# FROM ROME TO CONSTANTINOPLE

Antiquarian Echoes of Cultural Trauma in the Sixth Century

## Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
op gezag van de
rector magnificus, prof. dr. E. Sterken
en volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties

en

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor aan de
Universiteit Gent
op gezag van de rector magnificus prof. dr. R. van de Walle
en volgens besluit van de examencommissie

## Double PhD Degree

De openbare verdediging zal plaatsvinden op
donderdag 17 mei 2018 om 16.15 uur

door

Raf Gilbert Leonza Maria Praet

geboren op 28 november 1989
te Beveren-Waas, België

# Contents

# *Acknowledgements*

and for the many academic plans and schemes we had and will have to discuss "over lunch."

Groningen has been the scene of an important stage in my intellectual and spiritual development which started with a visit by Xavier Everaert. I would like to thank Providence for this chance meeting, Xavier for his friendship, and Minke Hartman, the unwitting muse of postmodernity.

There are some colleagues who were, for many reasons, my *compagnons de route*, and who therefore deserve a special mention. It was a true please to work with Johannes Bjerva on a small digital humanities spin-off *Cassiodigitalis*, which resulted not only in some articles, but also in a funny promotional YouTube video. Renaat Meesters has been a long-cherished classmate, colleague and friend, with whom I had the honour of celebrating the noble cult of Diwali. Lorenzo Focanti has never ceased to amaze me with his erudition without haughtiness, his magnanimity and his tolerance of my choice of music. For these things I am grateful to him. And finally, a warm word of thanks to Ruben Verwaal and David Vanderlinden. Ruben, you were a companion in the PhD-student's eternal struggle with bureaucracy, and it was a pleasure to translate with you Gaub's treatise *On the vain expectation of publishing a translation of a Dutch medical treatise*. I was always able to enjoy the hospitality of you and of David in the Mesdagstraat, for which I will be ever grateful.

In the final stages of this dissertation, I was helped by David, who let me use the template of his dissertation for this book, and by Kasey Reed, who proofread the first draft. I also want to thank my parents-in-law for the nice accommodation at the Belgian coast during the summer of 2017, which saw the writing up of the last chapters.

Thank you, Ineke, for being my support and the love of my life, and thank you dear father, mother and brother for always being there for me, especially in dark hours.

# *Abbreviations*

*PLRE* II        Martindale, J.R. (1980) (ed.) The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire: Volume II A.D. 395-527. Cambridge.

*PLRE* III       Martindale, J.R. (1992) (ed.) The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire: Volume III A.D. 527-641. Cambridge.

FROM ROME TO CONSTANTINOPLE

# Introduction

## 1. Antiquarianism?  Antiquarianisms? Roman Erudition and Cultural Unease

In Late Antiquity, there are different types of text which might aspire to the label of antiquarianism. These different possible antiquarianisms preclude assigning the term antiquarianism to just one of these modes of engaging with the past. Instead of a monolithic concept, the term antiquarianism is an archipelago with the antiquarianism studied in this dissertation as just one of its islands. The use of the term "antiquarianism" in this dissertation is therefore of necessity metaphorical.

The antiquarianism studied in this dissertation, "Roman antiquarianism", will be defined as a textual attitude with three characteristics. The interest in the past is centred on Rome and the Roman Empire. The past is idealised as a model for the present. The author is painfully aware of the growing distance between the past he *describes* as a declining standard of moral excellence and his present-day life.

Modern research has approached the phenomenon of antiquarianism from either a textual and genre-specific point of view or from a broadly cultural point of view. As both approaches have their limits, the Roman antiquarianism studied in this dissertation will be approached from the angle of the developing research field of cultural trauma studies, as developed by J.C. Alexander and D. LaCapra. The following thesis will be elaborated in this dissertation: Roman antiquarianism in the sixth century AD was a means to come to terms with the cultural unease generated by the diminishing importance of Rome as the centre of the Roman Empire, and the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople.

## 1.1. Antiquarianism? Antiquarianisms?

### 1.1.1.    Antiquarianism? An Elusive Phenomenon

Antiquarianism appears as a very elusive phenomenon because it is attested in several separate periods of time, in different parts of the world and in different cultures. All these instances of antiquarianism are connected by fundamental traits of the human nature. From prehistory on, man has been fascinated by the unusual, the strange and the distant, categories which were represented by the distant past.[1] Moreover, man sought to attain immortality by devising strategies to overcome the passing of time.[2] In the west, the antiquarian traditions of Egypt[3] and Babylonia[4] informed the antiquarianism in Greek and Roman Antiquity.[5] From the Iron Age on, the Greeks used material objects and elements of the landscape to recreate their Bronze Age past.[6] Antiquarian texts appear not only in the Greek classical period, but also in the final stages of the Roman Republic, in the imperial period and in Late Antiquity. After a silence during the Middle Ages, antiquarianism reappears in the Renaissance, to endure until the nineteenth century.[7] Antiquarianism does not only appear in the western tradition. Besides an extensive tradition of mediaeval

---

[1] The valuable contribution of Schnapp (2007) takes a comparative point of view to deduce some general human attitudes to the past from antiquarian traditions as diverse as those from Egypt, Babylonia and China. The curiosity for the exotic and unusual encapsulated in the past can be perceived in collections of strange objects from prehistory on (Schnapp 2007: 59). See also Boardman (2002: 183).

[2] Schnapp (2007: 65, 77-78; 2013a), Miller (2007c: 119). This fundamental antiquarian desire for eternity can be perceived until this day in, for instance, the remembrance of the Holocaust (Miller 2007a: 52-53).

[3] Boardman (2002: 184), Schnapp (2007: 61-65).

[4] Goossens (1948), Beaulieu (1994; 2013), Boardman (2002: 185-187), Schnapp (2007: 65-70).

[5] Schnapp (2007: 59, 62; 2013b).

[6] Boardman (2002), Wendrich (2013).

[7] Miller (2007), Stenhouse (2013: 296). On the mediaeval origins of humanism as the scene for the rebirth of antiquarianism in the West see Mann (1996). On the Renaissance origins of western antiquarianism see Stenhouse (2013). His contribution is also a useful survey of anti-quarianism until the seventeenth century. In the sixteenth and   seventeenth centuries, anti-quarianism was introduced into the scientific rationalism as a critical counterpart of classical history (Grafton 1996: 218-220). For the intellectual debates and challenges to antiquarianism in the eighteenth and nineteenths centuries, see Momigliano (1950).

Arabic antiquarianism,[8] there are antiquarian traditions in pre-Columbian societies, India and the Far East.[9]

The modern concept of antiquarianism, as the systematic study of the material remains of the past, which has been developed from the early modern period onward, has only a loose tie with antiquarianism in Antiquity through the elusive figure of Varro,[10] and should therefore be discarded from the analysis.

### 1.1.2.    Antiquarianisms in Antiquity

Throughout Antiquity several terms circulated denoting the antiquarian interest in the distant past. This interest was labelled for the first time by Plato with the term ἀρχαιολογία, "archaeology" (*Hipp. ma.* 285d):

> "They are very fond of hearing about the genealogies of heroes and men, Socrates, and the foundations of cities in ancient times and, in short, about

---

[8] The work of El Daly (2005) gives the first comprehensive survey of the mediaeval Arabic contribution to the study of ancient Egypt. Although the works described in El Daly are never characterised as antiquarian, the lion's share of the characteristics attributed to these texts point in the direction of a distinct antiquarian character. On the basis of advice given in the Qur'an, for instance, knowledge is collected for the sake of knowledge itself (El Daly 2005: 18-20). Therefore intellectual curiosity, typical for the antiquarian, is one of the driving forces behind these texts and the archaeological activities that surround them (El Daly 2005: 43-44, 54, 60). The (illusory) continuity between past and present is emphasised, particularly from a religious point of view (El Daly 2005: 20, 21, 47, 76, 81-93, 109, 123, 139-141). Cultural practices are explained through their origin (El Daly 2005: 84). The Arabic texts on ancient Egypt are based on oral accounts (El Daly 2005: 25, 47, 80-81, 139), autopsies of artefacts (El Daly 2005: 31-55, 69-71, 95-107, 139) and written sources, which are often referred to or quoted extensively (El Daly 2005: 26, 28, 109, 126, 139). Greek antiquarian texts make up a part of the various written sources (El Daly 2005: 57, 60, 62,S 69, 72, 76, 129-130). There are also numerous parallels between the mediaeval Arabic interest in ethnography (El Daly 2005: 25), Egyptian hieroglyphs (El Daly 2005: 57-58, 139-140), ancient monuments (El Daly: 48-54) the history of religion (El Daly 2005: 75-94, 140) and state administration (El Daly 2005: 126-127) on the one hand and the interest displayed in these subjects by antiquarian texts on the other hand. For another case study in this nascent field see Cooperson (2013).

[9] A preliminary attempt at tracing the different traditions of antiquarianism all over the world can be found in the contribution of Schnapp (2013). In the context of research on late antique antiquarianism, only the antiquarian traditions of Europe, i.e. Western Europe and the Byzantine east, will be taken into consideration for comparisons. The same applies for the mediaeval Arabic antiquarian tradition, as this tradition borders late antique antiquarianism both in time and space.

[10] According to Bravo (2007: 516), the affinities between antiquarian writing in Antiquity and traditional western antiquarianism from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries are very precarious at the best. Some antique antiquarian treatises were only used as a model for renaissance erudition. The case of Varro is the most conspicuous (Bravo 2007: 524). For a general sketch on the cultural and scientific influence of the works of Varro from the Middle Ages on, see Michel (1978).

antiquity in general, so that for their sake I have been obliged to learn all that sort of thing by heart.".[11]

As is usual for the philosopher, the lexical choice is not casual, but condenses two important concepts; on the one hand, that of a "collection" (λογεία), on the other hand, that of "antiquity" (ἀρχαῖος). We can say that Platonic archaeology consists of a collection of ancient testimonies. But we can go a bit further; the root ἀρχ– is strictly linked to the notion of an "origin" or "beginning".[12] Taking these elements into account, we can translate Plato's substantive as "collection of testimonies about an origin". Both examples made by the philosopher – the "genealogies of heroes and men" on the one hand, the "foundations of cities" on the other – involves the idea of beginning. This focus on antiquity explains why the term ἀρχαιολογία has been used to define a section of Thucydides' *Peloponnesian War*.[13] It is difficult to say whether the historian was aware of the definition or not. The substantive, however, was adopted by other authors for the titles of their works. The Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία of Flavius Josephus, and the Ἀρχαιολογία Καππαδοκίας of the sophist Eustochius,[14] to name a few examples, use ἀρχαιολογία as a reference to ancient history. Their works aim to describe the histories of Rome, Judea, and Cappadocia from the beginning. The Platonic focus on origins is therefore clearly present.

Along with the word ἀρχαιολογία, the Greek language provided other words to define persons who were interested in the past. We can mention the substantives γραμματικός ("grammarian") and πολυΐστωρ ("very learned"), as well as the adjectives φιλόλογος ("fond of words, talkative") and κριτικός ("able to discern"). All these terms could be used to denote other areas of intellectual activity.[15] In short, no Greek word completely coincides with the concept of the antiquarian as constructed in modern research.

Concerning Latin literature, the term *antiquitates* was canonised by the polymath Marcus Terentius Varro, the most famous writer dealing with antiquarian themes. As a quote of Augustine highlights, he aimed to determine *qui agant, ubi agant, quando agant, quod agant* - "who acts, where and when they act, what they do".[16] Such a 'journalistic approach'[17] was the basis of his *Antiquitates rerum humanarum et*

---

[11] "Περὶ τῶν γενῶν, ὦ Σώκρατες, τῶν τε ἡρώων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν κατοικίσεων, ὡς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐκτίσθησαν αἱ πόλεις, καὶ συλλήβδην πάσης τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας ἥδιστα ἀκροῶνται, ὥστ᾽ ἔγωγε δι᾽ αὐτοὺς ἠνάγκασμαι ἐκμεμαθηκέναι τε καὶ ἐκμεμελετηκέναι πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα." (Hermann 1909: 369-370), trans. Jowett (1926: 353).
[12] The Pre–Socratic search for the ἀρχή πάντων confirms this association: cf. Arist. *Met.* 983b.
[13] At the beginning of the first book, the historian provides a brief summary of the most ancient history of Greece, from the mythical origin to the fifth century BC (cf. I 2–19). Given the lack of direct witnesses, he is forced to collect information from archeological and mythical sources (Rood 2014).
[14] *FHistGr* 738 T1.
[15] For instance, the terms γραμματικός was also given to Athenaeus of Naucratis (*Sud.* α 731), the term πολυΐστωρ to Alexander of Miletus (*Sud.* α 1129), the term φιλόλογος to Andromachus (*Sud.* μ 1464), and the term κριτικός to Cassius Longinus (*Sud.* λ 645). For the use of the word "grammarian" in Late Antiquity, see Kaster (1988: 32–50).
[16] Cf. Augustinus, *Civ. Dei* VI.4 (= F 4 Cardauns).
[17] On the totality of the scope of antiquarian research, see Maslakov (1983: 100-101), Stevenson (2004: 141-151).

*divinarum*.[18] The enthusiastic testimony of Cicero points out the effects of Varro's work on Roman culture (*Acad. Post.* I.3):

> "For we were wandering and straying about like visitors in our own city, and your books led us, so to speak, right home, and enabled us at last to realise who and where we were. You have revealed the age of our native city, the chronology of its history, the laws of its religion and its priesthood, its civil and its military institutions, the topography of its districts and its sites, the terminology, classification and moral and rational basis of all our religious and secular institutions, and you have likewise shed a flood of light upon our poets and generally on Latin literature and the Latin language (…).".[19]

In spite of its success, the work of Varro did not inaugurate a new *genre*. As in the case of the Greek language, Latin had many words at its disposal to indicate people with antiquarian interests: e.g. *doctus* ("clever"), *eruditus* ("learned"), *literatus* ("person of letters"). None of them, though, with a specific technical meaning.[20] The word *antiquarius* is no exception. In his *Dialogus De Oratoribus* 21, Tacitus uses it to indicate the archaists who love and conduct research on the ancient rhetorical style. Juvenal and Suetonius use the word in a similar way. The former addresses a woman as *antiquaria* (cf. *Sat.* VI 454). The latter evokes Augustus' aversion towards *cacozelos et antiquarios*, "bad imitators and archaisers" (cf. *Aug.* 86). A more technical interpretation of the word is provided by Jerome (*Ep.* V 2). While writing to his friend Florentius, he mentions his *alumnos, qui antiquariae arti serviant* ("pupils devoted to the art of copying"). Such a connection between the *antiquaria ars* and the transmission of manuscripts prevails in Late Antiquity. The term *antiquarius* denotes the antiquarian author only in a few cases, whereas in Late Antiquity the vast majority of the occurrences of the term refers to scribes and the context of book production.[21] Even John Lydus, otherwise the example par excellence of antiquarianism in Late Antiquity, candidly states the following in his *De Mensibus* (I.33):

> "*antiquarii* are copyists according to the Greeks.".[22]

As is shown in this overview, the difficulty in grasping the concept of antiquarianism is in part due to the lack of a clear-cut definition of antiquarianism in Antiquity itself.[23] In Antiquity, different types of text might aspire to the label of antiquarianism. They recover, elaborate, and spread erudite traditions, adapting them to the aims of their authors. Many examples are at our disposal.

---

[18] For an introduction to Varro and his work, see Sallmann, 1975, Michel (1978). On Varro's influence on the late antique antiquarian tradition, see Maslakov (1983).

[19] "nam nos in nostra urbe peregrinantis errantisque tamquam hospites tui libri quasi domum reduxerunt, ut possemus aliquando qui et ubi essemus agnoscere. Tu aetatem patriae, tu descriptiones temporum, tu sacrorum iura, tu sacerdotum, tu domesticam, tu bellicam disciplinam, tu sedem regionum, locorum, tu omnium divinarum humanarumque rerum nomina, genera, officia, causas aperuisti, plurimum quidem poëtis nostris omninoque Latinis et litteris luminis et verbis attulisti (…)." (Rackham 1961: 418), transl. Brittain (2006: 87).

[20] For instance, Tibullus (III 6.41) calls the poet Catullus *doctus*.

[21] Miller (2007b: 33), Meier (2013: 249–250).

[22] "Ἀντικουάριοι οἱ κατὰ Ἕλληνας καλλιγράφοι (…)" (Wünsch 1898: 15), trans. Bandy (2013: 302).

[23] Momigliano (1950: 69-72, 1990: 60-61), Bravo (2007: 516-517).

The first is provided by periegetic literature, i.e. by texts linked to practices of ancient "tourism" (e.g. Pausanias' *Description of Greece*). While describing the geography of a certain locality, its monuments and places of interest, those works also gave historical information. In order to collect this historical data, periegetic authors must use antiquarian sources such as local myths, ancient stories and archeological remains.[24] The translation of Pausanias' work by the sixth-century grammarian Priscian of Caesarea shows that this type of literature was still popular in Late Antiquity.[25]

Another interesting example is constituted by the so–called *commentarii* (Latin term usually associated with the Greek ὑπομνήματα, "notes"). Such a definition could be attributed to different kinds of works: scholarly treatises, textbooks, commentaries, private memoirs, collections of notes.[26] Those texts aimed to preserve information as an aid or supplement to memory.[27] Three types of work can be distinguished: first, specific treatises (e.g. Rufus' *Musical History*,[28] Palladius' *On the Festival of Romans*,[29] and Priscian's *De Figuris Numerorum*);[30] second, miscellanies (such as Varro's *Antiquitates*, Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*, Clemens of Alexandria' *Stromata*, and Macrobius' *Saturnalia*): they provided "collections of isolated and self–contained pieces of knowledge, in a variety of fields, and which the author deems worthy of remembrance";[31] third, encyclopaedias (e.g. Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*). These works were often produced within the aristocratic context of accumulating knowledge for its own sake or for pleasure,[32] as John Lydus states at the beginning of Book II of his *De Mensibus*:

> "it seems to me necessary to speak about the months (…) This subject also would be, just as a relish [ἥδυσμα], to the ears of the many."[33]

Another important group of texts which could be considered to be antiquarian is composed of literary works cultivating the past for political reasons, such as legitimacy. Late Antiquity provides many examples of this category. This kind of works can exhibit a particularistic focus on a local level (a city, a region, a province), or can have an universalistic ambition (the Roman Empire): late antique πάτρια (i.e. compositions celebrating the foundations of Greek cities through an elaboration of mythic and historical material) exemplified the local scope; the writings of, for instance, John Lydus exhibited an universalistic outlook. It must be highlighted that the

---

[24] Angelucci (2011: 327).
[25] Van de Woestijne (1953).
[26] Vardi (2004: 162).
[27] Cornell and Bispham (2013: 371).
[28] *FGrHist* 826, T 2, F 1.
[29] *FGrHist* 837, T 1.
[30] Vardi (2004: 165).
[31] Vardi (2004: 164).
[32] Stevenson (2004: 151-155).
[33] "ἀναγκαῖόν μοι δοκεῖ περὶ τῶν μηνῶν εἰπεῖν, (…) γένοιτο ἂν καὶ τοῦτο ὥσπερ ἥδυσμά τι ταῖς τῶν πολλῶν ἀκοαῖς." *Mens.* II.1 (Bandy II.1), (Wünsch 1898: 18), transl. Bandy (2013a: 67).

two subcategories are not necessarily separate. They stand in a dynamic relation towards each other.[34]

One hypothesis is that the universalistic variant of antiquarianism tries to integrate and subsume the local variants. These processes of integration and diversification of knowledge are often parallel to processes of political integration and disintegration. During the Hellenistic period, we can see a flourishing of local and particularistic antiquarian works whose composition coincided with the particularistic ambitions of the political patchwork bequeathed to the eastern Mediterranean by Alexander's successors.[35] This particularistic form of antiquarianism was also present in one of the city-states at the periphery of the Hellenistic world: Rome. With the development of the Roman polity from a local power to a universalistic empire, Roman antiquarianism developed universalistic allures. We can interpret the vast erudite enterprise of Marcus Terentius Varro to document, catalogue and systematise all things human and divine, *res humanae et divinae*, as an intellectual counterpart to the establishment of the Roman Empire by Augustus. During the Roman imperial and late antique period, the universalistic strand of Roman antiquarianism coexisted with particularistic forms of antiquarian research, such as the *πάτρια*, which served the local ambitions of the cities within the Roman Empire.[36] In the wake of the transfer of imperial power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople, the universalistic branch of Roman antiquarianism came to the capital of the eastern Roman Empire, where it competed and merged with the particularistic traditions on Constantinople's predecessor, Byzantium. This mixed form of a Roman, universalistic and imperial antiquarianism with a localist branch developed throughout the centuries of the early and middle Byzantine period, during which the universalistic empire was gradually reduced to a local power. We have in the eight and ninth centuries, for instance, the *Παραστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικαί*, the *Excerpta Salmasiana* and the *Excerpta Anonymi* composed during the Macedonian Dynasty (AD 867-1056), and the works of Constantine VII Porpyrogenitus, which exhibit antiquarian elements and

---

[34] The division between universalistic and particularistic antiquarianism furthermore ignores any linguistic distinctions. We will include works in both Latin and Greek into the research.

[35] Notable examples are Berossus' *Babyloniaca*, (beginning of the third century BC), written under the patronage of the Seleucid king Antiochus I Soter (ca. 324/323 – 261 BC), and Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*, written under the Ptolemies in the early third century BC (Dillery 2015: 123-192). For instances of localist antiquarianism in Jewish historians of the Hellenistic period see Berthelot (2004: 46-48). For a general overview of these Hellenistic "cultural apologetics", see Burgess and Kulikowski (2016: 100-101).

[36] Work on these authors has been done by inter alia Al. Cameron (1965), Bravo (2009), Focanti (forthcoming).

tendencies.[37] This dissertation will focus on a short episode from this broad panorama of the history of antiquarianism. The focus will be on Roman, universalistic and imperial antiquarianism in the crucial period of the development of the second Rome on the Bosporus, Constantinople, in the sixth century.

As this preliminary overview shows, there cannot be any question of a single monolithic "antiquarianism". The different possible antiquarian traditions or antiquarianisms preclude assigning the term to just one of these many modes of engaging with the past. The term antiquarianism can be compared to an archipelago with many different antiquarianisms comprising the different islands of the archipelago. Connections and resemblances between different islands of the archipelago exist. However, not any single one of the separate islands can completely claim the name of the antiquarian archipelago for itself. Therefore, the uses of the term "antiquarianism" in this dissertation are of necessity metaphorical. The antiquarianism which will be subjected to analysis in this dissertation is the universalistic and imperial Roman antiquarianism as it existed in the sixth century.

### 1.1.3.    Roman Antiquarianism

Sixth-century Roman antiquarianism is a textual attitude[38] instead of a neatly defined literary genre.[39] It consists of several ideologically influenced approaches to dealing with the past, as we will see below. This textual attitude can be the dominant attitude towards the past in texts with an acknowledged antiquarian genre status, or it can manifest itself in other genres.

For instance, a treatise of the sixth-century grammarian Priscian of Caesarea, *De Figuris Numerorum*, is a typically antiquarian text because of its subject mat-

---

[37] Modern scholars on Byzantine history meticulously avoid the concept of antiquarianism. Holmes (2010) only refers in passing to the term in the context of tenth-century compilation literature and Markopoulos (2006) is very careful in his attributing an antiquarian character to the strategies of association between Constantine the Great and members of the Macedonian dynasty. Although modern scholarship has refrained from applying the term antiquarianism to Byzantine historiography, in my opinion, the history of antiquarianism in Antiquity, Late Antiquity and the early mediaeval period can benefit from the concept of antiquarianism. A preliminary exploration of such use of the concept of Byzantine antiquarianism has been conducted in the paper with the title "Approaches to the Past in Byzantium: Byzantine Antiquarianism?", given by Panagiotis Manafis (Ghent University) and myself at the conference "Finding the Present in the Distant Past: The Cultural Meaning of Antiquarianism in Late Antiquity", held at Ghent (19th – 21st May 2016).

