

# Rafał Kosiński

---

## «Corpus Theodorianum» : Preliminary Propositions for a New Arrangement of Theodore Lector's Legacy

---

Res Gestae. Czasopismo Historyczne 5, 111-124

---

2017

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.

Rafał Kosiński  
Uniwersytet w Białymstoku

## *Corpus Theodorianum*. Preliminary Propositions for a New Arrangement of Theodore Lector's Legacy

**Abstract:** The article is concerned with proposing a new view of the corpus of Theodore Lector's material. The author argues that the "dualistic" division of the entire body of the legacy material, as performed by Günther Christian Hansen, is not precise and may lead to a number of interpretation difficulties. The present article propounds that the *Corpus Theodorianum* be divided into the following sections: E (Greek and Latin epitomes), F (*fragmenta*), T (the remaining tradition), and, in addition, D (*dubia*), the latter part comprising the texts whose relation to Theodore's *Church History* is uncertain or controversial.

**Key words:** Theodore Lector, *Church History*, Theophanes, George the Monk, *Epitome*, Victor of Tunnuna

### The *Church History* by Theodore Lector in the Hansen Edition

When Günther Christian Hansen published his critical edition of the *Church History* by Theodore Lector in 1971, he divided the body of that author's work (available to him) into two parts. The first, and more extensive, part was comprised of an abridgement and selection from the original history, the so-called *Epitome*, most likely dating back to the early 7<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>1</sup> while the other one embraced the remaining pieces of the surviving literary material, generally termed as fragments. The *Fragmenta* in the Hansen edition have been con-

<sup>1</sup> For the dating of the *Epitome*, see G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 37–39, who dates the compilation to the years 610–615 (followed by Ph. Blaudeau, 2006, p. 536). Cf. also B. Pouderon, 1998, p. 178–185; P. Nautin, 1994, p. 242, who suggests an approximate date of c. 600.

veniently arranged in accordance with the *Epitome* narrative sequence. Of course, the *Epitome* itself had been known in academic circles before Hansen's edition, as it was published as based on the four, very much different even among themselves, manuscripts: *Codex Parisinus* gr. 1555 A, fol. 7<sup>r</sup>–23<sup>r</sup> (13<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> century, annotated P, previously published by J. A. Cramer in 1839<sup>2</sup>), *Codex Athous Vatopedi* 286, fol. 91<sup>r</sup>–218<sup>v</sup> (13<sup>th</sup> century, annotated V, previously published by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus in 1911<sup>3</sup>), *Codex Baroccianus* 142, fol. 216<sup>v</sup>–224<sup>r</sup> and 236<sup>v</sup>–240<sup>r</sup> (14<sup>th</sup> century, annotated B, previously published by H. de Valois in 1673, and again by W. Reading in 1720<sup>4</sup>), and the *Codex Parisinus* suppl. gr. 1156, fol. 26<sup>r</sup>–29<sup>v</sup> (10<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> century, annotated M, previously published by E. Miller in 1873<sup>5</sup>). Hansen combined and chronologically ordered various versions of the *Epitome* into one cohesive (however artificial) composition, to which he also added numerous passages from other sources such as the *Chronography* by Theophanes<sup>6</sup>, *Synodicon Vetus*<sup>7</sup>, the *Chronicle* by George the Monk<sup>8</sup>, and Kallistos' letter to Bishop Manuel Dishypatos of Thessalonika<sup>9</sup>, which according to the opinion expressed by Hansen (but also by some other German scholars whose argumentation Hansen basically follows<sup>10</sup>) must have been drawn from the *Epitome*, even though they are absent in its extant manuscripts. Hansen could not have recognized those excerpts as fragments from the *History* and inserted them in the second part of his edition on account of his assumption that the authors of those works would have drawn exclusively from the *Epitome*, with no possibility to have used the original of Theodore's work, which supposition deserves a more in-depth investigation, as we know that the bishops attending the proceedings of the Second Council of Nicaea (787) had used the original version of Theodore's *Church History* (or some florilegium with extracts from that work), therefore roughly at a time when Theophanes had been writing his *Chronography*, and shortly before George the Monk would begin to write his *Chronicle*.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>2</sup> J.A. Cramer, 1839, p. 100–109.

<sup>3</sup> A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 1901, p. 1–25.

<sup>4</sup> *Patrologia Graeca* 86.1, cols. 165–216.

<sup>5</sup> E. Miller, 1873, p. 396–403.

<sup>6</sup> C. de Boor, 1883. In his edition, Hansen regards many passages from Theophanes' *Chronography* as drawn from Theodore Lector's *Epitome*: E 415, 418, 421, 423, 429, 442, 443, 444, 445, 451, 452, part of 454, 459, 460, 464, 467, 470, 472, 476, 497, 498, 500, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 508, 509, 510, 511, 514, part of 517, 518, and 520. Cf. G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 29–30.

<sup>7</sup> J. Duffy, J. Parker, 1979; G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 30–31 considers E 418, 442, 472, 497, 511, 514, and 519 as derived from this work.

<sup>8</sup> C. de Boor, 1978. Hansen finds that Theodore's *Epitome* is the source for two passages in George's work: E 397 and 441, cf. G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 30, as well as my article in the present volume: "The *Chronicle* by George the Monk and Its Relation with Theodore Lector's Work".

<sup>9</sup> Sykoutres, 1930, p. 17–26. Hansen, 1995, p. 33 reconstructs a part of E 517 on the basis of this work.

<sup>10</sup> J.V. Sarrazin, 1881, p. 165–238; F. Diekamp, 1903, p. 553–558; C. de Boor, 1884, p. 573–577; C. de Boor, 1917, p. 314–316; H.-G. Opitz, 1934, cols. 1869–1881; C. de Boor, 1882, p. 276–295.

<sup>11</sup> For basic information on Theophanes, see C. Mango and R. Scott, 1997, p. 92–93, and W. Treadgold, 2013, p. 38–77.

