

# The *Excerpta Anonymi* and the *Constantinian Excerpts*

Panagiotis MANAFIS (Gent)

*The Constantinian Excerpts and the Excerpta Anonymi should be seen within the context of the culture of Sylloge. The two works share significant similarities in terms of content, format, and methodology. This article centers on the possibility of a textual relation between the Excerpta Anonymi and the Constantinian Excerpts. I advance the hypothesis that the anonymous compiler of the Excerpta Anonymi relied on earlier collections of excerpts and must have drawn on draft copies produced during the redaction of the Constantinian collections.*

This paper centers on the possibility of a textual relation between the tenth-century *Excerpta Anonymi*<sup>1</sup> and the *Constantinian Excerpts (CE)*.<sup>2</sup> The two collections of excerpts should be seen within the context of the *culture of sylloge*.<sup>3</sup> They share significant similarities in terms of content, format, and methodology. The hypothesis is advanced that the anonymous compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* relied on earlier collections of excerpts and must have drawn on draft copies produced during the redaction of the Constantinian collections. Andreas Nemeth has proved in his dissertation that draft copies were, indeed, written before the final copies of the *CE*.<sup>4</sup>

---

\*The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement n. 313153. All uncredited translations are my own.

<sup>1</sup>*Excerpta Anonymi Byzantini ex Codice Parisino suppl. Gr. 607 A*, M. Treu (ed.), Ohlau 1880 (Henceforth *Excerpta Anonymi*). On the *Excerpta Anonymi* see also: T. PREGER, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, I, Leipzig 1901, X; idem, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, II, Leipzig 1907, XXI–XXIV; A. CAMERON – J. HERRIN, *Constantinople in the early eight century. The Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai*, Leiden 1984, 4–8; M. L. AMERIO, Ancora sui nuovi frammenti di Appiano, *Invigilata Lucernis* 21, 1999, 35–42; P. ODORICO, Dans le dossier des chroniqueurs. Le cas d'Eustathe d'Antioche, in: J. Signes Codoner – I. Pérez Martin (eds.), *Textual transmission in Byzantium: Between textual criticism and Quellenforschung*, Leuven 2013, 373–389; P. ODORICO, Du recueil à l'invention du texte: le cas des Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai, *BZ* 107/2, 2014, 755–784; P. MANAFIS, Political margins. Geography and history in the *Excerpta Anonymi*, *Byz* 87, 2017 (forthcoming).

<sup>2</sup> Henceforth *CE*; *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*, I, Th. Büttner-Wobst (ed.), Berlin 1906 (henceforth: *EV 1*); *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis*, II, A. G. Roos (ed.), Berlin 1910 (henceforth: *EV 2*); *Excerpta de insidiis*, C. De Boor (ed.), Berlin 1905 (henceforth: *EI*); *Excerpta de legationibus*, C. De Boor (ed.), Berlin 1903 (henceforth: *EL*); *Excerpta de sententiis*, U. Ph. Boissevain (ed.), Berlin 1906 (henceforth: *ES*).

<sup>3</sup>The term characterizing the phenomenon of selecting, re-copying, synthesizing and presenting textual material was first advanced by P. Odorico; cf. P. ODORICO, La cultura della ΣΥΛΛΟΓΗ: 1) Il cosiddetto enciclopedismo bizantino. 2) Le tavole del sapere di Giovanni Damasceno, *BZ* 83/1, 1990, 1–21. The idea was further developed in: P. ODORICO, Cadre d'exposition / cadre de pensée – la culture du recueil, in: P. Van Deun – C. Macé (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 212), Louvain – Paris – Walpole 2011, 89–107. See also the review of the aforementioned volume by A. Kaldellis; cf. A. KALDELLIS, in: The Medieval Review 12.10.30, <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/tmr/article/view/17693/23811> (retrieved March 6, 2017); on the *culture of sylloge* as a literary phenomenon rooted in the florilegic tradition see: P. MAGDALINO, Orthodoxy and history in tenth-century Byzantine encyclopedism, in: P. Van Deun – C. Macé (eds.), *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?*, op. cit., 143 – 160; an overview of the subject is offered by P. Odorico in: P. ODORICO, Du Premier Humanisme à l'encyclopedisme: une construction à revoir (forthcoming).

<sup>4</sup>A. NEMETH, *Imperial Systematization of the Past: Emperor Constantine VII and his Historical Excerpts* (PhD thesis, Central European University 2010), 93–177.

In the following pages, I shall undertake a close analysis of the source texts of the *Excerpta Anonymi* chapters *Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ* (On the Istros river), *Περὶ Κύρου* (On Cyrus), and *Περὶ Ρώμου καὶ Ρωμύλου* (On Remus and Romulus) by studying the collection as a literary product of the *culture of sylloge*. More particularly, I suggest that, for the chapter *On the river Istros*,<sup>5</sup> the compiler drew on a collection of geographical material, whereas for the chapters *On Cyrus*<sup>6</sup> and *On Remus and Romulus*<sup>7</sup> he drew on a Constantinian collection of occult science. Similarly, passages on Roman history in the *Excerpta Anonymi* derive from a collection on dreams and occult science.

### The *Excerpta Anonymi*

The *Excerpta Anonymi* were published based on the unique *codex Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* by M. Treu in 1880.<sup>8</sup> As suggested by the title of the first and single edition, the *Excerpta Anonymi* belong to the genre of the so-called *Syllogai of excerpts*. The selection of material according to certain precise themes, their alphabetical arrangement, and the homogeneity of the narrative structure throughout the *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* indicate that the anonymous author of the *Excerpta Anonymi* intended to produce a coherent collection of excerpts.

The *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* consists of 84 folia measuring 190 × 128 mm. The text occupies an area of 125 × 66 mm, and there are 20 lines of text per page. The codex is made of ten and a half quaternions, and the folios are numbered 1 through 84 by a later hand. The handwriting of the author of the *Parisinus* is quite even and controlled betraying rather a professional scribe. The medium is the usual dark brown Byzantine ink. Headings and initials are in uncials but in the same ink. Codicological and palaeographic features of the manuscript suggest that it was made at the second half of the 10th century.<sup>9</sup> As far as the content of the *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a* is concerned, the source texts could be divided as follows: Patriographic texts: fol. 1v–2r: *Περὶ Αὐγουστέιου*, fol. 2r–2v: *Περὶ ἀτραβατικῶν*, fol. 2v–10r: *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων*, fol. 10v–29v: *Περὶ στηλῶν*. Historical texts: fol. 29v–72v: extracts from Cassius Dio, Procopius, Appianus, Herodotus, and John Lydus. Astronomic/geometric texts: fol. 75v–83r: excerpts from Leon the Mechanic's *Πῶς δεῖ ἰστὰν σφαῖραν* and *Διαιρέσεις τῆς σφαῖρας*, fol. 83r–84v: Theon of Alexandria's *Scholia*. Ethnographic/geographical texts: fol. 1r–1v: *Περὶ Ἀδιαβηνῆς*, fol. 9v–10r: *Περὶ ἀνδρείας*, fol. 10r: *Ἄλλο περὶ Γετῶν*, fol. 62v–67r: *Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*, fol. 72v–74r: *Ἐκ τῶν περιηγητικῶν τὰ χρειωδέστερα καὶ σαφηνέστερα τοῦ Διονυσίου*.