[38] Momigliano used the concept of 'mentality' to describe antiquarianism (Momigliano 1990: 57), Di Donato (2007: 78-82). I propose to abandon this concept in favour of the concept of an 'antiquarian attitude', to avoid an overly psychological approach. For it is simply not possible to probe the mind of an antiquarian author by means of textual or material evidence. Besides, the study of emotions is a rather recent field with very limited results yet (Miller and Louis 2007: 4). The concept of 'attitude', on the other hand, allows for a study of the material and textual results of a mentality. For the same reasons I abandon the term 'antiquarian experience', issued by Schnapp (2007: 62).

[39] For a discussion of the pros and cons of a narrow definition of antiquarianism as compared to a definition of antiquarianism as a broad cultural phenomenon, see Miller and Louis (2007: 12-13). I opt to follow their approach in analysing antiquarianism as a broad cultural phenomenon without losing track of its distinctive features.

ter (weights, measures and currency) and its terse prosaic form. On the other hand, the *Variae* of Cassiodorus are a rhetorically elaborated letter-collection which treats the currency as just one of its various subjects (i.e. in letters I.10, VII.32 and XI.16). Nevertheless, we will argue that the same antiquarian attitude underlies both the treatise of Priscian and the collection of Cassiodorus. The former is closer to the traditional picture of antiquarianism. The latter orbits in a more remote sphere of the antiquarian attitude as it consists of rhetorical state letters.

By defining antiquarianism as an attitude instead of a circumscribed genre, the concept in itself becomes a powerful tool by which we can characterise a major part of the literary production in Late Antiquity. Within the general genre fluidity of late antique literature, we can perceive many interfaces between the antiquarian attitude on the one hand and established genres on the other hand. In the writings of Priscian, for example, the antiquarian attitude is intertwined within the method and style of grammatical writing. In the prefaces to his *Novellae*, Justinian exhibited an antiquarian interest in the origins of different offices and the history of different peoples, whereas in the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, the antiquarian attitude is incorporated in the format of the rhetorical state letter. Antiquarianism also tends to converge with contemporary or recent history, as the antiquarian treatise of John of Lydia, *De Magistratibus*, at the end slides into an historical account.[40]

Apart from these examples, antiquarian passages seem to irresistibly trickle into late antique writing, regardless of their genre background. Antiquarianism, which in some periods was confined within the boundaries of a literary genre, expands during Late Antiquity into the literary field as a general cultural attitude which has its counterparts in other elements of the contemporary cultural sphere (e.g. *spolia* in architecture). This genre diffusion leads to the erosion of the strong classical division between terse antiquarian writing on the one hand and rhetorically elaborated literature on the other hand. The closer a late antique author is connected to the classical culture by way of education, the stronger this opposition persists.

Procopius, for example, is well aware of this opposition, as he fears antiquarian elements in his fraught rhetorical narrative will give him a reputation of bad

---

[40] "Antiquarianism merged easily into grammatical, literary, historical and legal scholarship (…)." (Stevenson 2004: 141). On the connection between the profession of the law and antiquarianism, see Honoré (1978: 33), especially in a shared emphasis on the knowledge of a phenomenon through its origins (Honoré 1978: 246-247). The interface between antiquarianism and philology is extant during several formative stages of antiquarianism and cannot, therefore, be interpreted as a novelty of Late Antiquity (Bravo 2007: 517, 521), (Herkoltz 2007: 131-136). Yet the opposition between rhetorically elaborated political history on the one hand and antiquarian writing on the other hand was a common feature of antique literature until Late Antiquity (Bravo 2007: 515-518).

taste.[41] In his *De Magistratibus*, John Lydus from time to time announced his antiquarian digressions as if they were infringements on the main thrust of his historical narrative.[42]

It is, therefore, not remarkable that in Late Antiquity there was no conceptualisation of antiquarian activity. Neither is it surprising that the Latin term *antiquarius* was assigned the limited, technical meaning of scribe. For it is easy for a contemporary witness to discern a literary genre on the one hand, yet to acknowledge a cultural attitude which underlies one's own literary and aesthetic assumptions on the other hand, is much more difficult. Indeed we get the impression that the antiquarian attitude is a thriving force, informing the literature of Late Antiquity, which was in its political aspirations, artistic production and cultural achievements an antiquarian age in itself.[43]

The textual attitude towards the distant past which underlies Roman antiquarianism has three characteristics; 1) it exemplifies the distant past as an ideal model, 2) it is centred on Rome and the Roman legacy, 3) it is informed by an uncanny awareness of the present as being distanced from the ideal past.

### 1.1.3.1.   The Past as a Model

---

[41] In *De Aedificiis*, antiquarianism is considered to be a mere digression (*Aed.* VI.4.10): "ἐγὼ δὲ ὅθεν τὴν ἐκβολὴν τοῦ λόγου ἐποιησάμην ἐπάνειμι" (Haury 1964: 178). The insertion of a catalogue is considered a means to avoid burdening the narrative (*Aed.* IV.4.3) "ὡς μὴ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπιμιξίᾳ ὄχλος τις ἐπιγένηται τῷ λόγῳ πολύς." (Haury 1964: 116). The repetition of data is avoided as a marker of bad taste (*Aed.* V.8.3): "ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τούτου δὴ ἕνεκα λέγειν ἀφίημι, ὡς μὴ ἀπειροκαλίας ἀνενέγκοιμι δόξαν." (Haury 1964: 168).

[42] On Lydus' extensive use of antiquarian digressions in his biography of John of Cappadocia, see chapter 6.2.2.2. (pp. 265-272 of this dissertation).

[43] The antiquarian attitude can be perceived in various types of material evidence from Late Antiquity. The well-known use of *spolia* clearly attests to this antiquarian attitude (Brenk 1987), (Alchermes 1994). In late antique dedicatory inscriptions, the rhetoric of the restoration of the past was cultivated intensely (Schnapp 2013b: 170-171). As regards late antique pagan dedications in particular, Machado (2009) aptly analyses several instances of the antiquarian attitude displayed in these dedications, in which literary, epigraphic, and other archaeological evidence are intertwined. For epigraphic evidence see his short bibliographical survey (Machado 2009: 335, n. 21). The same antiquarian attitude can be perceived in the practice of moving ancient images. For a concise bibliographical overview see Machado (2009: 350, n. 102). Archaeological findings confirm the antiquarian cultivation of the past was established beyond the official cultural mainstream of literature and architecture. In the French municipality Dax, for instance, the remains of the workshop of an antique-dealer and restorer have been unearthed (Santrot 1996). The workshop dates from the end of the third to the beginning of the fourth century AD. Cult figures and other artistic objects from the first to the third century AD were restored in this workshop. To explain this fascinating find, the archaeological analysis has its recourse to the traditional argument of restoration as a means to counter artistic and material decline (Santrot 1996: 327), an argument which has been successfully refuted in the literature on *spolia* (Alchermes 1994). Other than that, only classical sources such as Cicero and Pliny are cited to contextualise this archaeological find (Santrot 1996: 323-325). Yet in the light of a proposed general antiquarian attitude in Late Antiquity, this archaeological find becomes highly logical.

In Late Antiquity, we can perceive a revived interest in antiquarian writing. People became increasingly aware of the transformations of their own world. The Roman Empire was turning into something unrecognisable to classical standards. Roman antiquarianism was a textual strategy in which people reverted to the past as a distant mirror. This mirror served to project the moral, political and cosmic values congenial to Rome as an universal ideal onto the present.[44] The goal of Roman antiquarianism was to revive and keep alive this ideal.

The metaphor of the mirror aptly attests to the exemplary nature of antiquarianism. In traditional historiography, the narrative structure with its diachronic sequence of events implies a distance between the past and the present. On the other hand, the systematic nature of antiquarianism with its synchronic approach apparently evaporates the distance between the past and the present.[45] This distance being erased, the past becomes a template which can be superimposed onto the present as an example and moral directive. The use of the past as a model in antiquarian writing is indeed a mechanism which was already extant in Antiquity.[46]

The same emphasis on the past as an exemplary ideal detaches the antiquarian activity in Late Antiquity from the concrete material remains of the past. In Late Antiquity, the antiquarian activity will become a textual activity par excellence. References to material evidence do appear from time to time, but become gradually

---

[44] Machado (2009: 332-334): "To put it briefly, 'the past' was both a cultural heritage (and therefore something to be preserved) and an ideological filter through which late antique men and women perceived their world. (…) For many Romans, the antiquity of pagan cults and beliefs was one of the attributes that made them venerable. The religious initiatives were held as virtuous, and as such could be used as a standard for the appreciation of 'modern times'."

[45] On the systematic nature of antiquarianism, see inter alia Momigliano (1950; 1990), Stevenson (2004) and Bravo (2007).

[46] The antiquarian function of the past as a model for the present was by and large disregarded by Momigliano (Herklotz 2007: 130). For the exemplary function of the past in antiquarianism of the Greco-Roman period see inter alia Pasco-Pranger (1999-2000: 284-285), Bravo (2007: 527). A similar strategy is described in the highly valuable contribution of Edwards (1996: 27-30). In the republican period, the Romans extensively accessed and organised memories of the past through specific spaces, without the mediation of historical narratives. In this light we can consider antiquarianism to be just the textual residue of this complex process of mediating the past through material objects, buildings and places in the present. Edwards continues her analysis of this technique by indicating the possible contradictions and diversity in the interpretation of space as a repository of memory, in spite of attempts to impose a coherence on the past (Edwards 1996: 42-43). This possible diversity has its textual counterpart in antiquarian texts of the republican age and Antiquity in general, as the mention of different explanations is one of the acknowledged features of antiquarianism.

immaterial to the antiquarian discourse as the past became an exemplary and ide-
alised category.[47]

### 1.1.3.2. Gazing at Rome

At the centre of the antiquarian attitude stood the city of Rome.[48] The an-
tiquarian seeks to recollect the heritage of Rome, whether in its republican or imper-
ial form. In this respect the antiquarian attitude is closely linked to a contemporary
political project of legitimacy by cultivating the past.[49] The late republican antiquar-
ianism is, for instance, closely linked to Augustus and his project of moral reform in
the early empire.[50] In this dissertation, I shall ascertain the different, sometimes con-
trasting and contradicting political motives behind the antiquarian writing of, for
instance, John Lydus, Cassiodorus and Malalas - for the reasons behind the selection
of these three authors, see p. 33 of this dissertation. The all-encompassing figure of
Justinian and his legal reforms will overshadow much of the antiquarian writing in
sixth-century Constantinople.

---

[47] The use of non-literary sources in antiquarianism has been greatly overemphasised by
Momigliano (Herklotz 2007: 136-141). Modern research on antiquarianism acknowledges the
fact that a focus on non-literary sources in the definition of antiquarianism is greatly enhanced
if only material evidence is abundantly available: "The fact that we understand the ancient
Egyptian consideration of the past mostly through archaeology gives a suitable material-cul-
ture slant to our survey." (Wendrich 155-156). In Greco-Roman Antiquity, Momigliano's pic-
ture of antiquarianism based on the use of non-literary sources appears to be inadequate. The
inscription with a treasure inventory of the sanctuary of Athena at Lindos (99 BC) is an ex-
ample of the focus on literary sources in Greco-Roman antiquarianism. The authenticity of
the disappeared gifts is established by copies of their inscriptions, scholarly quotations and
letters from the sanctuary (Schnapp 2013b: 159-162). "The antiquarian curiosity about clas-
sical civilisation was connected not to the materiality of objects and constructions but to their
semiophoric quality, and there is no suggestion that this quality could be damaged by restora-
tion or complete renovation—on the contrary." (Schnapp 2013b: 171). The antiquarian in-
terest remained mainly focused on literary evidence in Late Antiquity and the early Middle
Ages. Only in the late Middle Ages and the early renaissance, an interest in the material re-
mains of the past is perceived (Meier 2013: 249-250).
[48] The *Romanitas* of antiquarianism has already been noted by Stevenson (2004: 150-151),
Rawson (1985: 237) and Momigliano (1990: 68). The centrality of Rome continues to be a
distinctive feature of European antiquarianism from the renaissance on (Miller 2007c: 127).
The typical *Romanitas* of antiquarianism can also be assumed from a parallel case. In his ma-
gistral work on Tribonian, Honoré (1978: 32) stated that the profession of lawyers, as a typi-
cally Roman profession, was not conceptualised in Latin, as it was not conceptualised in Greek
and as Roman genres derived from Greek conceptualisations. If we take this case to run paral-
lel to the generic classification of antiquarianism, its existence as a typically Roman genre
precluded its conceptualisation in terms of a traditional Greek genre. Both for the legal liter-
ature as for antiquarianism, its typical *Romanitas* precluded a genre definition.
[49] Also in Babylonia, antiquarian activities were informed by a government which sought sta-
bility through the cultivation of the past (Schnapp 2007: 65-70), (Beaulieu 2013). The same
goes for antiquarianism in Egypt (Wendrich 2013). The antiquarian activities in the Renais-
sance were also used to further various political claims (Stenhouse 2013: 299-300, 302, 311).
[50] Rawson (1985: 233-249), Momigliano (1990: 68), Moatti (1997), Pasco-Pranger (2000: 280),
Bravo (2007: 524), Herkoltz (2007: 130-131).

### 1.1.3.3. Looking from a Distance

The notion of distance from the projected ideal of Rome is essential to the antiquarian attitude.[51] Antiquarian authors describe a world which is not present in their daily life. Yet, as the past is used as an exemplary model, the antiquarian tries to evoke the illusion of the past being at hand in the present. Therefore the antiquarian emphasises the continuity between the past and the present. Nevertheless this illusion is a precarious one. The dynamics of tension between the past as a model and the distance from the past will give rise to various emotions towards the past. These emotive attitudes in the antiquarian text change with the distance between the model and the present. I give below a short survey of detected attitudes.

Instances of ignorance (i.e. errors which reveal a limited knowledge of the past) are signs of this intellectual distance from the past. Next comes the overtly idealising of the past and the lamentation for the loss of the past.[52] Feelings of disappointment at the apparent decline of the legacy of the past in the present are, for instance, manifest in the antiquarian works of John Lydus (*Magistr.* I.28):

> "And I myself clearly remember that this custom prevailed not only at Rome but, indeed, even in the provinces so long as the curial councils were governing the cities; when they had been done away with, the species slipped away along with the genera.".[53]

The distance of the past from the contemporary world of the antiquarian can also be articulated as a sense of admiration for the distant past. The past be-

---

[51] On the connection between antiquarianism and political and or intellectual crises see Rawson (1972: 35), Momigliano (1990: 59), Moatti (1997), Stevenson (2004: 120) and Machado (2009: 333). The same feelings of losing touch with the ancestral tradition triggered antiquarian activity in the late republican period. See Rawson (1985: 233-249), Moatti (1997), Pasco-Pranger (2000: 280). For the same motives in the works of Varro specifically, see Edwards (1996: 4-6). This connection returns also in studies of antiquarianisms in other periods and other cultures. See, for example Beaulieu (2013: 132) for the Neo-Babylonian period, Wendrich (2013: 140-141, 151-152) for the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth Egyptian dynasties, and Meier (2013: 256) for the late mediaeval period.

[52] Also in mediaeval Arabic antiquarianism, the retrieval of what was perceived to be lost alchemical knowledge and ancient wisdom was one of the rationales behind the study of Egyptian artefacts (El Daly 2005: 54-55).

[53] "Καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης μόνης ἀλλὰ μὴν κἂν ταῖς ἐπαρχίαις τοῦτο κρατῆσαν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ διαμέμνημαι, ἕως ἂν τὰ βουλευτήρια διῴκουν τὰς πόλεις, ὧν ἀπολομένων συνεζώλισθε τοῖς ἐν γένει τὰ ἐν εἴδει." (Schamp 2006b: 37), trans. Bandy (1983: 45).

comes a *mirabile* or wonder, for instance in Cassiodorus.[54] In other instances, late antique authors acquiesce in the workings of a divine plan which caused the apparent decline of the Roman legacy. Sometimes the intellectual distance is spiritualised by coupling it to the Christian narrative of the Fall of Adam (e.g. in Cassiodorus), or by attributing it to a general divine scheme, as in the case of John Lydus (*Mens.* IV.47, Bandy IV.52):

> "That her [the Sibylla's] lines are found to be unfinished and non-metrical is not the fault of the prophetess but of the speedwriters, who had not kept pace with the continuous stream of the words being said, or even of the scribes, having been uneducated and inexperienced. For the remembrance of the words said by her along with her inspiration had ceased and for this reason unfinished lines and limping thought are found, or this has occurred by the dispensation of God that her oracles might not be understood by the many and unworthy."[55]

Another attitude exhibited by the Roman antiquarians is a hope for the future restoration of the brilliant past by a strong leader, such as Justinian (ca. 482 -

---

[54] The sense of wonder evoked by the (monuments of the) past has a long history. Edwards (1996: 96-109) compares different strategies by which authors of the imperial period and Late Antiquity vent their sense of awe at the wonders of the city of Rome. Although the responses of authors in the imperial period are marked by a distinct ambiguity, the late antique Ammianus Marcellinus exhibits an unqualified admiration for the city of Rome. This sense of amazement will reappear in the works of Cassiodorus, as we will see in chapter 4.1.3. (pp. 135-140 of this dissertation). An interesting parallel can be made with mediaeval Arabic antiquarian texts on ancient Egypt, in which the past is subjected to a degree of mystification. Ancient Egypt was considered to be a land of fabulous wealth. This attitude to the Egyptian past is elicited by accounts of Egypt's riches in the Qur'an (El Daly 2005: 31, 33). The antiquarian activity of treasure hunting in the mediaeval Arabic period was, indeed, closely connected with magical practice (El Daly 2005: 36-37). For instance, mummies were treated as holy relics and were attributed magical characteristics (El Daly 2005: 95, 104-105). The realm of the antiquarian treasure hunter was a grey zone between reality and myth (El Daly 2005: 41). Ancient Egypt was not only famed for her treasures. The mediaeval Arabs also considered Egypt as the cradle of sciences and wisdom (El Daly 2005: 109, 111). The description of scientific *mirabilia* by bewildered Arabic scholars was a recurrent feature in mediaeval Arabic texts on ancient Egypt (El Daly 2005: 116-119, 141-142). Perhaps not by coincidence, some of these scientific wonders also appear in *Var.* I.45 of Cassiodorus (El Daly 2005: 117). Apart from treasure hunting and scientific wonders, the antiquarian Arabic descriptions of monuments closely resemble Cassiodorus' rhetorically expressed sense of wonder. For instance, see the description of the temple of Akhmim by Ibn Jubayr and Al-Tujibi. These descriptions coincide with popular magical and occult practices at the archaeological sites themselves (El Daly 2005: 51-53). In fact, most of the ancient Egyptian holy places continued to be venerated as important sites of pilgrimage (El Daly 2005: 86-93). For other instances of expressed bewilderment see El Daly (2005: 55, 101).

[55] "ὅτι δὲ οἱ στίχοι αὐτῆς ἀτελεῖς εὑρίσκονται καὶ ἄμετροι, οὐ τῆς προφήτιδός ἐστιν ἡ αἰτία ἀλλὰ τῶν ταχυγράφων, οὐ συμφθασάντων τῇ ῥύμῃ τῶν λεγομένων ἢ καὶ ἀπαιδεύτων γενομένων καὶ ἀπείρων γραμματικῶν· ἅμα γὰρ τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ ἐπέπαυτο ἐν αὐτῇ ἡ τῶν λεχθέντων μνήμη, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εὑρίσκονται στίχοι ἀτελεῖς καὶ διάνοια σκάζουσα, εἴτε κατ' οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ τοῦτο γέγονεν, ὡς μὴ γινώσκοιντο ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἀναξίων οἱ χρησμοὶ αὐτῆς." (Wünsch 1898: 102), trans. Bandy (2013a: 231).

565) in the case of John Lydus (*Magistr.* III.76), or Theodoric the Great (454 - 526) in the case of Cassiodorus (*Var.* IV.51.2):

> "[Under Justinian the] political order regained its brilliance, precisely as one, just when a flame is about to go out, abundantly pours oil over it and revives it. And transactions had an excitement that was gratifying, and profits that were honest and acceptable to the law came to those who served it, and the Temple of Justice was reopened, and rhetoricians became conspicuous for their speeches, and books were produced, and competition returned over the whole complexion of the government.".[56]

> "And therefore, I [Theodoric] have decided that the fabric of the Theatre [of Pompey], yielding to the pressure of its vast weight, should be strengthened by your [Symmachus'] counsel. Thus, what your ancestors evidently bestowed for the glory of their country will not seem to decay under their nobler descendants.".[57]

In the end, the consequent maintenance of the illusion of continuity between the past and the present became an absurdity. Therefore, some antiquarian authors acknowledge the existence of the present, resulting in the development of a concept for the present. Indeed, it is not a coincidence that the first instances of the Latin word for modern, *modernus*, are to be found in the antiquarian writings of Cassiodorus.[58]

The illusion of continuity between the past and present in late antique writing is a useful tool to distinguish late antique antiquarianism from other forms of antiquarian research in adjacent cultures, both before and after Late Antiquity. Before Late Antiquity, the early Greek cultivation of the Bronze Age past is virtually severed from the Bronze Age was depended solely on a loose complex of oral traditions, material objects and elements from the landscape.[59] In antiquarian texts from the classical period the interest was mainly in the difference between the distant past and the present.[60]

After Late Antiquity, antiquarian activity focused more on the alienation from the past than on its continuity with the present. In the east, the research done on the past in mediaeval Byzantium acknowledged the irreversible fissure between

---

[56] "Ἡ δὲ τάξις, καθάπερ τις σβεννυμένης ἤδη φλογὸς ἔλαιον ἀφθόνως ἐπιχέει, ἀνέλαμφεν · καὶ θόρυβος ἦν τοῖς πραττομένοις χαρίεις καὶ κέρδη σώφρονα καὶ φίλα τῷ νόμῳ τοῖς ὑπηρετοῦσιν ἠκολούθει καὶ τὸ Τέμενος τῆς Δίκης ἀνέῳγει καὶ ῥήτορες τοῖς λόγοις ἐνέπρεπον καὶ βιβλίων προαγωγαὶ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐφ' ὅλον τὸ χρῶμα ἐπανῄει τοῦ πολιτεύματος." (Schamp 2006c: 140-141), trans. Bandy (1983: 257).
[57] "Et ideo theatri fabricam magna se mole solventem consilio vestro credimus esse roborandam, ut quod ab auctoribus vestris in ornatum patriae constat esse concessum non videatur sub melioribus posteris imminutum." (Giardina et al. 2014: 126), trans. Barnish (1992: 79).
[58] Meier (2013: 249-250). We will ascertain at which point in time antiquarian authors such as Cassiodorus and John Lydus put the breaking point between the hallowed past and an unworthy present in chapter 6.2.1.2.
[59] Boardman (2002: 9, 183).
[60] Bravo (2007: 518, 526-527), Miller (2007b: 33).

the classical pagan past and the Byzantine present from a religious Christian motivation. Indeed, interest in the past was limited to a formal and superficial approach for fear of engaging too intensely with the pagan past.[61] The only instances of perceived continuity between the classical past and the Byzantine present were elicited by simply projecting contemporary traditions onto the past.[62] Also the mediaeval Arabic interest in the distant past was elicited by a religious motive. Both the Qur'an and the Hadiths comment favourably on the value of the study of the past.[63] Yet this positive attitude also implies a gap between past and present. For the study of the past of ancient Egypt was reduced to a tool to study universal history. In the Islamic concept of universal unity and common origin of mankind any continuity between the past of a specific culture and the Arabic present becomes altogether irrelevant.