## Are the *Fragmenta* fragments indeed? The case of the *Chronicle* by Victor of Tunnuna

Obviously, not all the excerpts considered as fragments in Hansen's edition are, strictly speaking, fragments. Some of them have been attributed to Theodore as based on the coincidence of the information with the *Epitome*, in view of the absence of the analogical information in other sources of the period, such as the works by Evagrius Scholasticus and John Malalas; these are extracts from John Moschos, Victor of Tunnuna, and the passages from the *Souda* lexicon parallel to the *Epitome*. Allowing for the fact that in a majority of cases the original content information may have been very likely indeed present in Theodore's work, it must be emphasized that there is no way to determine to what extent it was altered, abridged, or enlarged as compared with the original text. A perfect example is the chronicle by Victor of Tunnuna, whose passages make up an overwhelming majority, because there are as many as 58 out of 77 Hansen's fragments. Although the relation between Victor's *Chronicle* and Theodore's work is not a matter of dispute anymore, it is not known to what extent the Latin author made use of the Constantinopolitan lector's composition. Victor does not refer, anywhere, to Theodore explicitly, while his work differs, in terms of genre considerations, from that of Theodore (this is a chronicle that consists of terse, often in one sentence, items of information). Besides, it is composed in Latin, not Greek. In consequence, Victor's composition is generically more similar to an *epitome* than the *excerpta* or *fragmenta*. To understand Victor's methodology and his way of drawing on Theodore's *History*, it is worth comparing the three accounts dealing with an Arian named Olympius, who had blasphemed against the Holy Trinity and was sentenced to death for his transgression.

An excerpt from Theodore's Church History is incorporated, as an extensive citation, by John of Damascus in a florilegium of early Christian authors, which is featured in his work *De imaginibus* (annotated F 52a [131, 9–133, 32] by Hansen).<sup>12</sup> Let us quote this particular passage in extenso:

Τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας Θεοδώρου δ' τόμου·  
Ἰπὸ δὲ ταύτην τὴν ὑπατεῖαν κατὰ τὸν μῆνα τὸν Δεκέμβριον, ἔχοντα αὐτὸν τριακάδα καὶ πέμπτην ἡμέραν, θαῦμα φοβερὸν καὶ ἐξάϊσιον πᾶσάν τε ἀκοὴν ἀνθρώπων καταπλήττον γεγένηται. Ὀλύμπιος γάρ τις τοῦνομα Εὐθυμίου τοῦ τῆς Ἀρείου θρησκείας ἐξάρχοντος τὸν βαδιστὴν παραχορεύων ἐν τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ παλατίου Ἑλενιαῶν γενόμενος κατὰ τὸν προμαλάττοντα καὶ θεασάμενός τινος τῶν λουομένων τὴν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου δόξαν σεμνύοντος ἔφη αὐταῖς λέξεσιν οὕτως· «Τί γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τριάς; Ποίω δὲ τοίχῳ οὐκ ἐπιγέγραπται;» Καὶ κρατήσας τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἀναγκαίων ἔφη· «Ἴδε, καγὼ τριάδα ἔχω», ὥστε κινήθοντας τοὺς ἐκεῖ εὐρεθέντας μέλλειν αὐτὸν διαχειρίζεσθαι· ἀλλ' εἶρχθησαν ὑπὸ τινος Μάγνου, πρεσβυτέρου τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἐν τῷ περιτειχίσματι, ἀνθρώπου θαυμαστοῦ

<sup>12</sup> B. Kotter, 1975, p. 182–184.

