicholas of Methone (0 / 1), John Tzetzes (45+3 / 14+6), Isaac Tzetzes (5 / 0), John Cinnamus (0+7 / 1), Eustathius of Thessalonica (0 / 11), Theodora Raulaina (3 / 0), Euthymius Malaces (1 / 0), Neophytus the Recluse (1 / 8+1), Nicephorus Chrysoberges (0 / 2), Nicholas of Otranto (3 / 9), Michael Choniates (4 / 0), Nicetas Choniates (6 / 2), Theodosius Gudeles (1 / 1), Neilus of Thamasia (0 / 1), Nicephorus Blemmydes (2 / 2+2), Demetrius Chomatenus (0 / 1), Germanus II (0 / 1), Manuel Gabalas (1+1 / 0), *Vita Naumi Ohridense* (0 / 1), *Vita Bartholomei Simeritae* (0 / 2), Andreas Libadenus (0+1 / 0), Theodore II Ducas Lascaris (2 / 4), Joel the Chronographer (0 / 1), George Acropolis (11 / 9+1), Constantine Meliteniotes (3 / 0), Maximus Planudes (11 / 18), George Metochites (1 / 4), John XI Beccus (5+1 / 8),

Gregory II of Cyprus (0 / 1+1), George Moschamper (2 / 8), Athanasius I of Constantinople (**14 / 0**), George Pachymeres (0 / 4), John Pediasimus (0 / 2), Manuel Bryennius (0 / 3), Constantine Acropolitēs (6 / 0), Nicephorus Chumnus (2 / 1), Irene Chumnaena (1 / 0), John Actuarius (1 / 0), Theodore Metochites (**42 / 7**), Joseph Rhacendythes (0 / 3), Constantine Lucites (0 / 0+1), Matthew Blastares (0 / 1), Nicephorus Callistes Xanthopulus (5+1 / 6+2), Gregory Sinaites (1 / 0), Ephrem of Ainus (**34 / 2**), Issac Argyrus (1 / 0), Theoctistus the Studite (2 / 6), Theodore Dexius (**1 / 15+3**), Gregory Acindynus (**16 / 1**), Gregory Palamas (8 / 6+1), David Dishypatus (3 / 1), Schol. coll. Marc. in Dionysii Thracis (0 / 1), Joseph Calothetus (3+1 / 1), Michael Gabras (**13 / 0**), Thomas Magister (0 / 7), Nicephorus Gregoras (**8 / 23**), Registrum Patr. Const. (0 / 5), John VI Cantacuzenus (**3+6 / 7+19**), Constantine Harmenopulus (0 / 1), Nicholas Artabasds Rhabdas (0 / 2), Isidore Glabas (0 / 5), Nilus Cabasilas (0 / 1), Demetrius Cydones (2 / 3), Prochorus Cydones (1 / 0), Callistus I (4 / 7+1), Philotheus Coccinus (**32+1 / 6+2**), John Cyparissiotēs (+sp.) (1+1 / 1), Theodore Meliteniotes (**0 / 26+3**), Nicetas Myrsiniotes (0 / 1), George of Pelagonia (1 / 1), Theophanes III of Nicaea (5 / 0), Callistus Angelicudes (2 / 3+1), editor of Pachymeres (**0 / 20+1**), Manuel Chrysoloras (1 / 1), Symeon of Thessalonica (0 / 7), Vita Athanasii Methēoritae (2 / 3), Vita Oppiani Anazarbensis (0 / 1), De planetae (0 / 5), Manuel Calecas (8+1 / 0), Manuel II (2+1 / 0), John Anagnostes (1 / 1), John Eugenicus (4 / 0), Joasaph of Ephesus (0+1 / 1), John Doceianus (1 / 0), John Chortasmenus (0+1 / 0), Concilium Florentinum (0 / 7), Mark Eugenicus (0 / 2), Constantine XI (0 / 2), Thomas Palaeologus (0 / 2), Andreas Chrysoberges (0 / 1), Silvester Syropulus (1+1 / 1), George Gemistus Pletho (0+1 / 3), Laonicus Chalcocondyles (1 / 0), Gennadius II Scholarius (3+1 / 1+2), Theodore Agallianus (2 / 1), Michael Critobulus (2 / 0), Bessarion (1 / 0), George of Trebizond (0 / 2), Theodore Gazes (2 / 1), John Argyropulus (2 / 1), Michael Apostolius (5+1 / 1), Ducas (0 / 2), Pseudo-Sphrantzes (0 / 3)

**total: (507+31 / 381+48) | 538 s / 429 pl**

documents from Athonite monasteries (8+2 / 24), typica (8 / 10)

**total above: (2629+212 / 1239+126) | 2841 s / 1365 pl**

**valid for 18 October 2015, with 2420 authors included in TLG**

<i>Vita Alypii Stylitae</i> <sub>2</sub>	2 pl	<i>Vita altera</i> , 13; 24, [in:] H. DELEHAYE, <i>Les saints stylites</i> , Bruxelles 1923	(ὡς ἔφημεν)
<i>Laudatio Alypii Styl.</i>	1 pl	11, [in:] ut supra	(ὥσπερ ἔφημεν)
Stephen the Deacon	1 s	<i>Vita Stephani iun.</i> , 2, ed. M.-F. AUZÉPY, <i>La Vie d'Étienne le Jeune par Étienne le Diacre</i> , Aldershot–Brookfield 1997	(ὡς ἔφηγν)
Nicephorus I	1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , 7	(ὡς ἔφαμεν)
Theognostus	2 s	<i>Eusebii Caesariensis confutatio</i> , 66, 151 & 172, [in:] J.B. PRTRA, S. Nicephori Antirrheticus lib. IV, <i>Spicilegium Solesmense</i> 1, Paris 1852	(ὡς ἔφηγν)
Leontius of Damascus	1 pl	<i>Pseudo-Epiphani sive Epiphaniidis confutatio</i> , 14, ed. ut supra	(ὡς ἔφημεν)
Theodore the Studite	1 pl	<i>De orthographia</i> , 4, [in:] <i>Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptoris bibliothecarum Oxoniensium</i> , ed. J.A. CRAMER, vol. II, Oxford 1835	(ὡς ἔφαμεν)
Michael Syncellus	1 s	<i>Vita Stephani sabaitae</i> , 40, [in:] A.ASS Jul. III (1867)	(ὡς ἔφηγν)
Methodius	1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , 12	(ὥσπερ ἔφαμεν)
	1 s	ep. 383, 52, rec. G. FAROUROS, vol. II, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 1992	(ὡς ἔφηγν)
	1 pl	<i>Peri tes tou logou syntaxeos</i> , 15, [in:] <i>Le traité de la construction de la phrase de Michel le Syncelle</i> , ed. D. DONNET, Bruxelles 1982	(ὡς ἔφαμεν)
	5 s	<i>Vita Euthymii Sardiani</i> , 2, 21; 13, 258	(ὡς ἔφηγν)
	1 pl	<i>Encomium in sanctam Agatham</i> , 1; 5, 16; ed. ut supra	(ὡς ἔφημεν)
	+6 pl	<i>Vita Theophanis Confessoris</i> , 21, [in:] <i>Mefodija patriarcha K-poljskogo Žitije prep. Feofana Isprovednika</i> , wyd. V.V. LATYŠEV, St-Peterburg 1918	(ὡς ἀνωθεν ἔφημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , 57	(ὡς ἔφημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>Vita Euthymii Sardiani</i> , 26, 531; 33, 679; 46, 941, ed. ut supra	(ὡς ἔφαμεν)
	+1 pl	<i>Encomium in sanctam Agatham</i> , 32, ed. E. MIONI, AB 68, 1950	(καθὼς ἔφημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>Vita Theophanis Confessoris</i> , 18	(ὥσπερ ἔφημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>Vita Euthymii Sardiani</i> , 35, 745	(ὥσπερ ἔφημεν)
	+1 pl	<i>Vita Euthymii Sardiani</i> , 24, 485	(ὥσπερ ἔφαμεν)
	+4 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , 25, 514–515	
		<i>Vita Theophanis Confessoris</i> , 5; 45; 51	

Ignace the Deacon	3 s	<i>Vita Nicephori</i> , 69, [in:] <i>Nicephori patriarchae C-politani opuscula historica</i> , rec. C. DE BOOR, Lipsiae 1880 <i>Vita Tarasii</i> , 22; 35, ed. I.A. HEIKEL, Helsingfors 1891	(ὡς ἔφη)ν
Euodius	1 s	<i>Vita martyrum quadraginta duo Amoriensium</i> , 35, wyd. V. VASILJEVSKIJ & P. NIKITIN, Sankt-Peterburg 1905	(ὡς ἔφη)ν :oratio recta)
Saba	5 s	<i>Vita Ioannicii</i> , 22, AASS, Nov. 2.1, 3, 9, 24, 45, 48	(ὡς ἔφη)ν
	3 s	<i>Vita Petri Alroatae</i> , / <i>La Vie merveilleuse de saint Pierre d'Alroa</i> , 4, 22; 82, 2; 82, 9, ed. V. LAURENT, Bruxelles 1956	(ὡς ἔφη)ν
	+1 pl	52, 37	(ὡς ἔφη)μεν)
<i>Miracula Petri Atr.</i>	3 s	94, 106, 110, ed. V. LAURENT, <i>Subsidia hagiographica</i> 31, 1958	(ὡς ἔφη)ν
	+1 pl	96, 3	(ὡς ἔφη)μεν)
<i>Vita Theophylacti</i>	1 s	7, [in:] BHG 2452	(ὡς ἔφη)ν
<i>Vita Athanasiae</i>	1 pl	L. CARRAS, <i>The Life of St Athanasia of Aegina: A Critical Edition with Introduction</i> , 18, 3, [in:] <i>Maistor...</i> , cf. ut supra	(ὡς ἔφη)μεν)
<i>Vita Michaelis Sync.</i>	1 pl	2, M. CUNNINGHAM, <i>The life of Michael the Synkellos</i> , Belfast 1991, p. 46	(καθὼς ἔφη)μεν)
	+1 pl	<i>ibidem</i> , 24, p. 98	(καθὼς ἔφα)μεν)
Michael the Monk	1 s	<i>Vita Theodori Studitae</i> , 56, [in:] PG 99, p. 313	(ὡς ἔφη)ν
<i>Vita Theodorae imp.</i>	1 pl	10, ed. A. MARKOPOULOS, <i>Symmeiktia</i> 5, 1983, p. 267	(ὡς ἔφη)μεν)
<i>Vita Eliae spelaiotae</i>	1 s	76, [in:] AASS Sept. III	(ὡς ἔφη)ν
<i>Vita Pauli iun.</i>	3 pl	18; 19; 23, ed. H. DELEHAYE, Berlin 1913	(ὡ)στερ ἔφη)μεν)
Leo	2 pl	<i>Vita Theodori Cytherii</i> , 2; 4, ed. N. OIKONOMIDES, <i>Praktika tritou panioniou synedriou</i> , Athenai 1967	(ὡς ἔφη)μεν)
Pseudo-Basil	1 s	<i>Žitie iže vo sv. otca našego Feodora archiepiskopa Edesskogo</i> , 96, ed. I. POMIALOVSKIJ, Sankt-Peterburg 1892	(ὡς ἔφη)ν :oratio recta)
Nicetas the Teacher	2 s	<i>Confutatio falsi libri, quem scripsit Mohamedes Arabs</i> , 21, 7, 165 & 171, [in:] K. FÖRSTEL, <i>Schriften zum Islam</i> , Würzburg 2000	(ὡς ἔφη)ν



Table IV

* some numbers in columns 2 and 4 should be treated as approximate	1. ὡς προ- έφηγ and similar	2. ὡς/καθὼς ἔφηγ + ὡσπερ ἔφηγ	3. ὡς προέφημεν and similar	4. ὡς/καθὼς ἔφη(α)μεν + ὡσπερ ἔφη(α)μεν
Arius Didymus	1	–	–	–
Nicomachus	–	1	2	1
Justin Martyr	17	2	15	1
Irenaeus of Lyons	–	–	6 or 7	1
Galen	1	ca. 370 + 10	–	15
<i>Clementina</i>	1	25	–	2
<i>Hist. Alexandri</i> (ε)	2	2 + 1	1	–
Basil of Caesarea	1	6 + 1	–	4 + 2
Ps.-Ephrem of Chersonesus	–	–	3	–
Gregory of Nyssa	2	1	3	7
Evagrius Ponticus	–	–	1	–
Ps.-Athanasius	–	–	1	–
Epiphanius of Salamis	–	90	2 (in quot.)	7
John Chrysostom	2	19 + 12	–	–
Ps.-Macarius	–	–	4	–
John Stobaeus	1	2 + 1	1	2
Palladius	1	–	–	–
Philostorgius	1	–	1	–
Eutyches	1	–	–	–
<i>Vita Alexandri hegumeni</i>	–	1	1	–
Diadochus of Photice	1	12	–	–
Gennadius I	1	1	1	–
Proclus of Athens	1	15 + 9	1	7 + 3
anon. papyr. mag.	1	–	–	–
Procopius of Gaza	–	–	–	2
Pseudo-Gelasius	1	–	–	0 + 1
Ps.-Caesarius	4	1	–	–
John Scholasticus	1	5	5	6
John the Lydian	–	19 + 1	4	3
Abraham of Ephesus	–	–	1	–
Fl. Phoebammon	1	–	–	–
<i>Chronicon paschale</i>	1	3	–	1

* some numbers in columns 2 and 4 should be treated as approximate	1. ὡς προ- έφηγν and similar	2. ὡς/καθὼς έφηγν + ὡσπερ έφηγν	3. ὡς προέφημεν and similar	4. ὡς/καθὼς έφη(α)μεν + ὡσπερ έφη(α)μεν
John Climacus	–	–	1	–
Maximus Confessor	4	45	–	1
<i>Vita Alypii Stylitae</i> <sub>1</sub>	–	–	1	2 + 1
Pamphilus of Jerusalem	(1?)	(1?)	1	–
Tarasius I	1	–	–	–
<b>George Syncellus</b>	–	–	–	–
<b>Theophanes</b>	6	–	5	–
George Choeroboscus	–	–	1	1 (in quot.)
Michael Syncellus	–	–	2	1
<i>Vita Nicephori Medicii</i>	–	–	1	–
Methodius I	–	5	1	9 + 5
<i>Vita Andreae in trib.</i>	1	–	–	–
Saba ( <i>Vita Ioannicii</i> )	1	5	–	–
Saba ( <i>Vita Petri Atroatae</i> )	1	3	–	1
<i>Vita Athanasiae</i>	–	–	1	1
George the Monk	–	15	1	–
?Paul of Nicaea	1	–	–	1
Photius I	–	18 + 3	3	34 + 18
Nicholas Mysticus	1	1 + 2	4	2 + 3
Basil	–	–	1	–
Constantine VII	–	2	2	7 + 2
Pseudo-Heron	–	–	1	–
Nicephorus ( <i>Vita s. Andreae</i> )	2	–	–	–
<i>Vita Pauli iun.</i>	–	–	1	0 + 3
<i>De velitatione bellica</i>	–	2	1	9
<i>Digenis Acritas</i>	1	2	–	–
John of Sicily	2	10 + 1	–	1
Michael Cerularius	–	–	1	2
Michael Attaleiates	–	–	3	1
<i>Vita Niconis</i>	–	–	2	–
Christodulos	–	–	4	–
<i>Vita Phantini iun.</i>	1	–	–	–
<i>Translatio Nicolai</i>	–	–	1	–

Table IV (cont.)

* some numbers in columns 2 and 4 should be treated as approximate	1. ὡς προ- έφηγν and similar	2. ὡς/καθὼς ἔφηγν + ὡσπερ ἔφηγν	3. ὡς προέφημεν and similar	4. ὡς/καθὼς ἔφη(α)μεν + ὡσπερ ἔφη(α)μεν
John Tzetzes	3	45 + 3	3	14 + 6
Eustathius of Thessalonica	–	–	1	11
Neophytus the Recluse	6	1	9	8 + 1
Nicholas of Otranto	3	3	10	9
Manuel Holobolus	1	–	–	–
Andrew Libadenus	1	0 + 1	–	–
George Acropolites	1	11	1	9 + 1
Constantine Meliteniotes	2	3	–	–
Maximus Planudes	–	11	1	18
George Metochites	1	1	2	4
Gregory Acindynus	–	16	1	1
Gregory Palamas	1	8	1	6+1
David Dishypatus	–	3	3	1
<i>Schol. coll. Marciana</i>	–	–	2	1
Thomas Magister	–	–	2	7
Nicephorus Gregoras	1	8	1	23
Philotheus Coccinus	1	32 + 1	–	6 + 2
John Cyparissiotis, (+sp.)	–	1	1	1 + 1
Theodore Meliteniotes	–	–	6	26 + 3
Callistus Angelicudes	–	2	2	3 + 1
editor of Pachymeres	–	–	1	20 + 1
Symeon of Thessalonica	2	–	2	7
Manuel II	1	2 + 1	–	–
John Cananus	–	–	1	–
Ducas	–	–	2	2
Sphrantzes/Melissenus	1	–	2	3
<i>Ekthesis chronica</i>	–	–	1	–

Once again, the historical development and popularity of the phrases throughout the respective periods, as well as their presence in formal, archaising and vernacular language will not be treated here at length, and no sine wave of their frequency will be drawn below, even though such a presentation would bring forth some interesting data (tendencies in the singular/plural etc.). Overall, one may notice the rarity of the phrases with καθώς (79 in total, cf. 17 + προέφη-ην / προέφημεν / -αμεν), but generally ως ἔφη and ως ἔφημεν / -αμεν are undeniably frequent: despite the elimination of some potentially suitable examples, a total of 4500 occurrences with the second aorist of φημί is almost nineteen times as many as the alternative expressions with the second aorist of πρόφημι (total 246).

The earlier observations now become more expressive and distinctive. Firstly, the phrases pervade different literary styles, genres and fields of writing; secondly, they reveal individual characteristics, due to the frequency noticeable here on a large scale. There was a group of authors who applied diverse phrases in all or almost all of their variants in their texts (Flavius Joseph, Galen, Themistius, Socrates Scholasticus, Proclus of Athens, Photius, John Tzetzes, John VI Cantacuzenus, Philotheus Coccinus). Some others used only the basic, most standard versions, yet they did it often, and either the singular or the plural forms prevail (Dionysius of Halicarnas, Strabo, Claudius Ptolemy, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theon of Alexandria, Epiphanius of Salamis, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, John the Lydian, John of Sicily, George Acropolites, Theodore Metochites, Nicephorus Gregoras, Ephrem of Ainus, Theodore Dexius, Gregory Acindynus). Others, in spite of employing the clauses frequently, used consistently only one grammatical number (Philo of Alexandria, Methodius of Olympus, John Chrysostom, Diadochus of Photice, Syrianus, Maximus the Confessor, Trichas, George the Monk, Michael Glycas, patriarch Athanasius I, Michael Gabras, Theodore Meliteniotes). These are just the cases that particularly rivet our attention in terms of numbers, but the majority of the authors from table III could be said to fall into this pattern. A few writers are unrivalled as regards the frequency of the phrase, as e.g. Cyril of Alexandria (662 occurrences in TLG including only 10 repeated verbatim more than once, and 652 original, often preceded by γάρ) or another Alexandrian, Theon (188 unrepeated plural instances).

Obviously, many ancient and Byzantine *literati* who did not employ ως προέφη-ην, ως προέφημεν, etc. in their works knew and repeatedly wrote structures like ως ἔφη and ως ἔφημεν / -αμεν, exactly the contrary to what the author of the *Chronographia* did (e.g. Plato, Aristotle, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Philo, Plutarch, Eusebius of Caesarea, Libanius, Julian, Gregory Nazianzen, Themistius, Theon of Alexandria, Socrates Scholasticus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Evagrius Scholasticus, Stephen of Alexandria, Paul of Egina, Trichas, Theodore the Studite, Ignace the Deacon, patriarch Euthymius I, Arethas of Caesarea, Symeon the New Theologian, Anna Comnena, Michael Glycas, Athanasius I of Constantinople, John XI Beccus, John Cantacuzenus, Ephrem of Ainus and dozens of others). The view is slightly less transparent because the general statistics and proportions between

phrases with φημί and πρόφημι are not reflected in the individual cases. Nevertheless, one glance at table IV is enough to see that the expressions ὡς ἔφην and ὡς ἔφημεν / -αμεν are not always predominant in the respective cases, or that the numbers are closer or present a more balanced proportion in the case of ὡς προέφην, ὡς προέφημεν / -αμεν, as e.g. in Justin, Gregory of Nyssa, Nicholas Mysticus, Neophytus, or George Metochites.

The examples from the 7<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> cent., attest to the diversity during the period in which Theophanes was active. They reveal that the literature of that time, including hagiography, did not follow one established way of expression, either plural or singular. They also provide some important cases of ecclesiastic authorities who flourished roughly or exactly in the years when the *Chronographia* was finished, and who also used various forms (Methodius, Saba, Nicephorus).

Finally, table IV encapsulates the tendencies of diversity and individualism with regard to all the discussed phrases – even if columns 1+3 and 2+4 cannot be compared automatically (with only ὡς..., καθὼς..., ὥσπερ... in the latter), and even if some aspects of the variety remain unreflected (neither of the tables distinguishes the first person endings in the plural). To sum up, it is unnecessary to presume different hands or collective authorship where both plural and singular forms intertwine – the table shows nearly 45 examples of this kind, many of which include no or almost no quotations or passages copied from elsewhere and thus belonging to a different style. The use of a few various forms, both such built on φημί and πρόφημι, with an identical or similar function in the sentence was not isolated and had all the hallmarks of originality and individualism (cf. above all Galen, Justin, Basil of Caesarea, John the Lydian, Maximus Confessor, John of Damascus, Methodius I, Photius, Nicholas Mysticus, John Tzetzes, Neophytus the Recluse, Nicholas of Otranto, Philotheus Coccinus). Both situations might sometimes apply to the original fragments of a single work or, alternatively, to a group of works by the same author whose authorship is undisputed or strongly established from the modern perspective<sup>23</sup>. The use of προέφην, προέφημεν / -αμεν proves an uncom-

<sup>23</sup> Just to give a few striking examples from the ones summarised in table III:

- Eusebius of Caesarea – ὡς ἔφαμεν: IV, 11, 9; καθὼς ἔφαμεν: V, 7, 4;
- Socrates of Constantinople – ὡς ἔφην: 26 occurrences throughout the *Historia ecclesiastica*, and also ὥσπερ ἔφην: V, 22, 109; ὡς ἔφημεν: IV, 1, 2; ὡς ἔφαμεν: III, 7, 21; ὥσπερ ἔφημεν: VI, 8, 1;
- Evagrius Scholasticus – ὡς ἔφαμεν: III, 14, p. 112, 25 (in quot. from Zeno's *Henoticon*) and ὡς ἔφημεν: II, 8, p. 58, 8 (in quot. from the petition of the Egyptian clergy to Leo I; ed. J. BIDEZ, L. PARMENTIER, London 1898); Evagrius himself preferred ὡς εἶρηται;
- Andrew of Crete – in *Homilia in exaltatione s. crucis* (ed. M. DE GROOTE, HTR 100, 2007, p. 443–487) ὡς ἔφην: 5, 358 and 8, 510; ὥσπερ ἔφην: 6, 450; in *In s. Patapium* (= or. XIX, PG 97, col. 1206–1221[1254]) ὡς ἔφημεν: col. 1209d; ὡς ἔφαμεν: col. 1216a and 1217c (cf. also ὡς μικρῶ πρόσθεν ἔφαμεν in *In exaltationem ven. crucis* [= or. XI, *ibidem*], col. 1037a); interestingly enough, neither of the other Andrew's texts present in PG 97 or TLG preserves the abovementioned phrases; authorship of both *Homilia in exaltatione s. crucis* and *In s. Patapium* is not doubted (cf. M. DE GROOTE, p. 443–444 and e.g. A. KAZHDAN, *History of Byzantine literature (650–850)*, p. 52–54);

mon feature, with only three authors surpassing Theophanes in frequency. At the same time, the lack of phrases such as *ὡς ἔφην* and *ὡς ἔφημεν* / *-αμεν* emphasises the specificity of the *Chronographia*, as does the use of the clauses with *καθὼς*.