In the west, we can perceive several bonds of continuity in the study of Latin texts which range from the humanists in the fourteenth century to the Carolingian ninth century, or even to Late Antiquity itself. Yet any serious engagement with the classical past is thwarted by the church. The fourteenth-century humanists therefore have a real sense of the discontinuity between the past and the present. They tend to stress the need to restore and imitate the classical past in their antiquarian writings.[64]

With the definition of Roman antiquarianism as a textual attitude towards the past which is Romanocentric, which considers the past to be a standard of moral excellence and which is informed by an uncanny awareness of the increasing decline from the past to the present, I hope to present a coherent concept of antiquarianism in Late Antiquity. In the following section I shall scrutinise the different approaches

---

[61] Hunger (1969), Rapp (2008).

[62] The Byzantines generally did not perceive any difference between the realism of Greek and Roman visual arts on the one hand and the lack of realism in their contemporary art on the other hand. This distorted perception is occasioned by the Byzantines' limited acquaintance with the realism of Greek and Roman art. Furthermore, the Byzantines projected their own artistic practices onto artistic production during the period of Christ and the Apostles. By projecting the present practices into the past, any real engagement with the past was simply made impossible (Grigg: 1987).

[63] El Daly (2005: 17-20).

[64] Mann (1996). In the study of the Greek tradition, the discontinuity between Antiquity and the Renaissance is even more profound. The access to Greek texts from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries was limited to translations from Arabic intermediaries and sporadic contacts with Byzantine officials at the Angevin court of Naples. These contacts intensified in the context of increasing diplomatic activity between the West and the tottering Byzantine Empire. After the fall of Byzantium, the exodus of Byzantine scholars decisively triggered the revival of Greek studies in the West. (Mann 1996: 14-17). Miller (2007c: 113): "(…) a strong impetus for a new kind of historical precision was the search for tools to separate past from present and so reduce the threat of a glorious pagan past influencing, inundating, and threatening the fragile Christian present.". Schnapp (2013b: 172): 'Whereas, since the Renaissance, antiquarians and architects have worked to maintain a meticulous distinction between the old and the new, the Romans sought to shuttle continuously between the two (…)". Stenhouse (2013: 295): "Cyriac's letter embodies many of the central characteristics of early Renaissance antiquarianism. He celebrates a distant Roman past, distinguishes it from the present, and denigrates what came in between (…)".

to antiquarianism which were until now used in modern research. The contradictions and flaws of these different methods will urge for a new approach to Roman antiquarianism as a means to deal with cultural unease. The nascent field of cultural trauma theories will furnish an approach suited to our specific island of the antiquarian archipelago.

## 1.2. Roman Antiquarianism and Cultural Unease

In his seminal paper "Ancient History and the Antiquarian" (1950), Momigliano argued for the foundational importance of ancient antiquarianism as the real ancestor of modern historiography.[65] More than its better-known cousin, history of contemporary events in the vein of Thucydides or Procopius, antiquarianism focused on the understanding and preservation of material and documentary remains of a community. This contrast, it has to be said, between historiography 'proper' and antiquarianism is charged in the sense that history was seen as the better genre which thinks about the causes of historical events and processes, whereas antiquarianism was considered to be merely preoccupied with material remains. While deploring the absence of any real history of antiquarian practices and attitudes, Momigliano dismissed the vicissitudes of antiquarianism in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages in just some sentences. For Momigliano, the Varronian concept of *antiquitates*, namely the idea of recovering a civilisation through a collection of all the relics of the past, was in essence a classical concept. It was lost in the Middle Ages only to be recovered in the Renaissance period.[66]

Since the pioneering labours of Momigliano, antiquarianism has received increasing scholarly attention.[67] However, a general history of antiquarianism and its position within the history of intellectual life has not yet been achieved.[68] One of the gaps in this history of antiquarianism is formed by the absence of a history of late

---

[65] Momigliano (1950, 1990).

[66] "The middle ages did not lose the classical interest in inscriptions and archaeological remains. Inscriptions were occasionally collected. Monument were noticed. What was lost, notwithstanding the remainder contained in St. Augustine's *Civitas Dei*, was the Varronian idea of 'antiquitates' – the idea of a civilization recovered by systematic collection of all the relics of the past." (Momigliano 1950: 289). For an extensive analyses of this article, see Miller (2007a) and Herklotz (2007). Also in his later work on antiquarianism (Momigliano 1990), Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages are conveniently underplayed to emphasise the parallels between classical antiquarianism and modern antiquarianism from the renaissance on (Di Donato 2007: 74).

[67] A general survey of antiquarianism in Antiquity can be found in Bravo (2007). For the Hellenistic period, see Bravo (2009). The Roman antiquarianism of the late Republic has received some attention, for instance in Rawson (1985) and Moatti (1997). As regards antiquarianism in the imperial period, research was centred around specific authors. The antiquarianism of Ovid is treated in Pasco-Pranger (1999-2000). For Suetonius, see Wallace-Hadrill (1983). Aulus Gellius' antiquarianism is analysed by Stevenson (2004). This overview has the impression of a sporadic treatment of antiquarianism in the Greco-Roman era, as already noticed by Rojas (2013: 176). The material dimension of Roman antiquarianism has been neglected altogether apart from the case study of Rojas (2013) and the contribution of Schnapp (2012b).

[68] Miller and Louis (2007: 1), Miller (2007b: 27–28).

antique antiquarianism.[69] Although some attention has been devoted to individual late antique authors, such as the antiquarian author John Lydus in sixth-century Constantinople,[70] the tradition as a whole remains seriously understudied. Most significantly, the antiquarian tradition remains absent in overviews of late ancient historiography.[71] Mapping out the late antiquarian tradition is furthermore a project that is rendered difficult by the fragmentary survival of the exponents of this tradition. For instance, the edition of fragmentary Greek antiquarian historians before ca. AD 300, included in volume IV of Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, will not appear soon.

Another major impediment to understanding late antique antiquarianism is the difference in conceptualisation of the elusive concept of antiquarianism by scholars after Momigliano. Momigliano mainly focused on the empirical study of objects in antiquarian research. This focus on the material aspect of antiquarianism has been developed in the work of Alain Schnapp, in which material objects in different cultures were analysed as a form of antiquarianism - for instance, not only texts, but also Babylonian bricks and Chinese Ming vases were considered to be antiquarian.[72] Other scholars, such as Elisabeth Rawson and Andrew J. Stevenson, emphasised the textual aspect of antiquarian activity.[73] Rawson named as characteristics of antiquarian texts their scholarly nature, their lack of any literary or rhetorical pretension, their habit of citing predecessors, their focus on etymologies and origins of cultural practices and their Romanocentrism. Stevenson mentioned the same characteristics as Rawson, adding that antiquarian texts are systematic, i.e. nonchronological texts, which in their outlook and content consciously reflect the interests of the Roman aristocracy. He furthermore described the different aspects of the antiquarian working method, among which we can mention the attention to detail, the explanations of cultural phenomena through their etymologies and origins, the

---

[69] The neglect of Late Antiquity and the mediaeval period has regretfully been followed from Momigliano on. Bravo (2007: 525), for instance, only devotes two short paragraphs on antiquarianism in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages. In spite of his elaborate analysis of the gaps in Momigliano's research on antiquarianism, Miller does not make a single mention of antiquarianism in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages (Miller 2007a: 25–51). The same tendency persists in the contribution of Miller and Louis, where a short history of antiquarianism likewise passes from Varro directly to the Renaissance (Miller and Louis 2007: 2). Later on in the same volume, Miller traces the end of antiquarianism to the age of Augustine - in which he is clearly influenced by the stereotype of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire (Miller, 2007c: 105-106). The same disregard for Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages persists in the contribution of Herklotz (2007). He gives a critical review of the shortcomings in Momigliano's otherwise unapproachable article of 1950. In spite of this critical aim, Herklotz fails to acknowledge the gap in Momigliano's treatment of antiquarianism between Late Antiquity and the early renaissance. Only Justinian is mentioned shortly in the context of legal commentary (Herklotz 2007: 133). The early fifth-century grammarian Servius is mentioned as a final testimony to antiquarian and grammatical activity in Late Antiquity (Herklotz 2007: 132). Apart from the short article of Maslakov (1983), The contribution of Meier is one of the few examples mentioning Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages. Even in this case the short reference is used as a stepping stone to the main subject of the contribution, which starts "Nearly one millennium later (…)". (Meier 2013: 250).

[70] See chapter 3.1.1. (pp. 36-43 of this dissertation).

[71] Rohrbacher (2002), Marasco (2003), Treadgold (2007a).

[72] Schnapp (2013a).

[73] Rawson (1985: 233), Stevenson (2004: 118–119).

presentation of different, often contradictory explanations from which the student has to choose independently, the use of indices and sub-headings, the making of notes or ὑπομνήματα during the autopsy of material remains or during the lecture of an antiquarian predecessor, the *imitatio et aemulatio* of other antiquarians and the tendency for encyclopaedic accounts with personal focuses of the author.

Both conceptualisations of antiquarianism pose their own problems. On the one hand, the appearance of the same antiquarian elements in different genres in Late Antiquity belies any neat description of antiquarianism as a well-defined literary genre with a set of formal characteristics – such has been proposed by Stevenson.[74] On the other hand, the more recent definition of antiquarianism as a broad cultural phenomenon with aspects in all spheres of human activity in the edited volume of Schnapp[75] is too general to apply to the period of Late Antiquity – indeed, according to this definition, Late Antiquity was in its political aspirations, artistic production and cultural achievements an antiquarian age in itself. Only a few scholars frankly acknowledge the impossibility of defining antiquarianism only by a study of its form and method.[76]

The muddled conceptualisation of the term antiquarianism, both in recent scholarship and in Late Antiquity itself, has elicited merely one–dimensional interpretations of this otherwise fascinating cultural phenomenon. Until recently, explanations for the continued interest in late antique antiquarianism tended to fall in two groups: on the one hand, those who emphasise a religious interest (either for pagans wishing to preserve their heritage, or for Christians wishing to rediscover the classical past and argue with it);[77] on the other hand, those who detect political motives (as the description of past customs and states permitted veiled critique on contemporary absolutism).[78] Interest in late ancient antiquarianism is thus limited and one–sided. In particular, questions about continuity with classical antiquarianism are rarely asked, and the tradition as a whole has not yet been traced for Late Antiquity. This renders claims about late antique antiquarianism as an essentially religious or political enterprise fragile and provisional.

In order to overcome the muddled conception of antiquarianism in Late Antiquity, I opt to single out one of the many islands of the antiquarian archipelago for a detailed study, namely, Roman antiquarianism, such as was analysed in the previous chapter. The contradictory conceptions of antiquarianism in modern research call for a new approach to Roman antiquarianism as a way to come to terms with the cultural unease generated by the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople. A suitable approach to Roman antiquarianism can be found in the nascent field of cultural trauma studies.

---

[74] Stevenson (2004).
[75] Schnapp (2013).
[76] "Was hier allerdings unter der Ünterschrift ‚Rang- und Ämterverzeichnisse' zusammenge-fasst wird, ist im strenge Sinne keine geschlossene Quellengruppe, da ihr ein einheitlicher Charakter in Zielstellung, Methode, Aufbau felhlt. Das einigende Band liegt in einer weit verstandenen Thematik." (Winkelmann 1990: 336).
[77] Maslakov (1983), Ando (2001), Dillon (2007), Ratti (2010).
[78] Maas (1992), Kaldellis (2004).

Since the 1990s, the study of historical trauma's has received increased scholarly interest.[79] A prominent exponent of this growing field of historical trauma studies has been Dominick LaCapra, who, in his work, has aimed at ascertaining the relations between history and memory through a rethinking of psychoanalysis, and the relations between history and psychoanalysis.[80] As he stressed himself, his approach does not constitute a unified theory or closed system of thought,[81] and has therefore invited further elaborations. A (provisional) synthesis on the theory of historical trauma has been achieved in the work of Jeffrey C. Alexander, who referred to the work of LaCapra,[82] and who developed the term "cultural trauma". Since the pioneering labours of both scholars, the methodological achievements of the studies on historical trauma, which developed from the study of modern historical traumas such as the Holocaust, have increasingly been applied to other historical periods such as Antiquity.[83] In the following section, I shall elaborate on the different aspects of the theories of LaCapra and, to a lesser extent, Alexander, which will be used to furnish the theoretical framework for this dissertation. I shall furthermore signal which innovations I will apply in order to come to a suitable approach to Roman antiquarianism as a way to come to terms with the cultural unease generated by the transfer from Rome to Constantinople.

In his treatment of historical trauma, LaCapra (1999) distinguishes between absence on the one hand and loss on the other hand. Absence, or structural trauma, is part of a generalised discourse on the lack of a metaphysical foundation, as for instance, the story of Original Sin and the Fall of Adam.[84] This form of trauma is experienced by all human beings, and cannot be cured or overcome, but only lived through in various ways.[85] Losses, or historical traumas, on the other hand, are connected to specific historical events, as acts of war, genocides, and most emblematically, the horrors of the Second World War, such as the Holocaust and the Atomic Bomb. LaCapra points to the importance of distinguishing both levels of trauma. However, exceptional cases of historical trauma or loss threaten to blur the distinction between both levels:

> "(…) historical events of the seismic nature and magnitude of the Holocaust may, in transgressing a theoretical limit, pose a challenge to this distinction: the structural (or the existential-transcendental) seems to crash down into the empirical. Thus one has the tendency to figure these events as utterly unique and sacralised and demonic, as an index of God's intervention in history or, on the contrary, of his death and the upsurge of diabolically radical evil."[86]

---

[79] For overviews of the developments in the field of historical trauma theory, see Alexander (2004: 2-10), Smelser (2004).
[80] LaCapra (1998: 6, 180).
[81] LaCapra (1998: 180).
[82] Alexander (2004, 2012).
[83] For instance, in Becker, Dochhorn and Holt (2014).
[84] LaCapra (1998: 195, 1999: 700).
[85] LaCapra (1998: 195).
[86] LaCapra (1998: 195).

In this dissertation, the presumed fall of the western Roman Empire and the transfer of imperial power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople shall be considered as the event of "seismic nature and magnitude" which caused the blurring of the boundaries between structural trauma and historical trauma in antiquarian research of the sixth century. Although in the sixth century, the canonical fall of Rome had already happened decades before, this does not preclude the fall of Rome from being treated as a form of cultural trauma.[87] For the belatedness of the manifestation of cultural trauma is a key aspect of cultural trauma,[88] and cultural trauma affects all those who come into contact with it - not only the persons involved in the historical event, but also those who engage with it after its conclusion in, for instance, historical writing:[89]

> "Notably for those born later, these events may, through a kind of post-traumatic event, prompt a generalised hyperbolic or exorbitant style that at times becomes indiscriminate and verges on a paradoxically bland sensationalism, which may undermine critical judgment and obscure, or provide too one-sided a resolution of, the problem of the actual and desirable relations between excess and normative limits.".[90]

This hyperbolic or exorbitant style in the assessment of cultural trauma will indeed be observable in the reactions of antiquarian authors, such as John Lydus, to the fall of the empire and its perceived authors.

The belatedness of the cultural trauma implies a lack of any direct temporal relationship between the historical event at the root of the cultural trauma and the ensuing manifestation of cultural trauma. Alexander elaborated on the implications of the disconnectedness between the historical event and the cultural trauma which is a product of it.[91] In his contributions, he analysed how both the Holocaust and the Watergate Scandal had to undergo a process of cultural narration and construction before they could be seen as major cultural traumas.[92] In the same vein, we can interpret Roman antiquarianism as part of a process of constructing the transfer of the seat of the Roman Empire from Rome to Constantinople as (one of) the major cultural traumas of Late Antiquity.

The blurring of the distinctions between absence and loss severely impedes the process of coming to terms with historical trauma. Instead of coping with an historical trauma, both absence and loss combine into a vicious cycle of endless melancholy, impossible mourning and infinite nostalgia.[93] Furthermore, in such a discourse of infinite nostalgia, the blurring of the distinction between absence and loss

---

[87] See chapter 2 (pp. 29-32 of this dissertation).
[88] When memory of a trauma threatens to become inaccessible because of the passing of time, there is the threat that imagination alternates between melancholic repetition and superficial manic agitation (LaCapra 1998: 182).
[89] LaCapra (1998: 8-9).
[90] LaCapra (1998: 181).
[91] Alexander (2004: 2, 8).
[92] Alexander (2003a, 2003b, 2012).
[93] LaCapra (1998: 195, 1999: 698). On the relationship between mourning and melancholy, and the origins of these concepts in Freudian thought, see LaCapra (1998: 183).

runs parallel to a blurring of the distinction between the past and the present[94] - a feature which we indeed encountered in the definition of Roman antiquarianism, as a textual attitude to the past in which the seamless continuity with the past is painstakingly aspired to.

The main means to accomplish the conversion of a metaphysical absence into a specific loss is the narrative. A loss is a specific historical event, which can be presented in the form of a narrative sequence. Absence can be associated with loss through the presentation of absence in a narrative.[95] In such a narrative, a specific person or group of persons can figure as the scapegoats responsible for the absence.[96] Moreover, historical losses can be appropriated into the discourse of absence for reasons of ideologically constructing an identity.[97] Indeed, as we shall see further on in this dissertation, the construction of cultural trauma in Roman antiquarianism was in many cases brought about by narratives, such as emblematic biographies - such as Lydus' biography of John of Cappadocia for instance - and narratives of the fulfilling of age-old prophesies. Furthermore, the production of Roman antiquarianism was intimately connected to the formation of identity and social cohesion of different groups, carrier groups according to Alexander,[98] within the administration at Constantinople - and the scapegoating of competitors within this administration.[99] The social implications of the blurring of absence and loss touch upon another notion essential to LaCapra's definition of cultural trauma, namely, the notion that mourning and working-through a trauma requires a social context and specific social group.[100] Moreover, as Alexander states, the presence of a collectivity which considers an event to be traumatic is a *conditio sine qua non* for the existence of a cultural trauma:

> "Cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways".[101]

It is one of the aims of this dissertation to show that exactly the same process of conflating absence or structural trauma with loss or historical trauma is a motivator behind Roman antiquarianism in the sixth century and its coming to terms with its cultural trauma. After this theoretical essay there will be a introduction to the cultural trauma, namely, the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople (chapter 2). I shall pursue the analysis with an overview of the different carrier groups responsible for the perpetuation of a traumatic discourse on the fall of Rome and its replacement by Constantinople (chapter 3). Starting from three

---

[94] LaCapra (1999: 699).
[95] LaCapra (1999: 701).
[96] LaCapra (1999: 707).
[97] LaCapra (1999: 712).
[98] Alexander borrowed the term from Max Weber (2004: 11).
[99] See chapter 6.2.2. (pp. 258-284 of this dissertation).
[100] LaCapra (1998: 184-185).
[101] Alexander (2004: 1). On the social process behind cultural trauma see Alexander (2004: 10-24).

seemingly unrelated historians and contemporaries, John Lydus, John Malalas and Cassiodorus, I shall ascertain the different parallels and overlaps in their respective social networks which point to their being part of a densely interconnected carrier group of intellectualist bureaucrats in Constantinople receptive to and responsible for producing a rhetoric of cultural trauma. The investment of this group in the Greco-Roman *paideia* as the intellectual representative of Rome and Roman hegemony accounts for the relevance which the transfer from Rome to Constantinople had for this group. The parallels in the networks of the three authors coincided, as the analysis shall show, with remarkable parallels in the authors' treatment of antiquarian subject matter. This coincidence of social and textual connectedness can either be interpreted as being the result of a common and shared historiographical culture of Roman antiquarianism, or, more controversially, that some of the three authors were aware of each other's antiquarian production. The analysis in this dissertation consists of two triptychs. In the first triptych (chapter 4) I shall discuss the different strategies the three authors exhibit in their antiquarian treatment of the cities of Rome and Constantinople. The authors to a certain extent assimilated both cities in their antiquarian imagination, compared them, and construed new transferable emblems of empire in order to come to terms with the loss of the material city of Rome. In the second triptych, I shall expound on three ways by which the antiquarian authors partially replaced Rome as the all-encompassing centre of Roman antiquarian writing. First, the antiquarians reverted to localism and a focus on their own region of origin as a replacement for Rome as the framework for the generation of historical meaning (chapter 5). Second, the  bureaucratic context of the own department was furthered as a replacement of Rome (chapter 6). Third, the decline of Rome allowed for the emancipation in antiquarian writing of a sphere of human interest which was heretofore invisible in historiography and only marginally represented in antiquarianism: an antiquarian interest in women and children which was fuelled by personal concerns of the authors (chapter 7).

Throughout this dissertation and where possible, the theoretical framework of cultural trauma as sketched above will be used to explain different features and motivations behind the Roman antiquarianism of the three authors. As the systems presented by LaCapra and, to a lesser extent, by Alexander were not intended to form a closed system of thought, I intend to create a flexible dynamic between this theoretical framework and the historical and textual data in order to have a smooth generation of historical insight into the texts and the period at hand. This flexibility entails also some personal innovations to the theory of cultural trauma in order to better suit the treated texts. I opt to rephrase the concept of "cultural trauma" to "cultural unease". The concept of cultural unease suits the situation in the sixth century better than the concept of trauma for two reasons.

First, the concept of trauma implies an injury or form of injustice inflicted by a perpetrator onto a victim. This one-sided relation between an injured victim and an unjust perpetrator does injustice to the complexities entailed in the transfer from Rome to Constantinople. As the analysis will show, the main part of the carrier group responsible for the discourse of cultural trauma was part of a Constantinople-based administrative elite which fared well in the transfer from Rome to their city - a group which can hardly be interpreted to be the victim of a trauma. Second, the

notion of trauma implies a rupture-like event such as a genocide or act of warfare. In the case of the transfer of imperial power from Rome to Constantinople, a process which took several centuries, we can hardly speak of a cultural trauma as caused by such a rupturing event.

A second innovation I would like to propose is elaborated in chapter 6 of this dissertation. Whereas LaCapra used the conflation of absence and loss to explain the rhetoric of melancholy behind exclusively negative or traumatic events, I would like to apply this mechanism also to positive aspects of Roman antiquarianism; as a counterpoise to their strong rhetoric of eternal decline of the Roman Empire, the antiquarians also coupled in a positive way a metaphysical level of absence to a specific level of loss in order to vent their hopes for a future restoration of the empire by the hands of learned emperors and bureaucrats as sanctioned by higher powers.