καὶ τὸν θεὸν θεραπεύοντος, φήσαντος πρὸς αὐτούς, ὡς οὐκ ἂν διαλάθῃ τὸν τῆς παντεφόρου δικῆς ὀφθαλμὸν ἀκριβεῖ λόγῳ γράφοντα. Αἰδοὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τῆς ταραχῆς παυσαμένων ἐξανέστη ὁ Ὀλύμπιος καὶ τῇ ἐμβάσει τῶν θερμῶν ὡς ἔθος χρησάμενος ἕξεισιν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ψυχρῶν ὑδάτων δεξαμένην, ἥτις λαμβάνει τὰ ὑδάτα ἐκ πηγῆς τικτομένης μέσον τοῦ σεπτοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ εὐαγοῦς οἴκου τοῦ πρωτομάρτυρος Στεφάνου, ὃν ἐν παλαιοῖς ἔκτισεν ἀξιώμασιν ἀρχοντικοῖς διαλάμπας Αὐρηλιανός· ἐνθὲνδε ἠγοῦμαι θείας ἐποψίας τὸ ὑδωρ ἀξιούσθαι. Ἐν ἧ καταβάς θάττον ἐπαναβαίνει κραυγάζων· «Ἐλεῆσατέ με, ἐλεῆσατε», καὶ κινήθων αὐτοῦ τὰς σάρκας τῶν ὀστέων ἀπεμέριζε. Πάντες δὲ περὶ αὐτὸν γενόμενοι καὶ κρατήσαντες, σινδόνι περιτυλίξαντες ἀνέκλιναν ψυχορραγοῦντα. Ἐπρωτῶν δὲ, τί ἂν εἴῃ τὸ συμβάν· καὶ φησὶν ὁ Ὀλύμπιος· «Ἄνδρα κατείδον λευχιμονοῦντα ἐπιβάντα μοι κατὰ τῆς νεροφόρου καὶ τρεῖς σίκλας θερμοῦ περιχέαντά μοι καὶ λέγοντά μοι· Ἐλεῆσατέ με, ἐλεῆσατε.» Λαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν φορεῖω οἱ αὐτῷ διαφέροντες μετεκόμισαν ἐν ἐτέρῳ λουτρῷ προσκειμένῳ τῇ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ. Θελόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀποτυλίξαι τὴν σινδόνα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ συνεξέπαιρον πάσας τὰς σάρκας αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὕτως νεκρωθεὶς ἀπέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα. Γνωστὸν δὲ ἐγένετο τοῦτο σχεδὸν καθ' ὅλης τῆς βασιλίδος. Ἐφήμιζον δὲ τινες περὶ τοῦ πεπονητότος, ὡς χρόνοις τισὶν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ὁμοουσίον δοξαζούσης θρησκείας εἰς τὴν Ἀρείου μετεβαπίστατο λατρείαν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὸ συμβεβηκὸς καὶ ἀκοαῖς βασιλέως ἐπλησίασεν – Ἀναστάσιος δὲ ἦν –, ἐπέτρεψεν εἰκόνι χρωματισθῆναι τὸν τεράστιον ὑπερθεῖν τῆς νεροφόρου καταπαγήναι. Ἰωάννης δὲ τις διάκονος καὶ ἔκδικος τοῦ προλεχθέντος εὐαγοῦς οἴκου Στεφάνου τοῦ τῶν μαρτύρων πρώτου, ἀνὴρ εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος ζῆλον ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου δόγματος ἐκάστοτε ἐνδεικνύμενος καὶ αὐτὸς εἰκόνι κατέγραψεν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἀπλῶς· τῶν γὰρ ἐκεῖσε λουομένων καὶ θεασαμένων τὰ ὀνόματα κατέγραψε, καὶ ἔνθα εἴη ἕκαστος οἰκῶν, ἔτι τε καὶ τῶν τοῖς ὑδάσιν ὑπηρετοῦντων. Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡ εἰκὼν ἄχρι τοῦ παρόντος πεπηγυῖα ἐν τῷ ἐμβόλῳ τοῦ τετραστόου τοῦ πολλάκις εἰρημένου εὐκτήριου. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τῷ θαύματι θαῦμα ἐπηκολούθησεν, οὐχ ὅσιον παριδεῖν τῆς αὐτῆς ὑποθέσεως τυγχάνον, ὅπερ, εἰ καὶ τὸν παρόντα καιρὸν υπερῆλθε, λέγειν οὐκ ὀκνήσω. Θεασάμενοι γὰρ οἱ τῆς Ἀρείου συμμορίας ἐπικρατοῦντα θρίαμβον ἐλιπάρησαν τὸν τοῦ παλατίου Ἐλενιανῶν τὴν φροντίδα πεπιστευμένον ὡς ἐξάρχοντα καὶ τῆς τοῦ λουτροῦ διοικήσεως καθελόντα, κατακρύψαι τὴν εἰκόνα. Ὅς πρόφασιν εὐμήχανον εὐράμενος τὴν ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων προσγινομένην νοτίδα ὡς σκυλθεῖσαν τὴν εἰκόνα ἀφελόμενος, φησὶν, ἐπὶ διορθώσει κατέκρυψεν. Ἦν ὁ βασιλεὺς, ἐγκυκλίους ἐπιδημίας τελῶν εἰς ἕκαστον τόπον βασιλικόν, παραγενόμενος κάκεισε τὴν εἰκόνα ἐπεζήτη· καὶ οὕτως αὐθις τῷ τοίχῳ κατεπάγη. Παρὰ πόδας δὲ τὸν Εὐτυχιανόν (τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ὄνομα τῷ διαιταρίῳ) ὀργή τις θεοδικαστος παραλαβοῦσα τὸν μὲν δεξιὸν ὀφθαλμὸν διαρρεῦσαι πεποίηκε, κακίως δὲ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ περισείουσα μέλη, προσπελάσαι παρεσκεύασε τῷ εὐαγεῖ εὐκτηρίῳ, ἔνθα πεπίστευται ἀναπαύεσθαι μέρος τι ἱερῶν λειψάνων τῶν θεσπίων Παντολέοντος καὶ Μαρίνου, ἐπικαλουμένου τοῦ τόπου Ὀμόνοια ἐκ τοῦ ἐκεῖ συνελθόντος τοὺς ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἐπισκόπους ἐπὶ Θεοδοσίου τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως κοινήν τινα καὶ συμπεφωνημένην διδασκαλίαν τοῦ τε ὁμοουσίου τῆς θείας τριάδος ποιήσασθαι καὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως δὲ τοῦ κυρίου τρανώσαι τὴν ἐκ παρθένου πρόσληψιν, ταύτην τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τεκτῆνασθαι. Ἡμέρας τε περίπου ἑπτὰ προσκαρτεροῦντος καὶ ὄνοῦντος οὐδέν,

ἀλλὰ καὶ διαβρωθέντων αὐτῶ καὶ τῶν διδύμων, μεσοῦσης μιάς τῶν νυκτῶν ὁ λαχὼν ὑποδιάκονος τὴν παννύχιον ἔχειν ὄρα κατ' ὄναρ βασιλέα τινα ἐπιστάντα καὶ τῆ χειρὶ ὑποδεικνύντα τὸν ἀσθενῆ λέγειν· «Πῶς ὑπεδέξω τοῦτον; Τίς δὲ ὁ ἐνταῦθα ἀγαθόν; Οὗτος ὁ μετὰ τῶν εἰς ἐμὲ δυσφημούντων συμφραζάμενος. Οὗτος ὁ κατακρύψας τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ θαύματος.» Διαναστάς δὲ ὁ κληρικός τὸ ὄφθην διηγήσατο, φήσας τῶν ἀδυνάτων τυγχάνειν ἰαθῆναι τοῦτον τῆς μάστιγος. Τῆ δὲ αὐτῆ νυκτὶ ὁ Εὐτυχιανὸς ὡσπερ εἰς ὕπνον ἐκ τῶν ὀδυνῶν ὑπαχθεὶς ὄρα τινα νεανίαν εὐνοῦχον παραγαυδίῳ λαμπρῶ ἡμφιεσμένον λέγοντα αὐτῶ· «Τί ἔχεις;» Ὡς δὲ «Ἀποθνήσκω», ἔφη, «κατατηκόμενος καὶ θεραπείας μὴ τυγχάνων», ἤκουε λέγοντος, ὡς «οὐδεὶς σοὶ δύναται βοηθῆσαι· ὁ γὰρ βασιλεὺς δεινῶς ὀργίζεται κατὰ σοῦ.» Ἦντιβόλει οὗτος καὶ φησι· «Τίνα κινήσω ἢ τί ποιήσω;» Ὁ δὲ φησιν· «Εἰ θέλεις ἀνεθῆναι, ἄπιθι συντόμως ἐν τῷ λουτρῶ Ἑλενιανῶν καὶ ἐγγύθεν τῆς εἰκόνας τοῦ καυθέντος Ἀρειανοῦ ἀναπαύθητι.» Παραυτὰ δὲ διυπνίσας ἕνα τῶν ὑπηρετούντων ἐφώνει. Ἐξεπλάγησαν δὲ· τριῶν γὰρ ἡμερῶν ἤδη παρελθουσῶν ἀφωνία συνείχετο. Καὶ φησι πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ἀπάγειν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὸ προσταχθὲν διεκελεύσατο. Φθάσας δὲ τὸν τόπον καὶ πρὸς τὴν εἰκόνα τεθεὶς ἐξέπνει· τὴν γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος διάστασιν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐλευθερίαν ἀνέσεως ὁ ὄφθεις ἀγορευῶν ἠλήθευσεν.