Greek offers a larger group of phrases, unmentioned here, useful for expressing the same meaning. They are also marked stylistically only to a limited extent, and therefore more or less neutral and subject to symmetrical interrelationships (e.g. *ὡς εἶρηται* – 7153 in TLG and *ὡς προεἶρηται* – 1264 in TLG; both nearly absent from the *Chronographia*)<sup>24</sup>. In that context, the predilection of the author of the chronicle for *ὡς προέφην*, *ὡς προέφημεν* / *-αμεν* manifests itself distinctively. It differentiates his language from all those authors who applied the much more popular forms like *ὡς ἔφην* and *ὡς ἔφημεν* / *-αμεν*, and from George Syncellus, who did not use any of these expressions a single time.

All the above facts suggest strongly that the actual words of a single author – Theophanes – are present in the passages from the *anni mundi* discussed here. In spite of the circumstantial character, the evidence points strongly to Theophanes' fingerprint, identifies him as the author, distinguishes his own words both from George and from the other Constantinopolitan writers. The attestation of these phrases in the opening parts of the chronicle, in the middle of the text, close to the ending, as well as in the proemium points towards one more conclusion, especially if one realises that there is in the *Chronographia* no other similar narrative-organizing expression that is present within such a space: the standardising redaction of this kind was undertaken only once, and was not repeated later for the whole narrative from Diocletian to the 9<sup>th</sup> cent. This does not mean that the separate fragments or *anni mundi* did not undergo further deliberate modifications before

- Anna Comnena – *ὡς ἔφην*: I, 12, 2; XIII, 5, 4; XIII, 3, 4; *καθὼς ἔφην*: IX, 9, 6; *ὡς ἔφημεν*: III, 8, 5; *ὡς ἔφαμεν*: X, 2, 4 and X, 5, 8; *ὡςπερ ἔφημεν*: XIII, 3, 1; *καθάπερ ἔφημεν*: I, 7, 2; XIII, 2, 2; XIII, 3, 4 [the example is especially striking, even if one bears in mind the doubts concerning the authorship, expressed by J.D. Howard-Johnston and a few other scholars];
- Nicephorus Gregoras – in *Historia Romana* (ed. I. BEKKER, L. SCHOPEN, vol. 1, Bonnae 1829; vol. 2, 1830; vol. 3, 1855) *ὡς ἔφημεν* x 12: VII, 12, p. 273, 22; VIII, 2, p. 292, 5; VIII, 3, p. 294, 8; VIII, 13, p. 371, 3; VIII, 14, p. 373, 11; IX, 1, p. 395, 5; XII, 6, p. 591, 21; XIII, 8, p. 660, 21–22; XVII, 1, p. 845, 23; XVIII, 2, p. 878, 2; XXVIII, 23, p. 190, 19; XXXI, 21, p. 362, 8 and *ὡς ἔφαμεν* x 9: VII, 6, p. 248, 5 and 248, 15–16; VII, 7, p. 249, 6; X, 8, p. 512, 8, and also in ep. 44 and 54 (ed. P.L.M. LEONE 1982–1983), and 2 further occurrences in *Astrolabica A* (3 and Sch. 1; ed. A. DELATTE, Liège–Paris 1939);
- Ephrem of Ainus – 34 occurrences in singular and 2 in plural (*ὡς ἔφημεν*, v. 7981 and *ὡς ἔφαμεν*, v. 9316 [O. LAMPSIDES, *Ephraem Aenii Historia chronica*, Athens 1990]);
- cf. also John the Lydian, who used *ὡς ἔφαμεν* in *De magistratibus* and *De ostentis*, and *ὡς ἔφημεν* in *De mensibus*; Theodore Metochites, in whose works 5 occurrences of *ὡς ἔφημεν* and 2 of *ὡς ἔφαμεν* may be found; or Theodore II Ducas Lascaris (*ὡς ἔφαμεν* x 3 in *Epistulae* and *Sermones de theologia christiana* + *ὡς ἔφημεν* in *Oratio in laudem urbis Niceae*).

<sup>24</sup> Due to the popularity of both structures and the synonymous meaning, they were used very often in the same context; thus, the scope of the comparison is even broader, cf. e.g. the frequent *ὡς εἶρηται* in Peter's *Vita Ioannicii*, and *ὡς ἔφην* in Saba's life of the same saint. TLG statistics valid for 18 October 2015.

the split of the manuscripts tradition, but any comprehensive edition seems highly improbable – particularly after Anastasius the Bibliothecarius' translation, but also earlier than that<sup>25</sup>. The arrangement of the narrative with the use of προέφην, προέφημεν / -αμεν was therefore of a primary and authorial character. It should not be linked to any author of this era and milieu different than Theophanes himself – even to those who did use the phrases built on φημί and πρόφημι. There is at present no reason to think of anybody else but Theophanes himself.

### 3. Other expressions referring to the past and their various origin

#### 3.1. Forms of ἐπιμνήσκομαι, μιμνήσκω or μνημονεύω

A few similar expressions in the *Chronographia* and the *Ekloge chronographias* shall now be discussed in brief, as they seem to share an analogical function within the narrative. They display various originality, and the assessment of their usefulness for our purposes cannot be uniform, as only a part of them are sufficiently frequent or stylistically distinctive to indicate the authorship. On the other hand, although showing the limitations of the method, they indicate further differences between the two works and may contribute to the verification of some theories previously accepted without a deeper analysis. There are some *loci* where the links with the previous or the next parts of the text are built with ἐπιμνήσκομαι, μιμνήσκω or μνημονεύω.

##### a. ἐπιμνησθήσομαι

AM 5855 (AD 362/363), p. 52, 19–25: Ἰουλιανὸς πολλοὺς ἐν διαφόροις τόποις ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τε μαντείας καὶ χρηστήρια, ὅπως ἂν δόξη μετ' ἐπιτροπῆς τῶν δαιμόνων ἐπὶ Πέρσας πόλεμον ἐγχειρεῖν. καὶ πολλῶν ἐκ διαφόρων κομισθέντων αὐτῷ χρησμῶν, ἐνὸς ἐπιμνησθήσομαι. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως· νῦν πάντες ὠρμήθημεν θεοὶ νίκης τρόπαια κομίσασθαι παρὰ θηρὶ ποταμῷ, τῶν δὲ ἐγὼ ἡγεμονεύω θούρος πολεμόκλονος Ἄρης.

AD 362/363, p. 82: *Julian dispatched numerous emissaries to oracles that gave prophecies in different places so as to appear to be undertaking his war against Persia under the protection of demons. Of the numerous oracles that were brought to him from various places, I shall mention just one. It was as follows: 'All the gods have set out to bring trophies of victory to the wild beast river. I am their leader, impetuous Ares, raising the din of war.'*

**location in the entry:** (1) – 53 – 59 – (78), **parallel sources:** THEODORET OF CYRRHUS, III, 21, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. L. PARMENTIER, F. SCHEIDWEILER, Berlin 1954 (πέμψας δὲ εἰς Δελφοὺς καὶ Δῆλον καὶ Δωδώνην καὶ τὰ ἄλλα χρηστήρια, εἰ χρηὴ στρατεῦειν ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μάντις. οἱ δὲ καὶ στρατεῦειν ἐκέλευον καὶ ὑπισχνούντο τὴν νίκην. ἕνα δὲ τῶν χρησμῶν εἰς ἔλεγχον τοῦ ψεύδους ἐνθήσω τῇ συγγραφῇ. ἔστι δὲ οὕτως· «νῦν πάντες ὠρμήθημεν θεοὶ νίκης τρόπαια κομίσασθαι παρὰ Θηρὶ ποταμῷ· τῶν δ' ἐγὼ ἡγεμονεύσω θούρος πολεμόκλονος Ἄρης»); THEODORE ANAGNOSTES, 146, ed. G.C. HANSEN, Berlin 1995 (Μαντείας καὶ θυσίας καὶ δαιμόνων ἀπάταις φραζάμενος κατὰ Περσῶν ἐστράτευσεν· ὅτε καὶ χρησμὸν λέγεται λαβεῖν ἔχοντα οὕτως· «νῦν δὲ πάντες ὠρμήθημεν

<sup>25</sup> This opinion is not incompatible with the issue of the deterioration of the manuscripts, noted by C. MANGO and R. SCOTT in the introduction to their translatoroion, p. xcvi–xcviii.

θεοὶ νίκης τρόπαια κομίσασθαι παρὰ Θηρί ποταμῶ· τῶν δ' ἐγὼ ἡγεμονεύσω θουῶρος πολεμόκλονος Ἄρης»).

**Anastasius:** – (cf. p. 90, fragment p. 46, 21 – 53, 24 [AM 5853–5855, i.e. Julian's reign] is not included in Anastasius' translation)

### **b. ὁ δὲ ἀνωτέρω μνημονευθεὶς**

**AM 5940 (AD 362/363), p. 99, 28–31:** ὁ δὲ ἀνωτέρω μνημονευθεὶς Εὐσέβιος ὁ σχολαστικός, ὁ πρῶτος Νεστορίου λαβόμενος, προαχθεὶς εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν τοῦ Δορυλαίου καὶ πρὸς Εὐτύχην τὸν ἀρχιμανδρίτην περὶ πίστεως διαλεγόμενος εὗρεν οὐκ ὀρθὰ φρονοῦντα αὐτόν.

**AD 362/363, p. 82:** *Eusebios the scholasticus, who was mentioned earlier as the first person to tackle Nestorios, after being promoted to the bishopric of Dorylaion, happened to be conversing about the faith with the archimandrite Eutyches, and discovered that his views were not correct.*

**location in the entry:** (1) – 53 – 56 – (70), **parallel sources:** EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, I, 9, ed. J. BIDEZ, L. PARMENTIER, London 1898, p. 17 (Υφ' οὗ τὰ κατὰ Εὐτυχή τὸν δυσσεβῆ κινεῖται, μερικῆς κατὰ τὴν Κωνσταντίνου ἀλισθείσης συνόδου, λιβέλλου τε αὐτῆς ἐπιδεδωκότος Εὐσεβίου τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν τοῦ Δορυλαίου διέποντος, ὃς καὶ ῥήτωρ ἔτι τυγχάνων πρῶτος τὴν Νεστορίου βλαφημίαν διήλεγξεν).

**Anastasius:** p. 106, 1–3 (*porro Eusebius scholasticus, qui primus Nestorium reprehendit, ad episcopatum Dorylaei promotus et de fide cum Eutychi archimandrita disputans invenit eum non recta sapientem*).

### **c. οὗ πρόσθεν ἐμνήσθην / οὗ καὶ πρῶν ἐμνήσθην / οὗ πρόσθεν ἐμνημονεύσαμεν**

**AM 5964 (AD 471/472), p. 118, 2–4:** ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ δὲ Ῥεκίμερ ὁ στρατηγός, οὗ καὶ πρῶν ἐμνήσθην, γαμβρὸς δὲ Ἀνθεμίου, τοῦ εὐσεβῶς ἐν Ῥώμῃ βασιλεύσαντος, ἐπανίσταται τῷ ἰδίῳ κηδεστῇ.

**AD 471/472, p. 183–184:** *In Italy the general Recimer, whom I have mentioned previously, the brother-in-law of Anthemius who had ruled Rome piously, rose up against his own relative.*

**location in the entry:** (1) – 12 – 14 – (39), **parallel sources:** PRISCUS PANITES, restored from Theoph. (fr. 64, 2); no relevant passage either in Evagrius Scholasticus, or in PROCOPIUS III, 7, 1.

**Anastasius:** – (cf. p. 112, fragment p. 115, 18 – 118, 19 [AM 5961–5964] is not included in Anastasius' translation)

**AM 5997 (AD 504/505), p. 145, 16–18:** Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει στέλλεται παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀναστασίου στρατιὰ Γότθων τε καὶ Βέσσων καὶ ἐτέρων Θρακίων ἐθνῶν, στρατηγούντος τῆς ἔω καὶ ἐξαρχούντος αὐτῆς Ἀρεοβίνδου, τοῦ Δαγαλαΐφου παιδός, ὑπάτου γεγονότος ὀρδινάρου, (τούτου πρὸς πατρός ἐγένετο πάππος Ἀρεοβίνδος, ὁ κατὰ τὸν Θεοδοσίου τοῦ νέου χρόνον εὐδοκιμήσας κατὰ Περσῶν· ἐτέχθη δὲ Ἀρεοβίνδος τῷ Δαγαλαΐφῳ ἀπὸ Γοδισθεάς, τῆς Ἀρδαβουρίου θυγατρὸς τοῦ παιδὸς Ἄσπαρος, οὗ πρόσθεν ἐμνημονεύσαμεν) ἐπὶ δυναστεία μεγάλη, συναπεστάλησαν δὲ τῷ Ἀρεοβίνδῳ καὶ ἕτεροι πλείστοι στρατηγοί, ὧν οἱ περιφανέστατοι Πατρίκιος ἦν καὶ Ὑπάτιος, ὁ Σεκουνδίνου καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς Ἀναστασίου τοῦ βασιλέως υἱός, καὶ Φαρισμάνης, ὁ Ζουνᾶ πατήρ, τὸ γένος Λαζός, καὶ Ῥωμανός ὁ προειρημένος ἐξ Εὐφρατησίας συναφθεὶς τῷ στρατεύματι, καὶ Ἰουστίνος ὁ βασιλεύσας μετὰ ταῦτα, καὶ Ζήμαρχος καὶ ἕτεροί τινες,

**AD 504/505, p. 225:** *In this year the army of Goths, Bessi, and other Thracian races was sent out by the emperor Anastasius under the command of Areobindos, son of Dagalaiphos, who was magister militum per Orientem and exarch of it and had been consul ordinarius. His grandfather on his father's side*



had been the Areobindos who had served with distinction against the Persians in the time of Theodosios the younger, and he was born to Dagalaiphos by Godisthea, the daughter of Ardabourios, son of Aspar, **whom we have previously mentioned**. Many other generals were sent with Areobindos of whom the most distinguished were Patricius, Hypatios (whose parents were Secundinus and the sister of the emperor Anastasius), Pharasmanes the father of Zounas, a Laz by race, **the aforesaid** Romanus, who linked up with the army from Euphratesia, Justin, who later become emperor, Zemarchos, and several others.

**location in the entry:** (1) – 1 – 14 – (53), **parallel sources:** no relevant passage either in Evagrius Scholasticus, or in PROCOPIUS I, 8, 1–3.

**Anastasius:** – (cf. p. 120, fragment p. 144, 21 – 149, 25 [AM 5996–5998] is not included in Anastasius' translation)

**AM 6026 (AD 533/534), p. 189, 9–13 (cf. above):** Βελισάριος δὲ παρέλαβε τὴν στρατιὰν καὶ τὸν στόλον καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, Σολόμωνά τε τὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ Δωρόθεον, τὸν τῆς Ἀρμενίας, καὶ Κυπριανὸν καὶ Βαλεριανὸν καὶ Μαρτίνον καὶ Ἄλφιαν καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Μάρκελλον καὶ Κύριλλον, **οὗ πρόσθεν ἐμνήσθην**, καὶ ἑτέρους πολλοὺς τῶν Θράκην οἰκούντων.

**AD 533/534, p. 189:** *Belisarius took control of the army, fleet, and the officers, namely the general Solomon, Dorotheos of Armenia, Cyprian, Valerian, Martin, Alphias, John, Marcellus, and Cyril (the one just mentioned) and many others from Thrace.*

**location in the entry:** (1) – 86 – 90 – (861), **parallel sources:** PROCOPIUS, *De bellis*, III, 11, 5–6 **οὗ πρόσθεν ἐμνήσθην** (ed. H. B. DEWING, II, p. 102)<sup>26</sup>.

**Anastasius:** – (pp. 134–135, fragment p. 188, 32 – 189, 18 is not included in Anastasius' translation)

George Syncellus uses expression n° 1 only once, in a slightly different way:

**p. 452, 4–5:** Ἄλλοι δὲ πλείστοι κατὰ χώρας καὶ κώμας ὑπὸ τῶν ἔθνῶν διεσπάρσθησαν, **ᾧν ἑνὸς παραδείγματος ἕνεκεν ἐπιμνησθήσομαι**.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 532: *But others in great multitudes in the countryside and the villages were torn apart by the Gentiles, of whom I shall recall one for the sake of example*)

Phrases n° 2–3 are absent from the *Ekloge chronographias*. George often used forms like ἐμνημόνευσε, μέμνηται / οὐ μέμνηται (the most typical one, present in every part of the chronicle, occurred 15 times: p. 27, 25; 34, 12; 38, 18; 43, 27; 72, 10; 79, 32; 146, 16; 174, 8; 260, 25; 270, 26; 302, 30; 333, 23; 396, 1; 403, 15; 420, 14), μνησθεῖς, οὗ μνήμην, οὐ μνημονεύεται – but only in reference to his sources, with the authorities usually named (e.g. μέμνηται δὲ καὶ Ἡρόδοτος, p. 72, 10 and 174, 8 or τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσι μνημονευομένων, p. 74, 16 or Ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ γραφῇ μνημονευομένων ὀνομάτων, p. 243, 21), sometimes – though rarely – impersonally, and never while referring to his own words and the previous pages of his chronicle. Related expressions, more formal and elegant, may also be found here and there:

<sup>26</sup> ἄρχοντες δὲ ἦσαν φοιδαράτων μὲν Δωρόθεός τε, ὁ τῶν ἐν Ἀρμενίῳ καταλόγων στρατηγός, καὶ Σολόμων, ὃς τὴν Βελισαρίου ἐπετρόπευε στρατηγίαν· (δομέστικον τοῦτον καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι. ὁ δὲ Σολόμων οὗτος εὐνοῦχος μὲν ἦν, οὐκ ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς δὲ ἀνθρώπου τὰ αἰδοῖα ἐτύγχανεν ἀποτμηθεῖς, ἀλλὰ τις αὐτῷ τύχη ἐν σπαργάνοις ὄντι τοῦτο ἐβράβευσε·) καὶ Κυπριανὸς καὶ Βαλεριανὸς καὶ Μαρτίνος καὶ Ἄλθιας καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Μάρκελλος καὶ Κύριλλος, **οὗ πρόσθεν ἐμνήσθην**.

p. 48, 5–6: *χρή δὲ ἀναμνησθῆναι τῶν προλεχθέντων ἀνωτέρω*

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 62: *But one should be mindful of what has been previously stated*)

With this difference between the two parts and without any proper proof from the translation of Anastasius, the origin of Theophanes' phrases remains ambiguous. The respective passages were not translated by Anastasius with one exception that bears no trace of the phrase (n° 2)<sup>27</sup>, either due to its absence from the Greek original or because of the deliberate skip of the remark, deemed unnecessary in a shortened part of the chronicle. Only the expression in the last passage (AM 6026) was copied into the *Chronographia* from Procopius. The previous four cannot be traced back to the direct or the parallel sources, which does not necessarily mean Theophanes' wording here. One may tentatively assume that the bolded words in n° 1 were taken from the source and reworded by Theophanes, in n° 2 they were the addition of his own, in n° 3 (the first two examples) they were either rewritten from unknown sources (as they were in the last example from *De bellis*) or were the result of Theophanes' editorial activities, as the cross-references are not empty. Be that as it may, George's hand in the edition of the sources is at any rate improbable here<sup>28</sup>.

### 3.2 ὡς (προ)λέλεκται

Some expressions, like the relatively common ὡς (προ)λέλεκται, are even more dubious as far as their origin is concerned. In the *Chronographia* they appear rarely, but in various parts of the work:

1. AM 5857 (AD 364/365), p. 55, 1–5: *Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Οὐαλεντινιανὸς ὁ Αὐγουστος Γρατιανὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν Αὐγουστον ἀνηγόρευσεν, κοινῶν τῆς βασιλείας ὁμοῦ καὶ ὑπατον, προαναγορεύσας καὶ Οὐάλεντα τὸν ἀδελφὸν βασιλέα, ὡς προλέλεκται, διάπυρον Ἀρειανὸν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ὑπὸ Εὐδοξίου βαπτισθέντα.*

AD 364/365, p. 85: *In this year the Augustus Valentinian proclaimed his son Gratian Augustus, both as partner in the Empire and as consul, having previously proclaimed, as has been said, his brother Valens emperor, an ardent Arian who had been baptized by Eudoxios.*

location in the entry: (1) – 1 – 5 – (16), parallel sources:?

Anastasius, p. 90, 36–39: *interea Valentinianus Augustus Gratianum filium suum Augustum appellavit communicatorem imperii pariter et consulem ante pronuntiatum, et Valentem fratrem suum imperatorem.* [the underlined sentence edited out]

<sup>27</sup> Most of them are placed in that part of translation which forms an abbreviated summary – fragments of Theophanes (p. 46, 21 – 53, 24 [AM 5853–5855, i.e. Julian's reign], p. 115, 18 – 118, 19 [AM 5961–5964], p. 144, 21 – 149, 25 [AM 5996–5998], p. 188, 32 – 189, 18) are eliminated from the Latin text (see Anastasius, p. 90, 112, 120, 134–135). Only AM 5940 (example 2.) is given in Anastasius, but ὁ δὲ ἀνωτέρω μνημονευθεὶς is not translated (Anastasius, p. 106, 1–3).

<sup>28</sup> For n° 2 and 3.1 see also the papers of B. POUDERON and G. GREATREX in TM 2015.

2. AM 6071 (AD 578/579), p. 249, 22–23: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει μηνὶ Ὀκτωβρίῳ, ἰνδικτιῶνος ἰβ', ἐβασίλευσε Τιβέριος στεφθεὶς ὑπὸ Εὐτυχίου πατριάρχου, ὡς προλέλεκται. ὑπῆρχε δὲ τῷ γένει καὶ αὐτὸς Θράξ.

AD 578/379, p. 369: *In this year in the month of October, indiction 12, Tiberios became emperor, having been crowned by the patriarch Eutybios, as already mentioned. He, too, was a Thracian by descent.*

location in the entry: (1) – 1 – 3 – (15), parallel sources: cf. JOHN OF EPHEBUS, III, 9, ed. & trans. E.W. BROOKS [CSCO 104], p. 98, 26–29 (*Mortuo autem Iustino, postquam Tiberius regni diadema accepit, ut supra rettulimus, reginam Sophiam obsecravit ut ipse uxorem suam arcesseret et ea ingrederetur et ipsa etiam regina fieret*, cf. Mango/Scott, p. 370 note 2).