# I
# Cultural Unease

# 2

# Cultural Unease: From Rome to Constantinople

One of the fundamental sources of cultural unease in Late Antiquity was the fall of the western Roman Empire and the shift of imperial power from the West to the East.[1] From the crisis of the third century onward, several cities vied for supremacy as the capital of the Roman Empire.[2] These competitions crystallised during the fourth and fifth centuries into a contest between Rome and New Rome at the Bosporus.[3]

Although the city of Byzantium remained inconspicuous for the majority of its history, the destruction and rebuilding of the city by Septimius Severus (after AD 195) firmly established the city in the orbit of empire by instilling on it an image of *Romanitas*.[4] This Roman image of the city was intensified during the flurry of construction works under Emperor Constantine (AD 324-330).[5] Constantine furthermore tied the city as a privileged capital intricately to the city of Rome in a way that

---

[1] Edwards (1996: 66-68). For a general sense of growing distance from the Roman past informing the reorganisation and codifying of knowledge in the sixth century, see Maas (2005: 18-20).
[2] Eigler (2007), Grig-Kelly (2012: 6-8).
[3] An overview of previous scholarly debates on the comparison and competition between Rome and Constantinople can be found in Grig-Kelly (2012: 3-4). For an analysis of how the various late antique challenges to the image of Rome were tackled in different visualisations, see Grig (2012). See also Dagron (1974: 48-76). For an analysis of the use of antiquarianism and the distant past in the debate on the respective position of Rome and Constantinople in the fourth and fifth centuries, see Ando (2001).
[4] Janin (1964: 9-20), Dagron (1974: 13-47), Bassett (2004: 18-22), Schweizer (2007).
[5] Janin (1964: 21-31), Schweizer (2007).

surpassed associations between Rome and any other city in the empire.[6] The fourth century saw the gradual and silent growth of Constantinople,[7] and under the rule of Theodosius I, Constantinople acquired the status of a ruling city.[8] The rise of Constantinople did not automatically imply the fall of the city of Rome; it was only by the mid-fifth and the sixth century that the latter city was seen to be in decline.[9]

A symbolic event was needed for the residents of the empire to acknowledge the dominance of Constantinople over Rome.[10] The symbolic trigger for this acknowledgement did not occur when the empire was officially split in two halves in 395 AD,[11] nor did it occur after the sack of Rome in 410.[12] It was the symbolic end

---

[6] Chantraine (1992), Grig-Kelly (2012: 9), Ward-Perkins (2012: 53-54). Bassett (2004: 12, 22-33). "In [transporting statues to his new capital] the emperor proclaimed both his own authority as the sole ruler of the Roman world, and urban primacy for his city [Constantinople]. In an age when the city of Rome still held sway in the collective imagination as the capital and other centres such as Milan and Trier vied for imperial favour this was a necessary step." (Bassett 2007: 196). Bowersock (2009: 41-42) concedes that Constantine had no intention to name his city Second Rome, but that this name circulated from the middle of the fourth century onwards. Constantinople's intended status as a second Rome furthermore invites comparative approaches (Grig-kelly 2012: 4-5). On Constantine's intention to make Constantinople a new capital from its inception, see Bjornlie (2013: 41).

[7] Grig-Kelly (2012: 12-18). For instance, the fourth-century historian Ammianus Marcellinus remains conspicuously silent on the city of Constantinople (Kelly: 2003). Likewise, Claudius Claudianus does allude to the concept of Constantinople as the New Rome, without, however, accepting it (Kelly 2012). For Libanius' hostility towards Constantinople in comparison to his beloved home town of Antioch, see (Crow 2012: 117).

[8] Chantraine (1992), Grig-Kelly (2012: 16-17), Ward-Perkins (2012: 54). The rise in status of Constantinople as ruling city had, for example, its reflections in the monetary iconography of the fourth and fifth centuries, with an increasing likeness between Constantinople as a ruling city and Rome (Longo: 2005).

[9] In the fourth century, the eternity of Rome remained a cherished concept (Croke 1983: 83). For an overview of the status of Rome in the fourth century, see Grig-Kelly (2012: 18-23). The city remained an important imperial residence during the fifth century (Grig-Kelly 2012: 26). McEvoy (2010) even states that the transformation of the role of the emperor in the fifth century elicited a refocus on Rome as political and ideological centre of the western empire: "In the process of the transformation of the imperial office in the late fourth to mid-fifth centuries, Rome had regained its place as a centre of western imperial politics once more, a place it held thereafter until the very end of the western imperial regime" (McEvoy 2010: 192). The only factor impeding the decline of Rome from the end of the fifth century onward was Theodoric, whose building and restoration activities were closely etched on his self-representation (Grig-Kelly 2012: 27). For a description of the marked decline of monumental spaces, aristocratic housing and church building in Rome during the fifth century, as opposed to the growth in Constantinople, see Ward-Perkins (2012: 66-78).

[10] For the preceding fourth century there is no continuous narrative for the growth of Constantinople, although there is some resentment to the city in the writings of Ammianus Marcellinus, Libanius and Eunapius. Only Themistius provides an insight in the city's growth (Grig-Kelly 2012: 12).

[11] Grig-Kelly (2012: 17). In spite of the fact that the latent division of the empire was reinforced by the administrative parting, the empire remained officially unified under the Theodosian dynasty (Croke 1983: 83).

[12] Lipps, Machado and von Rummel (2013). Edwards does, however, consider AD 410 to be a decisive trigger in detaching a transcendental idea of Rome from its physical locality at the river Tiber (Edwards 1996: 89, 134-135).

of imperial rule in the western part of the empire, in 476 AD, which was used in sources of the sixth-century eastern Roman Empire as the trigger that heralded the shift of dominance to Constantinople,[13] and gave rise to a reassertion[14] and redefinition of *Romanitas* in the early Byzantine Empire.[15] Bowersock analysed how the late antique easterners pinpointed 330 AD as a pivotal time,[16] yet this observation does not exclude the hypothesis that it was only from 476 onward that the inhabitants of the eastern empire started reflecting on the shift from Rome to Constantinople. The point in time when people started reflecting on a traumatic change and the point in time when they imagined this traumatic change to have happened need not coincide - as mentioned in the introduction to this dissertation, the causal and temporal disconnectedness between the origin of cultural trauma and the creation of cultural trauma is one of the key aspects of cultural trauma. The sixth century finally witnessed a decisive shift in political focus from Rome to Constantinople.[17] The eastern Roman Emperor Justinian conceived his project of restoring the Roman Empire exclusively through the lens of its new centre in Constantinople. The results for the city of Rome were disastrous; by the middle of the sixth century, the Italian penin-

---

[13] Croke (1983) and Zecchini (1985) trace the narrative of the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476 AD to sources in Constantinople at the beginning of the sixth century, most notably Marcellinus Comes and Jordanes: "By the turn of the sixth century it will have been obvious that however desirable and however often it was contemplated (…) the restoration of the western empire was, practically speaking, a doubtful proposition. (…) Given the fact that, as far as the Byzantines were concerned at the beginning of the sixth century, the west had been overrun by barbarians and the western empire itself had ceased to be, it is hardly surprising to find that they attempted to pinpoint its passing away." (Croke 1983: 116). This specifically Byzantine viewpoint, as expressed by Marcellinus Comes (Bjornlie 2013: 93-94) and Jordanes (Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2017: 20), became common knowledge in the Latin West when it passed through Paulus Diaconus to the chroniclers of Western Europe and, later on, to the Renaissance humanists (Croke 1983: 81-83, 118-9). See also Chantraine (1992), Bjornlie (2013: 16). For a sketch of the "gradual evanescence" of the old Rome from the minds of inhabitants of the eastern Roman Empire in the sixth century, see Bowersock (2009: 42-44).

[14] Dmitriev (2010: 36): "But the idea of the fall of the Roman Empire in the west engendered the vision of the eastern Empire with the capital in Constantinople, which thus emerged already before the reign of Justinian, the earliest surviving reference to it being the *Chronicle*, of Count Marcellinus, whose original version is dated to ca. 518-519." Roueché traces the emphasis on Roman titles and the Latin language in Justinianic laws specifically to the shift from Rome to Constantinople after 476. (Roueché 1998: 87): "These assertions of *Romanitas* seem, therefore, to date from the period after the fall of the western Emperor, in 476. The first 'fall' of Rome – the sack of 410 – had been largely discussed in terms of what it implied about the divine will. (…) The events of 476, however, had the effect of making the Second Rome assume its powers in full, and this may have lead to a reassessment of "*Romanitas*"." See also Pabst (1986: 218-21).

[15] Bowersock (2009: 40-41, 45), Dmitriev (2010).

[16] Bowersock (2009: 42-49).

[17] Dmitriev (2010: 38-39).

sula was subdued as a peripheral province to Justinian's empire, and the former capital of the empire lay in ruins due to the ongoing Gothic wars.[18]

  The fall and continuous reduction of Rome as a material entity was a traumatic experience because throughout Antiquity, there existed a strong link between sites and monuments in the city of Rome and Roman collective memory.[19] The loss of the physical places in the city of Rome to the Roman Empire could short-circuit the interaction between the Romans and their collective memory. Antiquarian authors in the sixth century therefore had to devise several strategies to preserve their collective memory by detaching it from the physical city of Rome and transferring it to the city of Constantinople.[20] In case it was not possible to make this transfer, the antiquarian authors of the sixth century brought to the fore new centres for the creation of historical meaning to replace Rome; the home region, their own bureaucratic department, and a personal focus on women and children. Before we can turn to the analysis of these strategies used to deal with the cultural unease of the transfer from Rome to Constantinople, we will have to explore the nature of the social carrier group responsible for the creation of the discourse on cultural trauma.

---

[18] Holum (2005: 97-98), Grig-Kelly (2012: 27-28), Ward-Perkins (2012: 54). The ultimate nadir of Rome after the Byzantine conquest of Italy saw the rise in significance of the city of Ravenna as the provincial capital of a newly acquired borderland; before that moment, the city of Ravenna remained inconspicuous in comparison with Rome –the so called late antique importance of Ravenna as an imperial residence is part of the fallacious yet attractive rhetoric of the decline and fall of Rome (Gillett: 2001).

[19] See the article of Ando (2001) for the different responses, both pagan and Christian, to the diminishing importance of Rome as the material centre of the empire. On the associations between the material city of Rome and the Roman Empire on the one hand and specific places in the city and the Roman collective memory on the other hand, see Favro (2006: 34-35), Edwards (1996: 27-43, 87).

[20] On this concept of the transcendent city of Rome, see Edwards (1996: 134-135).

# 3

# The Audience of Cultural Unease: Lydus, Malalas, Cassiodorus and their Social Networks

In order to ascertain how erudite writing was used to cope with specific forms of cultural trauma or cultural unease, we need to identify the social groups which had an interest in pinpointing, defining, expressing and working through specific events and losses as significant forms of cultural unease. For this purpose I selected three authors and contemporaries from three different parts of the former Roman Empire in the middle of the sixth century to ascertain the differences and the resemblances in their use of Rome's distant past, namely Cassiodorus for the western periphery of the empire, John Lydus at the centre of the empire in Constantinople and John Malalas from the eastern half of the Roman Empire. This selection was made on the basis of two factors. On the one hand, the diversity of the authors' origins (Italy, Asia Minor, Syria) allowed a high yield from a comparative approach. On the other hand, the fact that all three were all at some point in time in the same city, namely Constantinople, could imply a certain unity in historiographical attitudes. First, after a short biography of the three authors (3.1.1.), this chapter will ascertain in general the common mechanisms of social cohesion and exclusion to which these authors were subjected in the creation of their networks; the structure of the administrative department will appear as the vital framework of social networking and interaction (3.1.2.-3.1.4.).

Second, a contextual study of erudite networks in sixth-century Constantinople will show that the resemblances between these authors are only the tip of the iceberg; their commonality is an indication and a result of a densely connected network of scholars, bureaucrats and politicians with shared erudite interests, and which

functioned around the "state university"[1] of Constantinople (3.2.1.).[2] This network appears to have revolved around two crucial yet undervalued individuals, namely the grammarian Priscian of Caesarea (3.2.1.) and Tribonian the legal scholar (3.2.2.1.). As a secondary result of this contextual study, this chapter will also show how this erudite network was more a factor of continuity in the transition from the rule of Anastasius I (ca. AD 431 – AD 518) to the rule of Justin I (AD 450 – AD 527) and Justinian I (AD 482 – AD 565), than that it was subject to a radical break. The opposition between Anastasius and Justinian will appear as a construct of the erudite discourse, and the reduction in secular intellectualism which is ascribed to Justinian will appear as a shift in the second part of his reign, which was heralded by the demise of Priscian and Tribonian in the 540s (3.2.3.). As such, the perceived decline of intellectual standards under Justinian has the characteristics of cultural unease: this decline is not necessarily grounded in reality, it was socially constructed and negotiated, and this negotiation was performed by a more or less socially coherent carrier group.

Third, this chapter will give a preliminary overview of the textual parallels between the three authors under scrutiny as an indication of this broadly shared culture of Roman erudition (3.3.) – these parallels and their comparative analyses will form the backbone of further chapters of this thesis, and are a prerequisite for the construction of cultural unease. Not only do we need a socially coherent carrier group for the negotiation of cultural unease, we also need to prove this group shared a common discourse for the expression of cultural unease.[3]

This chapter synthesises the profound research conducted on the theme of the commonality of erudite and political networks and related subjects.[4] Scholars such as M.S. Bjornlie, G. Greatrex and A. Kaldellis have already made a considerable case for the existence of this common intellectual culture on the level of political thought

---

[1] In order to avoid the controversies surrounding the precise nature of this "institution of higher education" (Kazhdan 1991: 2143), I shall use the term university as a conventional term.

[2] Some of these parallels between Procopius, Malalas, Lydus and Tribonian have been analysed by Greatrex (2016). "It is possible, moreover, that he (Procopius red.) deliberately leavened the final book of the Wars with explicit allusions to myths and earlier writers in an effort to please his public, thus rating closer to Malalas and the antiquarian interests prominent in other contemporary writers, such as John Lydus and Justinian/Tribonian (in the prefaces to *Novels* of the 530s)." (Greatrex 2016: 179).

[3] A precedent in coupling textual parallels to the acquaintance of historical characters can be found in the analysis of the connections between Jordanes and Cassiodorus made by Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 15): "Admittedly, textual contacts do not prove personal contact, but unless one makes unrealistic assumptions about a vast and fast circulation of books in Late Antiquity, the textual borrowings, especially from the recently completed *Historia Tripartita*, can only be explained by Jordanes' acquaintance with Cassiodorus.".

[4] For a useful *status quaestionis* with bibliography, see Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 16).

and historiographical culture.[5] The works of J. Caimi, T.F. Carney and C. Kelly have proved groundbreaking for the study of the sixth-century bureaucratic culture, with special attention to the oeuvre of John Lydus and Cassiodorus.[6] For an assessment of the former, the study of Maas is invaluable, whereas for the latter I was fortunate to contribute to an elaborate tradition of research on the life and works of Cassiodorus. The subject of Malalas, his work and intellectual affinities has received the attention of a developing field of study.[7]

Before starting with the analysis, I shall give a list of the types of evidence which are used to ascertain a connection between different persons.[8] The dedication of literary works was a means by which an author could connect himself to the imperial court or a person of power.[9] The membership of a certain institution is also an indication of connectedness. A third type of evidence is the mention an author makes of a person or another author. Reversely, with the necessary caveats, the systematically not mentioning of a person in an account where the mention of this person would be inevitable, i.e. a deliberate silence, is also an indication of a negative connection between a person and the author. Fourth, the inclusion of the works of an author into a corpus or anthology by another author could be seen as an indication of a connection. Although in most cases, the exact pinpointing of acquaintances is regrettably impossible for a want of specific types of evidence, the accumulation of circumstantial evidence makes it almost impossible for different persons not to have known each other – this type of argument therefore has been used by different scholars of the sixth century such as Kaldellis and Bjornlie to establish interpersonal connections.[10]

---

[5] Carney (1971b: 47, 77, 100), Bjornlie (2013: 82-123, more specifically 82-85). "The manner in which the authors of this period referred to each other either explicitly, indirectly or thematically betrays a definite pattern of critique and polemical riposte, suggesting a dynamic political environment in which writers were aware of the consequences of political ideology. Communicating through the correspondences of themes was a particularly important style of writing for authors of sixth-century Constantinople.", "Although one might identify different social and political contexts and aims for Zosimus, Procopius, John Lydus and Jordanes, the tangible recurrence of specific themes in their works attests to a political culture that was not entirely submissive to the idea of the emperor as the embodiment of the state." (Bjornlie 2013: 83, 122). Greatrex (2016). For the existence of "pagan networks" in the sixth century, see Kaldellis (2003; 2005b; 2013). On the affinities between Lydus and Procopius, see Kaldellis (2003; 2004; 2005b), between Lydus and Simplicius, see Kaldellis (2004, 2005b), and between Lydus and Zosimus, see Kaldellis (2003). For the common tradition of literary and intellectual expertise in bureaucracy (Maas 1992: 29).
[6] Caimi (1984), Carney (1971), Kelly (2004).
[7] See below, chapter 3.1.1. (pp. 36-43 of this dissertation). For the links between John Malalas and his contemporaries in the literary and erudite field specifically, see Scott (1990b).
[8] Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen summarise the criteria for assessing acquaintances in sixth-century Constantinople: "Shared interests, geographical origin and social network, then, were three important elements shaping relationships in the complex social make-up of sixth-century Constantinople." (Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2017: 16).
[9] Bjornlie (2013: 48-49).
[10] For example, Kaldellis (2003: 311) states that Zosimus and John Lydus most possibly knew each other on the basis of their being contemporaries and mutual interests. Likewise, he links Simplicius and John Lydus to Procopius on the basis of the same arguments. For the analysis of a broad network of politically interested authors, see Bjornlie (2013: 82-123).

## 3.1. Cassiodorus, John Malalas and John Lydus

### 3.1.1. Three Contemporaries

Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator (ca. AD 485[11] – ca. AD 585)[12] served under the Ostrogothic king Theodoric and his successors[13] until the collapse of the kingdom under the Byzantine armies (AD 535 – ca. AD 540). During his long bureaucratic career, Cassiodorus functioned as member of a core of trusted individuals and advisers to the Ostrogothic king.[14] He started his career in his mid to late teens, serving as a *consiliarius*,[15] or, legal assistant, to his father, who served as Praetorian Prefect from around AD 503.[16] In his function as *Consiliarius*, Cassiodorus impressed king Theodoric with his rhetorical skill, a feat to which he owed his first real advancement in the Ostrogothic administration:[17]

> "He was still a very young man [*adeo iuvenis*] when he became *consiliarius* to his father, the praetorian prefect and patrician Cassiodorus, and delivered a highly eloquent oration in praise of Theodoric, king of the Goths; he was made quaestor by the king".[18]

From ca. AD 507 to AD 511, Cassiodorus acted as quaestor, being active in legal drafting for the government and acting as Theodoric's ghostwriter. Cassiodorus was around 21 tot 23 years old in this period.[19] In AD 514, in his mid to late twenties, Cassiodorus was awarded the dignity of the consulship.[20] For the period AD 511

---

[11] Cassiodorus was born between AD 484 and AD 490 (O'Donnell 1979: 23).

[12] An overview of the life, career, and works of Cassiodorus can be found in Schanz (1920: 92-95), Carney (1971b: 97-99), O'Donnell (1979), Giardina (2016: 22-25), Bjornlie (2013: 16-19; 2017: 434-438), Lozovsky (2016: 322-324).

[13] For an overview of the Ostrogothic administration, see Giardina (2006: 47-71), Bjornlie (2016).

[14] As can be glanced also from Cassiodorus' descriptions of court life in *Var*.Praef.8, IX.24.8, IX.25.7-9. See Carney (1971b: 110), O'Donnell (1979: 27-28), Bjornlie (2013: 28; 2017: 35).

[15] Van de Vyver (1931: 247-248), Carney (1971b: 97-98), O'Donnell (1979: 24), Giardina (2006: 22), Lozovsky (2016: 322), Bjornlie (2017: 434).

[16] Cassiodorus 3 *PLRE* II.264-265. Cassiodorus ascended to this dignity not earlier than AD 501 (O'Donnell 1979: 19, 23), (Lozovsky 2016: 322). For a short introduction to the career of Cassiodorus senior, see Van de Vyver (1931: 247-249). See also Carney (1971b: 97), Bjornlie (2017: 434). In the east, a cousin of the Cassiodori, Heliodorus, also had a splendid career as Praetorian Prefect, as we can read in letter I.4 of the *Variae*. Yet, as this character is nowhere else attested, we can surmise that this Heliodorus was a part of the family history (Carney 1971b: 97, n. 2).

[17] Van de Vyver (1931: 248), Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 19, 21, 34-35, 57-58), Giardina (2006: 22), Bjornlie (2017: 434). Van de Vyver also pointed to the influence of Cassiodorus' father in his obtaining the quaestorship at a young age (Van de Vyver 1931: 247, 250).

[18] "iuvenis adeo, dum patris Cassiodori patricii et praefecti praetorii consiliarius fieret et laudes Theoderici regis Gothorum facundissime recitasset, ab eo quaestor est factus" *Ordo Generis Cassiodororum*, 20-23 (Viscido 1992: 40), trans. O'Donnell (1979: 21).

[19] Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 22, 58), Giardina (2006: 10, 22), Bjornlie (2013: 17; 2017: 434), Lozovsky (2016: 322-323).

[20] Van de Vyver (1931: 249), Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 20, 24), Giardina (2006: 10-11, 24), Lozovsky (2016: 322-323), Bjornlie (2017: 434).

to AD 523, there is no evidence for Cassiodorus' holding any office,[21] but from AD 523 to AD 527, Cassiodorus acted as *magister officiorum*[22] - although he did continue to perform some tasks pertaining to the quaestorship, which indicates his sustained interest in this office.[23] Treading in his father's footsteps, Cassiodorus saw the culmination of his service with his appointment to the office of praetorian prefect of Italy in AD 533, an office which he held until AD 537 or 538.[24]

During his long political career, he used, as many colleagues, his pen to further his political ambitions. He wrote panegyrics,[25] a *Chronicle* in 519[26] and a lost *Gothic History*.[27]

Apart from his political activities, Cassiodorus was mainly concerned with the preservation of educational standards. Already during his service in the Ostrogothic state he conceived of a translation programme of logical and mathematical works, and he had a keen interest in medicine and architecture.[28] During his term as praetorian prefect he and Pope Agapetus tried to raise funds for a Christian school of higher learning at the city of Rome.[29] This Christian school of higher learning[30] aimed at combining profane and spiritual Christian education.[31] A combined study of Greek and Latin Church fathers would serve to establish the city of Rome as an authority in Christian education. These particular plans for a Christian school of higher learning at Rome are framed within the generally felt need at the time to establish a Christian form of higher learning.[32] It materialised elsewhere in the *Didaskaleion* at Alexandria, the biblical School of Nisibis, and the university at Constantinople.[33] These plans were abandoned due to the Gothic wars.

---

[21] O'Donnell (1979: 24-25), Giardina (2006: 11).

[22] Van de Vyver (1931: 247), Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 26, 61-62), Giardina (2006: 24-25), Lozovsky (2016: 322-323), Bjornlie (2017: 435).

[23] Van de Vyver (1931: 250), Giardina (2006: 9, 22). See *Var.* IX.24.6 and IX.25.8 (O'Donnell 1979: 26-27, 62).

[24] See *Var.* IX.24-25. Van de Vyver (1931: 247, 252), Momigliano (1966: 193), Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 26, 30-31, 55, 63-66), Giardina (2006: 25), Lozovsky (2016: 323), Bjornlie (2017: 435).

[25] O'Donnell (1979: 33-36), Vessey (2004: 14), Giardina (2006: 11), Vitiello (2006, 2015), Lozovsky (2016: 323).

[26] Mommsen (1894: 109-161), Schanz (1920: 95-96), Van de Vyver (1931: 249), Momigliano (1966: 191), Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 25, 36-43), Vessey (2004: 14), Klaassen (2010), Procee (2014), Lozovsky (2016: 323), Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 14-15), Bjornlie (2017: 435).

[27] Mommsen (1882), Schanz (1920: 96-97), Van de Vyver (1931: 249, 257-258), Momigliano (1966: 191-199), Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 43-53), Barnish (1984), Croke (1987), Christensen (2002), Vessey (2004: 14), Giardina (2006: 11), Lozovsky (2016: 323), Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 2, 9, 19), Bjornlie (2017: 435).

[28] Cracco Ruggini (2008: 30-31) gives an elucidating sketch of Cassiodorus' scientific activities during his political career.

[29] Van de Vyver (1931: 252, 278), Momigliano (1966: 193), O'Donnell (1979: 31), Gribomont (1985: 145), Vessey (2004: 24-27), (Bjornlie 2013: 15), Lozovsky (2016: 339-340).

[30] For a short discussion of this enterprise, see Halporn and Vessey (2004: 24-27).

[31] Weissengruber (1993: 69-70), Peretto (1993: 220).

[32] Peretto (1993: 217).

[33] Fuchs (1926: 5), Peretto (1993: 218), Vessey (2004: 25). The biblical school of Nisibis was furthermore an explicit source of inspiration to Cassiodorus (Van de Vyver 1931: 259).