The diversity of these topics presupposes a well-equipped person who was acquainted with the works just mentioned and who knew precisely where to look for passages corresponding to the subject matter of the collection. It is noteworthy that there are no texts passing unaltered into the *Excerpta Anonymi*. Inaccuracies and obscurity of expression in some source texts but also political reasons and ideology led the compiler to intervene and re-edit the extracted passages.

<sup>5</sup>*Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*; cf. *Excerpta Anonymi* 42,5–44,21.

<sup>6</sup>*Περὶ Κύρου*; cf. *Excerpta Anonymi* 33,1–36,9.

<sup>7</sup>*Περὶ Ρώμου καὶ Ρωμύλου*; cf. *Excerpta Anonymi* 36,10–37,29.

<sup>8</sup>See note 1.

<sup>9</sup>The *Parisinus* shares a significant number of palaeographic characteristics with a group of manuscripts, written in the same script and well established in the second half of the 10th century—namely, the *Vaticanus gr. 1613*, the *Athos Dionysiou 70*, and the *Vaticanus Urb. gr. 20*. The frequent use of capital letters as well as the form of the letters beta, epsilon and omega in the *Parisinus* suggest a dating to the third quarter of the 10th century; H. FOLLIERI, *Codices graeci Bibliothecae Vaticanae selecti temporum locorumque ordine digesti commentariis et transcriptionibus instructi*, Vatican 1969; K. LAKE – S. LAKE, *Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200*, III, Boston 1934 – 1939, 154–155 (fig. 28a).

P. Goukowsky, when studying the Appian excerpts in the *Excerpta Anonymi*, arrived at the conclusion that the anonymous compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* a) was a monk who wrote in a monastic environment where b) he had at hand the complete text of Appian as well as the entire works of Herodotus, Dio Cassius, Procopius, and John Lydus.<sup>10</sup> Goukowsky's first argument is not tenable. On the contrary, his proposition is not in accordance with the selection of material on the part of the *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler, who roughly excised every religious reference existent in the original texts and who expressed covert admiration for pagan elements of the past.<sup>11</sup> Besides, the nature of the *Excerpta Anonymi*, a *dossier* of texts that could be used for teaching, fits the tenth-century Constantinopolitan imperial environment better than a monastic one. Regarding the second argument made by Goukowsky, the analysis of the passage *Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ* shows that it is highly likely that, in addition to any other historical sources—possibly complete historical works—the compiler also relied on pre-existing excerpt-collections.

### The chapter *Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*<sup>12</sup>

Richard Wünsch indicated as sources of the chapter *Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ* of the *Excerpta Anonymi* passages from the *De Mensibus* and the *De magistratibus populi romani libri tres*, both composed by John Lydus.<sup>13</sup> Yet John Lydus was not the source for the excerptor. With only very few exceptions, the passages of the *De Mensibus* and the *De Magistratibus* do not bear any textual similarities with the *Excerpta Anonymi* chapter *Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ*. This conflicts with the fact that the *Excerpta Anonymi* normally remain faithful to the original text and, in many cases, copy their sources word by word. In fact, more than half the passage *Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ* is drawn from Herodotus.<sup>14</sup> For the rest of the chapter, the source used by the compiler needs further investigation.

Specifically, the chapter *Περὶ Ἰστροῦ τοῦ ποταμοῦ* can be divided thematically into four consecutive parts, which refer to the four rivers of Paradise: Istros (42,5–43,14), Nile (43,14–26), Tigris and Euphrates (43,27–44,9), and again Nile (44,10–21). Let us attempt to pin down the source text for each one of the four parts. The part on the river Istros (42,5–43,14) is composed from three separate texts: Herodotus's *History*,<sup>15</sup> John Lydus's *De magistratibus*<sup>16</sup>, and Pseudo-Caesarius's *Quaestiones et responsiones*.<sup>17</sup> In particular, Herodotus appears to be the source text for the *Excerpta Anonymi*, 42,5–43,2; the *De magistratibus* is the source for the *Excerpta Anonymi* 43,3–11 and Ps-Caesarius for the *Excerpta Anonymi* 43,11–14. The material on the rivers Tigris and Euphrates (43,27–44,9) has been taken from the *Paraphrases in Dionysium Periegetam*.<sup>18</sup> Finally, the two passages

<sup>10</sup>P. GOUKOWSKY, *Trois nouveaux extraits d'Appien*, in: C. Brixhe (ed.), *Hellenica Symmicta, Histoire, linguistique, épigraphie*, Nancy 1995, 69–70; For a different view see: AMERIO, *Ancora sui nuovi frammenti di Appiano*, op. cit., 35–42.

<sup>11</sup>P. MANAFIS, *History through an excerpt collection. The case of the Excerpta Anonymi and the Patria of Constantinople* (forthcoming in: *Les historiens fragmentaires de langue grecque à l'époque impériale et tardive*, Université de Nantes, 26 – 28 novembre 2015).

<sup>12</sup>*On the river Istros*.

<sup>13</sup>John Lydus, *Ioannis Lydi Liber de mensibus*, R. Wünsch (ed.), Stuttgart 1898, x–xx.

<sup>14</sup>M. Treu indicates Herodotus along with a passage from John Lydus' *De Mensibus* as the only sources of the chapter *On the Istros river*; cf. TREU, *Excerpta*, op. cit., 58.

<sup>15</sup>*Herodotus*, 4, 48–50.

<sup>16</sup>*De magistratibus populi Romani*, 3,32.

<sup>17</sup>*Pseudo-Kaisarios. Die Erotapokriseis (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte)*, R. Riedinger (ed.), Berlin 1989, chapters 67 and 163.

<sup>18</sup>*Dionysii periegetae orbis descriptionem*, 977–1000; K. MÜLLER, *Geographi Graeci minores*, vol. 2., Paris 1861 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1965), 409–425.

on the Nile (*Excerpta Anonymi* 43,14–26 and 44, 10–21) are taken from Diodorus Siculus's *Bibliotheca historica*<sup>19</sup> and John Lydus's *De Mensibus*, respectively.<sup>20</sup>

The sources of the passage *On the Istros river*, 42,5–44,21

Theme:	Source:
Istros 42,5–43,2	Herodotus's <i>History</i> 4, 48–50
Istros 43,3–11	John Lydus's <i>De magistratibus populi Romani</i> , 3,32
Istros 43,11–14	Ps-Caesarius's <i>Quaestiones et responsiones</i> , ch. 67 and 163
Nile 43,14–26	Diodorus Siculus's <i>Bibliotheca historica</i> 1,37,9
Tigris and Euphrates 43,27–44,9	<i>Paraphrases in Dionysium Periegetam</i> 977–1000
Nile 44,10–21	John Lydus's <i>De Mensibus</i> , 4, 107.