This extensive narrative is summarized in Victor of Tunnuna's *Chronicle* s.a. 498 (annotated F 52b [133, 34–37] in Hansen's edition) as follows:<sup>13</sup>

Olympius quidam Arrianus, in balneis, quae Heleni anavocantur, apud regia murbem, sanctam et consubstantialem Trinitatem blasphemans, tribus igneis siclis angelo ministrante invisibiliter in piscina frigidae aquae percussus, vitam impiessimulque prodigiöse finivit.

And by the anonymous Greek epitomator (P, 106, 14–20; the passage annotated E 465 [131, 24–28] in Hansen's edition):

Ὀλυμπίος τις Ἀρειανὸς εἰς λουτρὸν λουόμενος Ἑλενιανῶν, τολμηρῶς βλασφημήσας ἐλεινῶ θανάτῳ ἐν τῇ νεροφόρῳ ἀπώλετο· τὸ δὲ γενόμενον γράψαντες οἱ πιστοὶ ἐν εἰκόνι πρὸς τῇ νεροφόρῳ ἀνέθεντο. Εὐτυχιανὸς τις τῶν διαιταρίων ὁ πρῶτος χρήματα λαβὼν ὑπὸ τινων Ἀρειανῶν τὴν εἰκόνα κατήγαγεν, καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ σῶμα δαπανηθεὶς ἀπώλετο.

Therefore, as we can see, 778 words of the original text are summarized into 47 words by the Greek epitomator and into 32 by Victor. As a result, both of them come up with the summaries amounting to approximately 1/20 of the original (6.04% and 4.11%, respectively; let us note the lack of articles in the Latin text). Of course, this proportion cannot be generalized, as not all of Theodore's passages were used by Victor and the epitomator (as can be seen, e.g., in the extant fragments of John of Damascus and the Second Council of Nicaea, of which just one, as quoted above, is incorporated by Victor). Also,

<sup>13</sup> A. Placanica, 1997, p. 24.

not all of them would make up such lengthy narratives. For instance, the story of the painter whose hand withered after he had painted Christ in imitation of Zeus (in Hansen's edition, annotated F 11 [107, 9–108, 8]<sup>14</sup>), is summarized in the *Epitome* (E 382 [107, 21–24]). The original version contains 114 words, while the abbreviated one – 36, i.e., 32% of the original text.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, Victor did not consider the narrative as significant enough to include it in his *Chronicle*.

Although such an ample reliance on Victor's work in order to reconstruct Theodore's *History* is no doubt something that Günther Christian Hansen should be given credit for, as the question of Victor's dependence on Theodore's work had been only perfunctorily mentioned previously,<sup>16</sup> the decisions taken by the German editor were basically arbitrary.<sup>17</sup> Hansen assumed that Victor had drawn on Theodore's *History* only for the passages parallel to the *Epitome*, possibly extended to include also some other religious issues and events in the East during the period covered by Theodore, even though it is not known which source he might have used for his representation of secular events, notwithstanding his admittance that the body of his information from the reigns of Zeno and Anastasius were almost totally based on Theodore. Antonio Placanica concludes that all the details relating to the emperor Zeno's reign as found in Victor's work are drawn from Theodore.<sup>18</sup> As regards the information concerning the western part of the Empire, this author is based most likely only on Prosper's work and its continuation. It also seems likely that Victor may have used just one source for the depiction of the events in the East in the years 447–518. The fact that Theodore's composition is a church history is no obstacle here. Although we have no knowledge on the extent of Theodore's interest in the political developments of the period, as based on the *Epitome*, it is still not certain what content was omitted from the anonymous

<sup>14</sup> B. Kotter, 1975, p. 196, supplemented with the passage from the manuscript *Codex Parisinus* gr. 1115, fol. 265<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> It should be taken into account that the fragment from Theodore Lector is only 66 words long in Kotter's edition. As can be seen, the epitomator abbreviated Theodore's original text unevenly, which makes a more accurate appraisal of the original version of the text impossible. Nonetheless, Warren Treadgold and Bernard Pouderon have noted that the *Epitome* covers roughly a tenth of Theodore's *History*, cf. W. Treadgold, 2007, p. 171, note 224 and B. Pouderon, 2014, p. 542.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. J.V. Sarrazin, 1881, p. 224 and E. Schwartz, 1934, p. 219, note 1. Nevertheless, the matter had not been very obvious prior to the publication of the critical edition of Theodore. Victor as the author very much dependent on Theodore's *History* is not even mentioned by, e.g., Hans-Georg Opitz in his article on Anagnostes in the *Realenzyklopädie* (H.-G. Opitz, 1934, cols. 1869–1881).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 21. Hansen pointed to a number of parallels between the *Epitome* and Victor's *Chronicle*: F 29~E 436, F 25~E 446, F 52b~E 465, F 55~E 475, F 68~E 512, F 69~E 515, F 71~E 516, F 77~E 524. The German scholar also noticed the convergent points in Victor's *Chronicle* and the *Chronography* by Theophanes, who used the *Epitome* for those narratives.

