Anna Kotłowska, Łukasz Różycki

De «Historiarum» indice Theophylacto Simocattae falso attributo observationes selectae

MUZEUM HISTORII POLSKI

Anna Kotłowska
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
Łukasz Różycki
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
In collaboration with Andreas Gkoutzioukostas
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

De *Historiarum* indice Theophylacto Simocattae falso attributo observationes selectae[1]

Abstract: De Historiarum indice Theophylacto Simocattae falso attributo observationes selectae is to thoroughly research the authenticity of the so-called index thorough research of Theophylact's *Historiae* (Οἰκουμενικὴ ἱστορία). The analysis of the relation of the table of contents to the text of Historiae in three independent aspects (1. Contents analysis, 2. Linguistic analysis, 3. Structural analysis) has demonstrated the existence of differences that are so significant, both on the informative and linguistic levels, that inauthenticity of the index is well-grounded.

Key words: Theophylact Simocatta, Theophylact's Historiae, Historiae – the table of contents

Status quaestionis[2]

To allow for a thorough research of Theophylact's *Historiae* (Οἰκουμενικὴ ἱστορία), one should, inter alia, question the authenticity of the so-called index[3] included between *The Dialogue between History and Philosophy*, and *The*

---

[1] This article has been drawn up based on a paper delivered in Cracow on 2 June 2017 at the conference on Theodorus Lector. The authors would like to thank the organisers for the invitation and extremely hospitable welcome.

[2] This article would not have been possible without the contribution of Dr. Andreas Gkoutzioukostas (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), whose comments and suggestions have shaped the final form of the piece (especially on the issue of interpolation, par. 3.4). Obviously, full responsibility for the text rests on the authors.

[3] It is worth noting that the manuscripts do not define this portion of the text in any way. On the other hand, modern researchers mention the "table of contents" (de Boor: "index", "capitum

Preface to the main text. At this point it should be noted that an identical title (*Historiae*) occurs both before each book in the table of contents and the *Preface*, however it is missing before *The Dialogue*.[4] Recognition of the table of contents[5] as an inauthentic interjection has not brought any evidence that would demonstrate exactness typical for these issues. The to-date researchers were limited to indicating occurrences of general inconsistencies in relation to the main text[6] and implied a similarity in terms of the source of information between the table of contents and the summary in Photios'[7] *Bibliotheca*, a consequence of which was the proposed dating of the addendum to the 9th century.[8] On our part, we can add a very convincing example:

Photios: "…περί τε τῆς κατὰ τὸν Καρδαρηγὰν τὸν τῶν Περσῶν στρατηγὸν ἀλαζονείας."

Paragraph 2.2 of the table: "Περί τῆς κατὰ τὸν Καρδαρηγὰν ἀλαζονείας."

Paragraph 2.1 of *Historiae*: "Ὁ δὲ Καρδαριγὰν ἐς τοσοῦτον ἐληλάκει φρυάγματος…"

The hypercorrectness of *iota* is discussed below (see item 2), at this point it is worth stressing the telling substitution of φρύαγμα with ἀλαζονεία. More of such unambiguous examples can be found (however, see note 4). Therefore, late Carolus de Boor made a mistake when he wrote so firmly (p. XII): "Sequitur summarium confectum esse e textu, non e Photio".

Unfortunately, the above findings, although right, demonstrate a high level of generality and basically stop at a rough content analysis (3). This paper complements it with its structural (1) and linguistic aspect (2), thus presenting full proof of a different origin of the table. We hope that the material provided will in future contribute to closer identification of its origin and authorship.

---

conspectus", Olajos: "Tartalomjegyzék", Schreiner: "Inhaltsverzeichnis", Whitby: "Table of Contents", Kotłowska, Różycki: "Spis treści") and this phrasing will be used hereinafter.

[4] A separate issue is that of the authenticity of the title, due to the fact that testimonia have given a form different from that specified in manuscripts: Photios: "ἱστοριῶν λόγοι ὀκτώ", Constantine Porphyrogennetos: "ἱστορία" (*exc. de sententiis*, p. 35), Agathias: "ἱστορίαι". The issue is not clear, however, as it was often the case that traditionally a work was operating under a title different than the original, usually abridged or adapted to the preference of the given period. Obviously, it is probable that the complement "οἰκουμενική" has the same origin as the table of contents, but to corroborate it a separate piece of evidence is required.

[5] Although, what is worth stressing, two major monographs on Theophylact's work demonstrate a pregnant silence when it comes to the table of contents. M. Whitby, 1988; T. Olajos, 1988. Whitby only wanted to say that the contents style of writing fits well to that of the text and as in other cases (Gellius), despite the mistakes or the differences the author is the same, see also note 6.