Anastasius, p. 153, 13–14: *Mundi anno VIIxxi, divinae incarnationis anno dlxxi, imperare coepit Tiberius redimitus ab Eutychio patriarcha, cum esset et ipse genere Thrax.*

3. AM 6095 (AD 602/603), p. 290, 31 – 291, 3: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει μηνὶ Νοεμβρίῳ, ἰνδικτιῶνος ἰβ', βασιλεύσας Φωκάς ὁ τύραννος ἀνείλεν, ὡς προλέλεκται, Μαυρίκιον σὺν πέντε παισὶν ἄρρεσιν.

AD 602/603, p. 418: *In this year, in the month of November, indiction 6, the usurper Phocas, upon his accession, slew Maurice together with his five male children as already indicated.*

location in the entry: (1) – 1 – 3 – (34), parallel sources: phrase absent from accounts of THEOPHYLACT SIMOCATTA, VIII, 11–12 and *Chronicon Paschale*, p. 693, 9 – 694, 12

Anastasius, p. 179, 8–9: *Mundi anno VIxcv, divinae incarnationis anno dxcv, anno primo imperii sui Phocas tyrannus peremit, ut praedictum est, Mauricium una cum masculis quinque pueris eius...*

4. AM 6259 (AD 766/767), p. 443, 11–18: Τούτῳ διὰ τοι τοῦτο καὶ Στρατήγιον, τὸν τοῦ Ποδοπαγούρου «ἀδελφόν», ἀστεῖον ὄντα τῷ εἶδει προσλαβόμενος, (ἐφίλει γὰρ προσοικειοῦσθαι τοῖς τοιούτοις διὰ τὰς ἀκολασίας αὐτοῦ) αἰσθόμενός τε αὐτὸν ἀηδῶς ἔχοντα πρὸς τὰς ἀθεμίτους ἀνδρομανίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ μακαρίῳ Στεφάνῳ, τῷ ἐγκλειστῷ τοῦ ἁγίου Αὐξεντίου, ταύτας ἐξαγορεύοντα σωτηρίας τε φάρμακα λαμβάνοντα, ὡς ἐπίβουλον αὐτοῦ τοῦτον διαφημίσας σὺν τῷ ἐγκλειστῷ, ὡς προλέλεκται, ἀνείλεν.

AD 766/767, p. 611: *For this reason, after he had befriended Strategios, the (brother) of Podopagouros, who was of attractive appearance (for he liked to have such intimates for the sake of his lewdness), but becoming aware that this man was repelled by his illicit homosexuality and was confessing it to the blessed Stephen (the hermit of St Auxentios) and receiving salutary treatment, he branded him as a traitor and killed him along with the hermit as has been said above.*

location in the entry: (1) – 69 – 76 – (84), parallel sources: absent from Nicephorus (circa 83–86); source unknown, but Theophanes indeed returns here to the matter already discussed (AM 6257)

Anastasius, p. 293, 4–10: *unde et Strategium, Podopaguri fratrem, cum esset urbanus specie, assumpsit: amabat enim talibus adhaerere propter luxurias suas. cum autem sensisset eum moleste tulisse infandas in viros insanias suas et beato Stephano in clauso sancti Auxentii has manifestas reddidisse salutisque remedia suscepisse, hunc quasi insidiatorem suum diffamans una cum in clauso, ut praedictum est, interfecit.*

In the *Ekloge chronographias* of George the phrase also occurs four times:

1. p. 195, 26–29: εἶτ' ἐπάγει γένεσιν Σεμιράμεως καὶ Ζωροάστρου μάγου ἔτη τε νβ' τῆς Νίνου βασιλείας, μεθ' ὃν Βαβυλῶνα, φησὶν, ἡ Σεμίραμις ἐτείχισε τρόπον ὡς πολλοῖσι λέλεκται, Κτησίᾳ, Ζήνωνι, Ἡροδότῳ καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτούς.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 242: *Then he attaches a description of the birth of both Semiramis and the magus Zoroaster and the fifty-two years of the reign of Ninus. After him, he says, Semiramis fortified Babylon in a manner that is described by many* – Ktesias, Zenon, Herodotos, and their successors).

**2. p. 317, 25 – 318, 1:** συμμαχοῦντων δὲ Βυζαντίοις Ἀθηναίων διὰ Χάρητος στρατηγοῦ ἀποτυχῶν ὁ Φίλιππος ἐπὶ Χερρόνησον χωρεῖ, καὶ ταύτην λαβῶν ἐπανήλθε. τότε καὶ Ἀθηναίους σπένδεται βασιλεύσας, **ὡς προλέλεκται**, ἔτη κγ', καὶ ἀναιρεθεὶς ὑπὸ Πausανίου κατὰ τὴν ρι' Ὀλυμπιάδα ἀρχομένην, καθ' ἣν Ἀλέξανδρος παῖς ἐβασίλευε Μακεδόνων.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 384: *But since the Athenians were aiding the Byzantines through the general Chares, Philip's siege was a failure and he withdrew to Cherronesos. Upon capturing it, he returned. At that time, he made peace with the Athenians and reigned, as we said previously, for twenty-three years. He was murdered by Pausanias in the beginning of the 110<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, at which time his son Alexander become king of the Macedonians*).

**3. p. 319, 10–14:** Μετὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτὴν διαιροῦνται τὴν ἡγεμονίαν Μακεδόνων μὲν, **ὡς ἤδη λέλεκται**, Ἀριδαῖος ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ πρὸς πατρός ἐκ Φιλίννης τῆς Θεσσαλῆς ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Φίλιππος πόθω τῶν Μακεδόνων τῷ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Φίλιππον, καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος παῖς Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐκ Ῥωξάνης τῆς Ὀξυάρτου.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 386: *Following Alexander's death, the Macedonian empire, as already stated, was divided between two men: Aridaïos, Alexander's paternal half-brother, born from Philinne the Thes-salian, and surnamed Philip because of the love of the Macedonians for his father Philip; and Alexander, the son of Alexander and Roxanne the daughter of Oxyartes*).

**4. p. 327, 15–21:** Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λάγου κεραυνῷ τεθνεώτος, **ὡς προλέλεκται**, ἐν τῇ κατὰ τῶν Γαλατῶν μάχῃ, τὴν μὲν Αἰγύπτου ἀρχὴν κληροῦται μετ' αὐτὸν Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Φιλιάδελφος παῖς αὐτοῦ, ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα σοφὸς καὶ φιλοπονώτατος, ὃς πάντων Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ Χαλδαίων, Αἰγυπτίων τε καὶ Ῥωμαίων τὰς βίβλους συλλεξάμενος καὶ μεταφράσας τὰς ἀλλογλώσσους εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλώσσαν, μυριάδας βιβλίων ἰ' ἀπέθετο κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐν ταῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ συστάσαις βιβλιοθήκαις.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 395: *When Ptolemy the son of Lagos died from a thunderbolt, as was previously stated, in the war against the Gauls, his son Ptolemy Philadelphos was apportioned rule of Egypt after him. A man of exhaustive learning and enormous industry, he collected the books of all the Greeks, Chaldaeans, Egyptians, and Romans, rendered those written in a foreign language into Greek, and deposited 100,000 books throughout Alexandria in the libraries he had established*).

N<sup>o</sup> 1 is a quotation from the chronicle of Eusebius<sup>29</sup>, but presumably neither n<sup>o</sup> 2 nor n<sup>o</sup> 3 were taken from George's reference sources, although in the latter case a similar expression had been used by Eusebius in the respective paragraph<sup>30</sup>. The

<sup>29</sup> Eusebius Werke, vol. V, *Die Chronik aus der Armenischen übersetzt*, ed. J. KARST, Leipzig 1911, p. 29: *und von Zaravyšt dem Magier, von seinem des Baktrerkönigs Kriege und seiner Besiegung durch Šamiram; und die Jahre des Königums des Ninus, 52 Jahre, und von dessen Ende. Nach welchem das Königum von Šamiram übernommen ward: die umgab Babelon mit Mauer von jener Art und Gestalt, wie von vielen ja gesagt worden ist, von Ktesias und Zenon und <H>erodot und andern, die nach diesen.*

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 109, 13–24: *Arideos des Philippos und der Philinna, der Thet(t)alerin, den die Makedonier aus Anhänglichkeit an das philippische Geschlecht Philipos nannten und als König einsetzten nach Alexandros, obgleich er aus einer anderen Gattin war und sie den Mann als geisteslos kannten: folgt in die Herrschaft jenes, wie wir gesagt haben, in der hundertvierzehnten Olympiade zweitem Jahre.*

Byzantine historian did not necessarily repeat here the phrase of his predecessor, which refers to another matter in a different context (see A.A. Mosshammer's opinion in *apparatus*). N° 4 may be an example of a similar issue, as George's version mixed two different passages from his source; the phrase 'as we previously stated', taken from one of them, might have been relocated with a shift of its point of reference. Still, a simple coincidence is not excluded<sup>31</sup>.

The phrase *ὡς προλέλεκται* in the *Chronographia*, showing no variation, is attested twice in Anastasius, and once by an early witness of the same tradition. The latter example is uncontroversially assumed to be copied from the source, but the origin of the three remaining passages is unverifiable, so the wording and composition can be ascribed to Theophanes only tentatively. It is not difficult to notice a slight difference between the usage of Syncellus and Theophanes, but since some of the phrases were not original, nothing more can be said than that this way of referring to the past seemed natural to both writers. The expression cannot give us any clear hints, being too popular and stylistically universal to be ascribed to individual styles.

### 3.3 δεδήλωται

Phrases referring to the past with *δεδήλωται* are also of some meaning for the matter. In the *Chronographia* such a phrase is to be found only once, and is almost surely copied:

**AM 6232 (AD 739/740), p. 413, 4–10:** καὶ ὅσα μὲν ἐπὶ Λέοντος τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς κακὰ Χριστιανοῖς συνέβη περὶ τε τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν καὶ περὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν διοικήσεων αἰσχροῦ κέρδους καὶ φιλαργυρίας ἐπινοία κατὰ τε Σικελίαν καὶ Καλαβρίαν καὶ Κρήτην, ἢ τε τῆς Ἰταλίας ἀποστασία διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ κακοδοξίαν, σεισμοὶ τε καὶ λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ καὶ ἐθνῶν ἐπαναστάσεις, ἵνα τὰ κατὰ μέρος σιγήσω, ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσι δεδήλωται κεφαλαίως<sup>32</sup>.

*Zugezählt werden ihm 8 Jahre; denn er lebte darauf noch bis zu der hundertfünfzehnten 20 Olympiade viertem Jahre. Es hatte aber hinterlassen Alexandros als Sohn den Herakles, aus der Pharsine, der Tochter das Phar[a]nabazos; und den Alexandros aus der Roxane, der Tochter des Oxiartes, des Königs der Baktrier, welcher beim Tode Alexanders des Philippos gleich in dem Königtum geboren ward.*

<sup>31</sup> The phrase is absent from EUSEBIUS, I, 75, 1–5 (except for here: *Diesen löst als Nachfolger ab Ptolemaios, sein Sohn, der genannt ward, wie wir gesagt haben, Philadelphos, und zu Lebzeiten des Vaters zwei Jahre das Königtum bekleidet*) and I, 111, 7–15, devoted to Ptolemy the Thunderbolt (*Sofort nach dem Siege des Seleukos tötete Ptolemaios, des Lagos und der Euridike Sohn, der Tochter des Antipatros, welcher Keraunos genannt ward, das ist 'Blitzgrimm', seinen Wohltäter, zu dem er auf der Flucht seine Zuflucht genommen hatte; und er selbst herrschte über die Makedonier. Und als er gegen die Galater eine Schlacht lieferte, ward er getötet, nachdem er regiert hatte ein Jahr und fünf Monate; so daß gerechnet wird die Zeit seiner Regierung vom vierten Jahre der 124. Olympiade bis zum fünften Monate des ersten Jahres der 125. Olympiade*); cf. p. 395 note 4 in Adler and Tuffin's translation.

<sup>32</sup> The cross-reference points to nothing in the transmitted text. See *The Chronicle of Theophanes...*, p. 574 n. 11 (*One may suspect that this passage has been mechanically copied from an iconophile tract similar in spirit to Nikephoros' Antirrheticus III, which dwells on the plague, famine, and earthquakes in the reign of Constantine V. Note that Crete has not been previously mentioned (cf. AM 6224, n. 2),*

AD 739/740, p. 573: *The evils that befell the Christians at that time of the impious Leo both as regards the orthodox faith and civil administration, the latter in Sicily, Calabria, and Crete for reasons of dishonest gain and avarice; furthermore, the secession of Italy because of his evil doctrine, the earthquakes, famines, pestilences, and foreign insurrections (not to mention all the details) have been related in the preceding chapters.*

location in the entry: (1) – 32 – 38 – (68), parallel sources: unknown

Anastasius, p. 268, 7–13: *et quidem quaecumque sub Leone impio Christianis evenerunt, sive circa orthodoxam fidem, sive super civilibus dispositionibus, sive super turpis lucri quaestu et avaritia per Siciliam, Calabriam et Cretam adinventata pariter et imposita, sive in Italiae apostasia propter huius cacodoxiam, sive in fame ac pestilentia gentiumque pressuris, ut particularia taceam, in praecedentibus ostenduntur capitulis.*

see above, ὡς προέφημεν n° 3

On the contrary, the past forms of (προ)δελῶ, including the participle, appear amply and diversely throughout the *Ekloge chronographias*:

### δεδήλωται / ὡς δεδήλωται / ὡς [...] δεδήλωται

1. p. 43, 6–7: μετὰ γὰρ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν εὐθὺς οὐδαμοῦ δεδήλωται ἐν αὐτῇ βασιλεύς.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 57: Now **there is absolutely no indication** in scripture of a king immediately after the Flood).

2. p. 77, 1–6: Οἶμαι τὸν Ἀφρικανὸν ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι καὶ ὁ παρ' αὐτῷ Ἄμως Ἄμωσις ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ Τέθμωσις υἱὸς Ἀσήθ, ὡς δηλωθήσεται· καὶ ὁ μετ' αὐτὸν ἕκτος Μισφραγμοῦθωσις ὁμοίως καὶ Ἄμωσις εὐρηται λεγόμενος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ μὲν τὸν πρῶτον Ἄμωσιν, ἦτοι Ἄμως παρ' αὐτῷ, ἢ πρὸ δ' τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ ἐτῶν, Μωυσῆς γεγένηται, ὡς δεδήλωται, κατὰ τὸ γψλβ' ἔτος τοῦ κόσμου·

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 99: *I am of the opinion that Africanus was unaware that his 'Amos' was also known as 'Amosis', identical as well Tethmosis the son of Aseth, as will be shown. And we find that Misphragmouthosis, the sixth king in succession after him, is likewise called Amosis. But during the reign of the first Amosis (that is, Amos according to Africanus), or four years before his rule, Moses was born, as has been showed, in AM 3732).*

3. p. 278, 3–7: ὁ μέντοι Ἰώσηπος συνηρίθησεν αὐτά, ὡς καὶ ἀνωτέρω δεδήλωται, ν' ἔτη, εἰπὼν ἀφανῆ τὸν ναὸν μείναι ἀπὸ τοῦ ιθ' ἔτους Ναβουχοδονόσωρ ἕως τοῦ β' ἔτους Κύρου τοῦ πρώτου Περσῶν καὶ Μήδων καὶ Ἀσσυρίων καὶ Χαλδαίων Συρίας τε καὶ Λυδῶν βασιλείας κρατήσαντος.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 339: *Moreover, as was noted above, Josephos enumerated a total of fifty years when he asserted that the temple remained desolate from the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, to the second year of Cyrus, who was the first to exercise control over the kingdom of the Persians and Medes and Assyrians and Chaldeans, and of both Syira and the Lydians).*

---

*that the only famine recorded by Theoph. during the reign of Leo III affected the Arab camp in 717/718, and the only plagues were in Syria (AM 6218, 6225); and for further and newer considerations on that source: W. BRANDES, Pejorative Phantomnamen im 8. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik des Theophanes und deren Konsequenzen für die historische Forschung, [in:] Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur, hrsg. L.M. HOFFMANN (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 17), Wiesbaden 2005, esp. p. 120–122.*

**4. p. 335, 9–15:** Μετὰ τὴν ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου καθαίρεσιν Περσῶν τῷ ζ' τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας ἦτοι πρώτῳ τῆς Ἑλλήνων βασιλείας ἔτει (Ἑλληνας γὰρ καὶ Μακεδόνας κατὰ τὴν τῶν Μακκαβαίων γραφὴν τοὺς αὐτοὺς μεμαθήκαμεν), ἐξ ὧν ἡ τε κατὰ τὴν Μακεδονίαν μετὰ θάνατον Ἀλεξάνδρου διαιρεθεῖσα ἀρχὴ εἰς ἀρχάς, τὴν τε κατ' Αἴγυπτον τῶν Πτολεμαίων καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν τῶν Ἀντιόχων καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς, **ὡς ἐκεῖ δεδήλωται**, καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν Μακεδονίαν, (...)

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 404: *Following Alexander's destruction of the Persians in the seventh year of his reign, that is, the first year of his reign over the Greeks (for we have learnt that the Greeks and the Macedonians, according to the writings of the Maccabees, are the same), the regime based in Macedonia was divided after his death into separate realms: the realm of the Ptolemies in the region of Egypt, the Antiochids in the region of Antiocheia and the other areas (as has been shown at that part of the narrative) and the region around Macedonia itself).*

**5. p. 354, 2–7:** τότε δύο στρατηγοὶ Ῥωμαίων ἠττηθέντες εἰς μὲν ἀνηρέθη, θάτερος δὲ ζωγρηθεὶς εἰς Ῥώμην ἐστάλη σὺν αἰχμαλώτοις πολλοῖς, αὐτός τε ἀναζεύξας Σκηπίων <...> τῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν καταγόντων τὸ γένος ἔτι κρατούντων ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου χρόνων Αἰγύπτου καὶ Συρίας καὶ Ἀσίας, ἐν μέρει δὲ ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ Βαβυλωνίας, τῆς Μακεδόνων δυναστείας ὑποφόρου Ῥωμαίοις ταχθείσης, **ὡς πρὸ βραχέος δεδήλωται**.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 425: *At that time, two Roman generals who had been defeated, one killed and the other taken captive, were sent to Rome with many other captives; and Scipio himself returned..., when those who traced their lineage from them had been ruling Egypt, Syria, and Asia ever since Alexander's time, and in turn also Babylonia at times, after the Macedonian dynasty had been made a tributary to the Romans, as was explained a little before).*

### ὡς προδεδήλωται

**6. p. 56, 7–10:** Οὕτως οὖν ὑπὸ τοῦ Νῶε τῆς ὅλης οἰκουμένης διαμερισθείσης θείῳ προστάγματι, **ὡς προδεδήλωται**, τῷ ,βφοβ' ἔτει τοῦ κόσμου, ἤλ' δὲ τῆς τοῦ δικαίου Νῶε ζωῆς πρὸ σδ' ἐτῶν τῆς κατὰ τὴν πυργοποιίαν διασπορᾶς, τοῖς τρισὶν αὐτοῦ υἱοῖς, (...)

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 71: *In this way, Noah, at the behest of God, apportioned the whole inhabited world among his three sons, as has been stated above, in AM 2572, the 930<sup>th</sup> year of the life of Noah the Just, 204 years before the dispersion at the time of the building of the tower).*

**7. p. 90, 4–6:** περὶ ὧν ὁ Καισαρεὺς Εὐσέβιος οὗτος σφόδρα αὐτὸν καταμύμφεται πλειοτέρως σφαλεῖς ἐν ταῦτῳ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς, **ὡς προδεδήλωται**, ἕως ἐτῶν σθ'.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 113: *For this additional years, this man Eusebios of Caesarea severely criticises him, although, as we have previously demonstrated, on this very point and on the other matters, the magnitude of his error was even greater, extending to 290 years).*

**8. p. 263, 27–30:** ταῦτα παρ' αὐτοῖς <ἦν> προφητεύων κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τούτους Οὐρίας υἱὸς Ἀμαίου, ὃν φυγόντα εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀγαγὼν ὁ Ἰωακείμ ἀνείλε, καὶ Ἰερεμίας ἀρξάμενος καὶ αὐτός, **ὡς προδεδήλωται**, τῆς προφητείας ἀπὸ τοῦ ιγ' ἔτους Ἰωσίου.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 324: *And one of those to make this prophecy at this time [was] Ourias, son of Amaios, whom Joakeim brought back and killed after he fled to Egypt. And Jeremiah, as was stated above, began prophesying in the thirteenth year of Josiah).*

**9. p. 271, 12–21:** Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἑαυτὸν παρελογίσατο καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ια' ἔτους Σεδεκίου ἕως τοῦ β' ἔτους Δαρείου τοῦ Ὑστάσπου τὰ ὀ' ἔτη ἐπιλογισάμενος φανερόν. ἀνθ' ὧν γὰρ ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν τὰ λοιπὰ κ' ἔτη τοῦ Ναβουχοδονόσωρ, τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἄλωσιν τοῦ ἔθνους ποιησαμένου, λογισασθαι καὶ τῶν ἐφεξῆς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, λέγω δὴ τοῦ τε υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ

Εὐειλάδ Μαρδοάχ καὶ Νιριγλησάρου τοῦ γαμβροῦ αὐτοῦ, ὡς προοδηλωται, εἶθ' ἐξῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Ναβόννηδον τὸν καὶ Δαρεῖον Ἀστυάγην τὸν Ἀσσουήρου ἐλθεῖν (ὅς γέγονεν ἔσχατος βασιλεὺς Μήδων ἀπὸ Ἀρβάκου τοῦ καθελόντος σὺν τῷ Βελεσὺ τὴν Ἀσσυρίων ἀρχὴν καὶ τὸν ταύτης ὕστατον βασιλέα Σαρδανάπαλον),

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 332: *Eusebius has deceived himself and the truth by calculating the seventy years for the period from the eleventh year of Sedekias up to the second year of Dareios, the son of Hystaspes – this is clear. For instead of these years, he should have computed the other twenty years of Nebuchadnezzar, who was the cause of the conquest of the nation, and the years of those who succeeded him (I mean the years of his son Eueilad Marodach, and Niriglesaros his brother-in-law, as was stated above); and he should then have proceeded next to Nabonnedos, who was Dareios Astyages, the son of Assoueros (he was the last king of the Medes from Arbakes, who, with Belesu, destroyed the kingdom of the Assyrians and its last king Sardanapalos).*)

### τὸν προοδηλωμένον

10. p. 281, 9–12: Κύρος οὗτος Ἀστυάγην τὸν προοδηλωμένον ἑαυτοῦ πάππον βασιλεύοντα Μήδων καθελόν, τὴν Περσικὴν εἰσήξε βασιλείαν, Μήδων βασιλευσάντων ἔτη που μετὰ Σαρδανάπαλον ἀπὸ Ἀρβάκου Μήδου τοῦ καθελόντος αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν Ἀσσυρίων ἀρχὴν.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 342: *Upon killing his own grandfather Astyages, king of the Medes (whom we have mentioned above), Cyrus ushered in the Persian kingdom. Medes were kings for some years after Sardanapalos, beginning with Arbakes the Mede who put an end both to him and the Assyrian kingdom).*

All the examples above are George's own words, either very likely (n° 1, 4, 5, 6, 10) or for sure (n° 2, 3, 7, 8, 9). N° 2 and 3 express the chronographer's critical commentary of his own source, as does n° 9, with Syncellus' opinions on the Eusebian chronology. The passage in n° 4 is absent both from 1 Macc. 1, 1–11 and Eusebius (cf. I, 59, 4–10)<sup>33</sup>, and n° 5, placed in the final section of the *sporaden*, has in this fragment no equivalent in any known source (George's authorship, especially as regards referring to the previous sections of the book, is probable here, but not demonstrable). N° 8 is the chronicler's epitome of the Biblical account, and in n° 10 one expects his paraphrase; the participle is absent from his sources, as it is consistent with his own narrative<sup>34</sup>.