On the basis of this table, though, it is apparent that the chapter *Περὶ Ἰστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ* of the *Excerpta Anonymi* is a mixture of different works, all concerned with the four aforementioned rivers. Impressively, the works combined in the chapter are of different literary genres; the text is made up of excerpts from two historical works (Herodotus, Diodorus), a geographical treatise (Dionysius Periegetes), two antiquarian texts (John Lydus), and an ecclesiastical work (Pseudo-Caesarius).

Interestingly, such an approach towards source texts on the part of the *Excerpta Anonymi* is unique: in all the other chapters of the *Excerpta Anonymi*, the texts excerpted are clearly distinguished from each other and occasionally identified by the compiler himself. The exceptional situation in the chapter on the River Istros therefore makes it unlikely that the compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* was the compiler of the passage handed down to us under the title *Περὶ Ἰστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ*. This hypothesis is corroborated when examining the collection in its entirety. The *Excerpta Anonymi* is a *sylloge* of excerpts just like those produced in Byzantium from the fifth century onwards. Excerpt collections appear to conform to a number of structural principles: namely, the compiler of a *sylloge* excerpts pre-existent texts and edits them while respecting their general structure and function. Furthermore, the selection of excerpts in the *Excerpta Anonymi* was based on general criteria such as accuracy, clarity, brevity, and yet faithfulness to the original narration; these, in turn, were determined by the collection's practical and educational aims.

The *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler thus creates a new narrative on the basis of excerpts. The chapter *Περὶ Ἰστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ*, by contrast, presents itself as a single excerpt but is in fact a brief compilation within a collection of excerpts. Throughout the *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a*, with the exception of the chapter *Περὶ Ἰστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ*, there is no evidence that our compiler merges separate source texts to create a single excerpt. The conclusion must be that the *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler has excerpted the passage on the four rivers of Paradise as a single entity from another manuscript. What was, however, the nature of that manuscript: was it a different excerpt-collection, miscellaneous writings, a depository of notes intended for the private use of the compiler or a manuscript representing an intermediate stage to a final work? The composite nature of the passage, a conflation of different works on the same subject, could favour the latter argument. The hypothesis is further strengthened by the existence of another work containing a text very close to the chapter *Περὶ Ἰστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ* of the *Excerpta Anonymi*. Leo the Deacon's *History* transmits a passage similar to that of our collection. The only divergence is that Leo the Deacon records that the Istros resurfaces in the

<sup>19</sup>Diodorus Siculus, 1,37,9; K. T. FISCHER, (post I. BEKKER – L. DINDORF – F. VOGEL, *Diodori bibliotheca historica*, 5 vols., 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Leipzig, 1:1888; 2:1890; 3:1893; 4–5:1906 (repr. Stuttgart 1964), 1:1–533; 2:1–461; 3:1–497; 4:1–426; 5:1–336.

<sup>20</sup>*De Mensibus*, 4, 107.

Celtic Mountains, whereas in the *Excerpta Anonymi* the river reemerges in the Apennine Mountains.

## Leo the Deacon

Leo the Deacon was born ca. 950 in western Anatolia and came to Constantinople in his youth to receive his secondary education. He was ordained a deacon around 970 and joined the palace clergy in 976 during the reign of Basil II. Several passages in his *History* manifest his classical education.<sup>21</sup> As a member of the palace clergy, he is likely to have had access to the imperial scriptorium and to the draft copies of the *CE*.<sup>22</sup>

In his *History*, Leo the Deacon draws on a significant number of earlier historians, such as Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus of Sicily, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Procopius, and Agathias.<sup>23</sup> It is noteworthy that all of these historians had also been excerpted and used in the *CE*. In addition, Leo the Deacon's *History* contains a considerable number of speeches and digressions reflecting topics of the 53 Constantinian *hypotheses*; the origin of the Mysians, the customs of the Rus, and the accounts on the *Hole Tile* and on the source of the river Istros.<sup>24</sup> As mentioned above, Leo's passage on the source of the river Istros bears a striking resemblance to the passage in the *Excerpta Anonymi*, labelled as *Περὶ Ἰστρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ*. The question to be raised is whether Leo the Deacon and the anonymous compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* used a common source, and, if they did so, what was this source? Could this source be one or more excerpts drawn from one of the Constantinian collections?

## *Περὶ Κύρου and Περὶ Ρώμου καὶ Ρωμύλου*<sup>25</sup>

The other two chapters which are under discussion in the present paper are *On Cyrus* and *On Remus and Romulus*. In the *Excerpta Anonymi* 32,28 – 33, the anonymous compiler interrupts the sequence of excerpts to insert a statement of his own. Apparently, he intends to inform the reader about the content of the forthcoming chapters:

Καὶ εἶπον ἄν καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ καθ' ἐξῆς τοῦ χρόνου μέχρι σχεδὸν τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς. ἄλλ' ἵνα μὴ δόξω θηρώμενος δόξαν κενὴν ταῦτα γράφειν, ἄλλως τε καὶ τῶν πλείστων πᾶσι γνωσκομένων Κύρου μνησθήσομαι καὶ Ρωμύλου σὺν τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ· τὰ γὰρ περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Πριάμου καὶ Οἰδίποδος τί καὶ γράφοιμι ὥς μηδενὸς τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς ἀγνωσύντος.<sup>26</sup>

If we take the statement at face value, we could say that the compiler had all four stories at hand, but that he selected only two, because they were less well known to the public. Moreover, the *Excerpta Anonymi* compiler names four characters, alluding to four mythical stories which are all connected thematically; they are stories about a son of a king, exposed to death but miraculously spared to accomplish great achievements later on. Dreams also play a crucial role in all four narratives. The compiler prefers to recount only two of them, namely

<sup>21</sup>A. M. Talbot – D. F. Sullivan (eds.), *The History of Leo the Deacon. Byzantine Military Expansion in the Tenth Century*, Washington, D.C. 2005, 9–10.

<sup>22</sup>The same has also been supported by A. Nemeth; cf. NEMETH, *Imperial Systematization*, op. cit., 99.

<sup>23</sup>Talbot – Sullivan, *The History of Leo the Deacon*, op. cit., 16–19. On the textual transmission of the work see: N. PANAGIOTAKES, *Λέων ὁ διάκονος*, Athens 1965, 42–129.