[6] Unfortunately, these are only loose, although entirely valid, side comments accompanying the publications and translations of Theophylact. A comprehensive, systematic study that would result in a published piece has not been conducted yet.

[7] *Photius, Bibliothèque*, edidit René Henry, Paris, 1999, quem correxit P. Wirth, Theophylacti Simocattae, Stuttgart, 1972, p. 28–39 et 3–19.

[8] T. Olajos, 2012, p. 24: "feltehetőleg a 9. század végén vagy az után iródhalott"; *pace* P. Schreiner, 1985, p. 13–14. *Contra* M. Whitby, 1986, note 1, who remains hesitant as regards this issue and even says: "The language of the table is rather pompous, which might support Theophylact's authorship."

Structural analysis

Deep imbalance is the most basic conclusion resulting from the comparison of the division of contents as presented in the table to the division of the main text. There are 126 paragraphs of the main text to 232 paragraphs of the table of contents (relation of 1.84:1), moreover, there is no clear correspondence and harmony in the distribution of the material. Often one of the initial (or final) sentences of the main text becomes the title in the table, even if the subject of narrative is bound to change dramatically in a short while (e.g. 4.19/4.15).

Chart 1 placeholder

A paragraph of the main text is frequently divided into separate entities, which makes them seem more important than they actually are, as if the author of the table wanted to draw special attention to them. The opposite oftentimes occurs, namely a serious abridgement of the main text, including the omission of certain themes. Although it is difficult to pinpoint clear motives underlying the specific decision of the author of the table, the following two situations seem plausible: 1) memorabilia which were carefully emphasized (see item 3.2); 2) Roman victories, which were highlighted disregarding the proportions of Theophylact's text, cf. e.g. episode on the life of a soldier named Busas (2.23–25/2.16–17), broken down into three parts in the table of contents.[9] The initial narrative pertained to the series of defeats in the Balkans, inflicted to Roman fortifications by the Avars. The author of the table of contents, on the other hand, included one item regarding the defeats (2.23) and then two items pertaining to the fortifications that withstood the Avars (2.24–25), which in the main text took up only two sentences. Without any doubt, this distorts not only the proportion of the main text, but also misleads the reader of the table of contents (although the information provided is consistent with the proper text), as the reader may have the impression that the specific fragment depicts Roman victories rather than defeats.

Another extreme example of the division of the text is item 3.21 which covers as many as seven paragraphs of the main text. At that, the phrasing of the table of contents is so general and correct at the same time, that one cannot deduce any specific details of the main text, although the phrasing is in no case contrary to the text. In all of the above situations, one term was used for the purpose of defining: interpretation. Obviously, the reason for abridgement may be different: inattention, lack of interest in an issue, misunderstanding of the meaning of an episode/word, desire to omit more drastic details etc. In four cases, however, the situation is different, cf. item 3.1. The division is presented in detail in table 1:

Book eight shows even more imbalance, with 15 paragraphs of the table of contents to 50 paragraphs of the main text which means the relation of 3.3:1,

---

[9] In the material aspect, the episode was separately discussed by G. Kardaras, 2005, p. 53–66.

i.e. twice the average. This fact may be explained, however, using an additional factor, discussed below.

Was there even book IX?

Despite earlier doubts, when it was suggested that at least two different versions survived, T. Olajos has proven beyond doubt that all surviving copies of *Historiae* come from Vat. gr. 977 (saec. XI–XII).[10] **Vaticanus**, apart from Theophylact's work (ff. 1r–184v), it includes *Breviarium* (Ἰστορία σύντομος) by patriarch Nikephoros (ff. 185r–209v).[11] Both works were recorded by two different, though contemporary, scribes. It is important as it means that all parts of Theophylact's work (*Dialogue, table of contents, Praface, main text, glosses*) were copied by one person from another manuscript, therefore the scribe of Vat. gr. 977 is not responsible for amendments and addenda to the initial version.

In his edition, Carolus de Boor (p. VII) wrote as follows: "Id mirandum quod, cum in capitum conspectu confirmante Photio octo libri distinguantur, in margine (lib. VIII cap. 12) ἱστορία θ′ significatur. Quod num recte factum sit, dubito, cum liber VIII nimis breviaretur."