In the whole chronicle, only two passages of this kind are unoriginal. P. 391, 3–6: Τὸ δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν πράξεων αὐτοῦ καὶ θεραπειῶν σωμάτων καὶ ψυχῶν καὶ τῶν τῆς γνώσεως ἀποκρῦφων, ἀναστάσεώς τε τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν αὐταρκέστατα τοῖς

<sup>33</sup> Cf. remarks on that passage in A.-M. ТОГОМАНОВА, *Славянската версия на Хрониката на Георги Синкел*, София 2008, p. 108–109; 474–477; 531; English summary of the scholar's beliefs on the chronicle and its patchwork structure is to be found in EADEM, *A Lost Byzantine Chronicle in Slavic Translation*, SCer 1, 2011, p. 191–204.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. EUSEBIUS, I, 30, 23–26 (*Und schließlich besiegelt er dessen Untergang: »Und nach dem Tode des Sardanapallos ließ Verbakes der Meder, als er die Herrschaft der Assyrer gestürzt hatte, auf die Meder die Herrschaft übergehen«. – Dieses Sämtliche Kephalion.*), and I, 32, 29–33 (*Unter diesem regierte Kyros über die Perser; abgesetzt habend den Aždahak beseitigte er die Mederherrschaft, die sich über 298 Jahre hin erstreckt hatte. Andere indessen stellen andere Könige der Meder in schriftlicher Überlieferung dar.*)



πρὸ ἡμῶν μαθηταῖς τε καὶ ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ δεδήλωται – but the expression has a different meaning here; it derives directly from Julius Africanus (as is known from the title above: Ἀφρικανοῦ, περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸ σωτήριον πάθος, καὶ τὴν ζωοποιὸν ἀνάστασιν [fr. 50]); p. 413, 10–12: αἴρεσιν δὲ μετήγει τὴν Σαδδουκαίων, οἵπερ εἰσὶ περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὡμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, **καθὼς ἤδη δεδηλώκαμεν**. The quotation from Joseph is attested by George himself above, p. 413, 5<sup>35</sup>.

The originality of the passages in the *Ekloge chronographias* is not surprising. The phrase reflects a higher, academic style of discourse, typical for George as long as he did not copy crucial fragments of his sources or compose short notes for his miscellanea.

### 3.4 ὡς δηλωθήσεται / ὡς [...] δηλωθήσεται

Some occurrences of δελῶ in the future tense only complement the picture.

1. AM 5841 (AD 348/349), p. 39, 20–22: τῶν γὰρ ὑδάτων μελλόντων τὴν θέσιν τῶν τειχῶν ἐξομαλίζειν πρὸς τὴν πτώσιν, μέρος μὲν τι τοῦ τείχους ἐπεπόνθει, καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ θεοῦ συγχώρησιν, **ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς δηλωθήσεται**.

AD 348/349, p. 66: *For as the waters were about to bring down the walls and flatten them to the ground, one part of the wall gave way, indeed by God's dispensation, as will be made clear in what follows.*

**location in the entry:** (1) – 8 – 10 – (33), **parallel sources:** *Chronicon paschale*, ed. L. DINDORF, Bonnae 1832, p. 537, 7–9 (ὡν γὰρ ὑδάτων μελλόντων τὴν θέσιν τῶν τειχῶν ἐξομαλίζειν εἰς πτώσιν, μέρος τοῦ τείχους πεπόνθει κατὰ θεοῦ συγχώρησιν ἐπὶ τῷ συμφέροντι, **καθὼς ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς δηλωθήσεται**).

**Anastasius:** – (pp. 88, fragment AM 5841–5842 is not included in translation)

2. AM 6221 (AD 728/729), p. 408, 13–18: Κωνσταντῖνος γὰρ μετὰ τὴν τοῦ γαμβροῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀρταβάσδου ἀνασοβῆν τῆς βασιλείας ἐπικρατήσας Ἀναστάσιον τοῦτον τύψας σὺν ἄλλοις ἐχθροῖς ἐν ἰππικῷ διὰ τοῦ διῖππιου γυμνὸν ἐπ' ὄνου καθήμενον ἐξανάστροφα ἐπόμπευσεν, ὡς τοῖς ἐχθροῖς συνανασκάψαντα αὐτόν, καὶ τὸν Ἀρτάβασδον στέψαντα, **ὡς δηλωθήσεται ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τόπῳ**.

AD 728/729, p. 564: *For when Constantine had obtained the Empire after the sedition of his brother-in-law Artabasdos, he had Anastasios flogged along with other enemies and paraded him naked in the Hippodrome, by way of the Diippion, seated backwards on a donkey; and this because Anastasios had cursed him, as did his other enemies, and had crowned Artabasdos as will be related in the proper place*

**location in the entry:** (1) – 34 – 39 – (74), **parallel sources:** unknown, the last fragment may be added by Theophanes – cf. much different treatment of the matter by NICEPHORUS (ed. C. MANGO, 66, 26–29: μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Ἀρτάβαζος καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ υἱοὶ τῇ αὐτῇ τιμωρίᾳ ἠκίσθησαν, πλείσταις δὲ πληγαῖς καὶ τιμωρίαις καὶ οἱ συγγνώντες αὐτοῖς τὰ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς ὑποβληθέντες ὑπερωρίας κατεδικάσθησαν).

**Anastasius, p. 264, 15–20:** *Constantinus enim post generi sui Artabasdi rebellionem cum imerium optinuisset, hunc Anastasium caesum et cum aliis inimicis in Hippodromium per Dihippium ingressum, nudum super asinum verso vultu sedentem pompavit, eo quod sibi una cum aliis inimicis mala fuerit imprecatus et Artabasdam coronaverit, sicut in suo indicabitur loco.*

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *Antiquitates iudaicae*, XX, 199–200, ed. B. NIESE.

3. AM 6303 (AD 810/811), p. 493, 9–10: καὶ ἐλθούσης πάσης τῆς συγκλήτου τοῦ ὄρθρου ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ, τοῦτον ἀνηγόρευσαν βασιλέα, **ὡς ἐξῆς δηλωθήσεται.**

AD 810/811, p. 675: *When at dawn the whole Senate had come into the palace, they did proclaim him [sc. Michael Rangabe] emperor as will be stated later.*

location in the entry: (1) – 165 – 166 – (170), parallel sources: unknown

Anastasius, p. 331, 23–24: *cumque totus senatus ad palatium de luce venisset, hunc pronuntiaverunt imperatorem, quemadmodum in subsequentibus indicabitur.*

The occurrences in George's part of the universal history are as follows:

### ὡς δηλωθήσεται / ὡς [...] δηλωθήσεται

1. p. 77, 1–2: Οἶμαι τὸν Ἀφρικανὸν ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι καὶ ὁ παρ' αὐτῷ Ἀμῶς Ἀμωσις ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ Τέθμωσις υἱὸς Ἀσῆθ, **ὡς δηλωθήσεται.** = cf. above, **δεδηλωται** n° 2

2. p. 359, 16–24: Πομπήιος παραδοὺς Σκαύρω διέπειν καὶ δύο Ῥωμαϊκὰ τάγματα πρὸς συμμαχίαν εἰς Ῥώμην ἠπειγέτο διὰ Κιλικίας, αὐτὸς τὸν μέγιστον κατατάξων θρίαμβον, ἐπαγόμενος τοὺς ἠττηθέντας αὐτῷ βασιλεῖς Φαρνάκην Μηθριδάτου υἱόν, τὸν καὶ καρτερήσαντα τὸν ἴδιον ἀνελεῖν πατέρα Μηθριδάτην τῇ πρὸς Πομπήιον χάριτι καὶ αὐθις κατὰ Ῥωμαίων στασιάσαντα, Κόλχων ἤτοι Λαζῶν βασιλέα, ἄρχοντα Ἰβήρων κ', Ἀριστόβουλον Ἰουδαίων βασιλέα σὺν θυγατράσι δυσὶ καὶ υἱοῖς, Ἀλεξάνδρω καὶ Ἀντιγόνω, ὧν ὁ νεώτερος ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ διαδράς Ἀλέξανδρος εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἐπάνεισι στασιάσων, **ὡς δηλωθήσεται.**

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 431: *Once Pompey had entrusted to the administration of Scaurus these cities and two Roman legions as an auxiliary force, he set out in haste to Rome through Cilicia, in order to make arrangements for the most magnificent triumph. He brought with him the kings whom he had defeated: Mithradates' son Pharnakes, (the one who to curry favour with Pompey had tolerated the killing of his own father Mithridates, and again revolted against the Romans), the king of the Colchians (that is, the Lazoi), the twenty chiefs of the Iberians, and Aristoboulos king of the Jews, along with his two daughters and sons, Alexander and Antigonos. Alexander, the younger of the two, escaped en route to Rome and made his way back to Judaea, to incite rebellion, as will be explained earlier).*

3. p. 368, 16–18: Ἡ τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ βασιλευσάντων ἐπαύσατο ζ' βασιλέων ἀρχή, διαρκέσασα ἔτη ρνδ' ἀπὸ τοῦ ,ετιγ' κοσμικοῦ ἔτους ἕως τοῦ ,ευξζ', **ὡς ἐξῆς δηλωθήσεται.**

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 439: *The reign of the seven kings who ruled in Pergamon ended, after lasting 154 years from AM 5313 up to AM 5467, as will be shown in what follows).*

4. p. 378, 30 – 379, 2: Τῷ ,εup' ἔτει τοῦ κόσμου ἢ τῶν Βιθυνῶν ἢ βασιλέων ἀρχὴ ἐπαύσατο ὑπὸ Αὐγουστον χρηματίσασα, ἀπὸ τοῦ ,εσηγ' κοσμικοῦ ἔτους ἀρξαμένη, **ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα δηλωθήσεται.** ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν Ποντικῶν ι' βασιλέων.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 452: *In AM 5480, the rule of the eight kings of the Bithynians, which began in AM 5268, came to an end through a decree from Augustus. Their names will be disclosed below. The reign of the ten kings of Pontos likewise came to an end).*

Theophanes did not seem to be fond of the phrase – it is rare, being obviously unoriginal in AM 5841, and two further examples (in AM 6221 and AM 6303) are also dubious. If it was not for the lack of comparative source material, ὡς ἐξῆς δηλωθήσεται in AM 6221 could well turn out to be a loan phrase. Although it

is difficult to assume any clear conclusions, the chronicler could have drawn the whole phrase from his source material, as he almost never used expressions of this type with ἐξῆς. On the other hand, he might have remembered it from his reading and imitated it in the narrative of his own; indeed, he is returning to the subject.

In George's part, on the contrary, a few further examples may be added to the ten original ones. N° 1 obviously belongs to the author, as has been said before (cf. **δεδήλωται** n° 2). N° 2 is the historian's additional remark to the material of his source, here Flavius Joseph<sup>36</sup>. It should be noted that according to Alden Mosshammer these were the last two words of the first codex of the bicodical *Ekloge chronographias*. Also in n° 4 the bolded phrase may be tentatively ascribed to George. Only n° 3 gives rise to some difficulties, with Mosshammer's remark in app.: *non alibi redeunt; haec imperia nonne multis annis ante Augustum desiderant?*, repeated by Adler/Tuffin in p. 439, n. 8. Still, the addition of 'ἐξῆς' in similar constructions is typical for Syncellus – either another author's words are reflected in this fragment, or this is a rare example of George's inconsistency, possible in the last sections of his book. Regardless of these minor doubts, what is clearly a rare phenomenon in Theophanes appears to be a typical way for Syncellus to express his thoughts. The difference in frequency stems here from the highly discursive language of George Syncellus, reflected in his chronological commentaries and in his critical approach towards his sources. In his polemical political attacks, Theophanes uses a quite different, more vernacular language.

### 3.5 ὡς ἀποδέδεικται / ὡς προαπεδείξαμεν

A certain passage in the opening part of the *Chronographia* contains two similar expressions that refer to facts discussed earlier in the chronicle. This doublet does not recur (either as a whole or partially) throughout the whole work. Accurately translated by Anastasius, in all probability it was not added by any later editor after Theophanes. Thus, this interesting way of double cross-referencing using the perfect and aorist forms of (προ)ἀποδείκνυμι draws attention and is worth comparing with the *Ekloge chronographias*.

**AM 5828 (AD 335/336), p. 33, 17–22:** καὶ ἐπιβὰς Κωνσταντίνος ὁ εὐσεβῆς τῇ Νικομηδέων πόλει κατὰ Περσῶν παραταξάμενος, ἀσθενήσας ἐκοιμήθη ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ὡς τινὲς φασιν Ἀρειανόφρονες τότε καταξωθεὶς τοῦ ἀγίου βαπτίσματος ὑπὸ Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Νικομηδείας μετατεθέντος ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει· ὅπερ ψευδὲς ἐστίν, ὡς ἀποδέδεικται· ἐν γὰρ Ῥώμῃ ὑπὸ Σιλβέστρου ἐβαπτίσθη, ὡς προαπεδείξαμεν.

<sup>36</sup> JOSEPH FLAVIUS, I, 157–158: παραδοὺς δὲ ταύτην τε καὶ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ τὰ μέχρις Αἰγύπτου καὶ Εὐφράτου Σκαύρω διέπειν καὶ δύο τῶν ταγμάτων, αὐτὸς διὰ Κιλικίας εἰς Ῥώμην ἠπείγετο τὸν Ἀριστόβουλον ἄγων μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς αἰχμάλωτον. δύο δ' ἦσαν αὐτῷ θυγατέρες καὶ δύο υἱεῖς, ὧν ὁ ἕτερος μὲν Ἀλέξανδρος ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ διαδιδράσκει, σὺν δὲ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς ὁ νεώτερος Ἀντίγονος εἰς Ῥώμην ἐκοιμίζετο. Cf. A.-M. TOTOMANOVA, *Slavjanskata versija...*, p. 125.

**AD 335/336, p. 54:** *The pious Constantine went out to the city of Nicomedia on his way to fight the Persians, but became ill and died in peace. Some Arians claim that he was then deemed worthy of holy baptism at the hands of Eusebios of Nicomedia, who had been transferred to Constantinople.<sup>[note 4]</sup> This is false, as has been pointed out; for he was baptized by Silvester in Rome, as we have already demonstrated.*

**location in the entry:** (1) – 7 – 12 – (28), **parallel sources:** *Chronicon paschale*, ed. L. DINDORF, p. 532, 7–13 (καὶ ἐπιβὰς Κωνσταντίνος λβ' ἐνιαυτῶ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας, ὀρμήσας ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνατολήν κατὰ Περσῶν, ἐλθὼν ἕως Νικομηδείας, ἐνδόξως καὶ εὐσεβῶς μεταλλάττει τὸν βίον ἐν προαστείῳ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως μηνὶ ἀρτεμισίῳ ια', καταξιώθεις τοῦ σωτηριώδους βαπτίσματος ὑπὸ Εὐσεβίου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, βασιλεύσας ἔτη λα' καὶ μῆνας ι').

**Anastasius, p. 87, 9–15:** *tunc Constantinus, cum transisset et in Nicomediensium civitatem contra Persas proeliaturus, languore praeventus in pace dormivit. tunc, ut quidam eorum; qui cum Arrio sentiunt, aiunt, ab Eusebio Nicomediensi Constantinopolim translato sanctum meruit baptismum percipere; quod mendacium est, sicut superius est comprobatum. Romae quippe a Silvestro baptizatus est, quaemadmodum et praestendimus.*

The chronicle of George Syncellus provides exceptionally abundant and diverse samples for comparison:

**ἀποδέδεικται / ὡς([...]) ἀποδέδεικται([...]) / καθὼς([...]) ἀποδέδεικται**

**1. p. 34, 2–9:** ἀλλ' ἔδει τούτων οὕτως αὐτῶ διεγνωσμένων καθὼς ἔφησαν, ὅτι πολλῶν μυριάδων ἐτῶν εἶναι τὸν κόσμον νομίζουσιν οἱ ἐθνικοὶ οἰήσει σοφοί, διαπτύσαι τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν μηδενὶ συμφωνοῦσαν ὡς ψευδῆ καὶ ἀντίθεον τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀληθείᾳ σπεῦσαι μᾶλλον ἀποδείξει ταύτην, ἐπεὶ, **καθὼς ἀνωτέρω σαφῶς ἀποδέδεικται** καὶ αὐθις ἐκ τῆς Γενέσεως **δειχθήσεται** προϊόντος τοῦ λόγου θεοῦ χάριτι, πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ οὐδὲ Χαλδαίων ὥφθη βασιλεία ἢ ἔθνος οὐδὲ Βαβυλῶν ἐχρημάτισεν, ἦν φασὶ μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμόν ἐπικτισθῆναι.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 44: *But since he recognized that the situation is just as they stated – that the pagans wise in their self-conceit think that the universe is many tens of thousands of years in age – he should have despised their thinking, and striven instead to demonstrate that, as a godless falsehood, it is entirely incompatible with our truth. For, just as I have already clearly demonstrated and will again (with God's grace) demonstrate from Genesis as the discussion proceeds, neither a Chaldaean kingdom nor nation was in evidence before the Flood; nor was Babylon even in existence, which, it is said, was established after the Flood).*

**2. p. 38, 12–16:** τῆς δὲ Βαβυλῶνος, ὡς ἀποδέδεικται ταῖς θεολέκτοις φωναῖς, μὴ οὔσης πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ οὐδ' ἡ Χαλδαίων βασιλεία ἔσται τὸ πρότερον ἕως τῆς βασιλείας Νεβρώδ καὶ τῆς πυργοποιίας, τούτοις δὲ **συναποδείκνυται** καὶ ἡ παρὰ Μανεθῶ περι τῶν πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ καὶ δυναστειῶν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων συγγραφὴ ψευδῆς, (...)

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 51: *And since Babylon, as has been demonstrated by divinely inspired utterances, did not exist before the Flood, neither will there have been a kingdom of a Chaldaean in the time before the reign of Nimrod and the building of the tower. And along with this, the account written by Manetho concerning the Egyptian dynasties before the Flood is also shown to be false).*

**3. p. 42, 20–27:** Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Πανόδωρος τὰς κατὰ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν θεοπνεύστων γραφῶν Αἰγυπτιακὰς συγγραφὰς συμφωνεῖν αὐταῖς ἀγωνίζεται δεικνύναι μεμφόμενος τὸν Εὐσέβιον, μὴ εἰδὼς ὅτι **καθ' ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀποδέδεικται** ταῦτα αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀναπόδεικτά τε καὶ ἀσυλλόγιστα, εἰ γε, **καθὼς προαποδέδεικται ἡμῖν** ἐκ τῆς Γενέσεως, οὔτε Βαβυλῶν

ἡ Χαλδαϊκὴ πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ οὔτε ἡ Αἴγυπτος πρὸ τοῦ Μεστρέμ ἐβασιλεύθη, οἶμαι δ' ὅτι οὐδ' ὤκισθη, καθὼς ἡ προσηγορία τῆς χώρας ἕως καὶ νῦν κεκράτηκε κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραϊδα Μεστραία λεγομένη καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ ἀντιγράφῳ.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 57: *And this is what Panodoros writes, in his struggle to prove that the Egyptian writings against God and divinely inspired scriptures are in harmony with them. And he rebukes Eusebios, not realizing that these theories of his are both beyond proof and beyond reason, and are shown to be against himself and against truth. For just as we have demonstrated above from Genesis, neither Babylon nor Chaldaea existed before the Flood, nor was Egypt ruled by a king before Mestrem. And in my opinion it was not even inhabited, just as the name of that region which has persisted even up to the present time is Mestraia in Hebrew and in the Hebrew copy of the Bible.*)

4. **p. 76, 5–9:** ὥστε ἐκ πάντων δείκνυσθαι διαμαρτάνειν ἐν τοῖς περὶ Μωυσέως χρόνοις ἔτεσι τοῦλάχιστον διακοσίοις τὸν Εὐσέβιον· ὅθεν καὶ τὴν παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις τῶν λεγομένων δυναστειῶν παρενόθευσε χρονολογίαν καὶ τὴν παρ' Ἀσσυρίοις, **ὡς ἐν τῷ τέλει τοῦ κανονίου τῶν Ἀσσυρίων βασιλέων δειχθήσεται**, καὶ τὴν παρ' Ἑλλήσι δέ, **καθὼς ἀποδέδεικται**.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 97–98: *From all this facts, it can therefore be demonstrated that Eusebios erred by at least 200 years in his dating of Moses. For this reason, he also corrupted the chronology of what the Egyptians call 'dynasties'. And, as will be demonstrated at the end of the table of the Assyrian kings, he also corrupted Assyrian chronology, as well as Greek chronology, as has already been shown.*)

5. **p. 78, 25 – 79, 2:** ὁ τε γὰρ ἐπὶ Ὀγύγου κατακλυσμὸς ἐπὶ Φορωνέως καὶ τῆς ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου πορείας τοῦ λαοῦ ἰστορεῖται τῷ αὐτῷ Ἀφρικανῷ, καὶ ὁ ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος ἐπὶ Κραναοῦ δευτέρου βασιλέως Ἀθηνησιν, **ὡς ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ συγγραμμάτων ἀποδέδεικται**.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 101: *It is recorded by this same Africanus that the Flood at the time of Ogygos occurred during the reign of Phoroneus and the Exodus of the people from Egypt. And Deukalion's flood, he says, occurred during the reign of Kranaos, the second king of Athenians, as has been shown from his own writings.*)

6. **p. 79, 10–14:** καὶ οὕτω μὲν ἐν τούτῳ διήμαρτεν οὐ συλλογισάμενος ἀκριβῶς ὅτι Κέκροψ ὁ διφυῆς καὶ Κραναὸς οἱ πρῶτοι βασιλεῖς Ἀθηναίων μετὰ Ὀγυγον, ἐφ' ὧν καὶ ὁ ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος γέγονε κατακλυσμὸς ἐν Θετταλίᾳ, μετὰ Μισφραγμούθωσιν ἦσαν χρόνοι ὕστερον τοῦλάχιστον ρν', **ὡς αὐτὸς μαρτυρῶν ἀποδέδεικται**.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 101: *And in this particular matter, he thereby committed an error; for he did not draw the proper conclusion from the fact that Kekrops the Double-Natured and Kranaos, the first kings, after Ogygos, of the Athenians, in whose time Deukalion's flood did in fact occur in Thessaly, where, as he himself has attested, at least 150 years after Misphragmouthosis.*)