At the end of his service he compiled the *Variae*, a collection of state letters in twelve books.[34] The treatise *On the Soul* was appended as a thirteenth book to the *Variae*.[35] Cassiodorus wrote these state letters on behalf of King Theodoric, his successors, and on his own account as praetorian prefect. The encyclopaedic digressions in these letters also betray Cassiodorus' erudite and didactical interests.[36] The date of the compilation and rewriting of the *Variae* has been posited recently by Bjornlie between to AD 540 and the mid-540s, which would imply that Cassiodorus revised and completed his collection in the city of Constantinople.[37] Indeed, after the toppling of the Ostrogothic regime,[38] Cassiodorus went to Constantinople, either of his own free will, as a refugee, or as a prisoner of war with the captured Ostrogothic king Witigis and the remainder of his court.[39] He also worked on his monumental *Commentary on the Psalms* in Constantinople[40] and finished his *Historia Tripartita* between AD 544/545 and 551/552 in the same city – a historical work which consists of translations of Greek Church historians.[41] His movements in the city must have come under close scrutiny by aristocratic émigrés from Italy in Constantinople, who followed the attempts at rehabilitation of Cassiodorus and other elements from the Ostrogothic court with a fair degree of hostile scepticism.[42] These hostile circumstances prompted Cassiodorus to write a short biographical pamphlet, the *Ordo generis Cassiodororum*, which he addressed to the Roman aristocrat Cethegus.[43]

---

[34] Schanz (1920: 97-99), Fridh (1965: 8-17), Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 55-102), Lozovsky (2016: 323-324).

[35] Schanz (1920: 100-101), Van de Vyver (1931: 253), Momigliano (1966: 193), Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 103-130), Vessey (2004: 19-22), Lozovsky (2016: 340), Bjornlie (2017: 442-443).

[36] Fridh (1965: 17-19), O'Donnell (1979: 88-89), Bjornlie (2013: 4; 2017: 439, 442-443), Lozovsky (2016: 324).

[37] Bjornlie (2013: 19-26, 32; 2017: 436). Although, it has to be said, that the *communis opinio* posited the date of the compilation of the *Variae* between AD 537 and AD 538 (Van de Vyver 1931: 252), (O'Donnell 1979), (Giardina 2006: 25).

[38] Vessey (2004: 14-15), Heydemann (2016: 36-40).

[39] Van de Vyver (1931: 254-260), Momigliano (1966: 193), O'Donnell (1979: 105-107), Barnish (1989: 158-165), Vessey (2004: 14-15), Bjornlie (2013: 17-18). On the evidence of Cassiodorus' stay in Constantinople, see Momigliano (1966: 191-193), O'Donnell (1979: 132-133).

[40] Schanz (1920: 101-103), Van de Vyver (1931: 254), Carney (1971b: 98), O'Donnell (1979: 32, 121-176), Lozovsky (2016: 340).

[41] For these translations Cassiodorus sough the assistance of a certain Epiphanius Scholasticus (*PRLE* III.446). See Bidez (1908), Schanz (1920: 106-107), Van de Vyver (1931: 264-265), Bieter (1938), Jones (1945), Laistner (1948), Hanslik and Jacob (1954), Szymanski (1955, 1963), Momigliano (1966: 188), Hanslik (1971), Weissengruber (1972), Ratti (2006), Bjornlie (2013: 22), Delacenserie (2016), Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 11-14).

[42] Bjornlie (2013: 30; 2017: 436), Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 18-19). An indication of the hostility which Cassiodorus must have confronted in Constantinople is the general silence on him in contemporary Greek accounts of this period (Bjornlie 2013: 36) – in spite of his proximity to the Gothic court and other key players of contemporary (geo)-politics. Apart from some references, Cassiodorus apparently was not deigned worthy of mention in the accounts of the Gothic wars of, for instance Procopius (Bjornlie 2013: 20, 36), who does not mention him although both are at the same time in Constantinople (Bjornlie 2013: 102).

[43] See chapter 3.2.2.2. (pp. 72-75 of this dissertation).

After his stay (or detention) in Constantinople (c. AD 540 – 554),[44] Cassiodorus fully concentrated himself on his own Christian didactical project within the confines of his Vivarium monastery in the South of Italy, where he composed, in addition to various other didactical works, translations, commentaries and his *Institutions on Divine and Secular Learning*, the last being a theoretical outline of Christian higher learning.[45] Through the person of Cassiodorus, the *Vivarium* monastery benefitted from a close connection with the scriptoria of Ravenna for its scientific and practical texts.[46]

One of the main causes of the elusiveness surrounding the person of John Malalas (ca. AD 490 – ca. AD 570)[47] is the lack of direct biographical evidence. Since the publication of the seminal edited volume *Studies in John Malalas* in 1990,[48] scholars, mainly from the Anglo-Saxon tradition, have projected several aspects of Malalas' *Chronographia* onto the person of John Malalas in the hopes of filling this gap. B. Croke used the following characteristics of the chronicle to make a reconstruction of Malalas' life.[49] The chronicle's initial focus on the city of Antioch and its administrative jargon[50] suggest that John Malalas was a rhetorically trained bureaucrat[51] active in Antioch, possibly in one of the *scrinia* of the *comes orientis*,[52] who was a subordinate of the praetorian prefect of the east. The abrupt change in focus in the chronicle, from Antioch to Constantinople, implies that Malalas at some point in time commuted to the capital of the eastern Roman Empire[53] - perhaps after the reform of the diocese of the *Oriens*. This shift also seems to imply that John Malalas wrote his chronicle in at least two redactions, one executed in Antioch and one in Constantinople.[54]

---

[44] Momigliano (1966: 193), O'Donnell (1979: 131, 135).
[45] Schanz (1920: 103-105), Peretto (1993: 219).
[46] Cracco Ruggini (2008: 29): "It seems therefore justified to postulate the existence of close textual and cultural connections through Cassiodorus between book production at Ravenna and the Calabrian monastic establishment of Vivarium. As early as the *Variae* and later on in the *Institutiones*, (…) Cassiodorus showed that he knew and set store by many of these same texts".
[47] Croke (1990), Thurn (2000: 1-4), Jeffreys (2003: 501-508), Treadgold (2007a: 235-240).
[48] Meier et al. (2016: 9-11).
[49] Croke (1990).
[50] Scott (1981).
[51] On the social status of John Malalas and its implications on his Bildung, see Croke (1990: 11), Thurn (2000: 1-4), Thesz (2016: 28-29). According to Treadgold (2007a), John Malalas was part of the lower echelons of the bureaucracy, whereas Croke (1990) and Scott (2017: 218) consider John Malalas to have served in the higher bureaucracy.
[52] On Malalas' activity in one of the *scrinia* of the *Comes Orientis*, see Jeffreys (1990b: 200, 208), Thurn (2000: I), Métivier (2006: 156), Treadgold (2007a: 236-237), Bjornlie (2013: 117-118), Greatrex (2016: 175-176), Thesz (2016: 28), Carrara and Gengler (2017: 15), Kulikowski (2017: 212), Borsch and Radtki-Jansen (2017: 238-240). The *scrinia* of the *Comes Orientis* furthermore furnished John Malalas with source materials for his historiographical work (Greatrex 2016: 175-176).
[53] On his relocation from Antioch to Constantinople between AD 528 and AD 540, see Treadgold (2007a: 238), Bjornlie (2013: 117), Kulikowski (2017: 211).
[54] On the redactions of the chronicle, see Croke (1990: 17-25), Treadgold (2007a: 239-240).

Since the 1990s, scholars have elaborated on this inferential hypothesis to flesh out Malalas' biography.[55] E. Jeffreys proposed, in addition to the reform of the diocese of the *Oriens* in AD 535,[56] the Sassanian sack of the city of Antioch in 540 as a possible trigger for Malalas' relocation to Constantinople.[57] W. Treadgold in his work[58] took this inferential hypothesis one step further, by assuming that detailed mentions of specific officials from Antioch in the chronicle implied that John Malalas functioned in their retinue on missions to Constantinople; in the periods AD 512-519/520, 522-523, and 527, John Malalas was, according to Treadgold, possibly present in Constantinople – first in the service of praetorian prefect Marinus,[59] second in the retinue of the new urban prefect Theodotus,[60] and third on an embassy with *comes orientis* Zacharias.[61] Marinus was a native of Apamia and was called a Syrian in the sources,[62] whereas Zacharias hailed from Tyre.[63] The connection of John Malalas with these officials and his own origins from Syria place him within a network with Syrian and Near Eastern interests.

It is the *communis opinio* that John Malalas only had the slightest acquaintance with the Latin language.[64] Malalas' lack of Latin proficiency could be interpreted as a bar to his administrative career prospects in Constantinople, as the Latin language was still a cherished aspect of late antique bureaucratic practice. However, in my opinion, Malalas' not knowing Latin does not need to impede the possibility of him being enrolled in the administration. He could have flourished in the administration through his local network, and the swift change from Latin to Greek in Justinian's legislation shows that in practice Greek, and not Latin, had become the dominant language in the administration.[65]

---

[55] See the references in the notes above and below.

[56] On the reform of the diocese of the *Oriens* in AD 535, see Honoré (1978: 59), Jeffreys (1990b: 208, 2003: 505), Kelly (2004: 71-76).

[57] Jeffreys (2003: 505).

[58] Treadgold (2007a: 237-238).

[59] Marinus 7 (*PLRE* II 726-728). Jeffreys (1990b: 169, 209). "It would not seem unlikely that Malalas gained this information from Marinus himself, a fellow Syrian, who had begun his career in the Constantinopolitan bureau of the comes Orientis, rose to become praetorian prefect for the East (between 512 and 515 and again in 519) and had died by 539 (…). Malalas could have met Marinus in Constantinople, perhaps in 520 (…)." (Jeffreys 1990b: 209).

[60] Theodotus qui et Colocynthius 11 (*PLRE* II 1104-1105).

[61] Zacharias 3, possibly identical with Zacharias 2 (*PLRE* II 1194). Treadgold (2007a: 237-238).

[62] *PLRE* II 726.

[63] *PLRE* II 1194.

[64] Jeffreys (1990a: 60, n. 40, 1990b: 196), Scott (1990b: 73, 80), Agusta-Boularot (2006: 132, 134), Rochette (2012: 330). On the second-hand knowledge of his Latin sources see Jeffreys (1990b: 171), Liebeschuetz (2004: 149).

[65] One could compare Malalas' situation with current bureaucratic practice in Belgium. Whereas the law stipulates the requirement of Dutch-French bilingualism for administrators in some departments, in reality, several high-ranking bureaucrats have only a flimsy acquaintance with Dutch, or French. For a *status quaestionis* on Latin in sixth-century Constantinople, see chapter 4.3.2. (pp. 167-173 of this dissertation). On the vicissitudes of Latin in Justinian's legislation under Tribonian and John of Cappadocia, see chapter 3.2.2.1. (pp. 67-71 of this dissertation).

It must be clear that the inferential hypothesis is a makeshift for a want of any direct biographical data and must be used with caution. Therefore, the careful inferences posited by Croke are the framework within which one must operate carefully for further fleshing out Malalas' biography. As these inferences have been acquiesced to in previous scholarship, I will, indeed, in this dissertation assume these biographical inferences to be correct. John Malalas was thus a historian from Antioch with a local Syrian network who between AD 528 and AD 540[66] relocated to Constantinople and made a there a second or later redaction of his historical work.[67] John Malalas wrote a *Chronographia* in eighteen books, of which the first six are accounts on biblical and classical mythology. Book Seven focuses on the earliest history of Rome, whereas book Eight has the history of Alexander the Great and the Diadochi. Book Nine deals with the end of the Roman republic, and from Book Ten on we have an account centred on the Roman emperors.[68] The text of the *Chronographia* as we have it now, is, regrettably, a truncated version which was subjected to an unknown number of revisions and abbreviations in later Byzantine redactions.[69]

Malalas' relocation to Constantinople is furthermore plausible as it was not only triggered by the more or less dramatic changes in the political and administrative landscape of the sixth-century Roman world. For his departure from his local context also conforms to a general pattern within the social dynamics of the later Roman Empire. In Constantinople, there was a constant influx of lawyers and administrators from the provinces who, also through their local networks, hoped to attract patronage and an office in the imperial administration by a display of their literary prowess.[70] We can surmise the same was the case for Cassiodorus, when he took his *Variae* to edit in Constantinople, and for John Malalas, when he entered Constantinople with the first redaction of his *Chronographia* in his hand. For the furtherance of their historiographical, literary and didactic ambitions, they would have found a very fertile ground in Constantinople indeed.

Sixth-century Constantinople was the theatre of an intense debate on and remoulding of the erudite memory of Rome and the Roman Empire. One of the pivotal figures in these debates is the professor of Latin, civil servant and polymath John Lydus (ca. AD 490 – ca. AD 565),[71] hereafter also called Lydus. Lydus was born around 490[72] and left in 511 his hometown of Philadelphia in Lydia to test his

---

[66] Treadgold (2007a: 238), Bjornlie (2013: 117).

[67] On the different reductions of Malalas' chronicle, see also Treadgold (2007a: 239-240). Throughout the entire work, we can discern a unity of scope and intent which makes it clear that one single author controlled the whole of the work through all of its redactions (Jeffreys 1990b: 216).

[68] A synopsis of Malalas' *Chronographia* can be found in Treadgold (2007a: 242-246).

[69] Jeffreys (1990b: 168), Greatrex (2016), Carrara and Gengler (2017: 17-18), Kulikowski (2017: 203, 205, n. 10).

[70] Rapp (2005).

[71] For introductions to the life and works of John Lydus see Momigliano (1966: 187), Carney (1971b: 3-19), Bandy (1983, ix-xxxviii, 2013, 1-29), Maas (1992: 28-37), Kelly (2004: 11-17), Schamp (2006a: xiii-lxxvi), Treadgold (2007a: 258-264), Turfa (2012: 8-11), Bjornlie (2013: 113-117, more specifically 114-115).

[72] Carney (1971b: 3).

luck at the city of Constantinople.[73] With the help of Zoticus,[74] a patron from Lydia, he secured a posting in the praetorian prefecture of the east – his choice for an administrative career path can be interpreted as a conscious avoidance of connecting himself to a high official of the imperial consistory.[75] Lydus owed his swift promotion to a local network of persons with their origins in Lydia, who apparently backed fellow Lydians in the capital. Next to his Lydian patron Zoticus, we can also mention his cousin Ammianus.[76] Lydus attributed his initial successes not only to Zoticus but also to Emperor Anastasius I, whose intellectualist policies he praises in his *De Magistratibus*.[77] During his long career in this department, he rose to the prestigious high office of *cornicularius*.[78] His learnedness attracted the attention of no less than Emperor Justinian himself, who invited him to deliver an encomium around 532 and commissioned a history of his Persian wars.[79] As in the case of Cassiodorus, Lydus' encomium impressed the ruler and resulted in a promotion, this time in the field of academia:

> "When the emperor, however, had learned of my vigilance with respect to learning, he first of all deemed me worthy of addressing a panegyric to him (…) When the emperor wrote a pragmatic sanction to the prefect with reference to me, he employed words such as the following. (…) After the one who was heading the city prefecture at that time had confirmed this and had set aside for me a place assigned to teachers in the court of the capitol, I began to teach".[80]

Indeed, perhaps around 543, under the urban prefecture of Gabriel, Lydus was appointed to a chair of Latin language and literature at the university of Con-

[73] Schamp (2006a: xvii-xxi).
[74] John Lydus composed a now lost verse panegyric on Zoticus to thank him for his patronage, *Magistr.* III.27 (Bandy 1983: xii), (Maas 1992: 31), (Kelly 2004: 44, 53), (Schamp 2006a: xxvii-xxix, lxxvii-lxxviii), (Treadgold 2007a: 259). Other persons who were part of Lydus' network were Empress Theodora (Carney 1971b: 10), Sergius (Kelly 2004: 45), Hephaestus (Carney 1971b: 11), (Kelly 2004: 45), Peter the Patrician (Carney 1971b: 10, 41) and Phocas (Carney 1971b: 10), (Bandy 1983: xxi), (Maas 1992: 33-34, 78-82), (Kaldellis 2003: 304-305), (Kaldellis 2004: 11), (Kelly 2004: 45, 53-56), Schamp (2006a: xxxvii).
[75] Carney (1971b: 9), Bjornlie (2013: 47).
[76] Caimi (1984:12-13). On Ammianus see Maas (1992: 31), Kelly (2004: 45), Schamp (2006a: xxviii), Treadgold (2007a: 259).
[77] *Magistr.* III.26.1-4; Carney (1971b: 41), Maas (1992: 28-29), Schamp (2006c: ci-cxxiii), Bjornlie (2013: 114). John's choice of studies was well attuned to Anastasius' policies (Carney 1971b: 3).
[78] Schamp (2006a: xlvi).
[79] Caimi (1984: 59-65), Schamp (2006a: xxxviii-xliii, lxxviii-lxxix). This work was most possibly sponsored by the patrician Phocas. See *Magistr.* III.28 (Maas 1992: 33), (Kaldellis 2013: 362).
[80] "γνοὺς δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν ἐμὴν περὶ τοὺς λόγους ἀγρυπνίαν πρῶτον μὲν ἐγκώμιον εἰπεῖν με πρὸς αὐτὸν κατηξίωσεν (…) Πραγματικὸν πρὸς τὴν ἐπαρχότητα γράφων ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπ' ἐμοὶ τοιούτοις ἐχρήσατο ῥήμασιν· (…) τούτοις ἐπιψηφισαμένου τοῦ τηνικαῦτα τὴν πολιαρχίαν ἰθύνοντος καὶ τόπον διδασκάλοις ἀπονενεμημένον ἀφορίσαντός μοι ἐπὶ τῆς Καπιτωλίδος αὐλῆς, ἐχόμενος τῆς στρατείας, ἐπαίδευον" *Magistr.* III.28-29 (Schamp 2006c: 78-79), trans. Bandy (1983: 177, 179).

stantinople.[81] He composed two of his erudite treatises, *On the Months* (*De Mensibus*) and *On Portents* (*De Ostentis*), during his early teaching, and dedicated them to Gabriel, the urban prefect of Constantinople.[82] Internal evidence points to the *De Mensibus* being composed before the *De Ostentis*,[83] although Lydus might have worked on them simultaneously.[84] *Termini post quem* for the latter treatise are 539-540.[85] The year 543, which saw Gabriel as urban prefect, is a *terminus post quem* for both treatises.[86] The tract *De Mensibus* deals with the Roman chronology.[87] The treatise *De Ostentis* is a compilation on various portents, with translations of Lydus from Latin into Greek.[88] After his retirement from the prefecture in 551-552,[89] he embarked on an ambitious treatise *De Magistratibus*, or, *On the Magistracies of the Roman State*, in which he described different military and civil institutions of the Romans, from their mythological origins up to the present.[90] He probably also continued his teaching after his retirement from office, and died between AD 557 and 561.[91]

As these short biographical sketches show, the three authors had similar social profiles. All three were connected, mutatis mutandis,[92] to the same governmental department of the praetorian prefecture.[93] They exhibited a literary, erudite and educational interest in the distant past of Rome and the Roman Empire and used this for the purpose of furthering their personal careers. More importantly, it is quite possible that these authors were at some point in time in Constantinople; John Malalas *possibly* from AD 512 to 519/520 and AD 522 to AD 523, and later from AD 535 or AD 540 onward to the end of his life, Cassiodorus from ca. AD 540 to AD 554. Lydus was a permanent resident of the city from AD 511 onwards, with the

---

[81] *Magistr.* III.26.1-III.30.10. See Chastagnol (1960: 65 n. 58), Caimi (1984: 79-81), Maas (1992: 35-36), Kelly (2004: 13), Schamp (2006a: xliii-xlv), Domenici (2007: 9), Bjornlie (2013: 114). Treadgold (2007a: 261) proposed the earlier date of around AD 533 for Lydus' professorship.

[82] Carney (1971b: 11), Caimi (1984: 66-68, 286), Maas (1992: 10), Kaldellis (2003: 313), Schamp (2006a: xvi-xvii), Domenici (2007: 9), Treadgold (2007a: 261).

[83] Carney (1971b: 65), Caimi (1984: 66-68), Schamp (2006a: lxxx-lxxxiii).

[84] Caimi (1984: 66-68).

[85] Caimi (1984: 66-68), Schamp (2006a: lxxix-lxxx). According to Carney (1971b: 10-11), the *De Ostentis* was composed about AD 540, possibly in Cyprus.

[86] Schamp (2006a: lxxix-lxxx). Carney (1971b: 10) dated the *De Mensibus* in the 530's.

[87] On *De Mensibus* see Caimi (1984: 68-71), Schamp (2006a: lxxxiv-xcix).

[88] On *De Ostentis* see Caimi (1984: 71-79), Maas (1992: 107), Schamp (2006a: xcix-cxv).

[89] On Lydus' retirement see Carney (1971b: 11), Caimi (1984: 81-83), Schamp (2006a: xlv-xlix). The treatise was written after his retirement (Caimi 1984: 81-83), and internal evidence points to the *De Magistratibus* having been written after the *De Ostentis* (Schamp 2006a: lxxxiii). Carney (1971b: 1) dated the *De Magistratibus* to the 550's, with Books I and II written before, and Book III after Lydus' retirement (Carney 1971b: 11). Schamp (2006a: xxxi) placed the composition of the *De Magistratibus* after AD 545. In an elaborate analysis, which also treated the hypothesis of Lydus writing under Justin II, Caimi concluded that the *De Magistratibus* was concluded not long after AD 552, probably in December AD 554 (Caimi 1984: 111-124).

[90] On *De Magistratibus* see Schamp (2006a: cxix-cxxxiii).

[91] Maas (1992: 11), Schamp (2006a: xlvi).

[92] Off course, we have to take into account that we can only *presume* that John Malalas worked in the prefecture, whereas Cassiodorus' prefecture in Ostrogothic Italy was not quite the same department as the prefecture in the eastern Roman Empire.

[93] The commonly accessible archives of the praetorian prefecture with official reports and despatches were furthermore common sources to our authors (Greatrex 2016: 175-176).

sole exception of a visit to Cyprus before AD 536.[94] Most significantly, both John Malalas and Cassiodorus were present in the capital at exactly the same time as Lydus began his teaching career (around AD 543).

Although we cannot determine with any certainty whether the three were acquainted, the estimates of the numbers of persons working in the praetorian prefecture plead in favour of civil servants in this department knowing each other. Procopius gave an estimate of 400 to 600 civil servants for each of the six departments, which would make approximately 5500 *scholarii* and 20000 civil servants in total for the city of Constantinople.[95] On the basis of estimates from the praetorian prefecture of Africa, the judicial side of the praetorian prefecture of the east would have around 1000 members of staff and the praetorian prefecture in total around 4000 members.[96] Carney gives an even smaller estimate of 2000 bureaucrats working for the praetorian prefect in Constantinople.[97]

A comparison with modern-day academia could prove illuminating; the 23rd International Conference of Byzantine Studies, organised in Belgrade (22nd – 27th of August 2016), hosted between 1000 and 1500 scholars, a number comparable to the number of civil servants working in the judicial side of the praetorian prefecture. Although it is quite impossible for each of these scholars to know each other, the chance of persons with the same interests, for instance, Russian epigraphy, getting acquainted, are fairly high. The chance of a senior scholar of Russian epigraphy at the height of his career not knowing colleagues in Russian epigraphy is very low – John Malalas was between 45 and 55 years when he entered Constantinople, Cassiodorus around 55, and Lydus was 50 years old by the time both Cassiodorus and John Malalas were his fellow residents in Constantinople. Furthermore, whereas the scholars present in Belgrade were in each other's company for only a week, the 1000 *Exceptores* worked for the whole of their careers in the same city and in the same building complexes. A further study of the social circumstances of the careers and lives of the three authors will reveal more profound parallels.