On the margin of paragraph 12, book 8 (Maurice's death) the following was noted: "book 9". If one were to compare this gloss with an exceptional fragmentation of book 8 in the table of contents (see above and table 1), and with the fact that ἀποσφαγή is emotionally the strongest and the most pejorative word in the table of contents and it appears next to semantically similar, though not as strong ἀναίρεσις occurring in 8.38/8.11 when discussing the death of Maurice and his sons, one could venture a hypothesis that someone very inclined to highlight the emperor's character is behind all these elements.[12] The person, i.e. the author of the table contents who believes that the last eighth book should be re-edited to depict only Maurice's murder and that other events following the death of the imperial family, having been duly extended, would comprise book 9. Therefore, de Boor's "dubito" was well-grounded, as it was not Simocatta that was responsible for the potential changes, as other researchers later thought.[13]

---

[10] T. Olajos, 1979, p. 261–266.

[11] *Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opuscula historica*, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1880; *Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople, Short History* (CFHB XIII), ed. C. Mango, Washington, D.C. 1990; *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*, ed. P.J. Alexander, Oxford 1958.

[12] The verb form appears in three other places in the body of the text: 2.16.4 (ἀποσφάττειν), 4.6.2 (ἀποσφάττουσι), 8.13.3 (ἀποσφάξαι).

[13] When pondering on the origins of the gloss, they could see only one solution, namely that the gloss was allegedly a proof that Theophylact himself did not finish his work and in this manner he noted the need to restructure book 8, see P. Schreiner, p. 12, T. Olajos, 1981, p. 417–424. However, it should be stressed that neither T. Olajos nor P. Schreiner thoroughly analysed the table of contents and failed to link its specific qualities with the gloss.

Linguistic analysis

Grammatical changes regarding single words (mainly proper names) occurring in the main text were noted in the table of contents. The nature of these changes, despite their diversity, indicates a l o w e r l i n g u i s t i c r e g i s t e r in relation to the main text, which is a very strong premise in favour of a different authorship. These changes, however, do not provide grounds for chronological specification.

Haplography of λλ>λ (for the haplography of lambda see S. Psaltes 1915, par. 237) occurs only once (6.9/6.5) for the notation of the toponym of Tzouroul(l)on;[14] the simplified form is encountered quite frequently, cf. also Procop., 7.38.5, Anna Comnena, 7.11.1, 10.4.5. Heteroclisis, understood as a shift of inflectional paradigm, may be included in the text identification process. Recently, on these grounds, Menander's authorship of a papyrus fragment of an anonymous comedy has been rejected.[15] In Historiae Smbat Bagratuni's (3.19/3.8) heteroclisis occurs: paradigm shift from II to I decl., Συμβάτιος>Συμβάτης. Although the derivational popularity of the –της suffix in the Middle Byzantine chronicles[16] may be indicated, this is not case with this name. Symbatios is the dominant hellenised form of the Armenian name of Smbat, as encountered both on seals and in literary sources.[17] Meanwhile, no other occurrence of Symbates outside the table of contents of Historiae and Scriptor incertus de Leone Armenio (e cod. Paris. gr. 1711)[18] has been confirmed. Idioclisis is an exceptional case of inflecting foreign words, also of Semitic origin, one of its determinants – and it is important in the context of the text in question – is a particular situation, when the masculina in declination I are given -ᾱ gen. sg.[19] The following occurs in the table of contents of the Historiae: 2.8: nom. sg. Μαρουθᾶς > gen.sg. Μαρουθᾶ;[20] 2.11: Ζαβέρτας > gen.sg. Ζαβέρτα (instead of Ζαβέρτου); 2.23: Βουσᾶς > gen.sg. Βουσᾶ; 8.35: gen.sg. Φωκᾶ. On the other hand, Theophylact attempts to use a different syntax in most cases (i.e. acc. instead of gen.), cf. (4.2): mostly nom.sg. Ὁρμίσδας, gen.sg. Ὁρμίσδου,

---

[14] A. Pralong, 1988, p. 182.

[15] B. Cartlidge, 2016, p. 17–24; for general information of heteroclisis cf. M. Maiden, 2009, p. 59–86; G.T. Stump, 2006, p. 279–322. Examples of heteroclisis: P. Mich. VIII 482, 8–12, [133 n.e.], Δαματρύς>Δαματρία (on late Byzantine Rodos, see G.N. Hatzidakis, 1905–1907, S. Psaltes, 1915, par. 19).

[16] S. Psaltes, 1915, par. 365.

[17] Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit 7166–7170; more famous characters: see. Theodosius Melitenos, p. 169; Leon Grammatikos., p. 242.16 (A. Rambaud, 1870, p. 148, 152, 538; F. Hirsch, 1876, p. 161, 232, 238–239, 246); S. Psaltes, 1915, par. 161.

[18] P. 346, line 4: φθασάντων τῶν ἑορτῶν ἔστεψεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ μικρὸν ὄντα, καὶ ἐπονομαζόμενον Συμβάτην ἐψεύσατο λέγων ὅτι Κωνσταντῖνος καλεῖται.