<sup>24</sup>Talbot – Sullivan, *The History of Leo the Deacon*, op. cit., 16.

<sup>25</sup>*On Cyrus and On Remus and Romulus*.

<sup>26</sup>*I could say even more of such things, one after another, up to our time, but in order not to be considered that I write about these things seeking vainglorious reputation, and because most of these things are known to all, I will mention Cyrus as well as Romulus and his brother. However, wherefore to write about Alexander, the son of Priam and about Oedipus, since everyone is acquainted with their stories.*

the story of Cyrus and the story of Remus and Romulus. At least two of these stories were known to the compilers of the *CE*; unlike the stories of Cyrus and Remus and Romulus, the story of Oedipus and of Alexander are included in the *CE*. The former is found in a short excerpt in the *EI* under the name of Nicolaos of Damascus.<sup>27</sup> The story of Alexander is presented briefly in the *EV 1*, where the excerptors used John of Antioch.<sup>28</sup> This renders it likely that the four stories had been excerpted and put together by the Constantinian excerptors in a now lost collection about dreams.

We can note in passing that it is likely that the *CE* also knew the two other stories. In the *EV 1*, the excerptors included two passages concerning Remus and Romulus, under the name of Nicolaos of Damascus.<sup>29</sup> The excerpts were inserted immediately after excerpts narrating Cyrus's conquest of Lydia.<sup>30</sup> The coincidence in content and sequence with the *Excerpta Anonymi* is striking. The *Excerpta Anonymi* chapter *Περὶ Κύρου* records the Herodotean story of Cyrus's early life. Herodotus was also excerpted in the *EV 2*.<sup>31</sup> One of the excerpts juxtaposed in the *EV 2* was extracted from the story of Cyrus's early life, which is also included in the *Excerpta Anonymi*.<sup>32</sup> In particular, in the *EV 2*, we encounter the story of Harpagus, whom Astyages tricked into eating his own son. After the meal, Astyages's servants brought Harpagus the head, the arms and the legs so that he would realize that he had eaten his own son. The previous part of the story is missing. It might or might not have been excerpted in one of the other 53 *hypotheses*.

The chapter *Περὶ Ρώμου καὶ Ρωμύλου* was inserted into the *Excerpta Anonymi* after the material on Cyrus and precedes a passage excerpted from Appian, namely the *Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας*.<sup>33</sup> In fact, the story of Cyrus is followed by two Appian excerpts, which are also thematically connected; they both narrate oracles who save someone's life; the life of *Ρώμου* and *Ρωμύλου* and the life of the author himself, respectively. With regard to the correlation between the *Περὶ Κύρου* and the two Appian excerpts, I have two points to make. First, on the left margin on f. 47v in the codex *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607a*, there is a number precisely in front of the title *Περὶ Κύρου*, which reads: ις (which equals 16). On the left margin on f. 53r, in front of the title *Περὶ Ρώμου καὶ Ρωμύλου*, the number ιζ (e.d. 17) occurs<sup>34</sup>, and, finally, on the left margin on f. 55v, in front of the title of the last Appian excerpt, we encounter the number ιη (e.d. 18). The numeration implies an order. However, what does this order refer to? I suggest that the numeration at this point in the *Excerpta Anonymi* reflects the order by which the three excerpts had been copied in the manuscript, which our compiler relied on. Given the fact that the three excerpts are thematically connected, this manuscript most probably was a dossier comprising material on omens and dreams, perhaps a depository of texts for later use. The fact that, in the *EV 2*, two different passages, on Cyrus and Remus and Romulus, respectively, had been copied in a sequence similar to that in the *Excerpta Anonymi* may be a coincidence. If we bear in mind, however, the way the Constantinian excerptors employed the complete narratives they had at hand, it seems probable that there was at least a draft manuscript containing, in sequence, material

<sup>27</sup>*EI* 7.

<sup>28</sup>*EV 1*, 166–67.

<sup>29</sup>*EV 1*, 349–353.

<sup>30</sup>Though the excerpts were extracted from Dionysius of Halicarnasus; they were mistakenly inserted into text passages of Nicolaos of Damascus.

<sup>31</sup>*EV 2*, 1–30.

<sup>32</sup>*Excerpta Anonymi* 33,1–36,9.

<sup>33</sup>*Excerpta Anonymi* 37,30–38,21.

<sup>34</sup>M. Treu here mistakenly indicates ις in the apparatus criticus instead of ιζ; cf. *Excerpta Anonymi* 36,10.

taken from the Herodotian version of Cyrus's early life and the Appian version of the founders of Rome.<sup>35</sup>

### The passages on Roman history

The *Excerpta Anonymi* 29,14–32,27 transmit a series of excerpts derived from the Cassius Dio tradition; some excerpts show similarities with Dio's direct tradition and some others exhibit textual congruence with Xiphilinus's epitome of Dio.<sup>36</sup> Interestingly, the concatenation of Dio excerpts in the *Excerpta Anonymi* is interrupted by four consecutive passages, which M. Treu either mistakenly assigns also to Cassius Dio or leaves unidentified.<sup>37</sup> Two of the passages, namely the *Ἄλλο Β*<sup>38</sup> and the *Περὶ Νέρωνος*,<sup>39</sup> respectively, derive from Peter the Patrician's *History* preserved in the *ES* of the *CE*.<sup>40</sup>

DC 58,23 (Xiph. 154, 7–8) <sup>41</sup>	ES 14, 243,11–13 <sup>42</sup>	<i>Excerpta Anonymi</i> 31,14–17 <sup>43</sup>
ἡγνόει μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν οὐδὲ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Γάιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰπέ ποτε αὐτῷ διαφερομένῳ πρὸς τὸν Τιβέριον ὅτι “σύ τε τοῦτον ἀποκτενεῖς καὶ σὲ ἄλλοι”· οὐτε δὲ ἕτερόν τινα ὁμοίως πάνυ προσήκοντα ἑαυτῷ ἔχων, καὶ ἐκεῖνον κάκιστον	Ὅτι διαπληκτιζομένου ποτὲ Γαίου καὶ Τιβερίου τοῦ ἐκγόνου ἔφη πρὸς τὸν Γάιον ὁ πάππος Τιβέριος „ <u>τί σπονδάξεις; καὶ σὺ τοῦτον φονεύσεις καὶ ἄλλοι σέ.</u> “	διαπληκτιζομένων ποτὲ Γαίου τοῦ υἱοῦ Γερμανικοῦ καὶ Τιβερίου τοῦ υἱοῦ Τιβερίου ἔφη πρὸς Γάιον ὁ Τιβέριος „ <u>τί σπονδάξεις; καὶ σὺ τοῦτον φονεύσεις καὶ ἄλλος σέ.</u> “