### 3.1.2. Common Social Backgrounds.

Although these authors hail from different parts of the former Roman Empire, their careers and lives were subjected to profoundly parallel mechanisms of social inclusion and exclusion. Before going to an analysis of the specific data on Constantinople's erudite networks, I shall give an overview of these patterns and mechanisms. After an analysis of common patterns of social mobility, the existence of a common competition between a higher and a lower branch of the elite, and the competition between different ethnic groups in the administration (3.1.2.), I will focus on the social and ideological dynamics which informed the departmental identities of the Roman administration (3.1.3.). These departmental identities will appear as a cluster of social and ideological factors; an interdepartmental competition etched itself on dynastic allegiances and crystallised in ideological debates on issues

---

[94] Carney (1971b: 3), Bandy (1983: xiv), Caimi (1984: 58-59), Maas (1992: 34), Schamp (2006a: xxxviii), Treadgold (2007a: 261).
[95] Bjornlie (2013: 45-46).
[96] Kelly (2004: 69).
[97] Carney (1971b: 4).

of symbolical significance such as the value of classical paideia, the republican roots of the Roman polity, the Latin language, the reunification of the empire and the use of Roman law. The break in style of government between Anastasius I on the one hand and Justin I and Justinian I on the other hand will appear as a construct of these departmental identities; in reality the policies of both dynasties showed a significant amount of continuity, a continuity which was mirrored in and supported by a continuity of erudite and bureaucratic networks (3.1.4.).

Cassiodorus, John Malalas and John Lydus advanced their careers through a common pattern of social mobility; the development of an intricate bureaucratic apparatus in Late Antiquity required a constant influx of literary trained lawyers and bureaucrats from the provinces.[98] These persons hailed from local elites and received their primary education in their region. They acquired some form of technical expertise or higher education in local centres such as Alexandria and Athens for philosophy, or Beirut for legal studies. They afterwards went to Constantinople to complete their education[99] and to pursue personal advancement by enrolling in the administration.[100] For this personal advancement, the bureaucrat in question was supported by a local network of members of the same home region who backed each other in the furthering of their careers.[101] Attracting a powerful patron for the commission of literary works was a good means to successfully commence or to speed up the ascent through the echelons of the administration.[102] John Lydus cleverly connected his literary output to persons of significance; he wrote a panegyric on praetorian prefect Zoticus, an encomium and history for Emperor Justinian, and dedicated two of his erudite treatises to urban prefect Gabriel. John Malalas either worked without a patron, or possibly attracted the attention of the *magister officiorum* Hermogenes.[103] Also Cassiodorus received many literary commissions from the Ostrogothic kings[104] and addressed his pamphlet *Ordo generis* in Constantinople to the Roman aristocrat Cethegus. These mechanisms of patron-sponsored social betterment could be combined and repeated; John Lydus combined a bureaucratic with an academic career path, John Malalas and Cassiodorus first were recruited in their local contexts – Antioch for the former and Rome for the latter – before the vicissitudes in their life brought them to try their luck in Constantinople.

These movements of upward social mobility did not occur without any resistance from other parts of the managerial elite of the empire. All three authors had,

---

[98] Rapp (2005). On the system of education in Antiquity, see Marrou (1964). On the mechanisms of late antique provincial education, see Cribiore (1999; 2005; 2007).

[99] For instance, John Lydus attended classes of the philosopher Agapius in Constantinople before taking up his post in the administration; (Maas 1992: 31), (Kaldellis 2003: 305-306), (Kelly 2004: 11), Schamp (2006a: xxi-xxvii).

[100] Kelly (2004: 101), Rapp (2005: 377-9), Bjornlie (2013: 42, 46-47). For similar social patterns of promotion via the legal profession see (Honoré 1978: 38-39).

[101] Rapp (2005: 390).

[102] Bjornlie (2013: 48-49), Kelly (2004: 52-53), Rapp (2005: 382-393).

[103] *PLRE* III 590-593 Hermogenes 1. Rapp (2005: 394-395) considers John Malalas to work without a patron. Jeffreys (1990b: 200, 209-210, 2003: 507-508), Treadgold (2007a: 239) and Greatrex (2016: 175-176) pinpoint to Hermogenes the *Magister Officiorum* as possible patron. Jeffreys (1990b: 209-210) and Borsch and Radtki-Jansen (2017: 240-249) even assume that Hermogenes was one of Malalas' informants.

[104] Bjornlie (2013: 17).

as members of a local middle class, to compete with the highest echelons of aristo-
cratic elites. In Ostrogothic Italy, a Rome-based senatorial elite coexisted uneasily
with the Ostrogothic regime, which actively recruited families of the landed provin-
cial aristocracy, such as the Cassiodori, into the governmental palatine aristocracy.[105]
Also in the east, members of regional elites competed on arrival in Constantinople
with the established aristocracy for wealth, power and prestige.[106] This divide
between a 'high' and a 'low' elite proved very resistant. For instance, the animosity
between senatorial and palatine aristocracy in Ostrogothic Italy endured between
the émigrés from Italy in Constantinople, and partially explains the resistance Cassi-
odorus encountered in this city. Our three authors will exhibit different attitudes to-
wards these competitors; Cassiodorus will devise a set of awkward strategies to en-
gage with aristocratic émigrés from the west, whereas Lydus will maintain a curious
selective silence on some of these aristocrats – these attitudes will be treated in the
second section of this chapter (3.2.).

In addition to the competition between the lower and higher echelons of
the bureaucracy, the ethnicity of the bureaucrats was a source of social inclusion and
exclusion. Each bureaucrat was supported by a network of members of the same
home region for the furtherance of his ambitions. These ethnic groups competed
with each other for the enhancement of their own network and the enhancement of
their own home region in the process of imperial patronage and funding. This resul-
ted in a vicious competition between these ethnic groups. Indeed, in chapter 5 of this
dissertation, we shall see how the antiquarian writing of our three authors was con-
ditioned by a strong localist outlook, and that their texts were furthermore written
with a local network in mind. The different internal divides of the managerial elite
of the empire as sketched above etched themselves on the main means by which
erudite bureaucrats created, maintained and expanded their networks; the depart-
mental structure of Roman administration.

### 3.1.3. Departmental Identities

As the study by Kelly has shown, the different departments of the Roman
administration constituted dense clusters of interlocking identities and loyalties.[107]
Corporate identity and solidarity were the key mechanisms of sixth-century bureau-
crats to protect their interests from the hostile intentions of competitors.[108] The bind-
ing identity of a department was constituted on three interlocking levels of 1) inter-
departmental competition, 2) dynastic allegiances and 3) controversy surrounding
specific symbolical issues.

---

[105] Bjornlie (2013: 10, 16-17, 30, 127-134; 2017: 437).
[106] Bjornlie (2013: 42, 46-47).
[107] "Faced with the need to defend their own area of responsibility against the expansionary
claims of rival departments, officials with similar interests banded together for protection and
mutual support. They formed close-knit, self-interested cliques. Similarities among members
of a particular department were emphasized, differences between rivals exaggerated." (Kelly
2004: 29).
[108] Kelly (2004: 1, 18-26, 26-36, 51), Bjornlie (2013: 43-44, 46, 48-53). The disciplined corpo-
ratism of the administrative departments was, for instance, a means of defense against the
high offices of the Emperor's consistory (Bjornlie 2013: 58).

The department of the praetorian prefecture, of which our three authors were part, two of them in the east, and one of them in the west, was internally structured around an internal competition between the elder, legal branch of the prefecture, the so-called *exceptores*, and the more recently created financial branch of the *scriniarii*.[109] The former branch vaunted itself on its learnedness,[110] whereas the latter branch was less dependent on the cultivation of classical learning. Cassiodorus attained the dignity of praetorian prefect of Italy in Ostrogothic Italy. John Malalas was probably – on account of his connection to the praetorian prefect Marinus from the financial branch of the prefecture, and also on account of the level of his Greek – part of the financial side of the praetorian prefecture,[111] whereas John Lydus eloquently asserts his affiliation with the *exceptores* in his *De Magistratibus*. John's affiliation with the *exceptores* made him a harsh critic of Marinus, who rather promoted John Malalas instead of Lydus because the former was a fellow Syrian and colleague from the financial department, whereas Lydus was not.[112] Another notorious example of Lydus' defence of the *exceptores* is his vicious description of the praetorian prefect John of Cappadocia, who is attacked in *De Magistratibus* for his reforms against the legal branch of his department.[113] As a structuring principle of social networks, this interdepartmental divide etched itself on two other interlocking levels, namely the attitude to ideological issues, which will be treated later on, and different dynastic allegiances.

Throughout the accounts of John Lydus and other contemporaries, it seems to me that indeed a picture arises of a praetorian prefecture which was divided along the lines of dynastic allegiances. In general, the autocratic nature of late antique government made administrators derive their power from their proximity to the emperor. Conversely, in the case of a dynastic shift, the former proximity of a bureaucrat to the old dynasty could have deleterious effects on the administrator's career prospects under the new dynasty.[114] In such cases, the internal solidarity of an administrative department proved a vital defence mechanism against the hostile power of the Emperor.[115] Exactly the same mechanisms appear to have been involved in the shift from the reign of Anastasius I Dicorus (ruled AD 491 – 518)[116] to the reigns of Justin I (ruled AD 518 – 527) and Justinian I (ruled AD 527 – 565). Because of the lack of legitimacy of the new dynasty, the political insecurity which resulted from it, and the presence of scions of the house of Anastasius in the bureaucracy,[117] Justin and Justinian perceived the bureaucracy as a threat.[118] Justinian therefore curbed the

---

[109] Carney (1971b: 4-7, 83, 111, 123), Caimi (1984: 16), Kelly (2004: 12, 30-31), Schamp (2006a: xxx), Bjornlie (2013: 45, 53).
[110] Scott (1972: 445).
[111] Bjornlie (2013: 117-118). For his possible connections with the praetorian prefect Marinus, who also hailed from the financial branch of the prefecture, see Treadgold (2007a: 237).
[112] Schamp (2006a: xxx), Treadgold (2007a: 259-260).
[113] Honoré (1978: 13), Kelly (2004: 12, 35-36), Treadgold (2007a: 260).
[114] Kelly (2004: 194).
[115] Bjornlie (2013: 58), Kelly (2004: 191, 203-231).
[116] Meier (2009).
[117] Bjornlie (2013: 62).
[118] Carney (1971b: 92), Bjornlie (2013: 60-62).

power of the bureaucracy by enhancing its internal division.[119] Through the actions of John of Cappadocia, Justinian promoted the *scriniarii* of the praetorian prefecture – to the detriment and the chagrin of the *exceptores*.[120]

Indeed, the bureaucracy in general, and more specifically the praetorian prefecture, cherished the memory of Anastasius I for several reasons. Originating from the bureaucratic corps of *silentarii* himself,[121] Anastasius had a keen sense of administrative reform[122] and shared the conservative and antiquarian tendencies which bureaucrats from the *Exceptores* liked to cultivate.[123] In general, Anastasius' intellectual tastes were congenial to the bureaucratic mentality. Anastasius is therefore praised by John Lydus for his support of education, learning, and his plans to promote the state university[124] – these praises implicitly contrast Anastasius with Justinian and more specifically Justin, whose lack of learning was a current stumbling block.[125] More relevantly for the interests of the bureaucracy, Anastasius' origins and intellectualist tastes materialised in his recruitment of educated bureaucrats – which also was promising for Lydus' own career prospects.[126] A short look at a list[127] of promotions under Anastasius shows the intellectual profile of the candidates, and their connections to John of Lydia. Anastasius recruited legal scholars such as Leontius, praetorian prefect in 510, and member of the legal commission of Justinian.[128] Perhaps this is the same Leontius who contributed to the cycle of Agathias, by writing a poem on Gabriel, the urban prefect to whom Lydus dedicated some of his

---

[119] Procopius and John Lydus both deplore the decline of educated civil servants and contrast the sorry state of the bureaucracy under Justinian to Anastasius' benign policies (Kaldellis 2004: 9-10).

[120] Bjornlie (2013: 62-64). On Justinian's contempt for the bureaucracy as seen through his reforms enacted by John of Cappadocia, see Scott (1972: 451).

[121] Haarer (2006: 190). Anastasius' affiliation with the *Silentiarii* could also link him to Phocas, who was a *Silentiarius* before AD 526 (Lamma 1947: 86, n.2), Purpura (1976: 63, n. 37), (*PLRE* II.881). On Phocas, see below.

[122] Meier (2009: 118-137). On the popularity of these reforms see Bjornlie (2013: 62), Haarer (2006: 7).

[123] Lamma (1947: 81-82). An example of Anastasius' antiquarianism is his letter to the Roman senate in which he addressed a series of obsolete offices Haarer (2006: 100-101). Another example is his policy of conveying imperial favour by giving persons the honour of the consulship. This last example is off course in sharp opposition to Justinian, who eventually abolished the consulship altogether (Haarer 2006: 193), (Bjornlie 2013: 80).

[124] *Magistr.* III.47 (Kelly 2004: 37). On the literary educated bureaucracy under Anastasius, see Carney (1971b: 52-53).

[125] Honoré (1978: 5-30, more specific 24-26), Kaldellis (2004: 11-12), Treadgold (2007a: 260).

[126] Maas (1992: 28-29), Haarer (2006: 7, 190-193), Treadgold (2007a: 260). John Lydus praised Anastasius in *Magistr.* III.26.1-4 (Bjornlie 2013: 114), *Magistr.* III.47 (Kelly 2004: 37), (Haarer 2006: 5), and *Magistr.* III.50 (Scott 1972: 445, 446), (Kaldellis 2004: 9-10), (Haarer 2006: 190). In the last passage Anastasius is praised for his promotion of skilled intellectuals into the administration – which can also be interpreted as a veiled compliment of John Lydus for himself, who also started his career under Anastasius. On the Praetorian Prefecture under Anastasius and Marinus, see Caimi (1984: 211-230). On allusions to Anastasius in Lydus' *De Ostentis*, see Domenici (2007: 31).

[127] Haarer (2006: 191-192).

[128] *PLRE* II.672-673 Leontius 23.

works.[129] Anastasius also appointed the legal scholar Sergius, who assumed the praetorian prefecture in 517 and pleaded before as a barrister in the praetorian prefecture – the same Sergius is also praised in Lydus' *De Magistratibus*.[130] Also Lydus' principal patron Zoticus received the praetorian prefecture in 511-512 from Anastasius.[131] Other appointees of Anastasius were Polycarpus, Marinus and John the Paphlagonian, who will be discussed later on. Other persons related to Anastasius and his house were Julian of Egypt, who wrote several poems on the scions of Anastasius after the Nika revolt,[132] and Peter the Patrician.[133] Anastasius' active policy of intellectualist patronage and recruitment contrasted sharply to the reign of Justinian, which saw a drastic decline in imperial patronage of the literary culture.[134]

Indeed, as, amongst others, the study of Al. Cameron has shown,[135] Anastasius' popularity with the educated bureaucracy lingered on for several decades after his demise, and caused the newly elevated Emperor Justinian a fair share of worries. The memory of Anastasius and his moderate policies towards the Ostrogoths also became a cherished topic amongst the Ostrogoths themselves.[136] In Constantinople, these lingering allegiances combined with the rioting of the circus factions during the Nika revolt of 532 to form a serious threat to Justinian's rule and life.[137] What initially began as one of the many factional riots was soon supported by elements in the senate and the administration, who supported the house of Anastasius and saw the riots as a chance to express their resentment of Justinian.[138] The fact that Anastasius' nephew Hypatius was unwillingly proclaimed as successor to Justinian[139] indicated that the house of Anastasius was considered to be a workable alternative to Justinian, and that this house enjoyed a massive support in the administration and senate at least until 532.[140] The lingering presence of the house of Anastas-

---

[129] *Anth. Graec.* XVI.32 (Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron 1966: 14). Gabriel himself also contributed to the Cycle of Agathias (Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron 1966: 11), Caimi (1984: 285-286), (Schamp 2006a: xvi). On Gabriel, see chapter 3.2.1. (pp. 54-65 of this dissertation).

[130] *PLRE* II.994-995 Sergius 7, (Kelly 2004: 45).

[131] *PLRE* II.1206-1207 Zoticus. *Magistr.* III.26; Carney (1971b: 9), Bandy (1983: x), Kelly (2004: 12, 44, 53), (Treadgold 2007a: 259), Meier (2009: 134).

[132] See chapter 3.2.1 (pp. 54-65 of this dissertation) and the appendix (pp. 331-332 of this dissertation). Al. Cameron (1978: 263-267), Schamp (2006a: xxxix-xl).

[133] *PLRE* III.994-998 Petrus 6. See chapter 3.2.2.2. (pp. 72-75 of this dissertation). Al. Cameron (1978: 273), Meier (2009: 65-67, 186).

[134] Rapp (2005: 385).

[135] Al. Cameron (1978).

[136] Totila mints coins in the name of "The long-since deceased pro-Gothic Anastasius", and Anastasius is exemplified as an example of compromise in Totila's letter to Justinian (Haarer 2006: 103). In contrast, Procopius depicts Justinian's military ambition as a cause of misery for the empire (Bjornlie 2013: 106).

[137] Leppin (2011: 142-148).

[138] Lamma (1947: 87).

[139] Lamma (1947: 90).

[140] Al. Cameron (1976a: 280), Al. Cameron (1978: 263-264), Honoré (1978: 54), Bjornlie (2013: 74, 77). The riots were presented by Marcellinus Comes explicitly as an attempt at coup by the heirs of Anastasius (Bjornlie 2013: 92), and the *Anonymus Valesianus* exhibits imperial propaganda to discredit the legitimacy of Anastasius' heirs in the wake of the Nika riots (Bjornlie 2013: 96).

ius in the administration and politics of the empire eventually urged Justinian to link his family with this solemn house.[141]

We can see this lingering allegiance to the house of Anastasius in the attention which different authors, of which also some of the three authors under scrutiny, devote in their erudite analyses to the late republican general Pompeius Magnus, or Pompey the Great (106 – 48 BC).[142] Pompey the Great was associated with the house of Anastasius for reasons of propaganda. The connections which allowed for this association were both Anastasius' and Pompey's victory over the Isaurians in Asia Minor, and the shared nomenclature; the father of Anastasius most possibly was called Pompeius, and the name Magnus recurs in different names of scions of Anastasius' house.[143] A revealing case is Cassiodorus' treatment of Pompey; in *Var.* IV. 51[144] he digresses on Pompey's theatre and derived the origin of the name Magnus from his greatness in building the theatre and in so helping to disseminate the theatrical arts in Rome. The same mechanism appears in letter VI.18, in which the name Magnus is derived from Pompey's greatness in dispensing food as *praefectus annonae*. If we consider that the name Magnus was a recurrent name in the house of Anastasius,[145] and if we also consider the senatorial interest of the period in genealogy with a flourish of polyonomy,[146] we can see in these details Flavius *Magnus* Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator doing antiquarian research on his own name, which also had the name of Pompey and of the house of Anastasius, Magnus. Apparently associating[147] with Anastasius was still useful political currency in the 540s when Cassiodorus was in Constantinople.

A third level onto which the interdepartmental divides[148] and dynastic allegiances of late antique networks of bureaucrats etched was the handling of different ideologically laden symbolical issues. One of these issues is the cultivation of the classical past and its pagan aspects[149] – whether or not the civil servants embracing the classical past were still pagan or not. Justinian's 'war on bureaucracy' used expressions of overt classicism as an indication of which pockets of bureaucratic conservative resistance should be curbed.[150] In defiance of these policies, a broad network of traditionalist civil servants cultivated the classical past – and lamented the

---

[141] Al. Cameron (1978: 267-269).

[142] Christodoros of Coptos; *Anth. Pal.* II.403-404, Priscian; *Laus* vv. 10-18, John of Lydia; *Mens.* IV.132, (Bandy IV.5), *Magistr.* I.38, II.1, II.21, Cassiodorus; *Var.* IV.51, VI.18, Malalas; *Chron.* VIII.29. On Pompey in Lydus' *De Ostentis*, see Domenici (2007: 30).

[143] Al. Cameron (1978: 295-263).

[144] O'Donnell (1979: 79).

[145] Al. Cameron (1978: 262).

[146] Barnish (1988: 148).

[147] Cassiodorus was very apt to associate himself handily with figures of ideological and political weight; for instance, in his *Ordo generis*, he also tries to associate himself with Symmachus and Boethius (Bjornlie 2013: 159-162).

[148] Kelly (2004: 30-31).

[149] Bjornlie (2013: 50-53), Kaldellis (2013: 352).

[150] Bjornlie (2013: 65-67). The closure of the Academy at Athens is a case in point; the fact that the closure of this pagan institution was not accompanied by a general purge of other known pagan cult centres in the empire such as Baalbek indicates that the closure of this institution was mainly a means to cripple the continuation of intellectualist and traditionalist bureaucratic networks. See chapter 5.4.2. (pp. 233-237 of this dissertation).

policies of Justinian.[151] Given this politicised context, the cultivation of the classical past was also intimately connected to tenets of republicanism and criticism of imperial rule.[152] The conservative outlook of the bureaucrats furthermore made specific emblematic aspects of the Roman legacy powerful tools for the enhancement of the prestige and power of their own network; the Latin language, the legacy of unified empire and law.

Roman law combined the ideological prestige of an emblem of the Roman legacy with the real exclusive or inclusive power of a social tool. This social tool worked alongside the interdepartmental divides between the *exceptores* and the *scriniarii*; the use of the Latin language was a means to guard the exclusivity of the praetorian prefecture,[153] and bureaucrats with knowledge of this language distinguished themselves from the civil servants who used or promoted the use of Greek as a means to enhance the efficiency of the administrative process.[154] As the bureaucratic identity of the *exceptores* was intricately connected to the Latin language, the reactions against any move to curb the use of the language were fierce. Anxieties over the decline of the Latin language were eloquently vented,[155] and officials such as John of Cappadocia, who dared to curb the usage of Latin, were viciously criticised.[156] John Lydus includes in his staunch defence of the *exceptores* also vociferous complaints on the decline of the Latin language. John Malalas, reversely, as member of the *scriniarii*, does not exhibit any interest in Latin - I shall explore the antiquarian attitudes towards Latin thoroughly in chapter 4.3.2. of this dissertation. Also connected to the Roman legacy was the issue of reunification of the empire; as will be shown in the second part of this chapter (3.2.2.2.), the presence of émigrés from parts of the former western Roman Empire is a significant factor in the networks of Constantinopolitan intellectuals. This ideal of reunification is also reflected in the oeuvres of the authors under scrutiny; both Cassiodorus and John Lydus were involved in translating texts from Greek to Latin or vice versa, and the networks which they frequented did the same. A final important ideological issue was the use of Roman law.[157] Justinian's ideology of *renovatio* was founded on his legal compilations,[158] and, as we will see below, these projects were designed to meet the demands of an intellectual network which consisted for a significant part of lawyers and legal scholars (3.2.2.1.).

### 3.1.4. The Bureau: Reality and Construct

---

[151] On these dissident network and their use of the classical heritage see Maas (1992: 67-82) – for John Lydus –, Kaldellis (2003) – for John Lydus and a broad network of intellectuals and bureaucrats into which he was embedded –, (Kaldellis 2004) – for the bureaucratic conservatism of Lydus and Procopius, and Kaldellis (2013) – for the circle of pagan intellectuals employed in the construction of the Hagia Sophia.

[152] Bell (2009). On republican tendencies in John Lydus and Zosimus, see Kaldellis (2003: 311).

[153] Kelly (2004: 34-35).

[154] Honoré (1978: 58-59).

[155] Scott (1972: 445), Bjornlie (2013: 64-65).

[156] Scott (1972: 447-448), Honoré (1978: 13), Kelly (2004: 12, 35-36), Treadgold (2007a: 260).

[157] Bjornlie (2013: 59). For the use of Justinian's edicts in John Lydus and Procopius, for example, see Kaldellis (2004: 8-9).