[19] For the Byzantine period see K. Dieterich, 1898, p. 166–167, 171–172; S. Psaltes, 1915, par. 276–280.

[20] As regards the name of Maruthas (Μαρουθᾶς) cf. also Socrates 7.8, on his activities in Mayafariqin (today: Silvan), renamed Martyropolis where Maruthas was the first bishop of the town (approx. 420), see most of all R. Marcus, 1932, p. 47–71; S.J. McDonough, 2008, p. 127–141: on the failed attempt to convert the shahenshah by Maruthas.

but also ὑπὸ Ὁρμίσδα (3.6.7). Special cases of idioclisis include: (5.2) of the main text – acc.sg. Ῥοσᾶν, treated in the table of context as gen.sg. Ῥοσὰν and (5.23) in the main text – acc.sg. Δαλαυζὰν, occurring in the table as gen.sg. with spirantisation[21] and substitution of υ>β[22] in handwriting (noteworthy, this stands also for Photios' Summaria for Σκλαβηνοί, but the compilator of the contents uses Σκλαυηνοί): Ζαλαβζάν. Perhaps, this was copied by someone who could not cope with the foreign nomina propria. Iotacism occurs when a phoneme is written as ι, ει, η, οι, υ, υι which is recorded graphically as six historically different phonemes, the phonemic value of which became unified.[23] Two cases are encountered in the Historiae: 7.3/7.3: Ἀσήμῳ>Ἀσίμῳ, 7.4/7.4: Πειράγαστος>Πιραγάστου.[24] Other cases of different types of names and use of words that do not exist in the text of Theophylact include: a) (2.19) νσ>σ, i.e. a typical loss of nasal sound preceding the sigma in an intervocalic position[25], and the mentioning the name of an essentially inferior leader (Ansimuth: nom.sg. Ἀνσιμούθ > gen.sg. Ἀσιμούθ) in the title shows that the table's author was absorbed by the foreignness of the Germanic name; b) (7.22) Γούδουϊς, nom./Γούδουϊν, acc. > Γώδουιν, acc., the following occurred: 1) ου > ω, cf. curcuma > κούρκωμον (Malalas); Δωράχιον (Theodosius Melitenos), 2) elimination of diaeresis, i.e. consonantalisation of ου, cf. Κουίντος;[26] c) simple orthographical mistakes mostly concerning punctuation: 1) Βοοκολοβρᾶ (1.18) instead of Βοοκολαβρᾶ (1.8.2), 2) Ἀρζαμον (2.3) instead of Ἀρζάμων (2.1.6–7), Δροκτῶν (2.27) but see τὸν Δρόκτωνα (2.17.9) and ὁ ὑποστράτηγος Δρόκτων (2.17.11); d) (2.2/2.2) hypercorrectness ι>η regarding the name Kardarigan (Καρδαρηγάν instead of Καρδαριγάν).

Contents analysis

1.1.
The contents of the four paragraphs of the table of content is so different from the relevant narrative of the main text, that it actually leads the reader to draw wrong conclusions, as it suggests a course of events that is different from Simocatta's account. These paragraphs include: 1.7, 2.26, 4.15, 8.29. It is worth discussing each of them separately:

1.7 Ὡς εἴκοσι χιλιάδας χρυσίων προσθεῖναι ταῖς συνθήκαις Ῥωμαίους ὁ βάρβαρος κατηνάγκασεν. This item leaves no room for interpretation, although other information can be found in the main text (1.3.13). Theophylact actually mentioned the khagan's demands, he stressed explicitly that the

---

[21] On the latter: J.M. Dosuna, 1991–1993, p. 82–114.

[22] It is common in the Middle Byzantine chronicles, see S. Psaltes, 1915, par. 114.

[23] S. Psaltes, 1915, par. 224–225; O. Jurewicz, 1992, par. 25 and 35.

[24] Photios: Πιράγαστος.

[25] O. Jurewicz, 1992, par. 166–168; S. Psaltes, 1915, par. 166, 209.

[26] S. Psaltes, 1915, par. 104–109 and in particular 107; O. Jurewicz, 1992, par. 26: ω had the phonetic quality of a long open o, which became unified with o after the loss of vowel length and without changing its tone; ω has also its equivalent/variant in the form of a long closed o, recorded as ου and this spelling confusion resulted in the error made by the table's author.

emperor, having heard the nomads' proposal, went into a frenzy and refused. The direct consequence of the refusal was the Avar attack on and capture of Singidunum (1.4.1), which the author of the table of contents included under item 1.9. That the author of the table stated that the emperor gave in to the demands of barbarians may be a result of his inattention or misunderstanding Theophylact's narrative. In this case it is difficult to discern purposeful actions, though misleading the reader is a fact.