<sup>35</sup>The *Excerpta Anonymi* contain three further excerpts from Appian in the first part of the collection; that is, the patriographic one. The first passage is labelled as *Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἔχοντος ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κέρατα* and was taken from Appian's book on the Syrian war (Syrian War, 11,57,293–294). The second passage is entitled *Περὶ Αὐγούστου εὐτυχίας* and corresponds to Appian's book on Civil Wars (Civil Wars, 2.57, 236). Finally, the last passage bears the title *Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐν πέτρᾳ τῆς Ἀραβίας*. The text has been copied also in the *Patria II* (*Patria II*, 84). The word *πέτρα* refers to the city of Petra. Appian refers to the city of Petra again in the excerpt *Περὶ Ἀράβων μαντείας*, a fact that led P. Goukowsky to attributing the excerpt *Περὶ ἀγάλματος ἐν πέτρᾳ τῆς Ἀραβίας* also to Appian; cf. GOUKOWSKY, *Trois nouveaux extraits d'Appien*, op. cit., 63–70.

<sup>36</sup>My thanks go to Dr. Dariya Rafiyenko for much helpful discussion on the matter; much attention is needed in dealing with Boissevain's edition of Cassius Dio. For Boissevain relied on Dio's direct tradition only when this is possible. In many cases, he combines Dio's sources in order to form a Dio text that is as reliable as possible. See for instance DC 59,25,5b–7 and 63,7,2.

<sup>37</sup>Treu does not mention any source for the chapters *Περὶ Τιβερίου*, *Ἄλλο Β* and *Ἄλλο Γ* and erroneously ascribes the chapter *Περὶ Νέρωνος* to Cassius Dio; cf. TREU, *Excerpta*, op. cit., 58.

<sup>38</sup>*Excerpta Anonymi* 31,14–17.

<sup>39</sup>*Excerpta Anonymi* 31,24–30

<sup>40</sup>ES, 243,11–13 and ES, 253, 23–27.

<sup>41</sup>Transl. T. M. Banchich, *The lost history of Peter the Patrician*, London 2015, 31: *Once when Gaius, the son of Germanicus, and Tiberius, the son of Tiberius were sparring, Tiberius said to Gaius, “Why hurry? You will kill him and another you.”*

<sup>42</sup>Transl. Banchich, *The lost history*, op. cit., 31: *Once when Gaius and Tiberius, his [Tiberius] descendant, were sparring, Tiberius the grandfather said to Gaius, “Why hurry? You will slay him and others you.”*

<sup>43</sup>Transl. Banchich, *The lost history*, op. cit., 31: *For he was ignorant of nothing that had to do with Gaius, but even said to him once, as he was quarreling with Tiberius, “You will kill him and others you.”*

DC 65,1,4  
(Xiph.193,23–30)<sup>44</sup>

Οὐτίλλιος δὲ ἐπεὶ ἐν τῇ  
Ρώμῃ ἐγένετο, τᾶλλά τε  
διώκει ὥς που καὶ ἐδόκει  
αὐτῷ, καὶ πρόγραμμα  
ἔθε-  
το δι’ οὗ τοὺς  
ἀστρολόγους ἐξήλασε,  
προειπὼν σφισιν ἐντὸς  
τῆσδε τῆς ἡμέρας, ῥητὴν  
τινα τάξας, ἐξ ἀπάσης  
τῆς Ἰταλίας χωρῆσαι. καὶ  
αὐτῷ ἐκείνοι νυκτὸς  
ἀντιπροθέντες γράμματα  
ἀντιπαρήγγειλαν  
ἀπαλλαγῆναι ἐκ τοῦ βίου  
ἐντὸς τῆς ἡμέρας ἐν ᾗ  
ἐτελεύτησε. καὶ οἱ μὲν  
οὕτως ἀκριβῶς τὸ  
γενησόμενον  
προέγνωσαν.

ES 89, 253,23–27<sup>45</sup>

Ὅτι βιτέλλιος ἐξέβαλε  
τοὺς γόητας καὶ τοὺς  
ἀστρολόγους διὰ  
προγράμματος εἰπὼν  
αὐτοῖς ἐντὸς ῥητῆς  
ἡμέρας ἐκχωρῆσαι πάσης  
τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ αὐτοὶ  
νυκτὸς πρόγραμμα  
ἀντιτεθείκασιν  
ἀπαλλαγῆσεσθαι αὐτὸν  
τοῦ βίου ἐν ᾗ τελευτᾶν  
ἔμελλεν· οὕτως ἀκριβῶς  
τὸ γενησόμενον  
προέγνωσαν

Excerpta Anonymi 31,24–  
30<sup>46</sup>

Ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς βασιλείας  
αὐτοῦ ὀργισθεὶς τοῖς  
γόησι καὶ ἀστρολόγοις  
ἐποίησε πρόγραμμα καὶ  
ἀνατέθεικεν αὐτὸ  
ἐμφαῖνον ἐντὸς τινος  
ῥητῆς ἡμέρας ἐξέρχεσθαι  
αὐτοὺς ἐκ πάσης τῆς  
Ἰταλίας· οἱ δὲ νυκτὸς καὶ  
αὐτοὶ ἀνατεθείκασιν  
προσαγγέλλοντες  
ἀπαλλαγῆσεσθαι αὐτὸν  
τοῦ βίου ἐντὸς τῆς ἡμέρας  
ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν.

Exc.Salm.II 54<sup>47</sup>

Οὐτίλλιος ἔθηκε  
πρόγραμμα τοὺς  
γόητας καὶ  
ἀστρολόγους  
ἐντὸς ῥητῆς  
ἡμέρας  
ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς  
Ἰταλίας, καὶ αὐτοὶ  
νυκτὸς  
ἀντιτεθείκασιν  
πρόγραμμα  
παραγγέλλοντες,  
ἀπαλλαγῆσεσθαι  
τοῦ βίου ἐντὸς  
ἡμέρας, ἐν ᾗ  
τελευτᾶν ἔμελλεν.

The Ἄλλο Β (Excerpta Anonymi, 31,14–17) is decidedly close to ES 14 of the CE. Stress should be laid on the fact that the Excerpta Anonymi as well as the ES put τί σπουδάσεις at the beginning of Tiberius’s statement. Dio’s ἀποκτενεῖς was substituted by the synonymous φρονεῦσεις in both the Excerpta Anonymi and the ES.