7. **p. 133, 23–29:** Ἰακῶβ ἔτει πβ' τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ ἐγέννησε τὸν Λεβὶ, **καθὼς ἐν τῇ προλαβούσῃ συντάξει σαφῶς ἀποδέδεικται**. ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἅπασα μεταξὺ τῆς γενέσεως Ἰωσήφ καὶ Λεβὶ θ' μεσεμβολεῖν ἔτη, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔνατος ἐτέχθη μετ' αὐτόν. ἀποδείκνυται δὲ Ἰωσήφ ἐκ τῆς γραφῆς τῷ ρα' Ἰακῶβ τεχθεὶς, εἴ γε ρκ' ἔτει τοῦ πατρὸς λ' ἔτος ἄγων ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀναβιβάζεται. **συναποδέδεικται** δὲ καὶ Λεβὶ διὰ τοῦτο πρὸ θ' ἔτων αὐτοῦ τῷ πβ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης γεννηθεὶς τοῦ Ἰακῶβ ἔτει.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 166: *Jacob, in the 82<sup>nd</sup> year of his life, begot Levi, as we have clearly demonstrated in the preceding synopsis. For there definitely must have been nine years intervening between the births of Joseph and Levi, inasmuch as Joseph was the ninth to be born after him. Now it can be shown from scripture that Joseph was born in the 91<sup>st</sup> year of Jacob, seeing that it was in his father's 120<sup>th</sup> year that*

he, in his 30<sup>th</sup> year, was elevated to the rule of Egypt. **And so we have also proved at the same time that Levi's birth, preceding Joseph's by nine years, must have occurred in Jacob's 82<sup>nd</sup> year.**

**8. p. 197, 27 – 198, 3:** πόθεν δὲ καὶ ὁ Λουκάς ὁ θεϊότατος, ὁ πᾶσαν θείαν τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην ἡσκημένος φιλοσοφίαν καὶ μυρίων Εὐσεβίων ἀσυγκρίτως προὔχων, ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ καὶ εὐαγγελικῇ αὐτοῦ βίβλῳ ἰγ' ἐξ Ἀδάμ ἔθετο τοῦτον; **ἀποδέδεικται** μὲν οὖν οὗτος καὶ ἑτέροις πρὸ ἡμῶν διημαρτηκῶς ἐτῶν ἀριθμῶν κατ' ἐλάττωσιν ςθ' ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ ἕως τῆς εἰκοσαετηρίδος Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ πανευσεβοῦς βασιλέως Χριστιανῶν α'. ἀντὶ γὰρ ,εως' ἐτῶν ,εφκζ' συνελογίσατο.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 244: *How is it that the most divine Luke, a man thoroughly trained in divine and human wisdom and incomparably superior to 10000 Eusebioi, cites him in his sacred gospel as the thirteenth descendant of Adam? Others who have gone before us have also demonstrated that Eusebios was 290 years short in the numbering of years from Adam up to the twentieth year of Constantine the Great and most holy first emperor of the Christians. For instead of 5816 years, he numbered 5527).*

**9. p. 294, 14–20:** Ταῦτα ἐν τῷ προφήτῃ Ζαχαρία φέρεται κατὰ τὸ β' ἔτος Δαρείου ὡς ἐκ τοῦ λαλοῦντος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀγγέλου πρὸς κύριον λεγόμενα, εἴτε τρόπῳ εὐχῆς εἴτε ἄλλης τινὸς προσωποποιίας χάριν οἰκονομήσαντος τοῦ ἀνεξερευνητοῦ θεοῦ τοῖς κρίμασι, ὅσον δέ γε ἡμᾶς κατανοῆσαι, δηλοῦντος τοῦ λόγου τὸν ο' χρόνον ἥδη πεπληρῶσθαι κατὰ τὸν λόγον κυρίου διὰ Ἰερεμίου ἐν τῷ α' ἔτει Κύρου, **ὡς ἐκέισε ἀποδέδεικται κατὰ τὴν τῶν Παραλειπομένων καὶ τοῦ Ἐσδρα γραφῆν, (...)**

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 357: *This is reported in the prophet Zacharias in the second year of Dareios, as if it being uttered to the Lord by the angel who was speaking to him. It was either in a form of a prayer, or it was to serve as some other personification of God, who, in the direction of human affairs, is inscrutable in his judgements. But to the extent that we can understand, his words make clear that the seventy-year period had already been completed according to the word of the Lord spoken through Jeremiah in the first year of Cyrus, as has been demonstrated up to that point according to the texts of Paralipomena and Esdras).*

**10. p. 393, 28–30:** Καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα· συνάγονται δὲ τοίνυν οἱ χρόνοι ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἔτη ,εφλα'. ἀφ' οὗ χρόνου ἐπὶ Ὀλυμπιάδα σν' ἔτη ροβ', **ὡς ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν ἡμῖν ἀποδέδεικται.**

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 357: (And after a few words:) *Therefore, from Adam there are altogether 5531 years up to the coming of the Lord and the Resurrection, from which time to the 250<sup>th</sup> Olympiad there are 192 years, as has been demonstrated by us above).*

### ὡς([...]) δέδεικται

**1 (11). p. 75, 25–30:** εἰ γὰρ μετὰ Φορωνέα Μωυσῆς, κατὰ Κέκροπα τὸν διφυῆ, οὐκ ἔστι Διὸς αὐτοῦ πράξεων καὶ πάντων τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσιν ἀρχαιολογουμένων, **ὡς δέδεικται**, παλαιότερος· εἰ δὲ παλαιότερος, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ πάντες οἱ πρὸ αὐτοῦ, πέφυκε Μωυσῆς τοῦ Διός, κατὰ Ἰναχον καὶ Φορωνέα, ἐνδέχεται αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσι πάντων εἶναι πρεσβύτατον.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 97: *for if Moses lived after Phoroneus and was a contemporary of Kekrops the Double-Natured, he is not earlier than the deeds of Zeus himself and all the events recorded by the Greeks in their ancient histories, as has been demonstrated. But if, as both Eusebius himself and all his predecessors attest, Moses was in fact earlier than Zeus and contemporary of Inachos and Phoroneus, than the possibility does arise that he also preceded all the past events involving the Greeks).*

2 (12). p. 89, 6–10: διόπερ ἐκ τῶν θείων γραφῶν πεπεισμένοι καὶ ταῦτα ψευδῆ εἶναι καὶ μηδεμίαν βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς γενέσθαι ἕως τῆς τοῦ Νεβρώδ ἐπὶ τῆς πυργοποιίας γιγαντομμηίου καὶ ἀποστατικῆς τυραννίδος, **ὡς καὶ ἀνωτέρω δέδεικται**, μόνους δὲ τοὺς τρεῖς ἄνδρας μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν ἕως τῆς διασπορᾶς ἠγεῖσθαι τῶν πολλῶν εὐσεβῶς, (...) (Adler/Tuffin, p. 112–113: *Therefore, we have been persuaded by divine scriptures that this too is false and no kingdom whatsoever existed on the earth up to the tyrannical rule of Nimrod, who in imitation of the giants revolted from God during the building of the tower (as has also been demonstrated previously). And from the Flood up to the time of the dispersion, there were only three men who, in devotion to God, exercised leadership over the masses [sc. Noah, Shem, Arphaxad].*)

3 (13). p. 96, 27 – 97, 1: Ἀπὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ ἕως α' ἔτους Ἀβραὰμ ἔτη ,αο'. ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀδάμ ἐπὶ μὲν τὸν κατακλυσμὸν ἔτη ,βσμβ', **ὡς δέδεικται**, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος Ἀβραὰμ ἔτη ,γτιβ', ὡς ἐν τῷ κανόνι σαφῶς ὑπόκειται.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 121: *From the flood up to the first year of Abraham there are 1070 years. From Adam to the flood are 2242 years, as has been demonstrated. Up to the first year of Abraham, there are 3312 years, as is clearly indicated in the table.*)

4 (14). p. 135, 25–27: ὁ πρῶτον ἔτος Λευί, τοῦτο δὲ ἦν, **ὡς πρὸ βραχέος δέδεικται**, κατὰ τὸ ββ' τοῦ Ἰακώβ, τὸ δ' αὐτὸ ἄλλιν τῆς μὲν ἐν τῇ Χανανίτιδι γῆ παροικίας ἔτος ἦν ρξζ' οὕτως (...)

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 169: *The first year of Levi: this occurred, as was shown a little before, in the 82<sup>nd</sup> year of Jacob, again the same year as the 167<sup>th</sup> year of the sojourn in the land of Canaan, as follows:*)

### ὡς προδέδεικται

1 (15). p. 3, 3–7: Ἐν τῷ πρωτοκτίστῳ νυχθημέρῳ, τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ παρ' Ἑβραίοις πρώτου μηνὸς Νισάν, **ὡς προδέδεικται**, παρὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίοις κε' τοῦ Μαρτίου μηνός, καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις κθ' τοῦ Φαμενώθ, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κυριακῇ, ἦτοι μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, τὸ σκότος καὶ τὰ ὕδατα, πνεῦμα καὶ φῶς καὶ νυχθήμερον, ὁμοῦ ἔργα ἑπτά.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 4: *On the first-created full day, the 1<sup>st</sup> day of the first Hebrew month of Nisan, as has been shown above, the 25<sup>th</sup> of the Roman month of March, and the 29<sup>th</sup> of the Egyptian month of Phamenoth, on the Lord's day, that is on the first of the week, God created the heaven and the earth, the darkness and the waters, spirit and light and a full day: altogether seven works.*)

2 (16). p. 36, 5–9: ἀμφοτέροι δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν Καισαρείας Παλαιστίνης Εὐσέβιον καταμέμφονται, ὅτι μὴ δεδύνηται ὡς αὐτοὶ τὸν μυριαδισμόν τῶν Χαλδαϊκῶν ἐτῶν, ἦτοι τῶν ρκδ', εἰς ἡμέρας νοῆσαι, καὶ ἀναλύσεως ἢ μερίσεως αὐτοὶ πεποιήκασιν, **ὡς προδέδεικται**, ἵνα σύμφωνος εὔρεθῇ τῇ γραφῇ.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 47: *Now both of them reprove Eusebius of Caesarea of Palestine for not being able, as they were, to conceptualize the myriads of Chaldaean years (that is, 124 myriads) as days; and what they have done is to reduce or divide them, as has already been shown, in order that they might be found in harmony with scripture.*)

3 (17). p. 289, 5–6: Τὸν Καμβύσην τινὲς Ναβουχοδονόσωρ νομίζουσι τὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδήθ· οὐκ ἔστι δέ, **ὡς προδέδεικται καὶ ἐν τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα δειχθήσεται**.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 351: *Some believe that Kambyses was Nebuchadnezzar mentioned in Judith. But this is not the case, as we have previously shown and shall demonstrate in what follows.*)

**καθώς προαποδέδεικται ἡμῖν**

1 (18). p. 42, 20–27 = see above (n° 3)

2 (19). p. 128, 29 – 129, 3: εἰσὶν οὖν οἱ πάντες ἐν Μεσοποταμίᾳ παῖδες ἰ' καὶ θυγάτηρ μία Δείνα, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἔσχατος μὲν τῇ τάξει, ἰβ' γὰρ ἀπὸ Ῥουβὴν, ὁ Ἰωσήφ, πρῶτος δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ῥαχὴλ κατὰ τὸ φα' ἔτος Ἰακώβ γεννηθεὶς, **ὡς προαποδέδεικται**.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 61: *Altogether, then, these make a total in Mesopotamia of ten sons and one daughter, Dinah. After them all came Joseph, chronologically the last, the 12<sup>th</sup> from Reuben; but as Rachel's first child he was born in Jacob's 91<sup>st</sup> year, as we demonstrated above.*)

**συναποδέδεικται**

1 (20). p. 16, 28 – 17, 4 = see below, (n° 22).

2 (21). p. 133, 28–29 = see above, (n° 7)

**ἀποδεδειγμένος, ἀποδεδειγμένη**

1 (22). p. 16, 28 – 17, 4: ἄτινα πάντα καὶ ἄλλα πλείστα πολλῆς ἀδολεσχίας γέμοντα ὀρώντες καὶ ταῖς θεαῖς ἡμῶν γραφαῖς ἀνακόλουθα οἱ τὰς Χριστιανικὰς ἱστορίας συγγράψαντες, θαυμάζω πῶς κατεδέξαντο ὅλως κανονικῆ στοιχειώσει ὑποβαλεῖν ἀνάξια πάσης ὄντα μνήμης, οὐς κατ' ὄνομα λέγειν περισσὸν ἠγοῦμαι αἰδοῖ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, δι' οὓς ἀναγκάζομαι κἀγὼ τῇ αὐτῇ στοιχειώσει χρῆσασθαι, ἵνα μὴ δόξη ἀτελεὲς εἶναι τὸ πόνημα. τῆς οὖν Χαλδαϊκῆς ἀρχῆς **ἀπὸ Νεβρώδ ἀποδεδειγμένης συναποδέδεικται** δηλονότι καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν δυναστειῶν ὑπὸ Μανεθῶ τοῦ Σεβεννύτου πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Φιλάδελφον συγγεγραμμένα πλήρη ψεύδους καὶ κατὰ μίμησιν Βηρώσσου πεπλασμένα κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς σχεδόν που χρόνους ἢ μικρὸν ὕστερον

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 22: *And when authors of the Christian histories see that all of this and a great deal more are saturated with a large amount of prattle and are at odds with our divine scriptures, I am amazed how they have at all consented to subject to a tabular arrangement what is unworthy of any mention whatsoever. Out of respect for these men, I deem in unnecessary to mention them by name. But this is because of them that I too am required to make use of this same arrangement, lest my work appear incomplete. Since, then, the Chaldaean kingdom **has been demonstrated** to have begun from Nimrod, **it has been also clearly demonstrated** at the same time that what has been written about the Egyptian dynasties by Manetho of Sebennytos to Ptolemy Philadelphos is full of untruth and fabricated in imitation of Berossos at about the same time or a little later than him).*

2 (23). p. 91, 1–2: Οὕτως **ἀποδεδειγμένου** τοῦ χρόνου, καθ' ὃν ὁ Ἐβερ τὸν Φαλέκ ἐγέννησε δέκατον [Goar: καὶ πέμπτων] ὄντα ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ, (...)

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 115: *Now that **I have thus demonstrated** the date at which Heber begot Phalek, the tenth [fifteenth] descendant from Adam,...*)

**ὡς [...] ἀπέδειξεν**

1 (24). p. 38, 26–29: εἰ καὶ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ὥσπερ τὰ τῆς Χαλδαϊκῆς, οὕτω καὶ τὰ τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς δυναστείας ψευδηγορήματα στοιχειῶσαι ἠξίωσαν πάντα ψεῦδη πεφυκότα, **ὡς ἡ ἀλήθεια μόνη ἀπέδειξεν**, ἥς οὐδὲν ἰσχυρότερον.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 51: *All the same, I do not know how they have seen fit to arrange chronologically, just as they did for Chaldaean history, the falsehoods about the Egyptian dynasty; for they are constituted entirely of lies, **as has been demonstrated solely by the truth**, than which nothing is stronger).*



## \*ἀπεδείξαμεν

1 (25). p. 233, 15–17: εἶτα ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ φησίν· ἦν δ' ἄρα τοῦ Ἄχας βασιλείας ἔτος πρῶτον, ᾧ συντρέχειν ἀπεδείξαμεν τὴν πρῶτην ὀλυμπιάδα.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 287: *Then in the fourth book he says: 'This then was the first year of the reign of Achas, with which we have shown the 1<sup>st</sup> Olympiad coincides*).

2 (26). p. 393, 23–24: ἰδίᾳ δὲ περὶ τούτων καὶ ἀκριβέστερον ἐν τῷ περὶ ἑβδομάδων καὶ τῆσδε τῆς προφητείας ἀπεδείξαμεν.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 470: *We have proved this in more detail in a separate work dealing with the weeks of years and this prophecy*).

This variety of examples found throughout the *Ekloge chronographias*<sup>37</sup>, and especially in its first half, is all the more important because Syncellus' own wording is detectable in the majority of cases. In n° 1–8 it is to be easily guessed from the context; n° 7 is George's proof for the exact dating of the patriarchs, in n° 8 a typical emphasis reveals the author. His authorship is probable in n° 9, as he used both of the sources mentioned<sup>38</sup>; n° 11 is his critical commentary of Eusebius' account, n° 12 – his repudiation of the Babylonian chronology as seen by his predecessors, Berossus and Alexander Polyhistor, and his reconstruction of the generations between the diluvial times and the dispersion of peoples. In n° 13 George summarised the proper chronology of the Biblical generations between Shem and Abraham, in n° 14 he gave a résumé of the years from Abraham to Jacob; in n° 15 he returned to the very first paragraph of his book. Similarly, in n° 16 the chronicler analysed the chronological scheme of his sources; n° 17 referred to Julius Africanus' view (pp. 282, 19–21)<sup>39</sup>. N° 19 contains George's own calculations, n° 23 forms the the beginning of the short explanatory paragraph between the lists of Hebrew chronology. In n° 24 Syncellus' own words are obvious, and even more so in n° 22,

<sup>37</sup> Cf. also some further instances of conjugated ἀποδείκνυμι, meaning 'as we can prove, sb. proves, as our reasoning shows, etc.' present in the *Ekloge chronographias* (p. 35, 22–24; 38, 15–16; 69, 10–11; 76, 29–30 [this one from Africanus]; 110, 18–19 [probably also from the source]; 128, 22–25; 133, 26–28 – for the last one see above, ἀποδέδεικται n° 7), but entirely absent from *Chronographia* (with the only exception in AM 6177, p. 361, 20, which is a famous so-called scholion on the *quinisextum*).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. EUSEBIUS, I, 58, 12–22: *Allein hierauf sage ich: Zwei siebzigjährige Zeiten bedeuten die prophetischen Worte: die eine von der Verwüstung des Tempels ab, welche zum Abschluß gelangt im 2. Jahre Darehs, wie es Zacharias Ausspruch vor Augen stellt; und die andere von der Gefangenschaft der Juden bis zur Einnahme Babelons und zur Beseitigung des Königtums der Chaldäer; welche anfang gezählt zu werden von der Prophezeiungszeit an und erfüllt wird unter Kyros, entsprechend Jeremias Worte, wodurch er von der Zukunft prophezeiend sagte: »So spricht der Herr: Wann im Begriffe sich zu erfüllen sein wird Babelons 70. Jahr, werde ich euch heimsuchen und werde bestätigen über euch meine Weissagung, Zurückzuführen euch an diese Stätte«.*

<sup>39</sup> Cf. A.-M. TOTOMANOVA, *Slavjanskata versija...*, p. 465; 529.

where George the Polemist is seen at his best. Three fragments only were copied: n° 10<sup>40</sup>, 25<sup>41</sup> and 26, all from Julius Africanus.

This juxtaposition of Theophanes' non-use and George's abundant use of these phrases serves not only to indicate the difference between the styles. It should be said that the underlined sentence in AM 5828 (335/336) of the *Chronographia*, and probably the final version of the previous one, constitute a commentary to the source, and not the words of the chronicler's source itself (cf. Mango/Scott, p. 55, note 4: *Theophanes invents the false claim regarding Eusebios of Nicomedia's translation, which was two years later and had nothing to do with his actual baptism of Constantine in Nicomedia*). However, I suppose that the very sentence was written rather by George Syncellus than Theophanes. Throughout his chronicle, the latter used the form *ὡς ἀποδέδεικται* only once – precisely here, whereas his predecessor did it nine times, not to count the other forms, listed above, which are not attested in the *Chronographia* at all. The phrase *ὡς προαπεδείξαμεν* is also a hapax in Theophanes (Syncellus used the verb twice, although in a different form). Since I believe (as I showed in the discussion on *προέφην* / *προέφημεν* above) that even this early part of the chronicle was authored (edited) by Theophanes, the sentence must have been present in the material entrusted to him by George. The issue will be supplemented with some other arguments below, but already here I would like to stress that these notes did not go in such an annotated version in Byzantine history much further.

The present argumentation should be complemented with the forms of *δείκνυμι* in the future; equally telling, as *δειχθήσεται* / *ὡς δειχθήσεται* are completely absent from Theophanes' *Chronographia*. In the *Ekloge chronographias* the reverse is the case, which is shown in the list below, containing only George's own expressions and no quotations<sup>42</sup>. As with the past tense variants, they are more numerous in the first half of Syncellus' chronicle, which is richer in the polemic tone of the kind in question, and evidently more strictly woven as far as the scheme of the narrative is concerned.

<sup>40</sup> See on that excerpt: R. W. BURGESS, *Apologetic and Chronography: The Antecedents of Julius Africanus*, [in:] *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronik. Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*, ed. M. WALLRAFF, Berlin–New York 2006, p. 41; A. MOSSHAMMER, *The Christian Era of Julius Africanus with an Excursus on Olympiad Chronology*, [in:] *Julius Africanus...*, p. 86; W. ADLER, *Eusebius' Critique of Africanus*, [in:] *Julius Africanus...*, p. 155; A.-M. TOTOMANOVA, *Slavjanskata versija...*, p. 508–509; 538.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. A.-M. TOTOMANOVA, *Slavjanskata versija...*, p. 447, 525.

<sup>42</sup> The originality of the instances is to be inferred from the context and the position within the narrative structure of the chronicle. N° 2 contains Syncellus' commentary to Abydenus' narrative on the kingdom of the Chaldaeans; n° 3 belongs to the analytical level of the chronicle; in n° 5 Syncellus' authorship is self-evident. N° 6 contains the chronicler's own words, as above in *ὡς προεδήλωται* (n° 7) and *ὡς ([...]) δέδεικται* (n° 2[12]). The subject in n° 7 refers to both Africanus and Eusebius a few lines earlier in the same paragraph, thus the passage must have been written by Syncellus. In n° 8 and 9 his authorship is very plausible; in n° 11 it is revealed by the topic (see below, *δείκνυται* n° 1).

1. p. 34, 2–9 = see above, ἀποδέδεικται (n° 1).

2. p. 39, 28 – 40, 4: Ἰδοὺ δὴ καὶ οὗτος ἐξηλλαγμένη τινὶ φράσει τὰ Μωυσαϊκὰ παραχαράξας Κρόνον φησὶ κεχρηματικέναι τῷ Νῶε, ἦτοι Ξισίθρω, τῷ παρ' αὐτοῖς οὕτω καλεῖσθαι συμφωνηθέντι, τοῦ Κρόνου πολλοῖς ἔτεσι μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν, **ὡς δειχθήσεται**, καὶ τὴν πυργοποιίαν γενομένου μοχθηροῦ τινοσ καὶ ἀλάστορος.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 53: *So see how he has restamped the Mosaic writings with a rather different verbal sense, saying that Kronos issued a command to Noah, that is Xisithros (the name upon which they all agree). But Kronos was a knave and a scourge who, as will be demonstrated, lived many years after the Flood and the building of the tower.*)

3. p. 57, 26–30: ...ὅτι αὕτη μὲν ἢ παλαιότερα νομιζομένη Αἰγυπτίων συγγραφὴ Ἡφαίστου μὲν ἄπειρον εἰσάγει χρόνον, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν κθ' δυναστειῶν ἔτη τρισμῦρια ,ςφκε', καίτοι τοῦ Ἡφαίστου πολλοῖς ἔτεσι μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν καὶ τὴν πυργοποιίαν τῆς Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύσαντος, **ὡς δειχθήσεται ἐν τῷ δέοντι τόπῳ**.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 74: *For this allegedly more ancient history of the Egyptians assigns a limitless period to Hephaistos, and 36525 years to the remaining twenty-nine dynasties, although Hephaistos ruled Egypt many years after the Flood and the building of the tower, as will be demonstrated in the proper place.*)

4. p. 76, 5–9 = see above, ἀποδέδεικται (n° 4).