<sup>18</sup> A. Placanica, 1997, p. 18–20; cf. C. Cardelle de Hartmann, 2001, p. 110\*. For a more cautious approach to Victor's dependence on Theodore, cf. Ph. Blaudeau, 2006, p. 542.

author's extracts, as we only know something about the epitomator's main concerns.<sup>19</sup> As Geoffrey Greatrex has rightly argued, there are clues suggesting that Theodore's History would have featured many details from the realm of politics.<sup>20</sup> For this reason, all the information related to the political history of the Eastern Roman Empire in the years 444–518, as found in the Chronicle, should be considered as part of Theodorian tradition as well.

### Is the *Epitome* an epitome? The case of Theophanes' *Chronography*

There is no question that Theophanes relied heavily on Theodore's work for his *Chronography*, either in the original form or its epitomized version.<sup>21</sup> However, the recent research by Bernard Pouderon has pointed to a number of differences in the wording of the borrowed text and in its arrangement within the framework of the internal narration of the *Chronography*, which was caused by the specific annalistic form of Theophanes' work as well as by his creative approach to the sources he used.<sup>22</sup>

It should be stressed that the contribution of Theophanes' work to the reconstruction of a more complete version of the *Epitome*, as published by Hansen, is considerable, especially in the part dealing with the reign of Anastasius (E 446–524). Out of 79 entries in this part, only 55 come from the *Epitome* manuscripts, with the other ones derived from some later sources, including 23 from Theophanes (not counting some minor complements to the *Epitome* text on the basis of the *Chronography*), therefore nearly a third of it.<sup>23</sup> Such a large proportion of the text recreated from Theophanes' work bears on the general reception of the *Epitome* as such. Of course, the relation of these excerpts with the *Epitome* does have its logical justification, but viewing them as literally borrowed from the anonymous epitome may be controversial in some respects. First of all, Theophanes had drawn on Theodore's composition in a creative manner, repeatedly adapting it to his own narrative, representing it in his own literary style (which does not have an essential impact on the sense of the transmission, but departs much from the original version), and altering some of its details.

For instance, already in the first extract from this book – E 446 (125, 27; B II, 6) – Theodore states that Euphemios thought Anastasius to be unworthy of Christians (καὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀνάξιον), whereas Theophanes (AM 5983) adds to this account that the bishop recognized him as unworthy of both Christians and the Empire (136, 8–9: ἀνάξιον... τῶν Χριστιανῶν καὶ τῆς βασιλείας). In the same narrative, empress Ariadne and the senators insisted, accord-

<sup>19</sup> The epitomator was not a passive abbreviator of Theodore's work, as evident from his numerous comments, emendations, and additions to the details drawn from Theodore, see, e.g., Ph. Blaudeau, 2006, p. 536, note 216.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Ph. Blaudeau, 2006, p. 529–530, note 176, esp. G. Greatrex, 2015, p. 121–130.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. C. Mango and R. Scott, 1997, p. 135–136; G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 29 and P. Nautin, 1994, p. 243.

<sup>22</sup> B. Pouderon, 2015, p. 279–314.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. also G. Greatrex, 2015, p. 125.



ing to the *Epitome* (126, 12), on Euphemios to accept Anastasius as emperor (Ἀριάδνης δὲ καὶ τῶν τῆς συγκλήτου συναινεῖν ἀναγκαζόντων Εὐφήμιον), while, as Theophanes reports, the pressure was exerted on Anastasius to sign the written declaration on Chalcedon (136, 9–11: βιαζομένης δὲ αὐτὸν τῆς βασιλίδος Ἀρεάδνης καὶ τῆς συγκλήτου, ἔλαβεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ἰδιόχειρον, ὡς ἀποδέχεται εἰς ὄρον πίστεως τὰ δόγματα τῆς ἐν Χαλκηδόνι συνόδου.). According to the E 447 (126, 16–17; B II, 8), Anastasius, when he was already in power, demanded that Euphemios hand him over the above-mentioned declaration (Τὴν ὁμολογίαν αὐτοῦ βιαίως τὸν Εὐφήμιον ἀπήτησεν Ἀναστάσιος βασιλεύσας), while, as Theophanes recounts (AM 5987, 139, 19–20: Ἀναστάσιος δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν ὁμολογίαν αὐτοῦ παρὰ Εὐφημίου μετὰ βίας ἀφείλατο), he took that document by force.

Theophanes also shows his inclination to make a rather moderate transmission of the *Epitome* stronger by adding some more pejorative phrasing, as seen in the table below (all the examples given in this section of the present article come from the part of the *Epitome* devoted to the reign of Anastasius):

Theodore, <i>Epitome</i>	Theophanes, <i>Chronography</i>
456 (128, 21; V 77) Μακεδόνιος πεισθεὶς βασιλεῖ τῷ ἐνωτικῷ Ζήνωνος καθυπέγραψεν.	140, 15–16 Μακεδόνιος δὲ <b>κακῶς</b> πεισθεὶς Ἀναστασίῳ ὑπέγραψε τῷ ἐνωτικῷ Ζήνωνος.
478 (136, 21; M, 398) Μοναχοὶ ὑπὲρ διακοσίου ἀποσχισταὶ	152, 6 μοναχοὶ τινες <b>αἵρετικοὶ</b>
484 (138, 7; M, 398; B II, 26) καὶ Σεῦρος	154, 7–11 καὶ Σεῦρου <b>τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς</b>
513 (147, 17; B II, 35) ὁ Σεῦρος	159, 9–10 Σεῦρος <b>ὁ δυσσεβὴς</b>
522 (151, 13; M, p. 399) Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρείας	162, 27–28 Ἰωάννου τοῦ Νικαιώτου, ἐπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας <b>αἵρετικοῦ</b>

Let us also notice that the epithet *δυσσεβής* cannot be found in the *Epitome* from the proper *Church History* by Theodore.