[158] Humfress (2005), Pazdernik (2005: 188-191, 189-202), Leppin (2011: 167-181).

The construction of a corporate identity along the lines of interdepartmental divisions, dynastic allegiances, and symbolic issues, created the impression of a profound break between the reign of Anastasius I on the one hand, and the reigns of Justin I and Justinian I on the other hand – a break which is easily taken over by modern scholarship together with its implied hostility towards Justinian.[159] However, this break is a construct of the bureaucrats themselves and is contradicted by some of the facts which point to a fair measure of continuity between Anastasius I, Justin I and Justinian I. As such, the decline of intellectualist standards in the bureaucracy under Justinian is a form of cultural unease: it is not necessarily grounded in reality, but the result of a social negotiation and construction by the carrier group of erudite bureaucrats in Constantinople.[160]

For instance, the coinciding of dynastic allegiance and interdepartmental divide is nuanced by the fact that Anastasius also recruited and promoted bureaucrats from the financial *scrinia*.[161] Notable examples are John the Paphlagonian, who became *comes sacrarum largitionum* after a career as *tractator*.[162] Another example is Polycarpus, who was recruited as praetorian prefect from the *scriniarii*.[163] The last example of Marinus nicely nuances the divide "allegiance to Anastasius – *exceptores*" versus "allegiance to Justinian – *scriniarii*".[164] Marinus was appointed by Anastasius to serve as praetorian prefect after he served as *tractator* in the *scrinium Orientis*. John Lydus criticises Marinus as a protégé of Anastasius in ways similar to how he criticised John of Cappadocia as a product of Justinian.[165] In this case both Anastasius and Justinian are subject to the same technique of indirect criticism – regardless of the assumed dynastic allegiances.

In general, we can perceive how the relative importance of the praetorian prefecture was continuously increasing during the reign of Anastasius and of Justin and Justinian.[166] Indeed, scholars such as Kelly have already neatly analysed the egocentrism of John Lydus which distorts these facts to transform his account of the praetorian prefecture into a continuous story of decline and fall.[167]

Another nuancing factor is Anastasius' and Justinian's attitude towards two interlocking ideological issues we have mentioned above, namely the law and the languages used for these laws. Despite the erudite anxieties on the decline of the Latin language under Justinian, Justinian did use more Latin in his legislation than Anastasius.[168] Actually, Anastasius' laws were promulgated directly in Greek, not in Latin. For instance, the law school of Beirut was more favourably disposed towards

---

[159] One of the many examples is Maas' chapter 'Changes in the Age of Justinian' (Maas 1992 : 13-27). See also the oeuvre of Kaldellis.

[160] Lamma noted, for instance, how Lydus was able to praise Anastasius whereas the latter's policies did prove detrimental to Lydus' cherished bureaucracy (Lamma 1947: 81, n.4).

[161] Bandy (1983: xvii), Haarer (2006: 7, 191-192).

[162] Ioannes 'the Paphlagonian' 45 *PLRE* II 604-605 (Meier 2009: 119, 126, 217, 380).

[163] Polycarpus *PLRE* II 895-896 (Meier 2009: 119, 376).

[164] Lamma (1947: 81-82).

[165] Maas (1992: 87), Kelly (2004: 57-58).

[166] Haarer (2006: 189-190).

[167] Kelly (2004: 76-80).

[168] On Justinian's interest in maintaining a Latin-Greek bilingualism, see Rochette (1997b: 414; 1998: 474).

Justinian than to Anastasius because of the former's use of Latin.[169] After Anastasius' Greek legislation, the laws of Justin and Justinian were promulgated in Latin. Justinian's eventual shift from Latin back to Greek came about, I would like to argue, not by a conscious choice of the Emperor, but because one of Latin's principal defenders, the legal scholar Tribonian, died (between AD 542 and AD 544).[170] Indeed, in the second section (3.2.2.1.), Tribonian will appear as one of the forces behind the continuity of the Constantinopolitan erudite network – a continuity which was not broken by imperial policy, but by natural factors such as the bubonic plague.

As regards the politicised use of the classical, pagan heritage of the empire and the persecutions because of this, in this case also Justinian's policies were no novelty. For instance, in Ostrogothic Italy accusations of paganism were liberally used to persecute political opponents.[171]

As these examples show, there seems to have been a significant continuity between the policies of Anastasius and Justinian, which unmasks the break between the two reigns alongside dynastic, interdepartmental and ideological lines as a form of cultural unease constructed and negotiated by the social carrier group of the Constantinopolitan intellectuals as a means to protect themselves and their networks. The next chapter will further investigate the specific connections between the different sixth-century intellectuals to posit the hypothesis of a strong continuity in intellectual networks. These continuities are founded on two structures; the existence of a network around the university of Constantinople, and a densely connected aristocratic network.

---

[169] The law school of Beirut was favourable towards Justin and Justinian because of their interest in private law, their adhering to the Chalcedonian creed and their use of Latin. Anastasius, reversely, was impopular at Beirut because of his use of public law, his Monophysitism and his promulgating Greek laws (Honoré 1978: 39).

[170] Honoré (1978: 39, 134-137), Maas (1992: 13). For instance, Kelly attests to the continued use of Latin during Lydus' career (Kelly 2004: 33-34).

[171] On the confusion between Neoplatonism and classicism with paganism in the works of Symmachus and Boethius, see Bjornlie (2013: 179-183). Also Cassiodorus attests in two of his letters (*Var.* IV.22 and IV.23) to trials of aristocrats on accusations of witchcraft (Bjornlie 2013: 140).

## 3.2. Erudite Networks in Sixth-Century Constantinople

### 3.2.1. Priscian of Caesarea and the University of Constantinople

The university of Constantinople,[172] and the networks which developed around it, can function as a framework for further contextualising and understanding the connections between the lives, careers and oeuvres of the three authors under scrutiny. The university of Constantinople was founded by the decree of Theodosius II on the 27th of February 425.[173] It determined that private teachers were henceforth prohibited to teach in public and that the only public teaching was to take place at the university. The university was funded by the state, located at the *auditorium Capitolii*,[174] and under the direction of the urban prefect of Constantinople. The second part of the decree outlined the disciplines given at the university and the number of teachers for each discipline. As regards the procedures behind the daily business, treatment of the students and the recruitment of the professors, we can safely compare these with extant information on university life in Rome, as this ran parallel to the situation at Constantinople's university.[175] The role of the urban prefect of Constantinople in the university's organisation was considerable. For instance, the urban prefect was omnipresent and the primary judge in the procedure of the employment of a professor.[176] After a preliminary exam or *probatio* by the urban prefect and a vote by the senate, the prefect informs the emperor of the outcome of the vote, after which a decree of the emperor confirms the enrolment. Furthermore, the prefect supervises the privileges granted to the professors.[177] All in all, the appointed professors at the university had strong ties to the urban prefect, who was their patron and to whom they dedicated literary works. Moreover, the prefect monitors students and reports to the *scrinia* of the court on the most distinguished students for admission into the administration.[178]

I shall give in the following paragraphs a selective overview of the personnel involved in the organisation of the university of Constantinople in the sixth century, in which I will focus on personalities who are of interest for the network of the three authors under scrutiny. After an overview of the urban prefects responsible for the university, I will focus on Priscian of Caesarea, his extensive network and his ties with John Lydus and Cassiodorus.

---

[172] Fuchs (1926: 1-8), Chastagnol (1960: 283-289), Hemmerdinger (1966: 175), Glück (1967: 56 n. 2), Lemerle (1971: 62-65), Caimi (1984: 80), Kelly (2004: 85), Scham (2006a: xliii, n. 116).
[173] *Cod. Theod.* XIII.3.16-18.
[174] On the location of the *auditorium*, see Janin (1964: 174-176).
[175] Chastagnol (1960: 284, 289).
[176] Chastagnol (1960: 285-286). A testimony of the procedure of enrolment can be found in Cassiodorus, *Var.* XI.21 (Chastagnol 1960: 286).
[177] Chastagnol (1960: 286).
[178] Fuchs (1926: 7), Chastagnol (1960: 288-287).

During the reign of Anastasius, who was a benign supporter of the university,[179] we have the following urban prefects:[180] AD 491 Julian, ca. AD 492 Secundinus, AD 500 Helias, AD 501 Constantinus, AD 498 and possibly from AD 507-512 Plato.[181] For our analysis the person of Julian will be of importance.[182]

For the reign of Justin I, we have the following urban prefects:[183] end of the sixth century Asterius, end of the sixth century Fl. Theodorus Petrus Demosthenes, before AD 519, AD 518/519 and AD 520 Theodorus Teganistes, and AD 522?-523 Theodotus.[184] This urban prefect, who before may have been the superior of John Malalas in Antioch as *comes Orientis*, possibly recruited him for his retinue when he came to Constantinople – this would bring John Malalas directly into the administration of Constantinople's university, and in direct contact with its personnel.[185] For the period 13/02/524 – 01/12/526 we have again Theodorus Teganistes, and finally somewhere in the sixth century, Menas, who was also praetorian prefect under Justin and later on under Justinian.[186] A lemma from Photius' *Bibliotheca* allows for the identification of this Menas with Menodoros, one of the interlocutors of the anonymous *Dialogue on political sciences*.[187] This identification would associate Menas/Menodorus with Thomas, the other interlocutor who can be identified with Thomas the Quaestor and member of Justinian's first legal committee,[188] an identification which is probable as also Menas was part of the legal commission and worked on the *Digest* and the second edition of the *Codex Iustinianus*.[189] Perhaps the anonymous author of this dialogue was a member of the teaching staff of the university – as already mentioned, professors of the university tended to dedicate works to the urban prefects who promoted them. The setting of the dialogue, although fictional, allows insight into the nature of the erudite networks of Constantinople; a praetorian prefect, legal scholar and head of the university freely converses with his colleague, another legal scholar also connected to the highest levels of imperial policy making. The connections between legal scholars and members of the university will be a recurrent feature of the analysis.

Under Justinian,[190] until the prefecture of Gabriel, we have the following prefects: AD 527/565 Tribonian, who is either a relative or identical to the legal

---

[179] As mentioned by John Lydus in *Magistr*. III.47 (Kelly 2004: 37).
[180] Haarer (2006: 283) who made a selection based on *PRLE* II.1256.
[181] Secundinus 5 *PLRE* II.986, Helias *PLRE* II.530, Constantinus *qui et* Tzourouccas 13 13 *PLRE* II.313, Plato 3 *PLRE* II.891-892.
[182] See later on in this chapter and the appendix (pp. 331-332 of this dissertation).
[183] *PRLE* II.1256.
[184] Asterius 10 *PLRE* II.172-173 (Al. Cameron 1977: 45), Fl. Theodorus Petrus Demosthenes 4 *PLRE* II.353-354, Theodorus *qui et* Teganistes 57 *PLRE* II.1096, Theodotus *qui et* Colocynthius *PLRE* II.1104-1105.
[185] During this period, John Malalas was also in contact with the diplomatic service (Treadgold 2007a: 238), Borsch and Radtki-Jansen (2017).
[186] Menas 5 *PRLE* II.755, Honoré (1978: 57).
[187] Menas 6 *PRLE* II.756, Bell (2009: 9-13).
[188] Purpura (1976: 61-62).
[189] Thomas 6 *PRLE* II.1113, Honoré (1978: 232-236), Kaldellis (2013: 350, 352). On Menas' role in Justinian's legal committees, see Honoré (1978: 57).
[190] *PRLE* III.1479-1481.

scholar Tribonian,[191] AD 528 Victor, AD 530/531 Eustathius,[192] AD 532 the urban prefect Eudaemon, who was removed from office after the Nika revolt,[193] AD 532 Tryphon, AD 536 Patricius,[194] twice before AD 539 Plato, possible identical with the Plato who was prefect under Anastasius,[195] AD 536?, 537-541 Longinus,[196] AD 543, perhaps between 542-547[197] Gabriel, urban prefect in AD 543 and the dedicatee of two treatises of John of Lydia.[198]

Before turning to the analysis of Priscian, his network, and his connections with John of Lydia, a list of legal professors under Justinian[199] shows the connections between the university and Justinian's legal commissions. Theophilos was a colleague of Thomas and Tribonian on the first law commission of Justinian. For the period under consideration, we also know of the teachers of law Cratinus, Dorotheus, Thalelaeus, Anatolius, Isidorus, and Julianus the Antecessor, who also contributed to the *Cycle* of Agathias.[200]

The denseness of the erudite network is exemplified by one of the professors of the university of Constantinople, Priscian of Caesarea. In the following, I shall give an overview of the extended network which Priscian maintained within the different echelons of sixth-century Constantinople, making him one of the centres of the whole network, connecting East and west, and, indirectly, our three authors to one another. Our information on Priscian is scanty and for the most part derives from his own works.[201] The *communis opinio* considers Priscian to be a native of Caesarea in Mauretania, North-Africa. At some point of his life, Priscian moved to the city of Constantinople, where he was enrolled as professor of Latin at the university of Constantinople.[202] Ballaira argued from the poor state of educational and literary culture in Vandal Africa that it is highly improbable that Priscian received his

---

[191] Tribonianus 3 *PRLE* III.1340-1341.
[192] Victor 1 *PLRE* III.1371-1372, Eustathius 1 *PLRE* III.469-470 (Al. Cameron 1977: 45).
[193] Eudaemon 1 *PLRE* III.455, Al. Cameron (1977: 45), Honoré (1978: 54).
[194] Tryphon 1 *PLRE* III.1343. Tryphon was also the brother of the previous Urban Prefect Theodorus 57. Patricius 3 *PLRE* III.972.
[195] Plato 3 *PRLE* III.1044.
[196] Longinus 2 *PLRE* III.795-796.
[197] Treadgold (2007a: 261).
[198] Gabrielius 1 *PRLE* III.498, Caimi (1984: 284-286), Maas (1992: 9-11, 80), Kaldellis (2003: 313), Schamp (2006a: xvi-xvii), Domenici (2007: 9). Gabriel also composed a poem on Eros, *Anth. Pal.* XVI.208 (Kaldellis 2003: 313), (Schamp 2006a: xvi).
[199] Fuchs (1926: 7).
[200] Cratinus *PLRE* III.362, Dorotheus 4 *PLRE* III.421-422, Thalelaeus *PLRE* III.1223, Anatolius 3 *PLRE* III.71, Isidorus 3 *PLRE* III.723-724, Iulianus 10 *PLRE* III.733. The latter's poems are *Anth. Graec.* XI.367-369.
[201] For Priscian's biography, see Schanz (1920: 221-238), Salamon (1979: 92), Passalacqua (1987: xiii), Kaster (1988: 346-348), Ballaira (1989: 17-19), Baratin (2005: 247-249), (2009: 1214-1217), Copeland and Sluiter (2009: 167-170).
[202] On Priscian's teaching career see Fuchs (1926: 6), Momigliano (1966: 186), Kaster (1988: 346), Ballaira (1989: 38-39), Rochette (1997a: 325-327). The testimonies to his teaching career are the subscriptions of the *Institutiones*, letter of dedication of the *Institutiones* to Julian and Cassiodorus, *De orthographia* 12 (GL VII.207.13) (Ballaira 1989: 38-39). On the didacticism of his works, see Copeland and Sluiter (2009: 170) and Kaster (1988: 347) – for the *Partitiones* – and Kaster (1988: 347) – for the *Institutio de nomine, pronomine et verbo*. His known students were Theodorus Flavianus, Eutyches (Craterus), and Terentius (Salamon 1979: 92).

education there.[203] Accordingly, Priscian moved at an early stage to Constantinople, where he received his education.[204] Scholars such as Fuchs,[205] however, have argued that Priscian was recruited into the corps of Constantinopolitan university professors directly from Africa – for recruiting African grammarians was by the sixth century an established procedure in Constantinople. The hypothesis of Fuchs deserves further consideration, the more so, as Ballaira's argument of a crisis of Latin culture and education under the Vandals has been refuted in recent research.[206] I will propose that, if Priscian arrived from Africa on an invitation from the authorities in Constantinople to teach, he may have arrived around AD 491, as I shall suggest below. This date is connected to the urban prefecture of Julian, and of Symmachus, which will be discussed later on.

Priscian composed all his works in Constantinople. His eldest work is the triptych of treatises *De Figuris Numerorum*, which was dedicated to Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus.[207] He composed a verse panegyric, *De Laude Anastasii Imperatoris*, in honour of Emperor Anastasius.[208] This poem is generally dated to AD 513.[209] Apart from these poetical works, Priscian's main interest was in Latin grammar. After the treatise *De Figuris Numerorum*, he composed the following works: a monumental grammar of Latin, the *Institutio Grammatica* (begun before AD 525), a shorter compendium of this grammar, the *Institutio De Nomine, Pronomine et Uerbo*, and a work for school use, the *Partitiones Duodecim Uersuum Aeneidos Principalium*. He also made a translation of Dionysius' *Periegesis*.

The date of Priscian's death, like the date of his birth, is subject to controversy. Kaster gave a conservative estimate of Priscian's death in the first third of the sixth century.[210] Others go a step further, saying that Priscian did not live much later than AD 540.[211] Ballaira gave the most progressive estimate, based on the extant testimony of Cassiodorus, *De Orthographia* 12 (*GL* VII.207.13).[212] In this passage, Cassiodorus stated that Priscian taught at Constantinople "in his time", "*nostro tempore*". This would make the *terminus ante quem* for Priscian's death Cassiodorus' own demise around AD 580. Ballaira presumed Priscian died perhaps around the time Cassiodorus was present in Constantinople, i.e. around AD 550, especially as the composition of his considerable oeuvre which followed the *Institutiones*, namely, the *Institutio de*

---

[203] Ballaira (1989: 29-33). Likewise, Courcelle and Momigliano painted a dark picture of the literary culture in late antique Africa (Courcelle 1943: 205-206), (Momigliano 1966: 184).
[204] He was a pupil of the grammarian Theoctistus (Kaster 1988: 346), Baratin (2009: 1214).
[205] Fuchs (1926: 6).
[206] Riché (1976: 37-39), Kay (2006: 7-13). See also Cilliers (2004: 344-346).
[207] Lozovsky (2016: 326). On Symmachus, see *PLRE* II.1044-1046. The treatise *De Figuris Numerorum* is generally recognized as the oldest of Priscian's grammatical works. The terminus ante quem of this work is AD 525 – the death of Symmachus (Ballaira 1989: 57). Passalacqua (1987: xvi) even dates the work before 485 AD.
[208] See Chauvot (1986), Coyne (1991).
[209] Ballaira (1989: 21-27), Baratin (2005: 248). Al. Cameron (1974), following the hypothesis of Bury (1923: 23), dates the poem to shortly after AD 503, in which he is followed by Haarer (2006: 102-103).
[210] Kaster (1988: 436).
[211] Cappuyns (1949: 1356-1357), Bjornlie (2013: 35).
[212] Ballaira (1989: 75-79). Kaster (1988: 347), however, traced the testimony of Cassiodorus to his time in the west, i.e. before AD 537.

*Nomine, Pronomine et Uerbo*, the *Partititiones* and the *Periegesis*, would have required some amount of time.[213]

The ramifications of this estimate of Ballaira, which I am inclined to follow, are considerable. Not only was Priscian probably still teaching at the time when Cassiodorus was in Constantinople, but the two possibly met. Dating the death of the professor of Latin to the period AD 540 – 550 would make John of Lydia, who started his teaching career as professor of Latin around AD 543, a suitable candidate to succeed Priscian as professor of Latin after the latter's demise. A passage in the works of John of Lydia, indeed, could hint at the otherwise elusive figure of Priscian. In *De Magistratibus* III.73,[214] Lydus recounted how somebody asked his advice in his search for a Latin teacher:

> "(…) he asked me to think of someone to teach him the Italian language, though he was searching for a Libyan; for he said that he had perceived that the latter conversed more elegantly than the Italians."[215]

Perhaps this reference to African Latin speakers using Latin more elegantly referred to Priscian, who hailed, as we already mentioned, from Caesarea in Mauretania, and who was probably recruited from Africa for his proficiency in Latin. The question is why John Lydus did not make any explicit mention of his possible predecessor, whereas his *De Magistratibus* otherwise abounded in affectionate intellectual portraits of some of his patrons and peers.[216] Indeed, these portraits subtly veil John's tendency to adopt selective silences as to his network and acquaintances; persons who posed a distinct threat to the intellectual image which John modelled for himself in his works, are passed over in silence, alluded to, or, at the most, mentioned very briefly.[217] We can clearly see how the career and oeuvre of Priscian, who composed one of the most fundamental Latin grammars until this very day, overshadowed the intellectual accomplishments of John of Lydia, who still chose to vaunt himself on his knowledge of Latin.[218] With all caveats, we can observe the same

---

[213] Ballaira (1989: 77-78).

[214] On this passage see Ballaira (1989: 30 n. 28).

[215] "ἠξίου περινοῆσαί τινα πρὸς διδασκαλίαν αὐτῷ τῆς Ἰταλίδος φωνῆς, Λίβυν ἐπιζητῶν· αὐτὸν γὰρ ἔφασκεν ἐγνωκέναι στωμυλωτέρως παρὰ τοὺς Ἰταλοὺς διαλέγεσθαι." (Schamp 2006c: 136), trans. Bandy (1983: 251).

[216] See chapter 6.2.2.3. (pp. 273-281 of this dissertation).

[217] A notable exception to this tendency is Lydus' praise on Peter the Patrician and his explicit mention of Peter's work on the *Magister Officiorum* in *Magistr.* II.25 (Maas 1992: 29). Caimi (1984: 281-28) and Schamp (2006a: cdlxxv n. 108, cdlxxxii) stated that the attachment of Lydus to Peter the Patrician had no apparent reason, besides from both being part of same political coterie surrounding Empress Theodora. I would say that in this case, Peter's oeuvre did not pose a threat to Lydus, as it is limited to an office which is out of Lydus' sphere of interest. Furthermore, the high social status of Peter the Patrician actually offered an opportunity of the enhancement of Lydus' cultural profile; by mentioning Peter the Patrician as a colleague historian of an administrative department, Lydus placed himself on a par with this high profile aristocrat and intellectual. Contrast, for instance, Procopius' negative description of Peter the Patrician (Bjornlie 2013: 108). Later on in this thesis, we shall indeed ascertain the complementary intellectualist agenda of both antiquarian bureaucrats as one of the possible reasons behind Lydus' warm praise of Peter the Patrician (6.2.2.3.).

[218] *Magistr.* III.27.

tendency to selective silence will in Lydus' treatment of the legal scholar Tribonian, and his treatment of western intellectuals present in Constantinople. Perhaps John Lydus and Priscian were not on the best footing; in several instances in *De Magistratibus*, (*Magistr*. III.11, III.13 and III.47), Lydus gave voice to his annoyance with some of his academic peers – perhaps Priscian was one of them:[219]

> "[Emperor Anastasius] respected learning so that, though he had wanted to grant to the teachers of learning a retirement and rank, he was hindered by their discords, for intellectuals are naturally prone to disagree with themselves because of their detachment from reality.".[220]

Priscian, with whom both Cassiodorus and Lydus were possibly acquainted, maintained an extensive network and thus provided a link between aristocrats from the west, the imperial entourage, and high officials with a background in the legal profession.[221]

Priscian's communication and links with the western aristocracy[222] can be deduced, amongst other things, from his panegyric on Emperor Anastasius.[223] In this poem, Priscian vented the frustrations of the disenfranchised western senatorial elite,[224] for which Anastasius' court in compensation provided honours and distinctions. Perhaps Priscian's warm praise of Anastasius' munificence towards refugees from the West was prompted by his own experiences as an émigré from Africa.[225] His praise also follows the lines of the bureaucratic identity which we analysed above; Priscian's allegiance to Anastasius[226] is articulated in praises of his enrolling learned bureaucrats,[227] and hopes for an imminent reunification of the empire are expressly aired.[228]

On a cultural plane, Priscian was part of a network of contacts between east and west that favoured cultural exchanges between both halves of the former Roman Empire. This cultural synthesis was a crucial aim of the friendship between

---

[219] Carney (1971b: 10, 52, 112, 124). "The most experienced officials on the Prefecture's judicial side came to be respected for their literary and legal abilities as well as for their scholarly erudition and impressive learning. Indeed, at that time, claimed John (perhaps reacting against the annoying pretensions of some of his professional colleagues at the State University of Constantinople), it was not uncommon for distinguished bureaucrats to be sought out by academics who hoped for enlightened discussion "on matters of which they were ignorant" (3.13, 3.11)." (Kelly 2004: 69-70).