5. p. 76, 22–26: Τετάρθωσαν δὲ ἡμῖν ἐφεξῆς αἱ λοιπαὶ δυναστεῖαι τῶν Αἰγύπτου βασιλέων ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡ' καὶ τοῦ πρώτου βασιλέως αὐτῆς Ἀμῶς μὲν κατὰ Ἀφρικανόν, κατὰ δὲ Εὐσέβιον Ἀμῶσιος, κατὰ δὲ τὸ παρὸν χρονογραφεῖον καὶ ἕτερα ἀκριβῆ, **ὡς δειχθήσεται**, δευτέρου τῆς αὐτῆς ἡ' δυναστείας Ἀμῶσιος.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 98–99: *Now let us arrange in sequence the remaining dynasties of the kings of Egypt from the same 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty and its first king, called Amos according to Africanus and Amosis according to Eusebios. But in the present chronography, and in other accurate ones, as will be shown, the sequence will be arranged from Amosis as the second king of the 18<sup>th</sup> dynasty.*)

6. p. 89, 14–15: ...ταῦτα οὖν οὕτω μαθόντες καὶ πιστεύοντες καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς τῶν ἱστορικῶν, **ὡς δειχθήσεται**, ὁμοφωνοῦντας,...

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 113: *This, then, is what we have learnt. And having confidence that it is true we are also supported by other like minded historians, as will be demonstrated.*)

7. p. 91, 8–11: οὕτω γὰρ ἐν πέντε κανονίοις κειμένων τῶν ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ ἕως τοῦ Φαλὲκ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Φαλὲκ ἕως Ἀβραάμ ἐτῶν, **εὐμαρῶς δειχθήσεται** ἡ σύμφωνος τῆ τε Μωυσαϊκῆ καὶ εὐαγγελικῆ γραφῆ γενεαρχία τε καὶ χρονολογία.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 115: *Once the years have been arranged accordingly in five tables from Adam up to Phalek and from Phalek up to Abraham, the genealogy of the patriarchs and the chronology that coincides with the writing of Moses and the gospels, will be readily evident.*)

8. p. 118, 15–18: ...οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ὁμοφωνήσας τῷ Μανεθῶ κατὰ τοὺς μερικοὺς τῶν βασιλέων χρόνους, οὔτε μὴν τελείως ἐν τῇ τούτων ὁμαδικῆ στοιχειώσει, **ὡς δειχθήσεται** ἐν τῇ πινακικῇ αὐτῶν στοιχειώσει.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 146: *Nor does it completely agree with Manetho in the overall computation of their [sc. the kings] dates; this will be pointed out in the exposition of them in the list following.*)

**9. p. 265, 16–19:** τῷ δὲ β' ἔτει τοῦ αὐτοῦ Δαρείου τελείας ἀφέσεως δοθείσης τῷ ἔθνει καὶ τῇ ἀνοικοδομῇ τοῦ ναοῦ, τῷ ζ' ἔτει Δαρείου ἐτελειώθη τὸ ἔργον, **ὡς ἐφεξῆς δειχθήσεται** ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς τοῦ Ἑσδρα γραφῆς.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 325–326: *After the final release of the nation was authorised in the second year of this Dareios, as well as the re-establishment of the temple, the work was completed in the sixth year of Dareios, as will be demonstrated next from the divine book of Esdras.*)

**10. p. 289, 5–6** = see above, προδέδεικται (π<sup>ο</sup> 3[17])

**11. p. 377, 4–6:** οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἡ τῆς ζωοποιῶν ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ ἡμέρα κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν πρωτόκτιστον ἡμέραν συναντήσεται κατὰ τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παραδόσεις, **ὡς δειχθήσεται**.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 450: *For in the same way the day of his life-bringing Resurrection will occur on this first-created day according to the apostolic traditions, as will be demonstrated.*)

**\*(12). p. 71, 10–12:** τὸν δὲ τρόπον ἐπὶ τὴν πρώτην ὀλυμπιάδα τὴν προειρημένην ἀπὸ Ἰγύγου ἔτη **δειχθήσεται**, ἀκ'. – slightly different usage in quotation from Julius Africanus.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 90: *1020 years will be demonstrated from Ogygos up to the aforementioned first olympiad.*)

#### 4. The passage on Constantine the Great

All the above-discussed forms constitute only a small part of the formulas and expressions that differ between the two texts, despite their similar semantic function. They will not be discussed here in view of limitations of space<sup>43</sup>. Yet to address the matter in at least a basic way, one more passage from the *Chronographia* concerning the reign of Constantine the Great needs to be treated at some length. It is original not only because of the content, but also in view of the form **δείκνυται**, applied here three times in the same paragraph (and nowhere else). It is not included in Anastasius' translation, and the text bears little resemblance in this regard to the known parallel source (*Chronicon paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, p. 532, 7–13):

**AM 5827 (AD 334/335), p. 32, 25 – 33, 8:** ταῦτα τῷ τριακοστῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει γέγονε τοῦ μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου, τοῦ θείου Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐπισκοποῦντος τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν, καὶ οὐχ ὡς φησὶν **Εὐσέβιος μόνος**, ὅτι ὁ Νικομηδείας Εὐσέβιος, ὅτε εἰς τὰ ἐγκαίνια τὰ κατὰ Ἀθανασίου ἐσκεύαζεν, τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον ἐπέιχεν. τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἐκ τῆς πᾶν χρόνων ὁμάδος **δείκνυται** ψεῦδος, ἐπεὶ περ Κωνσταντίνος τὰ ὅλα ἔτη λβ' ἐβασίλευσεν. ὃς μετὰ τὴν πρώτην δεκαετηρίδα, τῷ δεκάτῳ τρίτῳ αὐτοῦ ἔτει, καταλαβὼν τὸ Βυζάντιον Μητροφάνην τὸν πρὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου εὗρεν ἐπισκοποῦντα, εἶτα Ἀλέξανδρος ἔτη τρία καὶ

<sup>43</sup> One should mention e.g.: **εἶρηται / ὡς εἶρηται** – form often in *Ekl. chron.* (19 instances) and rare in *Chron.* (just 3 instances, perhaps all borrowed from the accounts used: AM 6026, p. 186, 18–22; AM 6256, p. 435, 22–24 – the Oriental source; and very late in AM 6305, p. 499, 5). The part. pass. form εἰρημένος is visible in both chronicles, but used a bit differently (George – 11, Theophanes – 9); **πρόκειται / ὡς πρόκειται** in *Ekl. chron.* (9 instances) – absent from *Chron.*; **ὡς ὑπόκειται** in *Ekl. chron.* (4 usages) – absent from *Chron.*; **λέγω** and **φημί** in both texts; **ὡς ἐξῆς σύγκειται** in *Ekl. chron.* (1) – absent from *Chron.*; **ὡς ἐξῆς ἐστοιχείωται** in *Ekl. chron.* (5 instances) – absent from *Chron.*

εἴκοσιν ἐπισκόπησεν· ὡς εἶναι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου ἕως κοιμήσεως Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔτη λζ', ἅπερ Κωνσταντίνος οὐκ ἔφθασεν· καὶ οὕτω μὲν ἐκ τῆς χρονικῆς ομάδος **δείκνυται** μὴ ἄρξαι τὸν Εὐσέβιον ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ θρόνου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. **δείκνυται δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων** ἀνωτέρω περὶ Ἀρείου καὶ Ἀθανασίου. ἢ τε γὰρ Ἀθανασίου ἐξορία καὶ ἡ Ἀρείου κατάλυσις μετὰ τὸ τριακοστὸν ἔτος Κωνσταντίνου γέγονε καὶ μετὰ τὰ ἐγκαίνια Ἱεροσολύμων· ὁ δὲ μέγας Ἀλέξανδρος ἔτι περιῆν.

**AD 334/335, p. 52:** *These events took place in the 31<sup>st</sup> year of Constantine the Great while the divine Alexander was bishop of Constantinople. And it was not, as Eusebius alone states, while Eusebius of Nicomedia was holding the throne of Constantinople that he plotted against Athanasios at the consecration. That this is false is shown from the total period of time, since Constantine ruled in all for 32 years. After his first decade, in his 13<sup>th</sup> year he arrived in Byzantium and found Alexander's predecessor Metrophanes was bishop, after whom Alexander was bishop for 23 years. The period from the beginning of Constantine the Great's rule to the death of Alexander was consequently 37 years, which Constantine did not attain. Thus from the total period of time it can be shown that Eusebius did not rule the throne of Constantinople in Constantine's time.<sup>[note 16]</sup> This also follows from what has been said above about Arius and Athanasios. For Athanasios' banishment and Arius' death occurred after Constantine's 30<sup>th</sup> year and after the consecration at Jerusalem. The great Alexander was still alive at that time.*

**location in the entry:** (1) – 71 – 88 – (88), **parallel sources:** cf. *Chronicon paschale*, ed. L. DINDORF, p. 532, 7–13: καὶ ἐπιβάς Κωνσταντίνος λβ' ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας, ὀρμήσας ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνατολὴν κατὰ Περσῶν, ἐλθὼν ἕως Νικομηδείας, ἐνδόξως καὶ εὐσεβῶς μεταλλάττει τὸν βίον ἐν προαστείῳ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως μηνὶ ἄρτεμισίῳ ἰα', καταξιώθεις τοῦ σωτηριώδους βαπτίσματος ὑπὸ Εὐσεβίου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, βασιλεύσας ἔτη λα' καὶ μῆνας ι'.

**Anastasius:** – (pp. 87; fragment p. 32, 12 – 33, 16 [AM 5827, the last half – 5828] is not included in Anastasius' translation)

The above passage, being the last part of the respective *annus mundi*, is usually attributed to Theophanes – let us quote the gloss in Mango/Scott, p. 54, n. 16: *Theophanes' determination to demonstrate that the Arian Eusebios of Nicomedia could not have been bishop of Constantinople in Constantine's lifetime is presumably linked to iconodule arguments in Theophanes' lifetime for the orthodoxy of Constantine. Cf. AM 5814, n. 3, 5847, for other rare examples of Theophanes resorting to argument with a similar objective.*

However, as in example AM 5828 above (ὡς ἀποδέδεικται / ὡς προαπεδείξαμεν), this fragment should rather be ascribed to George Syncellus, as part of the loose notes entrusted to Theophanes and – we may add – properly used. The arguments for such an ascription are as follows:

**I.** as previously said, it is the only example of **δείκνυται** (occurring three times here) in Theophanes' *Chronographia*. Although such a form is also rare in George's work, it is a bit more visible in the *Ekloge*, and obviously in his own words:

**1. p. 2, 21–26** (George's ~prooimion): ἀναγκαίως οὖν ἐκ πάντων **δείκνυται** χρονικὴ ἀρχή, καθ' ἣν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ γεγόνασιν, ἡ ἀγία αὕτη πρωτόκτιστος ἡμέρα, ἦν ὡς θεμέλιον ἀρραγὴ καὶ βᾶσιν ἄσειστον πηξάμενος τῆσδε τῆς συγγραφῆς, λιπαρῶ τὸν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ κατ' αὐτὴν οὐ μόνον τὴν αἰσθητὴν κτίσιν ὑποστησάμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ καινὴν κτίσιν Χριστὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν συνεργησαί μοι τῷ ἀμαθεστάτῳ,...

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 3: *From every respect, therefore, this holy first-created day is incontrovertibly proved to be a chronological beginning, during which the heaven and the earth came into being. And having established this day as a solid foundation and unmoveable basis for the present narrative, I entreat Christ our God who not only gave substance to the perceptible creation on and during this day, but who also established in him a new creation: may he assist me, a most ignorant man...*)

**2. p. 38, 12–16:** τῆς δὲ Βαβυλῶνος, ὡς ἀποδέδεικται ταῖς θεολέκτοις φωναῖς, μὴ οὔσης πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ οὐδ' ἡ Χαλδαίων βασιλεία ἔσται τὸ πρότερον ἕως τῆς βασιλείας Νεβρώδ καὶ τῆς πυργοποιίας, τούτοις δὲ **συναποδείκνυται** καὶ ἡ παρὰ Μανεθῶ περι τῶν πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ καὶ δυναστειῶν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων συγγραφὴ ψευδής, (...)

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 51: *And since Babylon, as has been demonstrated by divinely inspired utterances, did not exist before the Flood, neither will there have been a kingdom of a Chaldaean in the time before the reign of Nimrod and the building of the tower. And along with this, the account written by Manetho concerning the Egyptian dynasties before the Flood is also shown to be false.*)

**3. p. 107, 5–8:** ἐνταῦθα γὰρ μᾶλλον ἡ γραφὴ συνέτεμε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Θάρα συνάψασα, τὰ τε πρὸ τῆς πορείας τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν Χαναὰν καὶ τὰ μετὰ τὴν πορείαν, ἅπερ ἦν, **ὡς δείκνυται**, τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ρμ' ἔτους ἕως τοῦ σε' ἔτους τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ.

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 133: *Notice at this point is a rather abrupt break in scripture, which joins together the narrative about Terah before Abraham's journey to the land of Canaan with its narrative after the journey (the latter narrative encompassed, as we are showing, the period from the 140<sup>th</sup> year up until Terah's 205<sup>th</sup> year, the year of his death).*)

**4. p. 133, 23–29:** Ἰακῶβ ἔτει πβ' τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ ἐγέννησε τὸν Λεὺι, καθὼς ἐν τῇ προλαβούσῃ συντάξει σαφῶς ἀποδέδεικται. ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἅπασα μεταξὺ τῆς γενέσεως Ἰωσήφ καὶ Λεὺι θ' μεσεμβολεῖν ἔτη, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔνατος ἐτέχθη μετ' αὐτόν. **ἀποδείκνυται** δὲ Ἰωσήφ ἐκ τῆς γραφῆς τῷ ρα' Ἰακῶβ τεχθεῖς, εἴ γε ρκ' ἔτει τοῦ πατρὸς λ' ἔτος ἄγων ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀναβιβάζεται. συναποδέδεικται δὲ καὶ Λεὺι διὰ τοῦτο πρὸ θ' ἐτῶν αὐτοῦ τῷ πβ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης γεννηθεῖς τοῦ Ἰακῶβ ἔτει. – as above (George's proof of the exact dating of the patriarchs)

(Adler/Tuffin, p. 166: *Jacob, in the 82<sup>nd</sup> year of his life, begot Levi, as we have clearly demonstrated in the preceding synopsis. For there definitely must have been nine years intervening between the births of Joseph and Levi, inasmuch as Joseph was the ninth to be born after him. Now it can be shown from scripture that Joseph was born in the 91<sup>st</sup> year of Jacob, seeing that it was in his father's 120<sup>th</sup> year that he, in his 30<sup>th</sup> year, was elevated to the rule of Egypt. And so we have also proved at the same time that Levi's birth, preceding Joseph's by nine years, must have occurred in Jacob's 82<sup>nd</sup> year.*)

\* **p. 476, 24–27:** a phrase with **δείκνυται**, but rather useless here, as it had been rewritten from the chronicler's source

!Note that 2. and 4. have been used before as examples of Syncellus' typically discursive structures.

**II.** the passage furnishes the only instance of 'ὡς φησιν' in the *Chronographia*, a structure much more popular in the *Ekloge chronographias* (cf. George, p. 258, 20–22: τισὶ δὲ ἀκριβέστερον δοκεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ ε' ἔτους τῆς προφητείας Ἰερεμίου, ὡς φησιν Εὐσέβιος, τὰ ἐπὶ τὸ α' ἔτος Κύρου ἀριθμεῖν. ἀλλ' οὐδ' οὕτως ἀκριβῶς σφίζεται).

The expression ὡς φησιν ± source (ἡ γραφὴ / ἡ θεία γραφὴ / ἡ βίβλος τῆς Γενέσεως / ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ λόγῳ / [ὁ] Ἰωσήππος / ἡ λεπτή Γένεσις / ὁ Ἀφρικανός / ἐν

ταῖς πράξεσιν ὁ πρωτομάρτυς / ἡ τετάρτη Μωυσαϊκὴ βίβλος / ἡ δ' τῶν βασιλειῶν καὶ ἡ β' τῶν Παραλειπομένων / ὁ Πλάτων / ὁ Φιλόχορος / Ἡρόδοτος / Εὐσέβιος / Ἱερεμίας / ὁ Διόδωρος / ὁ θεῖος εὐαγγελιστὴς Λουκᾶς), predominantly added by George and not taken from his sources, occurs 32 times, evenly spread throughout the *Ekloge chronographias*<sup>44</sup>.

‘Φησιν’ is generally rare in Theophanes’ (11) work, but it occurs often in George Syncellus’ writings (121). Theophanes sometimes mentions his sources, where such words could have come from, and some of his instances of ‘φησιν’ are quotations or parenthetical clauses in direct speech (e.g. AM 6005, p. 159, 25–26: “γράμματα,” φησίν, “ἐδεξάμην σήμερον σημαίνοντά μοι ὅτι Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος τέθνηκεν”). Some early instances, especially “Εὐσέβιος δὲ ὁ Καισαρεύς φησιν...” and “Τελάσιος δὲ ὁ Καισαρείας τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπίσκοπός φησιν...” both in AM 5796, p. 11, 14–15 and 18–19, as well as “ὁ δὲ Θεοδώρητός φησιν ὅτι Εὐσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου σύμφρων τῶν Ἀρειανῶν ὑπήρχεν...” in AM 5818, p. 28, 9–10 may derive from George’s notes – definitely edited (AM 5796) by Theophanes, as we realise from the last sentence with ‘ὡς προέφη’<sup>45</sup>.

III. the following features should also be considered: a. the method of argumentation; b. Eusebius of Caesarea treated as the major, critically discussed source; c. opinions on the periods and reigns; d. the interest in bishops, visible in the last parts of the *Ekloge chronographias*; e. counting the periods of the world down to Constantine the Great (pp. 33, 20–23; 36, 19–20; 198, 1–2). All these elements resemble the style and method of George Syncellus much more than that of Theophanes.

Such an attribution of the fragments of AM 5827 and 5828 influences also the attribution of 5814, where the baptism of Constantine in Rome by Silvester is discussed – for Mango/Scott (note 3 on p. 32) once again *one of Theophanes’ rare authorial comments and places where he resorts to argument*. The use of ἐμοὶ δὲ... φαίνεται in AM 5814 to express one’s views also resembles the language of George<sup>46</sup>. The same is probably true for the discussion of Eusebius of Caesarea’s orthodoxy at AM 5818 (unattributed to any source in the 1997 translation) and it

<sup>44</sup> *Ekloge chronographias*, p. 11, 11; 37, 20–21; 43, 20; 54, 12; 75, 1–2; 105, 7–8; 107, 28; 111, 4; 111, 17; 115, 3; 116, 23; 117, 2; 120, 4; 120, 11; 123, 3; 123, 11–12; 123, 17; 126, 11; 127, 25–26; 158, 12; 166, 16; 174, 23–24; 179, 10; 190, 11; 190, 24; 241, 17–18; 258, 21; 260, 1–2; 263, 24–25; 316, 10; 349, 5; 380, 21.

<sup>45</sup> Both Theophanes and George used the structures ὡς φασιν, ὡς τινὲς φασιν(v) etc., thus they are irrelevant here.

<sup>46</sup> In the *Chronographia* the expression never occurs again with this meaning. In the *Ekloge chronographias* one encounters similar, although not identical structures (impersonal and with reference to the sources, not to the chronicler himself) here and there: p. 100, 16; 120, 19; 136, 1–2; 168, 4–5; 302, 28–29. One cannot exclude the possibility of a yet different authorship of the fragment ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀληθέστερον φαίνεται τὸ ὑπὸ Σιλβέστρου ἐν Ῥώμῃ βεβαπτίσθαι αὐτόν... (p. 18, 1–9). Still, it is highly probable that we are dealing with an unfinished note of Syncellus subsequently incorporated by Theophanes into the framework of his *anni mundi*.

may also be of help to ascribe to George a passage from AM 5796, p. 11, 13–19 (the last paragraph without the last sentence, due to George's way of citing the sources). George's harsh opinion on Eusebius would then find here its final expression, and the case of Constantine's baptism could be important for him as well. That he spent part of his life as syncellus of the Constantinopolitan patriarch should not be forgotten in this regard.

All this is by no means to suggest that the first folios of the *Chronographia* should be separated from the part by Theophanes and glued with the *Ekloge chronographias*. George's notes, regardless if one calls them *aformai* or not<sup>47</sup>, should not be treated as something more than they actually were, i.e. probably the loose notes, which did not reach beyond Constantine I. Even in the aforementioned *anni mundi* some marks of Theophanes' intervention can be traced, as e.g. ὡς προέφη in AM 5796, or ὡς φασί τινες in the first sentence of AM 5814, used rather by him (here, in AM 5976, p. 130, 15 and AM 6106, p. 301, 1 – in his Oriental account) than by George (who preferred ὡς τινές φασιν, cf. p. 113, 13 and 329, 8). These examples are but the most obvious and easiest to discover. Indeed, some differences in the opening decades of the *Chronographia* may be better understood if the existence of Syncellus' notes is assumed (some even morphologically different and constituting unique entries, like the genealogies in AM 5814). However, although he could have read some of the sources or guided Theophanes, it probably does not mean that he managed to write further than to the moment where the *Ekloge* stops, in the eve of the times of Constantine the Great – perhaps just apart from these scarce notes on contemporary events, which has unfortunately been understood too broadly and picked too eagerly in the recent times. It is improbable that Syncellus prepared the materials for the next few centuries, worked on them and then wrote the respective parts of the chronicle. The 'Eusebian' polemic described above – stylistically, factually and logically bound – may therefore be treated as Syncellus' last discussion with his sources, faithfully transmitted by his friend.