Except for the epithets as mentioned, Theophanes rarely puts in his own complementary information, which is absent in the *Epitome*, but he more often removes or changes them. For instance, in his adjusting the text to suit his own literary style, the author changes, on several occasions, the name Constantinople to Byzantium (E 478 [136, 22; M, 398] = *Chronography*, 152, 7; E 475 [136, 8; M, 398] = *Chronography*, 152, 17; E 522 [151, 14–15; M, 399–400] = *Chronography*, 162, 30). The name Byzantium cannot be found anywhere in the *Epitome* from Theodore Lector's *Church History* as preserved in the manuscripts, but appears twice in the passages recreated on the basis of Theophanes (E 452, 127, 21; E 470, 134, 20). Interestingly, Constantinople is named Byzantium in the *Epitome* from the *Church History* by John Diakrinomenos: E 527 (152, 22 and 23, manuscript M, 400) and E 544 (155, 11, manuscripts M, 402 and B II, 46).

As can be seen, the consistent use of the name Constantinople seems to be a characteristic more specific to Theodore Lector rather than the epitomator.

The table below shows modifications made by Theophanes in his *Chronography* on the basis of the passages drawn from Theodore Lector:<sup>24</sup>

Theodore, <i>Epitome</i>	Theophanes, <i>Chronography</i>
473 (135, 25–29; B II, 23) Anastasius orders Patriarch Elias to convoke a synod that would condemn Chalcedon.	151, 27–29 Anastasius orders Patriarch Elias to condemn Chalcedon.
474 (15, 31–32; B II, 24) The pope referred to as the bishop of the Great Rome.	152, 24 The pope termed as Bishop of Rome.
481 (137, 8; M, 397) The monk Dorotheus gives his written work in defence of Chalcedon to the monks.	152, 31–153, 3 absent
484 (138, 7–8; M, 398; B II, 26) Mention of the later conflict between Julian of Halicarnassus and Severus of Antioch <sup>24</sup>	154, 8–10 absent
489 (139, 8–10; M, 398) Ariadne and the senators value Macedonius for his honesty in the <i>politeia</i> , among other things	155, 7 absent
490 (139, 17–18; M, 398) Macedonius ready to defend himself against accusations at the amphitheatre or at the baths of Zeuxippos	155, 15 No mention of the baths of Zeuxippos.
491 (139, 23; M, 399) Kalopodios as the οἰκονόμος of a church	155, 21 Kalopodios as the οἰκονόμος of the Great Church.
495 (140, 19; M, 399) Reception of the <i>apokrisarii</i> of John of Alexandria by Patriarch Timothy	155, 28–30 absent
507 (144, 14; B II, 33) Stoudios monastery	158, 10 monastery of Dios
516 (148, 30–149, 10; P, 108, 3–12) Three potential reasons for the Alexandrians' strange conduct.	162, 11–12 Just one reason.
521 (150, 22–26; M, 399) absent	162, 22–23 Information on the bishops of Illyricum and Greece severing ties with their metropolitan and establishing communion with Rome.
521 (150, 26; M, 399) The epitomator mentions a historian.	162, 24–25 Theophanes mentions the historian Theodore.

<sup>24</sup> According to G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 138, *apparatus*, this mention was added by the epitomator.

523 (151, 21; M, 400) Patriarch of Constantinople John comes from Kalonea in Cappadocia.	164, 8–13 absent
523 (151, 20; M, 400) Before his elevation to the patriarchate, John of Cappadocia was a presbyter.	164, 10 Before his elevation to the patriarchate, John of Cappadocia was a presbyter and a σύγκελλος.
524 (151, 26; M, 400; B II 37) Justin was a member of the Senate before his accession to the throne.	164, 31–165, 2 absent
524 (151, 28; M, 400; B II 37) The name of emperor Justin's wife was Lupicina. Lupicina was made Augusta.	165, 2 The name of emperor Justin's wife was Lupikia. Lupikia was crowned Augusta.

There are also almost literal borrowings from the *Epitome* in the *Chronography* (e.g., E 477 [M, p. 397] = Theophanes, p. 152, 10–16 or E 475 [B II, 25] = Theophanes, p. 152, 16–21), which can be counted, however, among the very few exceptions. Hence, there is no way to find out if the material included in the *Chronography*, which Theophanes must have probably drawn from the *Epitome*, and which is absent in its surviving manuscripts, had undergone some modification, where the chronicler would have deleted or provided certain elements. For this reason, they cannot be treated as verbatim citations from the *Epitome*.

## Proposal for a New Arrangement of Theodore Lector's Literary Legacy

The case of Victor's *Chronicle*, which makes up the major part of the Hansen fragments, testifies to the fact that the propositions concerning Theodore's legacy material remain largely hypothetical. For this source, a more certain effort is to identify the pieces of information, of both secular and religious origin, for the initial part of Victor's *Chronicle*, which pertain to the Eastern Roman Empire (even though we do know that Theodore would write on matters of the West, as evident in his account of the Laurentian Schism featured in the *Epitome*), as a sort of a Latin *epitome*. Victor's composition can be therefore recognized as the earliest abbreviation of Theodore's material and held as a Latin counterpart to the Greek *epitome*.

It should be emphasized that the fragmenta which are indisputable as to their provenance and originality are only 9 from Hansen's edition (mainly from the works by John of Damascus [6 fragments]<sup>25</sup> and the acts of the Council of Nicaea II [2 fragments],<sup>26</sup> plus one from the Athos Codex (Codex Athous

<sup>25</sup> B. Kotter, 1975, p. 90 (F 52a [131, 9–133, 32]), 97 (F 51 [131, 2–6]), 99 (F 22a [117, 8–11]), 100 (F 58 [140, 7–11]), 101 (F 62 [142, 5–14]), 130 (F 11 [107, 9–108,8]).

<sup>26</sup> E. Lamberz, 2008, p. 98–99 (F 2 [99, 2–8]) and E. Lamberz, 2012, p. 566–567 (F 35 [124, 2–12]).

Iviron 497, fol. 25r, 17th century).<sup>27</sup> Also included should be the so-called brief report from the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon (yet this is the largest fragment, encompassing as many as 15 pages of Greek text in the Fontes Minores edition, i.e., more than all the remaining ones), published by Hansen in 1998,<sup>28</sup> which gives the total amount of 10 fragments. I propose that the designation F – fragmenta be used in reference to these 10 passages.