2.26:῝Οπως ἐλοιδοροῦντο τῷ αὐτοκράτορι οἱ Βυζάντιοι διὰ τὰ συμβάντα ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων περὶ τὴν Εὐρώπην ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν δυστυχήματα. This time it is not an error but a considerable omission which distorts the events that occurred in the capital. The author of the table stresses that the people of Constantinople resented the ruler for the defeats suffered from barbarians in Europe. In Theophylact's opinion on the other hand, the reason for the outbreak of dissatisfaction among the people of the capital was the information of the Avars capturing two Roman leaders, Castos and Ansimuth (2.17.5). The author of the table of contents omitted the direct reason for riots, which were quickly put out by the emperor who ransomed Castos (2.17.7). Although this error may be treated as generalisation, it nevertheless has a direct impact on the perception of the text, thus distorting the original message.

4.15 Περὶ τῶν συγκυρησάντων τῷ Βαρὰμ καὶ Χοσρόῃ πρὸ τῆς ῾Ρωμαϊκῆς συμμαχίας. This is the most evident example of the inadequacy of the table's relation to the main text. According to the table of contents, the paragraph should include information of the mutual relations between Baram and Chosroes in the period preceding the Roman intervention in Persia. Meanwhile, in Theophylact's text the narrative is continuous, devoid of any flashbacks and it pertains to events that occurred after the Roman-Persian alliance, during joint military action. It does not include any mention of the shahenshah's past, and the name of Baram does not occur at all, even by default. A question arises whether the author of the table of contents intended to restructure this fragment similarly to book VIII (see item 1.1).

8.29 Περὶ τοῦ ἐμπρησμοῦ τοῦ γεγονότος τῇ πόλει. In book VIII which was by far the most interesting for the author of the table of contents (see item 1.1) one can find perhaps the most intriguing change of Theophylact's work. The author of Historiae wrote that in the period of emperor Maurice's demise, the crowd of capital dwellers was to set fire to the house of patrician Constantine Lardys (8.9.5–6).[27] The table's author ignored Constantine and by writing that fire broke out in the city, he presents the reader an image of catastrophe, covering the entire metropolis with tragic consequences. Three solutions to the above inconsistency are possible: a) mental shortcut totum pro parte, b) actual spreading of the fire to which the table's author was particularly sensitive or had sources other than Theophylact; c) rhetorical strengthening of the negative image of emperor's opponents, thus stressing the importance of Maurice's

---

[27] T. Wolińska (2014, p. 374) believes that it was the office of *praefectus praetorio* held by Constantine became the reason for burning his house down during the riots.

death as a tragedy for Rome, which seems to confirm the very emotional wording of the table's author when describing the murder (see p. 1.1 and 3.3).

All the above cases of major changes in relation to Theophylact's main text confirm the hypothesis of inauthenticity of this part of *Historiae*. The author of the table of contents made too far-fetching generalisations, overinterpreted the text itself and sometimes simply did not understand the sequence of events. It is impossible that the author of the main text made such glaring errors when drawing up the table of contents. The results of the contents analysis explicitly demonstrate a different authorship of the table of contents.

1.2.

Its author also shows a passion to memorabilia, does not omit any of them when, frequently and with certain casualness, ignoring complete political and military episodes. The term *memorabilia* denotes the description of any and all phenomena that cannot be explained on the grounds of natural science, in line with the then knowledge. The differentiation based on the religious criterion does not seem proper as it may lead to erroneous interpretations. In all cases of describing such a phenomenon, the intellectual process is constant. The author of the table of contents carefully enumerated all supernatural phenomena in Theophylact's work, and when including them in the table he was even forced to disrupt the proper, integral narrative. The most shocking example of this was the specification, in the table of contents, of the information regarding the miraculous, beautiful creates in the rapids of the Nile (7.16–17) which artificially broke down the geographical digression of Theophylact's narrative into two parts. The memorabilia in the table of contents are found in: 1.5/1.3; 1.6/1.3; 5.13/5.10; 5.20/5.15; 6.19/6.11; 7.10/7.6.; 7.28/7.16–17.

1.3.

The author of the table avoids negative information. On the other hand, if any judgemental semantics appears, it is, in overwhelming majority, positive. At this point, a surprisingly frequent use of ethically strong ἀριστεία should be noted (1.32; 2.29; 3.10; 7.2; 7.22; 8.5; in the main text they are mentioned twice: 2.16, 6.7 and in a different context) as well as ἀνδραγαθία (1.17; 1.28; 5.2; 6.14; 6.15; 7.4; only once in the main text: 3.15.2, pertaining to the community and not an individual). What is important, one will not encounter negative equivalents thereof in terms of clarity, except for 8.38, which is significant, cf. 1.1.