## 5. Conclusions; the 'genuine friendship' of George and Theophanes

References to the past or to the future inside the narrative are, as I hope to have demonstrated in this paper, of great value for displaying the individual habits of the Byzantine historians. Thus, such a survey provides further arguments for the discussion on the authorship; although circumstantial, they should not be disregarded. It is not my intent to claim that the method is free of disadvantages: frequency should not be compared mechanically, some of the words or phrases are

---

<sup>47</sup> On ἀφορμαί see e.g. C. MANGO, *Who Wrote the Chronicle...*, p. 9–10; I. ŠEVČENKO, *The Search for the Past...*, p. 287; *The Chronicle of Theophanes*, p. lv; A. KAZHDAN, *History of Byzantine literature (650–850)...*, p. 216–217; *The Chronography of George*, p. lxxxii–lxxxiii; P. SOPHOULIS, *Byzantium and Bulgaria, 775–831*, Leiden 2012, p. 8–9; see also the paper of C. ZUCKERMAN in TM 2015 (p. 39–40).



too common, and sometimes the material available for comparison is too uneven. Fortunately, both George Syncellus and, surprising as it may seem, Theophanes left vast and rewarding samples to compare. The general results may be summarised in the following way. The comparison of the two chronicles firmly shows the different authorship of the respective parts, whereas comparisons inside the *Chronographia* point to a homogeneous authorship<sup>48</sup>, with all the limitations typical for the era, genre and milieu, and with the reservation that some later and partial editorial interventions are conceivable (rubrics?) and in some instances certain (cf. AM 6177). I am personally not inclined to think that any of these additions or changes in narrative between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and the 9<sup>th</sup> cent. had the character of a general, thorough reworking, with authorial control of the whole project<sup>49</sup>. These opinions remain valid no matter if one accepts or refutes the traditional ascription of the *Chronographia* to Theophanes the Confessor or another contemporary bearer of the same name.

Even a relative identification of the authors, with Theophanes using the notes of George for some *anni mundi* in the first pages of his chronicle, would lead to a somewhat distorted view if deprived of a commentary. The continuity between both chronographies is not merely a resumption of the interrupted narrative. As it was said at the beginning and as is to be maintained now, it is obviously and strikingly denser and more direct than the connection between the vast majority of the Byzantine chronicles or histories, even if one admits the many dissimilarities.

<sup>48</sup> My opinion stems not only from the wording, but also from the way of retelling the sources through separate centuries A.M. One may consider e.g. the similarities in the story of the Persian ex-emperor Kavād (AM 5968 sqq) and the Byzantine ex-emperor Justinian II (AM 6196 sqq), as compared with Procopius' *De bellis* in the former, and of necessity with patriarch Nicephorus' *Historia syntomos* in the latter case. The resemblance and parallelism of the accounts on the deposed emperors exist on the logical and narrative levels, not lexical or stylistic ones. The fragments can be easily distinguished from their textual environment: they reflect more than a year, showing a predominance of continuity of narration over the annalistic structure of the *Chronographia*. But above all, the separate sequences of the accounts accompany and correspond to each other in a permanent, parallel relationship, as if only the same aspects or categories of information were found interesting or appropriate by the chronicler. Common to both accounts are the motifs of guilt and punishment, loss of power as a consequence of tyrannical rule, as well as the adventurous character of the story, the presence of stratagems, the help of the wives and barbarians in escape or return to power etc. Certain similar elements in Kavād and Justinian's stories are stressed, others disappear. The combined comparison indicates at least that the same person abbreviated and summarised the available sources in both examples, which are quite distant in the overall structure of the chronicle; more loci can be compared that way. The idea was laid out in A. KOMPA, *Zbieżność losów a zbieżność narracji. O strukturze i autorstwie „Chronografii” Teofanesa*, [in:] *Średniowieczna wizja świata. Jedność czy różnorodność (idee i teksty) – III Kongres Mediewistów Polskich, Polska i Europa w średniowieczu. Przemiany strukturalne. Łódź 22–24 września 2008*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, Łódź 2009, p. 141–161.

<sup>49</sup> These were suggested by some scholars or arise from their theories (e.g. P. SPECK, *Der 'zweite' Theophanes...*, p. 433–470; P. YANNOPOULOS, *Les vicissitudes...*, p. 536–552 and IDEM, *Comme le dit Georges le Syncelle...*, p. 140–145).

The survey above is so by no means contradictory to the acknowledgement of the unique bond that the *Chronographia* of Theophanes shares with George Syncellus' *Ekloge chronographias*, a link that resembles to some extent the ties between the two authors; indeed, both parts constitute a uniform project. To be more precise, the idea established and developed by George was then taken over by his friend; the differences result from the independent work of the former and then of the latter, presumably with only rudimentary guidance at the beginning<sup>50</sup>. This simple and traditional view has been perceived for a few decades as too straightforward and suspicious, yet it still has a certain appeal and cannot be treated as abandoned.

The two chronicles, with all the differences, should be once again perceived as a whole, and as the crucial part of the tripartite history, as they were treated when Anastasius the Librarian laid foundations of the reception of the chronographies in the Latin West. The *Tripartita* might have been an involuntary and unintended project, but the course of events made it integral, as shown by the reconstructed *stemma codicum*. It is evident regardless of whether one accepts de Boor-Wilson's reconstruction of the preserved manuscripts or calls for reconsideration of the oldest witnesses and the place of the crucial MSS in the genealogy of the chronicle. Even if the text of Theophanes we possess now (thanks to the 1883 edition and Mango/Scott's remarks within the translation) is not definitive, the link is to be easily seen in the majority of the MSS. As it is widely known, Anastasius began his Latin translation precisely in the place where the second codex of the *Ekloge* begins (the bicodical archetype is expected because of the title in some manuscripts and certain traces in MSS AB)<sup>51</sup>, and many of the codices more or less conform to this pattern (Vat. Gr. 154, Vat. Gr. 155, Vat. Gr. 979, Coisl. 133, Oxon. Chr.Ch. Wake 5, Vat. Pal. 395, Vallicell. f 35, Monac. Gr. 391, etc.). Some others, perhaps distanced too far away from the rest of the branches in the stemma, merge yet wider parts or an unabridged version of the *Ekloge* with Theophanes and contemporary authors, with the order of the *tripartita* retained (as e.g. Par. Gr. 1711, Vat. Gr. 978)<sup>52</sup>.

<sup>50</sup> I am inclined thus to follow the *via media*, blazed above all by Alexander KAZHDAN in *A History of Byzantine Literature, 650–850...*, p. 206–234; also R. SCOTT, "The Events of Every Year, Arranged without Confusion": Justinian and Others in the Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor, [in:] *L'écriture de la mémoire. La littérature de l'historiographie*, ed. P. ODORICO, P.A. AGAPITOS, M. HINTERBERGER, Paris 2006, p. 49–65; L.M. WHITBY, *Theophanes: A Great Chronographer*, Dia 6, 1999, p. 101–102, J.D. HOWARD-JOHNSTON, *Witnesses...*, p. 272–274, or I. ŠEVČENKO, *The Search for the Past...*, p. 287–289.

<sup>51</sup> See *Ecloga chronographica*, p. xvi–xix, and in the introduction to the Adler and Tuffin's translation (p. lxxvi sq.). The otherwise inexplicable title is found in *Ecloga*, p. 360, 1–9, followed by the sentence Πομπήιος οὐν πολιορκία λαβῶν τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα Ἀριστόβουλον μὲν δέσμιον σὺν τοῖς παισὶν Ἀλεξάνδρω καὶ Ἀντιγόνῳ κατέϊχεν εἰς Πρώμην ἀπιῶν, θριαμβεύσων καὶ ἄλλων ἔθνῶν βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας. (p. 360, 10–12).

<sup>52</sup> C. DE BOOR, *Ueber die kritischen Hilfsmittel zu einer Ausgabe des Theophanes*, [in:] *Theophanis Chronographia*, vol. 2, Lipsiae 1885, p. 374–399; N.G. WILSON, *A Manuscript of Theophanes in Oxford*, DOP 26, 1972, p. 358; *Ecloga chronographica*, p. viii, xi–xviii; C. MANGO, R. SCOTT, *Introduction to The Chronicle of Theophanes*, p. xcv–xcviii; see also Filippo RONCONI's and Jesse TORGERSON's contributions in the TM Theophanes volume (2015).

Despite the uneven popularity, the links between George and Theophanes (and their works) were also familiar to Byzantine consciousness – irrespective of the precise character of the link and the correctness of the view. This should be remembered even if reception is not the decisive factor<sup>53</sup>.

From these assumptions it should be clearly visible that I do not dismiss the message of the proemium to the *Chronographia*; indeed, I suppose it is much more credible than the discussion, sometimes hypercritical, on the *vitae* and the scraps of the Confessor's biography. Although I by no means wish to trivialise the problem, there are many psychological assessments involved<sup>54</sup>, and perhaps the encomiastic language and factography are taken too literally. As the biographical data remain obscure, there is an unavoidable need to return over and over again to proemium, the only part of the *Chronographia* which is almost universally assumed to express the words of the author/editor, no matter if we identify him with St. Theophanes the Confessor or another man bearing that name. The proemium largely resembles the taste and style of the era, with an attitude of humility (ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀμαθίαν οὐκ ἀγνοοῦντες καὶ τὸ στενὸν τοῦ λόγου παρητούμεθα τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ὡς ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς τὴν ἐγγείρησιν οὐσαν / ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀμαθέσι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοῖς / ἀμαθία ἡμῶν... καὶ τῇ ἀργία τοῦ χαμερπούς νοδὸς ἡμῶν), some rhetorical phrases (e.g. οὐ γὰρ μικρὰν ὠφέλειαν, ὡς οἶμαι, καρποῦται τῶν ἀρχαίων τὰς πράξεις ἀναγινώσκων), and the unfeigned admiration for the predecessor (ἐλλόγιμος ἀνὴρ καὶ πολυμαθέστατος ὑπάρχων). Yet this layer, in any case not so impenetrable, cannot fully cover something genuine – two personalities, the interactions between them, and the genesis of the universal chronography. Some fragments point out George's activity (πολλοὺς τε χρονογράφους καὶ ἱστοριογράφους ἀναγνοὺς καὶ ἀκριβῶς τούτους διερευνησάμενος, σύντομον χρονογραφίαν..., ἀκριβῶς συνεγράψατο / τούς τε χρόνους ἐν πολλῇ ἐξετάσει ἀκριβολογησάμενος καὶ τὰς τούτων διαφωνίας συμβιβάσας καὶ ἐπιδιορθώσάμενος καὶ συστήσας ὡς οὐδεὶς ἄλλος τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ), some others attest Theophanes' input (ἡμῖν, ὡς γνησίους φίλοις, τὴν τε βίβλον ἦν συνέταξε κατατέλοιπε καὶ ἀφορμὰς παρέσχε τὰ ἐλλείποντα ἀναπληρῶσαι / κόπον οὐ τὸν τυχόντα κατεβαλόμεθα.

<sup>53</sup> P. YANNOPOULOS, "Comme le dit George le Syncelle...", p. 139–145; R. SCOTT, *Byzantine Chronicles*, MChr 6, 2009, p. 37 (remarks on Scylitzes' evaluation of George and Theophanes).

<sup>54</sup> Is there really 'an undeniable discrepancy between the saint's character and the attributes one would expect in a compiler of a massive work of historiography and computation' (Mango/Scott's introduction, p. li; cf. also C. MANGO, *Who wrote the Chronicle...*, p. 11 sq)? Can we be sure that the man's real character was fully grasped in a text like Theodore's or the *vitae*? Do we not possess a multitude of examples of historians or writers whose character and way of life was completely unexpected for typical intellectuals of the era? On the other hand, if we are to believe in such expectations and the relations between personal dispositions and the output of one's life, why do we fail to see the discrepancy between the artless, holy life known from the bios and the double lie in the proemium, provided that Theophanes indeed lied in the introduction and falsely ascribed someone else's merits to himself? These are just scattered bits of problems and doubts, which I shall not analyse here due to space limitations. 'The Confessor's visible defects as author' (C. ZUCKERMAN, TM 2015, p. 41–46) are still not very convincing.

πολλὰς γὰρ βίβλους καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκζητήσαντες κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐρευνήσαντες τόδε τὸ χρονογραφεῖον / κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἡμῖν ἀκριβῶς συνεγραψάμεθα, οὐδὲν ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν συντάξαντες, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἱστοριογράφων τε καὶ λογογράφων ἀναλεξάμενοι ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις τόποις τετάχαμεν ἐκάστου χρόνου τὰς πράξεις, ἀσυγχύτως κατατάττοντες / φίλον γὰρ θεῶ τὸ κατὰ δύναμιν).

The author of the preface calls himself George's γνήσιος φίλος. But how are we to understand this 'genuine friendship', the crucial relation between the two? Such words tend to lose their literal meaning, and often shift from expressing cordial, emotional categories to formal, half-hearted relations. On the other hand, the phrase is known from various styles of literature and was hardly ever used lightly. The expression never occurs in George's *Eklōge*, although here and there the adjective is attached to other nouns – Syncellus has γνησίους ἀνελῶν παῖδας for 'legitimate offspring' (p. 354, 10–11), τοῖς γνησίοις πολίταις 'legitimate citizenry' (p. 359, 13), γνησίας αὐτοῦ γαμετῆς as 'lawfully begotten wife' (p. 375, 18), υἰὸν γνήσιον as 'lawfully begotten son' (p. 384, 6–7), ἀδελφοῦ τε γνησίου as 'legitimate brother' (p. 414, 28 – 415, 1). Whether own or copied, these phrases carry a slightly different meaning than in Theophanes' part, where γνήσιος / -ια with this lexical sense occurs only twice – copied, as one may assume, from the source covering the late 7<sup>th</sup> and the early 8<sup>th</sup> cent. in the *Chronographia*, i.e. the putative *Scriptor anni 717*: in AM 6190 (p. 371, 9–10) Apsimar's brother, Heraclius is called γνήσιος αὐτοῦ ἀδελφός, and in AM 6196, (p. 373, 1–2) Justinian II's new wife is described in relation to the Khagan of the Khazars as γνησία αὐτοῦ ἀδελφή<sup>55</sup>.

However, these are only quotations from the sources, and all they prove is that the chronicler was aware of the different meanings of the word. Except for these two examples, seven other instances should be understood as 'genuine, faithful'. Let us omit two that are not quite parallel to the proemium<sup>56</sup> and focus on the

<sup>55</sup> Out of the nine occurrences of the adjective in the *Chronographia*, one more example can be added to the above-mentioned two in AM 6187, p. 368, 25–26. Irrespective of the originality of the latter example, which might have been copied or rephrased, the wide use of γνήσιος suggests the style of the Theophanes' source and, in consequence, is yet another small piece of evidence for the hypothesis on the reconstructed source for the period of the last Heraclid on the Byzantine throne and this direct successors – see D. AFINOGENOV, *The Source of Theophanes' Chronography and Nikephoros' Breviarium for the years 685–717*, XB 4, 2005, p. 3–14; IDEM, *The History of Justinian and Leo*, [in:] *La Crimée entre Byzance et le Khaganat Khazare*, ed. C. ZUCKERMAN, Paris 2006 (CHCB Monographies, 25), p. 181–200 (184; 186; 187). Still, in spite of this reconstruction, one must observe that yet another instance lurks very close in the narrative (AM 6209, p. 391, 6–11), associated by the author with a different piece of middle Byzantine historiography. For this meaning of γνήσιος compare also Old-Church-Slavonic ПРИСИЬ – *Řecko-staroslověnský index*, vol. I, *Prolegomena. Tabellae synopticae monumentorum slavlicorum A–G*, ed. E. VLÁHOVÁ, Praha 2014, p. 514 (s.v. γνήσιος).

<sup>56</sup> AM 6303, p. 489, 29 (ὕπο τινος γνησίου θεράποντος) and p. 492, 17–18 (ὁ τῆς πατρικῆς γνώμης γνήσιος κληρονόμος).

crucial set: 1. Retelling the story of the disastrous rivalry between Boniface and Aetius (AM 5931, p. 93, 34–94, 9), Theophanes says that the former believed in the treacherous messages from the latter and followed his guidance against the imperial will ὡς γνησίῳ φίλῳ Ἄετίῳ πιστεύσας<sup>57</sup>. 2. In the entry on Zamanarzos' visit to Constantinople, the chronicler says that the latter's wish was to become αὐτὸν σύμμαχον Ῥωμαίων καὶ φίλον γνήσιον – a wish that was fulfilled due to emperor Justinian's consent (AM 6027, p. 216, 6–14). 3. AM 6187 (pp. 368, 18–30) describes the scene where strategos Leontius was accompanied to the harbour of Sophia by his friends, among whom Paul of Callistratus and Gregory the Cappadocian are named οἱ γνήσιοι αὐτοῦ φίλοι – perhaps not only because they had often visited him in prison before and heralded him a smile of fortune. 4. In an incident that happened when Justinian II was on his way back to Constantinople with the Bulgarians to reclaim his paternal throne, he crossed ways with spatharius Leo, whose family had been relocated to Messembria by that emperor a dozen years earlier. To ingratiate himself with the Rhinotmetos, Leo gave him 500 sheep. θεραπευθεὶς δὲ Ὀῤουστινιανὸς σπαθάριον αὐτὸν εὐθέως πεποίηκεν, καὶ ἔσχεν αὐτὸν ὡς γνήσιον φίλον (AM 6209, p. 391, 6–11). Theophanes' words may be expected rather in n° 1 and 2, whereas n° 3 and 4 seem to be quotations. In any case, these four situations, although linked with a political and quite official level of social relations (which I would attribute to the character of the chronicle rather than to any other factor) show different levels of actual personal involvement and closeness. Political friendship or confidence is the minimal variant; more individual relations do not seem improbable in n° 1 and 3.

Fortunately, there is further material to be compared, as references to 'genuine friendship' pop up in different genres of Byzantine literature. In the vast correspondence of Theodore the Studite there is a letter to a certain patricia, recommended to him by his pupil Peter. The lady is praised because of her strong antiiconoclast beliefs, after which Theodore, himself not acquainted with her, declares that he was 'a genuine friend' of her late husband<sup>58</sup>. Apostrophes to 'true friends' or remarks on 'genuine friendship' occur in three other letters, and these relations seem to be held by Theodore in high esteem, judging by the context, which is at least partially religious<sup>59</sup>. The latter feature is not uncommon in contemporary writers' output

<sup>57</sup> Cf. PROCOPIUS OF CAESAREA, *History of the Wars*, III, 3, 19–20.

<sup>58</sup> THEODORE STUDITE, ep. 206, 17–22, [in:] *Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, rec. G. FATOUROS, vol. II, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 1992, p. 328–329.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibidem*, ep. 243 (Καὶ πάλιν κόπους σοι παρέσχον, ἄνθρωπε τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ γνήσιε φίλε, ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀποστολαῖς σου·), ep. 260 (Ὡ πῶς καλὸν τὸ πλάσμα τῆς ψυχῆς σου, φίλε καλὲ καὶ πιστέ, φίλε γνήσιε καὶ φιλόθεε, φίλε κοινωνὲ θλίψεων καὶ περιστάσεων·), ep. 451 (διὸ ἠναγκάσθημεν οἰονεῖ πετασθῆναι τοῖς γράμμασιν ὡς ἐν σώματι καὶ ἰδεῖν σε, τὸν καλὸν πατέρα, τὸν γνήσιον φίλον, τὸν γενναῖον μάρτυρα τῆς ἀληθείας·).

(cf. Michael Syncellus' phrase ὁ δὲ τῶν Χριστοῦ θεραπόντων γνήσιος φίλος<sup>60</sup>, or expressions like ἄνευ γνήσιος φίλος τοῦ θεοῦ<sup>61</sup>). The use of the expression γνήσιος φίλος among the closest family relations had in the 9<sup>th</sup> cent. a long-established tradition, as described by Philo (κἄν ἀδελφὸς ἢ υἱὸς ἢ θυγάτηρ ἢ γυνὴ ἢ οἰκουρὸς ἢ γνήσιος φίλος ἢ τις ἕτερος εὖνους εἶναι)<sup>62</sup> or Pseudo-Macarius the Egyptian (ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, τριημέρου σκότους γενομένου, οὐκ ἔβλεπεν υἱὸς πατέρα οὔτε ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν οὔτε φίλος γνήσιον φίλον, τοῦ σκότους καλύψαντος αὐτοῦς or, in another passage: ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων, ἐπὶ μὲν τὸ σῶμα δύνηται λαβεῖν τροφήν, ἀπελιζοῦσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ κλαίουσι πάντες γνήσιοι φίλοι, συγγενεῖς καὶ ἀγαπητοί)<sup>63</sup>. Theological literature is not devoid of the notion of a sincere, emotional friendship conceived in the way we understand it intuitively – in Theodore of Mopsuestia's explanation to psalm 54[55], 15a–b one reads “Ὅς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐγλύκανας ἐδέσματα. – Ἐγλύκανας ἐδέσματα, τουτέστιν συνέφαγες μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἡδονῆς, οὐχ ὡς ξένος παρ’ ἐμοὶ φαγὼν ἀλλ’ ὡς γνήσιος φίλος μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἡδονῆς καὶ τῆς τέρψεως καὶ τοῦθάρσους συμφαγῶν, and in a sort of summary “Ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπορεύθημεν ἐν ὁμοιοίᾳ. – Τούτων ἐμνημόνευσεν ἀπάντων, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι ἰσόψυχος, ὅτι ἡγεμών, ὅτι γνωστός, ὅτι ἐγλύκανεν ἐδέσματα, ὅτι συνεπορεύθη ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, δεικνὺς ὡς ἐν πολλοῖς τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔχοντες κοινωνίαν<sup>64</sup>. Finally, no other ecclesiastical authority ever defined friendship as aptly as John Chrysostom in his commentary to 1 Thess.:

Οὐδὲν γὰρ, οὐδὲν τῆς τοιαύτης ἀγάπης γλυκύτερον γένοιτ’ ἂν· οὐδὲν ἐκεῖ λυπηρὸν συμπεσεῖται. Ὅντως φίλος πιστὸς φάρμακον ζωῆς· ὄντως φίλος πιστὸς σκέπη κραταιά.

Τί γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ἐργάσαιτο φίλος γνήσιος; πόσην μὲν οὐκ ἂν ἐμπούσειεν ἡδονήν; πόσην δὲ ὠφέλειαν; πόσην δὲ ἀσφάλειαν; Κἄν μυρίους θησαυροὺς εἴπης, οὐδὲν ἀντάξιον γνησίου φίλου. Καὶ τὰ αὐτῆς πρῶτον εἶπωμεν τῆς φιλίας πόσην ἔχει τὴν ἡδονήν. Γάννυται ὁρῶν αὐτὸν καὶ διαχεῖται, συμπλέκεται συμπλοκὴν αὐτῷ τινα κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν ἄρρητον ἔχουσαν τὴν ἡδονήν· κἄν ἀναμνησθῆ μόνον αὐτοῦ, διανέστη τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ ἀνεπερώθη<sup>65</sup>.

<sup>60</sup> MICHAEL SYNCELLUS, *Encomium martyrum XLII Amoriensum (versio Γ)*, 5, [in:] *Сказания о 42 Амориѣскихъ мученикахъ и церковная служба им*, ed. В. ВАСИЛЬБЕВСКИЙ, П. НИКИТИН, Санкт-Петербург 1905, p. 25.

<sup>61</sup> *Vita et miracula sancti Demetrii*, mir. V, 299, [in:] P. LEMERLE, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans*, vol. 1, Paris 1979, p. 232. Cf. e.g. Πατάπιος ὁ θεοῦ θεράπων γνήσιος in ANDREW OF CRETE'S *In Patapium*, PG 97, col. 1213.