The rest of the Hansen “fragments,” derived from the works by John Moschos,<sup>29</sup> the treatise On Schisms,<sup>30</sup> the two brief scholia to the Church History of Evagrius Scholasticus (which would serve the function of testimonies rather than fragments),<sup>31</sup> and those from the Suda,<sup>32</sup> might have indeed been associated in some way with Theodore’s work (either directly or, very likely, indirectly, as the case of John Moschos’ work points out), belong certainly to the assemblage which I have termed “Theodorian tradition” in several of my previous publications. In short, it would comprise all the works that contain the information known to modern historiography solely from Theodore’s composition (through the Epitome or the fragments), or which can be attributed, on the basis of other criteria, to Theodore (the absence of parallel items of information in other sources of the period and the thematic convergence with the extant Theodorian corpus). I would suggest applying the designation T (traditio) to all these works. Disengaged from the “fragmenta” category, these passages should be, I believe, linked with Theodore, without the necessity to resolve definitively whether they were derived from the original version of the History or the Epitome. As a result, it could also encompass all of Hansen’s additions to the Epitome, originating from the works by Theophanes, George the Monk, and the Synodicon Vetus, whose authors, in the German scholar’s opinion, could have only used the epitomized version. This would also provide us with the opportunity of complementing Hansen’s fragments with the political passages from the Chronicle by Victor of Tunnumna, as noted before, one passage from George the Monk’s Chronicle (607, 13–608, 9), as well as one extensive excerpt from another source, not included by Hansen, i.e., the Laudatio

<sup>27</sup> S.P. Lambros, 1900, p. 157, cod. 4617 (F 37 [124, 20–125, 14]).

<sup>28</sup> G.Ch. Hansen, 1998, p. 101–139.

<sup>29</sup> *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 87.3, cols. 3008 C–3009 B = F 12 [108, 10–25]. Cf. Ph. Blaudeau, 2006, p. 542.

<sup>30</sup> F. Diekamp, 1903, p. 553–558.

<sup>31</sup> J. Bidez, L. Parmentier, 1898, p. 244 (scholia to III, 18 [p. 117, 11] = F 27c [120, 11] and the scholia to III, 21 [p. 119, 25] = F 27d [120, 15–16]).

<sup>32</sup> A. Adler, 1928–1938. Hansen has determined that the passages from the following Suda entries are derived from Theodore Lector’s work: πρόκριμα (Π 2485) = F 56 (138, 2–5); ἀλλαρίοις (A 1075) = F 53 (134, 2–3); κατασπεύσαντα (K 780) = F 44 (128, 2–4); ὑπεράγοντα (Υ 215) = F 43 (127, 10–12); φατρία (Φ 136) = F 33 (123, 2–7); παρενθήμενος (Π 551) = F 27e (120, 18–20). Cf. G. Ch. Hansen, 1995, pp. 22–23. In my opinion, the *Church History* is also the source for the following entries in the Suda: θύινα (Θ 541); Θευδέριχος (Θ 297); Κατασπεύσαντα (K 780), and perhaps also Λεόντιος μοναχός (Λ 257) – uncertain because the entry includes a reference to an anecdote from Plutarch’s *Moralia*, whilst Theodore does not seem to have used secular literature (cf. Ph. Blaudeau, 2006, p. 550), as well as προστεθεντος (Π 2811).

in honour of Apostle Barnabas by Alexander the Monk.<sup>33</sup> The central story in the *Laudatio* is, parallel to the one in Theodore's History, the description of the finding of Apostle Barnabas' relics under a carob tree, in Cyprus, extended by a narrative on Peter the Fuller, telling of his origin, relations with Zeno, arrival at Antioch and his subsequent elevation to episcopate, incorporation of the Theopaschite addition to the Trishagion, and, finally, his wish to subordinate the Church in Cyprus to Antioch.<sup>34</sup>

Furthermore, we also possess some sources which may be claimed to be fragments from Theodore's work or refer to it, primarily the excerpts from the *Parastaseis syntomoi chronikai*, whose author makes reference to Theodore Lector, or from the work by Cyril of Scythopolis, and whose authenticity or provenance would raise much doubt.<sup>35</sup> All of these disputable passages should be included in a separate part, with a clear note on their uncertain origin.

In conclusion, the new edition will be composed of three, not two, parts: **E** (the *Epitome* cleared of Hansen's additions, but also featuring, simultaneously, the entries from Victor's *Chronicle* as the Latin *Epitome*); **F** (*fragmenta*), and **T** (the remaining tradition). In all probability, some of Hansen's "fragments" will be put into question as a result of our research and incorporated as part of the supplement **D** (*dubia*). The whole shall be preceded by a short section titled **Test.**, namely the three *testimonia* on Theodore and his work (from the introduction to the *Historia Tripartita* (Hansen, p. 1), from the Suda and the scholion to the *Codex Athous Vatopedi* 286, fol. 210<sup>r</sup> = Hansen, p. 9).

There is a twofold advantage of such a division: first, because it provides the modern historiography with the means to distill what is derived from Theodore **without question**, and, secondly, because it represents, in the broadest spectrum possible, everything that may have **likely** been once on the pages of his history, albeit quite possibly in the form that was very remote from the extant tradition.

## Bibliography

- Adler A., 1928–1938, *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, vol. 1–5, Lipsiae.
- Bidez J., Parmentier L., 1898, *The ecclesiastical history of Euagrius with the scholia*, eds. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, London.
- Blaudeau Ph., 2006, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491). De l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie*, Roma.
- de Boor C., 1882, *Zur Kenntnis der Weltchronik des Georgios Monachos*, [in:] *Historische Untersuchungen Arnold Schaefer zum fünfundzwanzigjährigen Wirksamkeit gewidmet*, Bonn, p. 276–295.

<sup>33</sup> P. Van Deun, 1993.