3.4.

In the contents of Theophylact's History there is a "suspicious" reference to 'Augusta and Viminikion': Ὅπως Αὐγούσταν καὶ τὸ Βιμινίκιον, πόλεις Ῥωμαίων, ὁ Χαγάνος ἐπόρθησεν (1.10). In the main text, of course, the cities are named correctly: Βιμινάκιον six times and Αὐγούσται (in plural) only once. It would be strange for Theophylact to mistake the names of both cities. Of course, it could be a mistake on the part of the copyist, but for both of them? In our opinion, the reference to πόλεις Ῥωμαίων is also odd, since Theophylact says

that these cities were important and belonged to Illyricum. He would hardly have specified that these were cities of the Romans: for him it was evident that they belonged to the Roman Empire; what he wanted was to inform the reader about their importance and location: cities of Illyricum. Besides, Theophylact never refers to "cities of Romans" in his text. In any case, it seems once again that the compiler of the contents was not Theophylact but someone else, who was inattentive and made mistakes with the names of the cities, which were probably unknown to him.

The same type of 'Augusta' for 'Augustae' occurs also in Photios' Summaria (p. 4), but there Viminakion is correct.

Conclusion

The analysis of the relation of the table of contents to the text of *Historiae* in three independent aspects has demonstrated the existence of differences that are so significant, both on the informative and linguistic levels, that its inauthenticity is well-grounded. The consequence thereof is the acknowledgement of the fact that **Vaticanus gr. 977**, and therefore all surviving manuscripts containing the *Historiae*, represent a tradition different from what was available to patriarch **Photios**, although the relations between them require a separate study, as the author of the table of contents must have known ***Bibliotheca.***

Table 1. Relation of the paragraphs of the main text (126) to the items of table of contents (232)

Number in the table of contents	Number in the main text	Type of change
1.1	1.1	None
1.2	1.2	Interpretation
1.3	1.2	None
1.4	1.3	Interpretation
1.5	1.3	Interpretation
1.6	1.3	Interpretation
1.7	1.3	Interpretation: major change in meaning
1.8	1.3–4	None
1.9	1.4	None
1.10	1.4	None
1.11	1.4	None
1.12	1.4–5	Interpretation
1.13	1.6	Interpretation
1.14	1.6	None
1.15	1.6	None
1.16	1.7	None
1.17	1.7	Interpretation
1.18	1.8	None
1.19	1.8	Interpretation

1.20	1.9	Interpretation
1.21	1.10	None
1.22	1.11	None
1.23	1.11	None
1.24	1.12	None
1.25	1.12	Interpretation
1.26	1.12	None
1.27	1.12	None
1.28	1.13	Interpretation
1.29	1.13	Interpretation
1.30	1.13	Interpretation
1.31	1.14	Interpretation
1.32	1.14	Interpretation
1.33	1.14	None
1.34	1.15	None
1.35	1.15	None
2.1	2.1	None
2.2	2.2	Hypercorrectness ι>η
2.3	2.3–4	Interpretation
2.4	2.4	None
2.5	2.4–5	None
2.6	2.6	None
2.7	2.7	None
2.8	2.7	Idioclisis
2.9	2.8	None
2.10	2.8	None
2.11	2.8	Idioclisis
2.12	2.8	None
2.13	2.9	None
2.14	2.9	None
2.15	2.10	Interpretation
2.16	2.10	None
2.17	2.10	None
2.18	2.10–11	Interpretation
2.19	2.12	Loss of nasal sound
2.20	2.12	None
2.21	2.13–14	None
2.22	2.15	None
2.23	2.16	Idioclisis
2.24	2.16	None
2.25	2.17	None
2.26	2.17	Interpretation: major change in meaning
2.27	2.17	None
2.28	2.18	None

2.29	2.18	None
2.30	2.18	None
3.1	3.1	None
3.2	3.1	None
3.3	3.1	None
3.4	3.2	None
3.5	3.2	None
3.6	3.2	None
3.7	3.3	None
3.8	3.4	None
3.9	3.4	None
3.10	3.5	None
3.11	3.5	None
3.12	3.5	Interpretation
3.13	3.6	Interpretation
3.14	3.6	None
3.15	3.6–7	Interpretation
3.16	3.8	None
3.17	3.8	None
3.18	3.8	None
3.19	3.8	Heteroclisis
3.20	3.8	None
3.21	3.9–16	Interpretation
3.22	3.16–17	None
3.23	3.18	Interpretation
4.1	4.1	None
4.2	4.1	None
4.3	4.2–3	None
4.4	4.4	None
4.5	4.5	None
4.6	4.6	None
4.7	4.6	Interpretation
4.8	4.7	None
4.9	4.7	None
4.10	4.8–10	Interpretation
4.11	4.10	None
4.12	4.10–11	None
4.13	4.12	None
4.14	4.12	None
4.15	4.13	Interpretation: major change in meaning
4.16	4.13	None
4.17	4.14	None
4.18	4.14	None
4.19	4.15	None