In addition, the Excerpta Anonymi exhibit significant similarities with another excerpt collection, namely, the Excerpta Salmasiana II<sup>48</sup> with regard to the selective use of passages in the section on Roman history. Both excerptors have chosen to excerpt and include the same passages from the Cassius Dio tradition.<sup>49</sup> The wording is virtually identical. Accordingly, the

<sup>44</sup>Transl. Banchich, *The lost history*, op. cit., 72: When Vitellius was in Rome, he was, I suppose, managing other matters as seemed right to him, and he issued an edict through which he expelled the astrologers, having told them to leave from all Italy within this day, having posted the specified one. And they, when they had issued a counter notice at night, in turn ordered him to depart from life on the day in which he died. And thus, on the one hand, they accurately prognosticated what was going to occur.

<sup>45</sup>Transl. Banchich, *The lost history*, op. cit., 72: Vitellius expelled the sorcerers and the astrologers through the edict, having told them to depart all of Italy on the specified day. And they, during the night, set up a counter edict stating that he was going to depart from life on the day in which he died. And thus, they accurately prognosticated what was going to occur.

<sup>46</sup>At the end of his rule, irritated by the sorcerers and the astrologers, he edicted on what specified day they were to leave from all Italy. They, on the other hand, during the night, countered by announcing that he was going to depart from life on the very day he died.

<sup>47</sup>Vitellius issued an edict to send the astrologers and the sorcerers away from Italy on a specified day. And they, during the night, countered by announcing that he was going to depart from life on the very day he died.

<sup>48</sup>The excerpta salmasiana are a sylloge of historical excerpts named after the French humanist Claude Saumaise, who copied them around the year 1606 from a mid-twelfth century codex in Heidelberg. The compiler of the sylloge remains anonymous, but, in all likelihood, he collected and put the excerpts together between the 8<sup>th</sup> and the 11<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> centuries. The excerpta salmasiana, in the form they have been handed down to us, represent a compilation of two distinct collections of excerpts. Each of the two collections is based on a different historiographical tradition. The first part, the Exc. Salm. I, is transmitted under the name of John of Antioch. As far as the Exc. Salm. II are concerned, the arrangement of the selected excerpts reveals the activity of an excerptor who attempted to expand on the Exc. Salm. I by composing a sylloge running from the Deluge to the 5<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>49</sup>Exc. Salm. II 44 = Excerpta Anonymi 29,19–21 and 25–27 = DC 44,17,1 and 37,52,2, Exc. Salm. II 45 = Excerpta Anonymi 29,28–30,10 = DC 45,1,3–45,2,2, Exc. Salm. II 54 = Excerpta Anonymi 31,24–30 = Pet. Patr.



excerptors appear to share an interest in occult science as well as in dreams predicting the future. They both incorporate texts dealing with emperors who mistakenly underrated the abilities of astrologers to foresee the future. The common selective use of passages testifies to the use of a common source, that is, an excerpt collection comprising certain excerpts from the Cassius Dio tradition.<sup>50</sup> The collection must have been on dreams and occult science.

I would like to draw attention to the *Exc. Salm. II* 54. As the table shows, the excerpt is impressively identical to a passage from Peter the Patrician's *History*, preserved in the *ES* 89 of the *CE*. The respective passage in the *Excerpta Anonymi* is, likewise, derived from the *ES*; the addition *τοὺς γόητας* in Peter the Patrician has been transmitted in both the *Exc.Salm.II* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*. The same holds true for the sentence *καὶ αὐτοὶ νυκτὸς πρόγραμμα*, which is copied verbatim in the *Exc.Salm.II* 54 and the *Excerpta Anonymi* 31,24–30. Cassius Dio, by contrast, says *καὶ ἐκεῖνοι* instead of *καὶ αὐτοὶ*. Moreover, the imperfect indicative *ἔμελλεν* at the end of the *Exc. Salm. II* 54 is only found in Peter the Patrician's text. Furthermore, that Dio's text was first abridged and used by Peter becomes manifest in the inclusion of the sentence *οὕτως ἀκριβῶς τὸ γενησόμενον προέγνωσαν* at the end of the *ES* 89. Neither the *Exc.Salm.II* 54 nor the *Excerpta Anonymi* 31,24–30 excerpt the phrase.

Strikingly, excerpt 54 is not the only passage in the *Excerpta Salmasiana* to derive from Peter the Patrician. *Exc. Salm.II* 59 is blatantly identical to *ES* 112 of the *CE*. The *Exc. Salm. II* 59 preserves Peter's order (*τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν δορυφόρων* and *καὶ ἐν ἀγρῷ ἔτη ζ*), as well as the number of years that Similis lived (*ἔτη ν*). Cassius Dio, on the other hand, records only that Similis had a life of many years (*ἔτη τόσα*), without giving the exact number.

Finally, *Exc. Salm. II* 53 corresponds to *ES* 59 of the *CE*. The passage transmits an oracle foretelling that the last of Aeneas's sons would kill his mother and govern.<sup>51</sup>

If I am right in postulating a common source between the *Exc. Salm. II* and the *Excerpta Anonymi*, this source could be:

1) a collection of excerpts on dreams and occult science, taken from Cassius Dio and Peter the Patrician's works.

2) Peter the Patrician's *History*.

The latter possibility is tempting, if very difficult to prove given the paucity of evidence for Peter's texts: the *ES* and *EL* of the *CE* are the unique sources for the sixth-century author from Thessaloniki.<sup>52</sup> The extant fragments from his history show a strong adherence to Dio's text. This seems to be the only piece of evidence we possess with respect to his literary preference. The unidentified passages in the *Excerpta Anonymi* are congruent with the historical interests of Peter's and could easily plug gaps in his narrative as it was handed down in the *CE*. Nevertheless, both arguments are not sufficient to positively ascribe the whole section on Roman history in the *Excerpta Anonymi* to Peter the Patrician.

## The *CE* as a depository of knowledge

(*ES* 89) = *DC* 65,1,4, *Exc. Salm. II* 56 = *Excerpta Anonymi* 32,1–9 = *DC* 67,16,2–3 *Exc. Salm. II* 57 = *Excerpta Anonymi* 32,11–21 = *DC* 67,18,1–2.

<sup>50</sup>It is noteworthy that *Exc. Salm. II* 53, 54 and 59 correspond to Peter the Patrician, *ES* 59, 89 and 112, respectively.

<sup>51</sup>The oracle is also found in the *Anthologia Graeca*; cf. *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina: cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum*, III, E. Cougny (ed.), Paris 1871, 512; The oracle has also been transmitted as a later scribal addition to Symeon Logothetes' Chronicle; cf. *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon I*, S. Wahlgren (ed.), Berlin 2006, 85.

<sup>52</sup>The grammatical treatise *Περὶ Συντάξεως* transmits two brief quotations from Peter's *History*; cf. *Lexica Segueriana. Anecdota Graeca*, I. Bekker (ed.), Berlin 1814, 130, 149.