<sup>34</sup> On the relation between the *Laudatio* and the *Chronicle* by Victor of Tunnuna, see P. Van Deun, 1993, p. 21 and B. Kollmann, 2007, p. 59–60. A detailed discussion of the above-stated parallels and the grounds for including the extensive passage from this work in the Theodorian corpus will be given a separate treatment.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. B. Flusin, 1983, p. 60–67 and Ph. Blaudeau, 2006, p. 542.

- de Boor C., 1883, *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, vol. I, Lipsiae.
- de Boor C., 1884, *Zu Theodorus Lector*, “Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte”, 6, p. 573–577.
- de Boor C., 1917, *Zu Suidas*, “Hermes”, 52, p. 314–316.
- de Boor C., 1978, *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, editione manni MCMIV correctorem curavit P. Wirth, vol. 1–2, Stuttgartiae.
- Cardelle de Hartmann C., 2001, *Introducción*, [in:] *Victoris Tunnunensis Chronicon cum reliquiis ex Consularibus Caesaraugustanis et Iohannis Biclarenis Chronicon*, ed. C. Cardelle de Hartmann, Turnhout 2001, p. 7\*–160\*.
- Cramer J.A., 1839, *Anecdota graeca e codd. Manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis*, ed. J.A. Cramer, vol. 2, Paris.
- Diekamp F., 1903, *Zu Theodorus Lektor*, “Historisches Jahrbuch”, 24, p. 553–558.
- Duffy J., Parker J., 1979, *The Synodicon Vetus*, eds. J. Duffy and J. Parker, Washington.
- Flusin B., 1983, *Miracle et histoire dans l'oeuvre de Cyrille de Scythopolis*, Paris.
- Greatrex G., 2015, *Théodore le Lecteur et son épitomateur anonyme du VI<sup>e</sup> s.*, [in:] *L'historiographie tardo-antique et la transmission des savoirs*, eds. Ph. Blaudeau, P. Van Nuffelen, Berlin–Boston, p. 121–142.
- Hansen G.Ch., 1995, *Theodoros Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.Ch. Hansen, Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage, Berlin, p. ix–xli.
- Hansen G.Ch., 1998, *Ein kurzer Bericht über das Konzil von Chalkedon*, [in:] *Fontes Minores*, vol. 10, ed. L. Burgmann, Frankfurt, p. 101–139.
- Kollmann B., 2007, *Alexander Monachus, Laudatio Barnabae. Lobrede auf Barnabas*, introd. B. Kollmann, trans. B. Kollmann and W. Deuse, Turnhout.
- Kotter B., 1975, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, vol. 3, *Contra imaginum calumniatores orationestres*, ed. B. Kotter, Berlin–New York.
- Lamberz E., 2008, *Concilium universale Nicaenum secundum, concilii actiones 1–3*, ed. E. Lamberz, Berlin–New York (ACO II, 2, III, 1).
- Lamberz E., 2012, *Concilium universale Nicaenum secundum, concilii actiones 4–5*, ed. E. Lamberz, Berlin–New York (ACO II, 2, III, 2).
- Lambros S.P., 1900, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, vol. 2, Cambridge.
- Mango C., Scott R., 1997, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284–813*, transl. and introd. C. Mango and R. Scott, Oxford.
- Miller E., 1873, *Fragments inédits de Théodore le Lecteur et de Jean d'Égée*, “Revue Archéologique”, 26, p. 396–403.
- Nautin P., 1994, *Théodore Lecteur et sa “Réunion de différentes histoire” de l'Église*, “Revue des Études Byzantines”, 52, p. 213–243.
- Opitz H.-G., 1934, *Theodoros Anagnostes 48.*, [in:] RE, Zweite Reihe, vol. 5, Stuttgart, cols. 1869–1881.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus A., 1901, *Νέα τεμάχια τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Ἱστορίας Θεοδώρου Αναγνώστου τοῦ Ἐντολέως*, “Журнал Министерства Народнаго Просвѣщенія”, 333, p. 1–25.
- Placanica A., 1997, *Vittore da Tunnuna, Chronica. Chiesa e Impero nell'età di Giustiniano*, ed. A. Placanica, Firenze.
- Pouderon B., 1998, *Le codex Parisinus graecus 1555 A et sa récénsion de l'Épitomé byzantin d'histoires ecclésiastiques*, “Revue des Études Byzantines”, 56, p. 169–191.

- Pouderon B., 2014, *Pour une évaluation de l'Épitomé anonyme d'histoires ecclésiastiques: confrontation des trois historiens sources, de la Tripartite de Théodore le Lecteur et de celle de Cassiodore*, "Travaux et Mémoires", 18, p. 527–545.
- Pouderon, B. 2015, *Théophane, témoin de l'Épitomé d'histoires ecclésiastiques, de Théodore le Lecteur ou de Jean Diacrinoménos?*, "Travaux et Mémoires", 19, p. 279–314.
- Sarrazin J.V., 1881, *De Theodoro Lectore Theophanis fonte praecipuo*, [in:] *Commentationes Philologiae Jenenses*, vol. 1, Leipzig, p. 165–238.
- Schwartz E., 1934, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma*, München.
- Sykoutres, 1930, *Περὶ τὸ σχίσματῶν Ἀρσενιατῶν, III, Ἐπιστολὴ Καλλίστου πρὸς τὸν Θεσσαλονίκης Μανουὴλ Δισύπατον*, "Ἑλληνικά", 3, p. 15–44.
- Treadgold W., 2013, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Basingstoke.
- Treadgold W., 2007, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, New York.
- Van Deun P., 1993, *Hagiographica Cypria. Sancti Barnabae Laudatio auctore Alexandro Monacho et Sanctorum Bartholomaei et Barnabae Vita e Menologio imperiali de prompta*, ed. P. Van Deun, *Vita Sancti Auxibii*, ed. J. Noret, Turnhout–Leuven.

Rafał Kosiński  
Uniwersytet w Białymstoku  
Instytut Historii i Nauk Politycznych  
Plac Uniwersytecki 1, 15-420 Białystok  
e-mail: rkosiu@interia.pl