4.20	4.15	None
4.21	4.15–16	None
5.1	5.1	None
5.2	5.1	Idioclisis
5.3	5.2	Interpretation
5.4	5.2	None
5.5	5.2	Interpretation
5.6	5.3	None
5.7	5.3	None
5.8	5.4	None
5.9	5.5	Interpretation
5.10	5.6–7	Interpretation
5.11	5.8–9	None
5.12	5.9–11	Interpretation
5.13	5.10	Interpretation
5.14	5.12	None
5.15	5.11	Interpretation
5.16	5.13	None
5.17	5.14	None
5.18	5.14	None
5.19	5.15	None
5.20	5.15	Interpretation
5.21	5.15	None
5.22	5.16	None
5.23	5.16	Idioclisis and spirantisation
6.1	6.1	None
6.2	6.1	None
6.3	6.2	Interpretation
6.4	6.3	Interpretation
6.5	6.3	None
6.6	6.4	None
6.7	6.4	None
6.8	6.5	None
6.9	6.5	Haplography
6.10	6.5	None
6.11	6.6	Interpretation
6.12	6.7	None
6.13	6.8	None
6.14	6.8	None
6.15	6.9	None
6.16	6.9	None
6.17	6.10	None
6.18	6.10	Interpretation
6.19	6.11	Interpretation

6.20	6.11	None
6.21	6.11	Interpretation
7.1	7.1	None
7.2	7.2	None
7.3	7.3	Iotacism
7.4	7.4	Iotacism
7.5	7.5	None
7.6	7.5	None
7.7	7.6	None
7.8	7.6	None
7.9	7.6	None
7.10	7.6	Interpretation
7.11	7.7	Interpretation
7.12	7.8	None
7.13	7.8	None
7.14	7.9	None
7.15	7.9	None
7.16	7.9	None
7.17	7.9	None
7.18	7.10	None
7.19	7.11	None
7.20	7.11	None
7.21	7.12	None
7.22	7.12	a) ου > ω, b) elimination of diaeresis, i.e. consonantalisation of ου
7.23	7.12	None
7.24	7.13–14	Interpretation
7.25	7.14	Interpretation
7.26	7.15	None
7.27	7.15	None
7.28	7.16	None
7.29	7.17	None
8.1	8.1	None
8.2	8.1	None
8.3	8.1	None
8.4	8.1	None
8.5	8.2	None
8.6	8.3	None
8.7	8.3	None
8.8	8.3	None
8.9	8.4	None
8.10	8.4	None
8.11	8.4	None
8.12	8.4	None

8.13	8.4	None
8.14	8.4–5	None
8.15	8.5–6	Interpretation
8.16	8.6	None
8.17	8.7	None
8.18	8.7	None
8.19	8.7	None
8.20	8.8	None
8.21	8.8	None
8.22	8.8	None
8.23	8.8	None
8.24	8.8	None
8.25	8.8	None
8.26	8.8	None
8.27	8.9	None
8.28	8.9	None
8.29	8.9	Interpretation: major change in meaning
8.30	8.9	None
8.31	8.9	None
8.32	8.9	None
8.33	8.9	None
8.34	8.9	None
8.35	8.10	Idioclisis
8.36	8.10	None
8.37	8.11	None
8.38	8.11	None – absence of book IX?
8.39	8.11	None
8.40	8.12	None
8.41	8.12	None
8.42	8.12	None
8.43	8.13	None
8.44	8.13	None
8.45	8.13	None
8.46	8.14	None
8.47	8.15	None
8.48	8.15	None
8.49	8.15	None
8.50	8.15	None

Bibliography

Sources and modern translations

Agathiae Myrinaei Historiarum Libri Quinque (CFHB 2), ed. R. Keydell, Berlin 1967.

Annae Comnenae Alexias (CFHB 40), eds. D.R. Reinsch, A. Kambylis. Berlin–New York 2001.

Excerpta de Sententiis, ed. U.Ph. Boissevain, Berlin 1906.

Johannes Malalas Chronographia, ed. H. von Thurn, Berlin 2000.