The idea that other imperial treatises also used material gathered in the first place for the *CE* was first advanced by I. Ševčenko.<sup>53</sup> For the story of Soldan's capture by Louis II and his escape, he assumed the direct use of the *Excerpta de legationibus* from the *De Thematis* (*DT*), *De Administrando Imperio* (*DAI*), and *Theophanes Continuatus*. In fact, ethnographical and geographical interest dominates the *DT* and the *DAI*.<sup>54</sup> The *DT* made use of historians excerpted also in the *CE*.<sup>55</sup> The same holds true for the *DAI*. In addition, the codex *Laurentianus Plut.* 55.4, which was a product of the imperial scriptorium, contains geographical information, too.<sup>56</sup>

Interestingly, there is also a group of histories that were certainly produced under the direction of Constantine VII (944 – 959) and Basil the Nothos (that is under Nicephorus Phocas's reign, 963 – 969) through processes of compilation. This bunch of texts comprises Genesis's *On the reign of the emperors*,<sup>57</sup> the *Theophanes Continuatus*,<sup>58</sup> Pseudo-Symeon's chronicle<sup>59</sup>, and the two versions of Symeon Logothetes's chronicle.<sup>60</sup> These works, produced in imperial circles, show affinities in methodology, content, and sources. Accordingly, they quite often correlate with each other in terms of common references to the past, mythological figures, exaggerated accounts, and geographical allusions.<sup>61</sup> The phenomenon implies the existence of an analogous, written tradition<sup>62</sup>, as well as a common repository of relevant references that is a collection of ethnographical/geographical material. J. Signes Codoñer

<sup>53</sup>I. Ševčenko speculated the direct use of the *Excerpta de legationibus* from the *DT*, *DAI* and *Theophanes Continuatus* in the case of the story of Soldan's capture by Louis II and his escape; cf. I. ŠEVČENKO, Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in: J. Shepard – S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy*, (Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990), Ashgate 1992, 191.

<sup>54</sup>It is noteworthy that these compilations are all conveyors of Constantine VII's geographical outlook on the empire and serve to propagate the emperor's political aims; cf. P. MAGDALINO, Constantine VII and the Historical Geography of Empire, in: S. Bazzaz – Y. Batsaki – D. Angelov (eds.), *Imperial Geographies in Byzantine and Ottoman Space*, Washington, D.C. 2013, 23–42.

<sup>55</sup>See for instance passages taken from Nicolas of Damascus and Polybius.

<sup>56</sup>J. A. FOUCAULT, Les stratégistes byzantins par Alphonse Dain, *TM* 2, 1967, 362.

<sup>57</sup>The history by Genesis covers more briefly the same period as the first part of the *Theophanes Continuatus* (813–867) and similarly to *Theophanes Continuatus* is addressed to Constantine VII. The narrative contains geographical notices and quotations from Homer (like the *Excerpta Anonymi*); cf. *Iosephi Genesisii, Regum Libri Quattuor*, H. G. Beck – A. Kambylis – R. Keydell (eds.), Berlin 1978, (henceforth *Genesisii*); A. KALDELLIS, *On the reigns of the emperors*, Canberra 1998.

<sup>58</sup>*Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius monachus*, I. Bekker (ed.), Bonn 1838, 3–481; A new critical edition of Books I–IV of *Theophanes Continuatus* accompanied by an English translation in: *Chronographiae Quae Theophanis Continuati Nomine Fertur Libri I–IV*, (CFHB, 49), J. M. Featherstone – J. S. Codoñer (eds.), Berlin 2015. The text has been handed down to us in a single manuscript, the codex Vat. gr. 167 and comprises six books or three distinct parts: part 1 (four books on the reigns of Leo V, Michael II, Theophilus and Michael III respectively), part 2 (a book entitled The Life of Basil I) and part 3 (a book on the reigns of Leo VI, Alexander, Constantine VII, Romanos I, Constantine VII and Romanos II). The third part may consist of two separate parts given the distinct political orientation of each of them.

<sup>59</sup>The text is transmitted in the codex Parisinus gr. 1712, ff. 18v–272 and remains unedited except for the folios 235–272 edited first by F. Combefis (F. COMBEFIS, *Historiae Byzantinae scriptores post Theophanem*, Paris 1685, 401–498) and reprinted by I. Bekker in: *Theophanes Continuatus*, op. cit., 603–760.

<sup>60</sup>The first version of Symeon's chronicle was edited by S. Wahlgren; cf. *Symeonis Magistri*, op. cit. On the manuscript tradition of the first and second version of the chronicle see: ibidem, op. cit., 27–49. On the dating of the two versions see also: A. MARKOPOULOS, Le témoignage du Vaticanus gr. 163 pour la période entre 945 – 963, *Symm* 3, 1979, 83–119; W. TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, New York 2013, 203–217.

<sup>61</sup>Markopoulos seems to be certain that Genesis's history and Theop. Cont. used common sources; A. MARKOPOULOS, Genesis: A Study, in: S. Kotzabassi – G. Mavromatis (eds.), *Realia Byzantina*, (Byzantinisches Archiv, 22), Berlin – New York 2009, 137–150; Ševčenko argued that the author the *On the reign of the emperors* was member of the literary circle of Constantine VII; cf. ŠEVČENKO, op. cit., 171.

<sup>62</sup>Diller first observed that the idea of historical embellishment is parallel to the revival of antique pagan themes in contemporary Byzantine plastic arts; cf. A. DILLER, Excerpts from Strabo and Stephanus in Byzantine Chronicles, *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 81, 1950, 245, esp. note 11.

holds the same view when arguing that a common source should be considered an anonymous collection of historical excerpts.<sup>63</sup> When exploring the sources of the ethnographical/geographical digressions encountered in the official histories throughout the 10<sup>th</sup> century, we arrive at two significant conclusions: 1) these original texts were also excerpted in the *CE*, and 2) the sources were used in works which were compiled decades after Constantine VII's death. The latter point may suggest that material employed in the Constantinian imperial scriptorium continued to be used and elaborated for years inside and out of it.

