

Studies in John Malalas

Edited by

Elizabeth Jeffreys

with

Brian Croke

Roger Scott



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

BYZANTINE CHRONICLE WRITING

1: The early development of Byzantine chronicles

Brian Croke

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2: The Byzantine chronicle after Malalas

Roger Scott

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁷It is worth examining the traditional dating, which is based on the following passage:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹³I owe this interesting suggestion to John Wortley.

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

So world chronicles continued to be written even beyond the end of the Byzantine empire and to provide at least Greek speakers with a Malalas-like picture of world history perhaps until the formation of the modern Greek nation and Greek independence in 1821 (cf. Mango, 1980, 193; 1981, 54-55). The first printed edition of Dorotheos was in 1631 after which it went through, at a minimum, a remarkable 33 editions until 1818¹⁴ as well as surviving in part in at least 58 manuscripts (see Stanitsas, 1986), mainly connected with monasteries, particularly those on Mount Athos. It is clear that the world chronicle, as represented by the *Biblion Historikon*, was extremely popular, providing many Greeks with their understanding of the past and their place in history, for in addition to four editions by 1654, at least one edition appeared in every decade from 1676 to 1818, apart from a half-century gap between 1691 and 1743. In addition to Dorotheos there is the chronicle of Kigalas, printed in 1637 and again in 1650 with a narrative continuing somehow to 1648 even though Kigalas probably died in 1642¹⁵ and there are also manuscripts of the huge tripartite (Jewish, Roman and Mysian i.e. Ottoman) history of Alexandros Mavrokordatos (1642-1709), of which just the first part was printed posthumously in 1716.¹⁶ Both Kigalas and Mavrokordatos contain much the same kind of material as Dorotheos, although Kigalas shows rather more interest in ancient Greece, that is, in Malalas-like euhemerised accounts of Greek myths. Although Kigalas' chronicle appears not to have been reprinted after 1650, there are many manuscript translations of it into Roumanian. If these manuscripts could be dated, they may possibly explain the gap in editions of Dorotheos between 1691 and 1740 (albeit not in Greek) while the slight difference in emphasis from Malalas may reflect the attitudes of the highly influential Greek community in Jassy, though elsewhere Phanariot historiography (e.g. Mavrokordatos) appears to show even less interest in ancient Greece than does Malalas.

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

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

¹⁵Oikonomides, 1959, 139-142 citing Russo, 1939, 53-86.

¹⁶Mavrokordatos, 1716; cf. Mango, 1973, 53-54.

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

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

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

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

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

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