Nicephori archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opuscula historica, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig 1880.

Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople, Short History (CFHB XIII), ed. C. Mango, Washington 1990.

Photius, Bibliothèque, ed. R. Henry, vol. 1–8, Paris 1959–1977.

Procopius Caesariensis, De Bellis, rec. J. Haury (corr. G. Wirth), Lipsiae 1962–1963.

Sokrates. Kirchengeschichte (GCS N.F. 1), ed. G.C. Hansen, Berlin 1995.

Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon, ed. Staffan Wahlgren, Berlin 2006.

Teofilakt Simokatta, Historia powszechna, trans. A. Kotłowska, Ł. Różycki, Poznań 2016.

Theophülaktosz Szimokattész, Világtörténelem, ed. trans. T. Olajos, Szeged 2012.

Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae, eds. C. De Boor, ed. rev. P. Wirth, Stutgardiae 1972.

Theophylaktos Simokates, Geschichte, trans. P. Schreiner, Stuttgart 1985.

Studies

Alexander P.J., 1958, *The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople*, Oxford.

Cartlidge B., 2016, *Heteroclisis in Menander and the Authorship of P.Ant. 15 (=Fr.Com.Adesp. 1084 K.–A)*. "ZPE", 199, p. 17–24.

Dieterich K., 1898, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Byzantinisches Archiv 1), Leipzig.

Dosuna J.M., 1991–1993, *On "Z" for "Δ" in Greek Dialectal inscriptions*, "Die Sprache", 35, p. 82–114.

Hatzidakis G.N., 1905–1907, *Μεσαιωνικὰ καὶ Νεοελληνικά*, Αθήνα.

Hirsch F., 1876, *Byzantinische Studien*, Leipzig.

Jurewicz O., 1992, *Gramatyka historyczna języka greckiego: fonetyka – fleksja*, Warszawa.

Kardaras G., 2005, *The Episode of Busas (596/7) and the Use of Siege Engines by the Avars*, "Byzantinoslavica", 68, p. 53–66.

Lexikon zur Byzantinischen Gr.zit. t 6, ed. E. Trapp et al., Wien 2007.

Maiden M., 2009, *Where does Heteroclisis Come From? Evidence from Romanian Dialects*, "Morphology", 19, p. 59–86.

Marcus R., 1932, *The Armenian Life of Marutha of Maipherkat*, "Harvard Theological Review", 25, p. 47–71.

McDonough S.J., 2008, *A Second Constantine? The Sasanian King Yazdgard in Christian History and Historiography*, "Journal of Late Antiquity", 1, p. 127–141.

Olajos T., 1979, *Remarques sur la tradition manuscrite de l'Histoire universelle de Théophylacte Simocatta*, "Revue d'histoire des textes", 9, p. 261–266.

Olajos T., 1981, *Contributions à une analyse de la genèse de l'Histoire universelle de Theophylacte Simocatta*, "Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica", 29, p. 417–424.

Olajos T., 1988, *Les sources de Théophylacte Simocatta Historien*, Leiden.

Pra long A., 1988, *Remarques sur les fortifications byzantines de Thrace Orientale*, [in:] *Géographie historique du monde mediterranéen* (Byzantina Sorboniensia 7), ed. H. Ahrweiler, Paris.

Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit, ed. F. Winkelmann, vol. 1–6, Berlin–New York 1998–2002.

Psaltes S., *Grammatik der Byzantinischen Chroniken*, Göttingen 1915 (2. unver. Aufl. 1974).

Rambaud A., 1870, *L'empire grec au dixième siècle*, Paris.

Stump G.T., 2006, *Heteroclisis and Paradigm Linkage*, "Language", 82(2), p. 279–322.

Whitby M., 1988, *The Emperor Maurice and his Historian Theophylact Simocatta on Persian and Balkan Warfare*, Oxford.

Wolińska T., 2014, *Ciemna strona Miasta. Przestępczość we wczesnobizantyńskim Konstantynopolu*, [in:] *Mieszkańcy stolicy świata. Konstantynopolitańczycy między starożytnością a średniowieczem*, eds. A. Kompa, M.J. Leszka, T. Wolińska, Łódź, p. 347–380.

Anna Kotłowska
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
Instytut Historii
ul. Umultowska 89d, 61-809 Poznań
e-mail: anna.kot@amu.edu.pl

Łukasz Różycki
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu
Instytut Historii
ul. Umultowska 89d, 61-809 Poznań
e-mail: lukasz.rozycki@amu.edu.pl

Andreas Gkoutzioukostas (collaboration)
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
e-mail: agkoutzi@hist.auth.gr