Specifically, the aforementioned histories transmit ethnographical and geographical allusions that originally occurred in Homer, Strabo, Stephanus Byzantius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus's *Roman Antiquities*, Nonnus's *Dionysiaca*, *Scholia on Apollonius Rhodius*, *Scholia on Dionysius Periegetes*, Arian's *Bithyniaca*, John Malalas's *Chronicle*, and Hesychius's *Patria*.<sup>64</sup> As far as the *Excerpta Anonymi* are concerned, the excerpt collection contains geographical and ethnographical references that occur likewise in some of the histories, namely, the *Excerpta Anonymi* 49,1-4 on Tarsus occurs in Genesis<sup>65</sup>, and the *Excerpta Anonymi* 49,17-18 on the origins of the name of the Medes bears significant resemblance to a passage in Pseudo-Symeon.<sup>66</sup>

I would also like to draw attention to two chapters embedded into the first part of the *Excerpta Anonymi*. The first part is mainly made up of passages on Constantinopolitan statuary. The thematic sequence is contaminated by two apparently irrelevant ethnographic digressions of two peoples, namely the Norici<sup>67</sup> and the Getae.<sup>68</sup> The first chapter is a mythical account of how the Norici adopted their ethnic name: a divinely sent boar was ravaging the land, until a man managed to catch it. Then the Norici shouted "one man," which in their own language means "*berounous*," and that way the city was named Berounion. The account, not found elsewhere in Greek literature,<sup>69</sup> bears marked resemblance to a similar digression about the naming of Italy in Genesis<sup>70</sup>: some people, when crossing Italy, met a cow and shouted "Italian, Italian," which in their dialect meant cow. The account is also unique in Greek literature. Both accounts seem to derive from a common tradition. (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom, 1.35 and Apollodorus, the Library, 1.8.2-3.).

<sup>63</sup>J. SIGNES – CODOÑER, Constantino Porfirogéneto y la fuente común de Genesio y Theophanes Continuatus I–IV, *BZ* 86/87, 1993 – 1994, 319–341.

<sup>64</sup>For a detailed analysis of the common use of these allusions in the four official histories of the 10<sup>th</sup> century see: DILLER, Excerpts from Strabo and Stephanus, op. cit., 246–252.

<sup>65</sup>*Genesisius*, 47,6–10; The geographic notice on Tarsus is originally derived from Stephanus Byzantius; cf. A. MEINEKE, *Stephan von Byzanz. Ethnika*, Berlin 1849, 605, 6–13.

<sup>66</sup>The passage, originally found in Stephanus Byzantius, has passed similarly changed in terms of structure to both the *Excerpta Anonymi* and Pseudo-Symeon; cf. *Theophanes Continuatus*, op. cit., 706.16. The *Excerpta Anonymi* claim that the Medes' name comes directly from Medea. Pseudo-Symeon, instead, gives Medos as eponymous ancestor of the Medes. Herodotus claims that the name came directly from Medea herself, when she came to their land after leaving Athens; Herodotus, 7.62.1. There are various traditions on the parentage of Medos; he was a son of Medea either by Aigeus (Pseudo-Apollodorus 1.9.28), an Asian king (Diodoros 4.55.7), or Jason (Strabo 11.13.10).

<sup>67</sup>*Excerpta Anonymi*, 8,28 – 9,9. On the passage as a source of information on Virunum see: G. DOBESCH, Zu Virunum als Namen der Stadt auf dem Magdalensberg und zu einer Sage der kontinentalen Kelten, *Carinthia I* 187, 1997, 107–128; J. NOLLÉ, *Side im Altertum: Geschichte und Zeugnisse*, Bonn 2001; A. HOFENEDER, Die Gründungslegende von Virunum, in: K. Stüber – T. Zehnder – D. Bachmann (eds.), *Akten des 5. Deutschsprachigen Keltologensymposiums*, Vienna 2010, 123–135.

<sup>68</sup>*Excerpta Anonymi*, 9, 10–13.

<sup>69</sup>The only parallel is an entry in the Souda, which draws on the *Excerpta Anonymi*; cf. s.v. Βηρούνιον [158 T 1]).

<sup>70</sup>*Genesisius*, 82, 50–55.

## Conclusion

To conclude, the *CE* appear to have been used in treatises produced within court circles as well as in non-imperial works. The latter were written by persons associated with the palace or the imperial library. The anonymous compiler of the *Excerpta Anonymi* must have drawn on draft copies produced during the redaction of the Constantinian collections. In fact, the historical part of the *Excerpta Anonymi* bears similarities with the *CE* in content and methodology.

As the analysis of the chapter *On the river Istros* has shown, the passage must have been excerpted from an earlier dossier, presumably a collection of notes on geography. The chapters *On Cyrus* and *On Remus and Romulus* reflect the selection and arrangement of similar material in the *CE*. The passages on Roman history in the *Excerpta Anonymi* derive from a collection of excerpts on dreams, which could have been produced during the redaction of the Constantinian collections. Among now lost Constantinian collections of excerpts, there probably existed collections of geography, dreams, and portents. In the surviving Constantinian collections, we detect excisions of passages on geography that can be explained by Constantine's intention to include them in another thematic collection. To cite but one example: when excerpting Procopius for the *Excerpta de Legationibus*, the excerptors leave out the description of Beroea.<sup>71</sup> The omissions in the *CE* cover a subject usually mentioned with the phrase *ζῆται ἐν τῷ περὶ* (*Look for it in the*) followed by the name of the collection. The phrase appears in the surviving manuscripts when a passage in the main narrative is missing. Based on this system of cross-references, scholars have been able to restore twenty-six out of the fifty-three collections.<sup>72</sup> Concerning geographical materials, the cross-references reveal the existence of three relevant, but now lost, collections: *περὶ ἐθνῶν* (*On customs*), *περὶ ἐθνῶν* (*On peoples*), and *περὶ οἰκισμῶν* (*On settlements*). And the possibility of yet more collections on the subject cannot be excluded.

The *CE* and the *Excerpta Anonymi* should be seen within the context of the *culture of Sylloge*; the two works share significant similarities in terms of content, format, and methodology. Both enterprises belong to a period in which collections of historical excerpts prevail as an approach towards the transmission of knowledge to succeeding ages by embedding historical texts into the new social, political, and theological context. The *CE* and the *Excerpta Anonymi* also reflect a fashion in terms of literary production during the tenth century and onwards; the chief concern of a writer was to collect writings corresponding to a particular subject matter and to extract information that was perceived as essential to be preserved.

Panagiotis Manafis  
Ghent University  
Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 35, UFO  
9000 Gent  
[Panagiotis.manafis@ugent.be](mailto:Panagiotis.manafis@ugent.be)

---

<sup>71</sup>*EL*, 96; On the passage on Beroea in Procopius see: *Procopii Caesariensis opera Omnia*, J. Haury – G. Wirth (ed.), Leipzig 1963, 2.7.2.

<sup>72</sup>On the number and names of the collections see: P. LEMERLE, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, Paris 1971, 327–328; B. FLUSIN, *Les excerpta Constantiniens. Logique d'une anti-histoire*, in: S. Pitta (ed.), *Fragments d'historiens Grecs, Autour de Denys d' Halicarnasse*, Rome 2002, 553–555; P. SCHREINER, *Die Historikerhandschrift Vaticanus graecus 977: ein Handexemplar zur Vorbereitung des Konstantinischen Exzerptenwerkes*, *JÖB* 37, 1987, 14–21; NEMETH, *Imperial Systematization*, op. cit., 65–92.