<sup>62</sup> PHILO, *De specialibus legibus*, I, 316, [in:] *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, rec. L. COHN, vol. 5, Berlin 1906.

<sup>63</sup> PSEUDO-MACARIUS THE EGYPTIAN, hom. 28, 4 and hom. 1, 11, [in:] *Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, ed. H. DÖRRIES, E. KLOSTERMANN, M. KRÜGER, Berlin 1964.

<sup>64</sup> *Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes (I–LXXX)*, ps. LIV [55], 15a–b, ed. R. DEVRESSE, Citta del Vaticano 1939.

<sup>65</sup> JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, *In epistolam primam ad Thessalonicenses commentarius (homiliae 1–11)*, hom. II, PG 62, col. 403.

These senses of the phrase must have been known to an average literate Byzantine, the more so because the Christian authors did not lose even the proverbial usage with γνήσιος or γενναίος, e.g. μακάριος ὅστις ἔτυχε γνησίου φίλου<sup>66</sup>, or γνήσιος φίλων ὁ τὰς περιστάσεις κοινούμενος<sup>67</sup>. Although γνήσια φιλία may be semi-official, confidence is crucial here, irrespective of whether one prefers to link it with *fratria*<sup>68</sup> or with yet more emotional relationships. That is why in Palladius' *Historia Lausiaca* an angel revealed himself to Evagrius of Pontus in disguise of his 'genuine friend', to save him from oppression and guide him. Similarly, in another place, as Palladius writes on his brother (i.e. his *alter ego*), one of the major merits he praises is exposing himself to dangers for his 'truthful friends'<sup>69</sup>. 'Genuine friendship' does not exclude either admiration or the relation of authority. Equal level relations, respect due to difference in age or position, self-reference of a human being to God are all comprised by the notion. On the one hand γνήσιος φίλος τοῦ θεοῦ may be parallel to γνήσιος δούλος τοῦ θεοῦ, on the other hand there is no sign of the inequality of the two parts in many passages on the relation of friendship where the phrase is used.

In this perspective, 'genuine friendship' is not at odds with the significance of the proemium to the *Chronographia*. The personal relationship between George and Theophanes – stronger than that between simple acquaintances and not devoid of respect or even a certain dose of idolising – fits in this framework without any dissonance. The depth of the relation, often difficult to judge even in eras for which we have many more sources, must remain indeterminable here. Yet the incentive to continue the chronicle due to a request of a friend should not be treated with such incredulity. One may well presume that reality was in concordance with the topos in that case, not replaced with one. That in turn helps to appreciate the author of the *Chronography* as the real creator. Further arguments are manifold: George indeed gathered vast material, as Theophanes claimed, and the latter one indeed 'did not set down anything of his own composition', as he used the sources throughout his part of the chronography. Nevertheless, the amount of (often authorial) labour was impressive – this is also admitted in the introduction. Both Alden A. Mosshammer's and William Adler and Paul Tuffin's estimates of the time in which George wrote his part leave much space for Theophanes'

<sup>66</sup> *Vita Aesopi Westermanniana (recensio 2)*, 110, 12, [in:] *Aesopica*, ed. B.E. PERRY, vol. 1, Urbana 1952; cf. Μακάριος, ὅστις ἔτυχε γενναίου φίλου, [in:] *Menandri sententiae*, 471, ed. S. JÄKEL, Leipzig 1964.

<sup>67</sup> EVAGRIUS OF PONTUS, *Spirituales sententiae per alphabetum dispositae*, 27, [in:] *Gnomica*, rec. A. ELTER, vol. 1, Lipsiae 1892, repated in *Sacra parallela* ascribed to John of Damascus in Περὶ φίλων χρηστών – PG 96, col. 405, 37–41.

<sup>68</sup> P. SPECK, *Kaiser Leon III., die Geschichtswerke des Nikephoros und des Theophanes und der Liber pontificalis*, vol. 1, Bonn 2002 (PB 19), p. 117–118, here with a concept of *fratria* derived from H.-G. BECK, *Byzantinisches Gefolgschaftswesen*, München 1965 (cf. also P. SPECK, *Der 'zweite' Theophanes...*, p. 457–458).

<sup>69</sup> PALLADIO, *La storia Lausiaca*, 38, 5; 71, 1, ed. G.J.M. BARTELINK, Verona 1974.

completion of the project before the hapless *anni mundi* 6306–6307<sup>70</sup>. There are clear differences as regards what we could call the chronicles' morphology or internal structure, a different way of citing the sources, distinctive methods of calculating time and divergent literary techniques<sup>71</sup>. The explanation expounded in the proemium is straightforward and understandable; negative statements usually include too many unverifiable assumptions and do not explain the meaning and purpose of such a fake introduction. If the distance between the authorship and redaction were not that significant, why should one assume that George left such an abundance of raw material and was not able to utilize it in his own book? Why should one suppose that Theophanes, George's 'genuine friend', lied in the proemium? Why should one think that his self-criticism in the preface was anything more than a humility formula, if he was not a *homo rudis* at all? And, then again, why would someone uneducated or untrustworthy be burdened by George with such a daunting task? As for the biography of Theophanes, why to focus on the kidney problems, which might have been either exaggerated in the *vitae*, or not very precisely described by the hagiographers?

The final point of the *Ekloge* and the starting point of the *Chronographia* is not irrelevant and it is not a mere coincidence that Syncellus finished where he did. The last part of his text is a patchwork, with fewer digressions, less complex discussions, without résumés or a final touch. The next centuries demanded change of the sources, even those which had accompanied the historian throughout the whole project. Big chronological issues that had occupied his mind were solved. Finally, one cannot exclude that his intellectual stamina died away or his capabilities of fully creative work dwindled. Whatever the reasons, the change cannot be overlooked by any careful reader. The end seems neither entirely accidental nor fully deliberate, with Diocletian as the turn of the eras and the chronicler's forced retirement<sup>72</sup>. Finally, we may have here an example of an intellectual and his epigone, a loyal friend who undertook the commissioned task – in a slightly less sophisticated manner and agenda than his predecessor, but still successfully – with his own biases and opinions. It is not inconceivable that it was his only literary

<sup>70</sup> *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga*, p. xxv; *The Chronography of George*, p. xxix. Cf. e.g. also H. HUNGER, *Die Hochsprachliche...*, vol. 1, p. 331–332; A. KAZHDAN, *History of Byzantine Literature (650–850)...*, p. 206; L.M. WHITBY, *Theophanes: a Great Chronographer...*, p. 102; M.J. LESZKA, *Leon V i chan Krum w świetle fragmentu Chronografii (AM 6305) Teofanesa Wyznawcy*, PNH 6, 2007, p. 109–117; P. SOPHOULIS, *Byzantium and Bulgaria...*, p. 12.

<sup>71</sup> The differences are elegantly described by A. KAZHDAN, *History of Byzantine Literature (650–850)*, p. 216–234; cf. also И.С. ЧИЧУРОВ, *Феофан Исповедник – публикатор, редактор, автор?*, есп. р. 85–87; Я.Н. ЛЮБАРСКИЙ, *Феофан Исповедник и источники*, p. 86; П. КУЗЕНКОВ, *Хронография Георгия Синкелла – Феофана Исповедника: хронологический аспект*, [in:] КΑΝΙΣΚΙΟΝ: Юбилейный сборник в честь 60-летия проф. Игоря Сергеевича Чичурова, ed. М.В. ГРАЦИАНСКИЙ, П.В. КУЗЕНКОВ, Москва 2006, p. 156–168; P. SOPHOULIS, *Byzantium and Bulgaria...*, p. 10–11.

<sup>72</sup> *The Chronography of George*, p. xlvi.



undertaking, although this has been considered suspicious by the scholars. Thus, with two authors of an ultimately uniform historiographical project, the view displayed in the proemium and the conclusions of the survey on the chroniclers' own words can be considered consistent.

## Bibliography<sup>73</sup>

### Sources

*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature*, University of California (<http://www.tlg.uci.edu>).

\* \* \*

ANDREW OF CRETE, *In exaltationem venerandae crucis* [= or. XI], PG 97.

ANDREW OF CRETE, *Homilia in exaltatione s. crucis*, ed. M. DE GROOTE, HTR 100, 2007, p. 443–487.

ANDREW OF CRETE, *In s. Patapium*, [in:] PG 97, col. 1206–1221[1254].

*The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813*, trans. with introd. and comm. C. MANGO, R. SCOTT, with assist. of G. GREATREX, Oxford 1997.

*The Chronography of George Synkellos: A Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*, trans. with introd. and notes W. ADLER, P. TUFFIN, Oxford 2002.

*Le commentaire de Théodore de Mopsueste sur les Psaumes (I–LXXX)*, ed. R. DEVRESSE, Citta del Vaticano 1939.

*Concilium Quinisextum*, ed. H. OHME, Turnhout 2006.

*Eusebius Werke*, vol. V, *Die Chronik aus der Armenischen übersetzt*, ed. J. KARST, Leipzig 1911.

EVAGRIUS OF PONTUS, *Spirituales sententiae per alphabetum dispositae*, [in:] *Gnomica*, rec. A. ELTER, vol. I, Lipsiae 1892.

EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, ed. J. BIDEZ, L. PARMENTIER, London 1898.

GEORGES PACHYMERES, *Relations Historiques*, VI, 24, ed. A. FAILLER, trans. V. LAURENT, vol. I, Paris 1984.

*Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica*, ed. A.A. MOSSHAMMER, Leipzig 1984.

JOSEPH FLAVIUS, *Antiquitates iudaicae*, ed. B. NIESE.

*Menandri sententiae*, 471, ed. S. JÄKEL, Leipzig 1964.

MICHAEL SYNCELLUS, *Encomium martyrum XLII Amoriensum (versio Γ)*, [in:] *Сказания о 42 Аморийских мучениках и церковная служба им*, ed. В. ВАСИЛЬЕВСКИЙ, П. НИКИТИН, Санкт-Петербург 1905.

NICEPHORUS GREGORAS, *Historia Romana*, ed. I. BEKKER, L. SCHOPEN, vol. I, Bonnae 1829; vol. II, 1830; vol. III, 1855.

PALLADIO, *La storia Lausiaca*, ed. G.J.M. BARTELINK, Verona 1974.

*Papyri Graecae magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, vol. II, ed. K. PREISENDANZ & A. HENRICH, <sup>2</sup>Stutgardiae 1974.

<sup>73</sup> The bibliography does not include the sources cited in tables.

*Passio magni martyris Artemii*, [in:] *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. V, ed. P.B. KOTTER, Berlin–New York 1988.

*Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, rec. L. COHN, vol. V, Berlin 1906.

PSEUDO-MACARIUS THE EGYPTIAN, [in:] *Die 50 geistlichen Homilien des Makarios*, ed. H. DÖRRIES, E. KLOSTERMANN, M. KRÜGER, Berlin 1964.

*Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, rec. G. FATOUROS, vol. II, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 1992.

*Theophanis Chronographia*, rec. C.G. DE BOOR, vol. I, Lipsiae 1883.

*Le version brève des Relations Historiques de Georges Pachymérés*, VI, 24, ed. A. FAILLER, vol. I, Paris 2001.

*Vita Aesopi Westermanniana (recensio 2)*, [in:] *Aesopica*, ed. B.E. PERRY, vol. I, Urbana 1952.

*Vita et miracula sancti Demetrii*, [in:] P. LEMERLE, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Démétrius et la pénétration des Slaves dans les Balkans*, vol. I, Paris 1979.

## Secondary literature

ADLER W., *Eusebius' Critique of Africanus*, [in:] *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronik. Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*, ed. M. WALLRAFF, Berlin–New York 2006, p. 148–157.

AFINOGENOV D., *The History of Justinian and Leo*, [in:] *La Crimée entre Byzance et le Khaganat Khazare*, ed. C. ZUCKERMAN, Paris 2006 (CHCB Monographies, 25), p. 181–200.

AFINOGENOV D., *The Source of Theophanes' Chronography and Nikephoros' Breviarium for the years 685–717*, XB 4, 2005, p. 3–14.

BECK H.-G., *Byzantinisches Gefolgschaftswesen*, München 1965.

DE BOOR C., *Ueber die kritischen Hilfsmittel zu einer Ausgabe des Theophanes*, [in:] *Theophanis Chronographia*, vol. II, Lipsiae 1885, p. 374–399.

BRANDES W., *Pejorative Phantomnamen im 8. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik des Theophanes und deren Konsequenzen für die historische Forschung*, [in:] *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*, hrsg. L.M. HOFFMANN (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 17), Wiesbaden 2005, p. 93–125.

BRUBAKER L., HALDON J., *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (c. 680–850): The Sources – an Annotated Survey*, Aldershot 2001.

BURGESS R.W., *Apologetic and Chronography: The Antecedents of Julius Africanus*, [in:] *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronik. Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*, ed. M. WALLRAFF, Berlin–New York 2006, p. 17–42.

*Dumbarton Oaks Hagiography Database*

FERBER J., *Theophanes' Account of the Reign of Heraclius*, [in:] *Byzantine Papers: Proceedings of the First Australian Byzantine Studies Conference, Canberra, 17–19 May 1978*, ed. E. JEFFREYS, M. JEFFREYS, A. MOFFATT, Canberra 1981, p. 32–42.

HOWARD-JOHNSTON J.D., *Witnesses to a World Crisis: Historians and Histories of the Middle East in the Seventh Century*, Oxford 2010.

HUNGER H., *Die Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, vol. I, München 1978.

KARPOZĒLOS A., *Byzantinoi historikoi kai chronographoi*, vol. II, 80s–100s ai., Athens 2002.

KAZHDAN A., *History of Byzantine literature (650–850)*, Athens 1999.

- KOMPA A., *Zbieżność losów a zbieżność narracji. O strukturze i autorstwie „Chronografii” Teofanesa*, [in:] *Średniowieczna wizja świata. Jedność czy różnorodność (idee i teksty) – III Kongres Mediewistów Polskich, Polska i Europa w średniowieczu. Przemiany strukturalne. Łódź 22–24 września 2008*, ed. M. J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, Łódź 2009, p. 141–161.
- KOMPA A., *In search of Syncellus’ and Theophanes’ own words: the authorship of the Chronographia revisited*, TM 19, 2015 (= *Studies in Theophanes*, ed. M. JANKOWIAK, F. MONTINARO, Paris 2015), p. 73–92.
- LAMPSIDES O., *Ephraem Aenii Historia chronica*, Athens 1990.
- LESZKA M. J., *Leon V i chan Krum w świetle fragmentu Chronografii (AM 6305) Teofanesa Wyznawcy*, PNH 6, 2007, p. 109–117.
- LJUBARSKIJ J., *Concerning the Literary Technique of Theophanes the Confessor*, Bsl 61, 1995, p. 317–322.
- MANGO C., *The Availability of Books in the Byzantine Empire, A.D. 750–850*, [in:] *Byzantine Books and Bookmen*, ed. C. MANGO, I. ŠEVČENKO, Washington 1975, p. 29–45.
- MANGO C., *Who Wrote the Chronicle of Theophanes?*, 3PBI 18, 1978, p. 9–17.
- MOSSHAMMER A., *The Christian Era of Julius Africanus with an Excursus on Olympiad Chronology*, [in:] [in:] *Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronik. Julius Africanus und die christliche Weltchronistik*, ed. M. WALLRAFF, Berlin–New York 2006, p. 83–112.
- OLSTER D., *Syriac Sources, Greek Sources, and Theophanes Lost Year*, BF 19, 1993, p. 218–228.
- PIGULEVSKAJA N., *Theophanes’ Chronographia and the Syrian Chronicles*, JÖBG 16, 1967, p. 55–60.
- PROUDFOOT A. S., *The Sources of Theophanes for the Heraclian Dynasty*, B 44, 1974, p. 367–439.
- Řecko-staroslověnský index*, vol. I, *Prolegomena. Tabellae synopticae monumentorum slavlicorum A–G*, ed. E. BLÁHOVÁ, Praha 2014.
- ROCHOW I., *Byzanz im 8. Jahrhundert in der Sicht des Theophanes. Quellenkritisch-historischer Kommentar zu den Jahren 715–813*, Berlin 1991.
- ROCHOW I., *Malalas bei Theophanes*, K 65, 1983, p. 459–474.
- SCOTT R., “*The Events of Every Year, Arranged without Confusion*”: *Justinian and Others in the Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, [in:] *L’écriture de la mémoire. La littérature de l’historiographie*, ed. P. ODORICO, P. A. AGAPITOS, M. HINTERBERGER, Paris 2006, p. 49–65.
- SCOTT R., *Byzantine Chronicles*, MChr 6, 2009, p. 31–57.
- SCOTT R., *From Propaganda to History to Literature: the Byzantine Stories of Theodosius’ Apple and Marcian’s Eagles*, [in:] *History as Literature in Byzantium*, ed. R. MACRIDES, Aldershot 2010, p. 122–127.
- SCOTT R., *Writing the Reign of Justinian: Malalas versus Theophanes*, [in:] *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning*, ed. P. ALLEN, E. JEFFREYS, Brisbane 1996, p. 21–34.
- ŠEVČENKO I., *The Search for the Past in Byzantium around the Year 800*, DOP 46, 1992, p. 287–289.
- SOPHOULIS P., *Byzantium and Bulgaria, 775–831*, Leiden 2012.
- SPECK P., *Das geteilte Dossier. Beobachtungen zu den Nachrichten über die Regierung des Kaiser Herakleios und seine Söhne bei Theophanes und Nikephoros*, Bonn 1988.
- SPECK P., *Kaiser Leon III., die Geschichtswerke des Nikephoros und des Theophanes und der Liber pontificalis*, vol. I, Bonn 2002 (PB 19).
- SPECK P., *Der ‘zweite’ Theophanes. Eine These zur Chronographie des Theophanes*, [in:] *Poikila Byzantina*, vol. XIII, *Varia V*, Bonn 1994, p. 431–483.
- Studies in Theophanes*, ed. M. JANKOWIAK, F. MONTINARO, Paris 2015 (= TM 19).

- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Canon of Greek Authors and Works*, ed. L. BERKOWITZ and K. A. SQUITIER, Oxford 1990 (& on-line version, ed. M. PANTELIA).
- Thesaurus Theophanis Confessoris*, ed. B. COULIE, P. YANNOPOULOS, Turnhout 1998.
- ТОТОМАНОВА А.-М., *A Lost Byzantine Chronicle in Slavic Translation*, SCer 1, 2011, p. 191–204.
- WHITBY L.M., *The Great Chronographer and Theophanes*, BMGS 8, 1982/1983, p. 1–20.
- WHITBY L.M., *Theophanes' Chronicle Source for the Reigns of Justin II, Tiberius and Maurice (A.D. 565–602)*, B 53, 1983, p. 312–345.
- WILSON N.G., *A Manuscript of Theophanes in Oxford*, DOP 26, 1972, p. 358.
- YANNOPOULOS P., „Comme le dit Georges le Syncelle ou, je pense, Théophane”, B 74, 2004, p. 139–146.
- YANNOPOULOS P., *Théophane de Sigriani le Confesseur (759–818). Un héros orthodoxe du second iconoclasme*, Bruxelles 2013.
- YANNOPOULOS P., *Les vicissitudes historiques de la Chronique the Théophane*, B 70, 2000, p. 527–553.

\* \* \*

- КУЗЕНКОВ П., *Хронография Георгия Синкелла – Феофана Исповедника: хронологический аспект*, [in:] ΚΑΝΙΣΚΙΟΝ: Юбилейный сборник в честь 60-летия проф. Игоря Сергеевича Чичурова, ed. М.В. ГРАЦИАНСКИЙ, П.В. КУЗЕНКОВ, Москва 2006, p. 156–168.
- ЛЮБАРСКИЙ Я.Н., *Феофан Исповедник и источники его «Хронографии»*: (К вопросу о методах их освоения), ВВ 45, 1984, p. 72–86.
- ТОТОМАНОВА А.-М., *Славянската версия на Хрониката на Георги Синкел*, София 2008.
- ЧИЧУРОВ И.С., *Феофан – компилятор Феофилакты Симокатты*, АДСВ 10, 1973, p. 203–206.
- ЧИЧУРОВ И.С., *Феофан Исповедник – компилятор Прокопия*, ВВ 37, 1976, p. 62–73.
- ЧИЧУРОВ И.С., *Феофан Исповедник – публикатор, редактор, автор?* (В связи со статьей К. Манго), ВВ 42, 1981, p. 78–87.

**Abstract.** In a nutshell: 1. I believe that *Ekloge Chronographias* of George Syncellus and *Chronographia* of Theophanes the Confessor should be treated as a single project, undertaken in turn by two authors; 2. There are important stylistic differences between the two parts, noticeable in the fragments, in which the authors deliver some editorial remarks or disclose their personal opinions; from a wider selection of such phrases, references to the past or future such as ‘as I have mentioned/as I said/as have been said/as we demonstrated above, etc.’, being diverse and individual, are especially helpful. 3. This observation is of great use not only for the texts analysed here, it may be used to confirm authorship of many other texts. 4. As for George and Theophanes, the TLG search of such structures in all extant classical Greek and Byzantine output confirms the statement nr 1, with clauses like *ὡς προέφην / καθὼς καὶ προέφην / ὡς προέφημεν / καθὼς προέφημεν* both rare in the whole preserved corpus, and relatively often used by the author of *Chronographia*. The style of the proemium of *Chronographia* fits the rest of the work and differs from *Ekloge Chronographias*. 5. Precise analysis of a wider group of similar clauses shows that *Ekloge Chronographias* and *Chronographia* were written by two different authors; *Chronographia* was created by one author, distinctive and independent, no matter how reproductive at the same time he was. I see no convincing arguments not to call this author Theophanes. Some later and partial editorial interventions to *Chronographia*, conceivable (rubrics?) and in some instances even certain, do not challenge this view. 6. Only a few entries from the initial parts of *Chronographia* fit more the George’s work; their style and content bear much more similarities with *Ekloge* (in AM 5796, 5814, 5818, 5827, 5828). These paragraphs,

George's *aphormai*, probably in form of loose notes, were inserted to *Chronographia* by its author the same way as he used his sources for the subsequent parts; they did not reach beyond the times of Constantine I. 7. I do not dismiss the message of the proemium to the *Chronographia* as it is much more credible than the discussion, sometimes hypercritical, on the *vitae* and the scraps of the Confessor's biography. I see no reason not to believe that the idea established and developed by George was then taken over by his friend; the differences result from the independent work of the former and then of the latter, presumably with only rudimentary guidance at the beginning. 8. The 'genuine friendship', the crucial relation between the two authors is still the most useful key to understand the history of the *tripartita* – therefore, I analyse it in the final part of the paper.

**Keywords:** Theophanes Confessor, George Syncellus, Georgios Synkellos, Byzantine chronography, *Chronographia*, *Ekloge chronographias*, *gnesios filios*, friendship, *historia tripartita*, TLG, world chronicles, *aphormai*, *prophemi*, *hos proephen*, *kathos kai proephen*, *hos proephemien*

**Andrzej Kompa**

Uniwersytet Łódzki  
Wydział Filozoficzno-Historyczny  
Katedra Historii Bizancjum UŁ  
ul. A. Kamińskiego 27a  
90–219 Łódź, Polska/Poland  
andrzejkompa@uni.lodz.pl  
andrzejkompa@o2.pl