[220] "(…) ἐρυθριῶν τε τοὺς λόγους, ὡς καὶ πλήρωμα χρόνου καὶ βαθμὸν τοῖς τῶν λόγων διδασκάλοις βουληθέντα παρασχεῖν ταῖς αὐτῶν διχονοίαις ἐμποδισθῆναι· πέφυκε γὰρ ἐξ ἀπραγμοσύνης τὸ λογικὸν πρὸς ἑαυτὸ διαφωνεῖν." (Schamp 2006c: 101-102), trans. Bandy (1983: 207).

[221] Momigliano (1966: 187).

[222] Nicks (2000: 189-190), Bjornlie (2013: 84, 135).

[223] Bjornlie (2013: 136).

[224] *Laus*, vv. 239-253. Bjornlie (2013: 130).

[225] Ballaira (1989: 19).

[226] A panegyric was a staged event, showing the active loyalty of the speaker to the praised ruler (O'Donnell 1979: 34).

[227] *Laus*, vv. 248-253. Haarer (2006: 192-193).

[228] *Laus*, vv. 239-245. Haarer (2006: 102-103).

Priscian and one of the most influential senatorial aristocrats from Italy, Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus.[229] Symmachus had been urban prefect of the city of Rome in AD 476/491[230] – at the same time Julian was urban prefect in Constantinople. Perhaps Symmachus was, as urban prefect, connected to higher education in the city of Rome. At some point in time, Symmachus met Priscian in Constantinople, on which occasion Priscian dedicated his *De Figuris Numerorum* to him.[231] As regards the date of Symmachus' visit to Constantinople and his meeting with Priscian, we can only guess. Ballaira dated the meeting to the beginning of the sixth century.[232] Dating the meeting to around AD 491 would connect Priscian's *De Figuris Numerorum* to the tenure of Symmachus' urban prefecture, and therefore indirectly to the systems of higher education in Rome. The date of AD 491 also coincided with the urban prefecture of Julian in Constantinople, Priscian's later patron and dedicatee of the *Institutiones*. This is an attractive coincidence, as it would make Priscian the centre of attention of both eastern and western aristocrats, and officials at the beginning of the reign of Anastasius. Priscian clearly connected both East and West throughout patterns of patronage.[233]

Priscian's western connections were perpetuated in the careers of his pupils. Flavius Theodorus[234] assisted Symmachus' son-in-law, the polymath and philosopher Boethius in his translation of Aristotle's *Categories*.[235] The same Theodorus is possibly mentioned in a subscription to Boethius' *De hypotheticis syllogismis* 3 in codex Parisinus Latinus n.a. 1611.[236] Theodorus indeed copied works of Boethius,[237] such as his *De praedicamentis*.[238]

Under the aegis of Symmachus, Priscian, together with Boethius, gave voice to their shared project of the cultural reunification of both halves of the former Roman Empire.[239] This educational project entailed the dissemination of Greek philosophical heritage in Latin and the promotion of the Latin language in the eastern part of the empire. The political implications of this programme were wholeheartedly endorsed by Emperor Anastasius,[240] as we can read in Priscian's praise of him (*Laus* vv. 248-267):

---

[229] Courcelle (1943: 304-312), Momigliano (1966: 185-187), Salamon (1979: 92-93), Ballaira (1989: 41-53).
[230] *PRLE* II.1045, Ballaira (1989: 42).
[231] Courcelle (1943: 309), Momigliano (1966: 186), Ballaira (1989: 41, 57), Bjornlie (2013: 135), Kaster (1988: 347). Testimony to the meeting is Priscian's dedication to Symmachus in the introducing letter to the *De Figuris Numerorum*; *GL* III.405.6.
[232] Ballaira (1989: 48-51).
[233] Ballaira (1989: 46-47).
[234] *PRLE* II.1098, Momigliano (1966: 187).
[235] Bjornlie (2013: 135). Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius iunior 5 *PLRE* II 233-237.
[236] Courcelle (1943: 311, n. 3), Kaster (1988: 348).
[237] Ballaira (1989: 69-70), with bibliography in n. 101.
[238] Salamon (1979: 93).
[239] Passalacqua (1987), Ballaira (1989: 45-47), Rochette (1997a), Baratin (2005), Dmitriev (2010: 34).
[240] Ballaira (1989: 46).

"Mighty Princeps, you also choose as your associates in just government those distinguished for their eloquence who are embellished by the power of learning and the exercise of poetry, those whose wisdom protects the Roman laws. You alone grant to learned men deserved rewards for their labours, endow them with gifts and support them with your generous heart. For these reasons the almighty Lord of the lofty heavens turned aside from your stronghold dangerous enemies (…) Both Romes, I hope, may now obey you alone with the help of the almighty Father who sees all things and whom you with unfailing piety placate throughout the whole world (…)".[241]

The suspicion which arose from the ties between Boethius, Symmachus, and the imperial court of the East also contributed to the eventual demise of both aristocrats at the hands of the Ostrogoths in respectively AD 524 and AD 526 - a demise which benefitted Cassiodorus, as he succeeded Boethius as *magister officiorum*.[242] This educational programme materialised in different translations.[243] As already mentioned, Priscian translated the *Periegesis* of Dionysius, and his *De Figuris Numerorum* consists of three treatises, of which one was also a translation of the *Progymnasmata* of Hermogenes of Tarsus. The influence of this ideology of bilingualism is tangible in the works of both Cassiodorus and John of Lydia, as both also produced translations.[244] This ideology is also reflected in Priscian's grammatical work; it exhibits a thorough theoretical and conceptual bilingualism.[245]

To recapitulate: possibly around AD 491, or later, Priscian of Caesarea enrolled into the teaching corps of the university of Constantinople, under urban prefect Julian, to whom he dedicated his *Institutiones*.[246] Before we analyse the ramifications of Priscian's dedication of his *Institutiones* to Julian, we have to ascertain the exact identity of this character. Such an analysis of the specific identity of Julian the dedicatee of Priscian's *Institutiones* can be found in Appendix 9.3. of this dissertation. Apart from the testimonies we already cited in favour of Priscian teaching at the university, the very dedication of the *Institutiones* to Julian as urban prefect pleads in favour of a pattern of patronage between an urban prefect and a professor at the university; the parallel case is John Lydus dedicating his treatises to Gabriel the urban prefect a couple of decades later. Furthermore, Julian is perhaps also the Julian who appears in the subscription of Statius' *Thebais* IV in codex Parisinus Latinus 8051 or codex Puteanus.[247] This would mean Julian the urban prefect took a lively interest in Latin literature – an interest which indeed is not at odds with the rector of

---

[241] "Nec non eloquio decoratos, maxime princeps, Quos doctrina potens et sudor musicus auget, Quorum Romanas munit sapientia leges, Adsumis socios iusto moderamine rerum; Et solus doctis das praemia digna labore, Muneribus ditans et pascens mente benigna. Haec propter celsi dominator maximus axis Infestos uestris auertit ab arcibus hostes, (…) Vtraque Roma tibi nam spero pareat uni Auxilio summi, qui conspicit omnia, patris, Quem placas omnem stabilis pietate per orbem" (Chauvot 1986: xxx-xxx), trans. Coyne (1991: 60-61).
[242] See below.
[243] Momigliano (1966: 186).
[244] See chapter 4.3.2. (pp. 167-173 of this dissertation).
[245] Courcelle (1943: 307-308), Kaster (1988: 347), Copeland and Sluiter (2009: 167-168), Baratin (2009: 1215). This bilingualism is probably also a product of Priscian's education with Theoctistus (Ballaira 1989: 36-37), (Baratin 2009: 1214).
[246] Courcelle (1943: 307), Momigliano (1966: 187), Salamon (1979: 92).
[247] Momigliano (1966: 187), Kaster (1988: 347-348).

a university who sponsored a gifted Latin grammarian. Moreover, also in this case the pupil of Priscian, Theodorus connects Priscian with Julian. In the *Anthologia Palatina* two poems of Julian praise Theodorus for his copying of precious manuscripts – we could read these poems as indirect compliments of Julian to his client Priscian through the latter's pupil Theodorus.[248]

Julian was a very well-connected official with erudite interests. He was possibly connected to the omnipresent house of Anastasius.[249] Two anonymous epigrams from the *Anthologia Palatina* (XVI.70 and XVI.71) commemorate a Julian who restored a public library in Constantinople under Anastasius – yet again an act typical of an erudite official under the rule of an intellectually minded Emperor.[250]

Apart from connections with western aristocrats such as Symmachus and Boethius, and ties to a well-connected high official such as Julian, and aside from the ties to Emperor Anastasius which resulted from these connections, Priscian of Caesarea was connected with other highly placed legal officials who flourished under Justinian. The influence of Priscian also in these cases comes about through his pupils.

Yet again, Theodorus connects Priscian to important officials under Justinian. In the five subscriptions of Theodorus to his master's *Institutiones*, which he copied, we can read how Theodorus describes himself: "memorialis sacri scrinii epistolarum et adiutor v.m. quaestoris sacri palatii".[251] Apparently, Theodorus was an assistant to the quaestor. The dates given in these subscriptions range from 01/10/526 to 30/05/527.[252] This means that Theodorus was in the service of the quaestor Proclus (01/12/518 – 22/04/527),[253] and would make his continued service under Thomas (12/02/528 – 07/04/529),[254] and Tribonian (17/09/529 – 14/01/532),[255] who both were part of the legal commissions of Justinian, very probable.

Another example of Priscian's being well-connected through his pupils is the case of Eutyches, who, like Priscian, was a teacher of Latin at Constantinople.[256] Eutyches dedicated his manual to Craterus, who was perhaps also a pupil of Priscian.[257] This Craterus was the subject of some poems of Julian,[258] and was the father of Phocas, who was part of Justinian's legal committee and who is highly

---

[248] Salamon (1979: 94), Ballaira (1989: 84).

[249] Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron (1966: 12-14), McCail (1969: 87-88), Al. Cameron (1977: 47), Caimi (1984: 270-271), Schamp (2006c: cxc-cxcii).

[250] McCail (1969: 88, n.2). Al. Cameron (1977: 48-56) however, arguments against identifying the Julian of *AP* XVI.70-71 with the Julian under consideration.

[251] Schanz (1920: 230), Momigliano (1966: 187), Kaster (1988: 348), Ballaira (1989: 39).

[252] Ballaira (1989: 57-64).

[253] Honoré (1978: 226-232).

[254] Honoré (1978: 232-236).

[255] Honoré (1978: 236).

[256] Schanz (1920: 238-240), Salamon (1979: 92-93, 96), Schamp (2006a: clx).

[257] Salamon (1979: 92, 94-85).

[258] McCail (1969: 88), Salamon (1979: 94-95), Caimi (1984: 269-272), Ballaira (1989: 84), Schamp (2006c: clxxxix).

praised by John of Lydia.[259] Caimi and Schamp even speak of a circle consisting of John Lydus, Julian, Craterus and his son Phocas.[260] Lydus possibly did not mention Julian in his treatises for reasons of political self-protection, as the latter had to lie low after the unsuccessful usurpation of Hypatius, with whom Julian was acquainted.[261]

Through these connections, the picture arises of a dense network of legal officials, erudite bureaucrats and university teachers who all knew each other, engaged in different relations of patronage and service, and expressed these relationships through erudite literature, of which we now alas only possess a fraction. A personality such as Priscian forms one of the elusive centres of this network, which shows how the combination of different connections transcends the apparent linguistic or regional, ideological, dynastic or departmental divides. Priscian unites in his network connections from both the Latin West and the Greek East, and academic connections and connections with the highest echelons of imperial administration.[262] In the orbit of his network possibly hover both Cassiodorus and John Lydus, Priscian's possible successor.

The existence of a university with a dense network of scholars and intellectuals could explain the high measure of parallels in career and biography between John of Lydia, John Malalas, and, albeit to a lesser degree, Cassiodorus on the one hand, and the textual parallels their oeuvres exhibit, on the other hand, which will be treated later on (pp. 77-121 of this dissertation). Both parameters, namely, the existence of a socially unified carrier group and a common narrative are prerequisites for the creation of cultural trauma. One hypothesis to explain these social parallels is to posit the existence of a scholarly relationship between John Lydus on the one hand and John Malalas and Cassiodorus as presumable attendees of Lydus' lectures on the other hand – as already mentioned, both John Malalas and Cassiodorus were present in Constantinople at the beginning of his teaching career around AD 543. Both John John Malalas and Cassiodorus could have attended the lectures of Lydus and could have used materials from these lectures to upholster their accounts. In case Cassiodorus met Priscian in Constantinople, perhaps frequenting his lectures, Cassiodorus' continued frequenting of the same erudite environment, in which Lydus possibly started to work after Priscian's demise, becomes completely logical.

---

[259] Phocas was a patron to literati who was praised highly by John Lydus for his patronage and for his interest in the Latin language. He was praetorian prefect in the interlude of the John of Cappadocia's career in the aftermath of the Nika revolt. He was charged for paganism in 529, indicted but acquitted. A second charge during the pagan purge in the mid-540s led to his suicide. John Lydus pictures Phocas as an antithesis of John of Cappadocia, a description which also implied a political stance by Lydus (Lamma 1947: 86, n.2), (Purpura 1976: 63, n. 37), (Honoré 1978: 47, 54-56), (*PRLE* II.881-882 Phocas 5), (Bandy 1983: xxi), (Caimi 1984: 257-273), (Maas 1992: 33-34, 70-73, 78-82), (Kaldellis 2003: 304-305, 2004: 11, 2013: 348-353), (Kelly 2004: 45, 53-56), (Schamp 2006a: xl, 2006c: clxxxix-cciii).

[260] Caimi (1984: 60, 269-273), Schamp (2006a: xli, 2006c: cxcii).

[261] Caimi (1984: 272-273).

[262] "Um einen aus dem Westen stammenden Professor scharten sich hier die Vertreter der byzantinischen Aristokratie und Hofbeamtenschaft. Sie pflegten gute Beziehungen mit den intellektuellen Kreisen des Westens (Symmachus, Boethius), doch eine isolierte italienische oder afrikanische Kolonie waren sie nicht." (Salamon 1979: 96).

We do know that John Malalas made multiple redactions of his *Chronographia* in Constantinople.[263] Furthermore, previous research has made a considerable case for Cassiodorus' reworking of some of his state letters during the compilation of the *Variae* in Constantinople.[264] Barnish summarised the principles underlying the composition of the *Variae*. Portions of official files are included, mostly undisturbed, at the centre of each book. The beginning and end of each book, on the other hand, are determined by more literary criteria. Diplomatic showpieces are set in front or conclude each book.[265] This ordering principle of the *Variae* left Cassiodorus with ample opportunity to rework portions of his correspondence for various reasons.[266] Unsurprisingly, for example, the majority of antiquarian references appear in letters at the beginning and end of a book. The letters which have a general antiquarian character have a strong predilection for the beginning or the end of a book.[267] We do not even need elaborate analyses to discern traces of Cassiodorus' revision of the work. Only the fact that he systematically omits names to give the letters a more exemplary character clearly shows that the letters were subjected to some sort of reworking.[268] Further on in this dissertation (pp. 172-173 of this dissertation), I shall elaborate on a specific case in the letter collection which indeed points to Cassiodorus' reworking of his letters (*Var.* III.53).

Further indications of borrowings from Lydus are the bundled appearance of parallels in John Malalas and Cassiodorus, as we will see later on (pp. 77-121 of this dissertation). Malalas' use of Lydus is particularly conspicuous in Book VII on

---

[263] Treadgold (2007a: 239-240).

[264] O'Donnell (1979: 76-81, 93), Haarer (2006: 98), Bjornlie (2013: 19-26, 32, 163-184; 2017: 434, 436). For Cassiodorus' reworking of letters involving Boethius specifically, see Bjornlie (2013: 171-184). For Cassiodorus' substitution of names, anonymization and different hypotheses for these practices, see Fridh (1965: 2), O'Donnell (1979: 57, 93), Bjornlie (2013: 175). "Attempting to reconstruct an epistolary record of the Amal regime over a span of thirty years, and quite possibly lacking access to original documents at the time, Cassiodorus relied on his innate capacity to elaborate and reconstruct as he saw fit. (…) But that same lack of command over the events also provided Cassiodorus with enough latitude to reinvent particular moments embedded within an epistolary narrative." (Bjornlie 2013: 176). We could also presume Cassiodorus added erudite subject matter which circulated in Constantinople around John Lydus and the university of Constantinople.

[265] O'Donnell (1979: 29, 77-79), Barnish (1992: xviii), Bjornlie (2017: 438).

[266] Giardina (1993: 69-70), for instance, has already showed how one can single out several passages of the *Variae* which were added or reworked at the publication of the *Variae* to fit a specific Cassiodorean purpose. The singling-out of these purpose-specific passages can even amount to a relative chronology of composition.

[267] See the appendix (pp. 333 of this dissertation).

[268] Bjornlie (2009: 149): 'Signs of heavy revision and adaptation appear throughout the *Variae*, including two extensive prefaces, the deletion of epistolary protocols, and the inclusion of two books of *formulae*.'. Bjornlie uses these signs of revision to argue for a reworking of the state letters out of political motives (Bjornlie 2009: 144). On the other hand, we want to argue how these revisions could also serve the didactic preoccupations of Cassiodorus. Gillett (1998: 46), for example, explains these systematic omissions as indications of the didactic purpose of the *Variae* as models of imitation. The political motives behind this reworking of the state letters, however, need not exclude the didactical purposes of Cassiodorus, as he developed a didactic paradigm for learned bureaucrats. The continuous reworking of a literary work seems to have been a specific trait of Cassiodorus' method, as the composition history of the *Institutiones* shows (Vessey 2004: 39-42).

the foundation of Rome and the earlier books. In Cassiodorus, the parallels with Lydus appear most notably in Books VI and VII with model letters of appointment and in so-called rhetorical showcases at the beginnings and endings of a book.[269]

Furthermore, the treatises of Lydus betray their didactical origin.[270] For instance, the *De Mensibus* is structured on the Leitmotiv of the calendar of the year which is interspersed with encyclopaedic digressions on the basis of loose associations – these digressions are also indicated in the text as such,[271] next to some explicit references to the educational context of lessons.[272] This structure mirrors the educational methods of Antiquity;[273] a *Grammaticus* used the frame of the text he discussed as a mnemonic peg to communicate all sorts of encyclopaedic knowledge.[274] Fortunately, we have a written example of this method in the treatise of Lydus' possible predecessor Priscian, namely the *Partitiones duodecim versuum Aeneidos*

---

[269] "It is often the case that Cassiodorus positioned diplomatic letters at the beginning and end of a book in order to 'bracket' letters concerning the internal administration of Italy with letters demonstrating Amal foreign policy." (Bjornlie 2013: 175).

[270] Carney (1971b: 37, 47), Maas (1992: 97).

[271] Also Lydus' *De Magistratibus* is interspersed with digressions (Schamp 2006a: cxxv). I give some examples from Lydus' *De Magistratibus*. *Magistr*. I.51 "Ὅτι δὲ ἀναγκαῖον οἶμαι ἐμβραδῦναι τῷ λόγῳ" (Schamp 2006b: 51), *Magistr*. I.43 "Τοιαῦτα μέν τινα παρατραπεὶς τοῦ σκοποῦ εἴποιμ' ἂν περὶ τούτου" (Schamp 2006b: 53), *Magistr*. II.1 "καὶ δῆλα τὰ λοιπά" (Schamp 2006c: 2), *Magistr*. II.4 "περὶ ὧν κατὰ λεπτὸν ἀφηγεῖσθαι περιττὸν ὑπολαμβάνων πάρειμι" (Schamp 2006c: 6), *Magistr*. II.14 "περὶ οὗ μακρηγορεῖν ἀηδὲς εἶναι κρίνων ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀναλαβεῖν τὴν ἀφήγησιν συνωθοῦμαι, (…) πρὸς δὲ τὸ προκείμενον ἐπανέλθωμεν" (Schamp 2006c: 19), *Magistr*. III.2 "περὶ ὧν ἂν κατὰ τὴν τῶν τακτικῶν παράδοσιν ἀφηγησάμην εἰ μὴ πόρρω τοῦ σκοποῦ παρωθούμην" (Schamp 2006c: 43), *Magistr*. III.13 "καὶ τί χαλεπὸν ἐμβραδῦναι τῷ λόγῳ πρὸς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ προκειμένου" (Schamp 2006c: 60), *Magistr*. III.31 "ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ βραχὺ παρατραπέντι τοῦ σκοποῦ περὶ τῆς προσηγορίας τοῦ ποταμοῦ διὰ βραχέων εἰπεῖν (…) ὥστε δεήσει διδασκαλίας" (Schamp 2006c: 82), *Magistr*. III. 32 "καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῶν ποταμῶν, ὡς ἐν παρεκβάσει" (Schamp 2006c: 84), *Magistr*. III.63 "Ὅτι δὲ τυχὸν ἕλοντος τοῦ ἰχθύος μνήμη παρῆλθεν, περὶ αὐτοῦ τὰ γνωσθέντα μοι παραθήσομαι" (Schamp 2006c: 122), *Magistr*. III.64 "Τοιαῦτα μέν τινα τοῦ ἰχθύος χάριν εἰρήσθω" (Schamp 2006c: 123), *Magistr*. III.64 "πρὸς βραχὺ δὲ τὸ προκείμενον ἀφείς" (Schamp 2006c: 123), *Magistr*. III.65 "Τοιαῦτα μὲν ἂν τις ὡς ἐν παρεκβάσει λέγοι" (Schamp 2006c: 124).

[272] For example, *Magistr*. III.31 "ὥστε δεήσει διδασκαλίας" (Schamp 2006c: 82).

[273] Maas (1992: 36) fails to see this educational method in Lydus' works: "It has been suggested that the material compiled in his books originated as his "lecture notes", but this sort of information would have filled awkwardly into the usual curriculum."

[274] An overview of educational trends in late antique Egypt can be found in Cribiore (2007: 47-66). In a first stage of education, the elementary teacher taught children to read. The second phase focused predominantly on poetry under the guidance of the grammarian. The ultimate aim of these preliminary phases was a rhetorical education with the *rhetor*, who focused on prose composition. The grammarian started with a grammatical and metrical word-by-word analysis, or *praelectio*, of the text under scrutiny and continued with the explanation of subject-matter or *historia*, which provided ample opportunity for a wide range of encyclopaedic digressions (Clarke 1971: 23-24).

*principalium*.[275] The structure of *De Mensibus* is similar to it:[276] a Leitmotiv, such as the overview of the week, the month, or the calendar of the year, is used as a mnemonic peg to which encyclopaedic digressions are added. Moreover, some of the lists in Lydus of Latin terminology from the sphere of law, taxes and the military recall similar glossary lists in the works of Priscian.[277] As befits a good teacher, John also quoted different handbooks[278] – although he did not mention any of the works of his eminent predecessor.

Although attractive, the hypothesis of a "school of Roman *érudits*" must of necessity remain in the field of speculation for a want of conclusive evidence. One might even say the differences in social status preclude the possibility of, for instance, Cassiodorus' attending lectures of Lydus – Cassiodorus is a high-ranking aristocrat and official, whereas Lydus and John Malalas enjoyed a less prominent social status.[279] In spite of the impossibility to prove this hypothesis of a "school of Roman *érudits*", the data and connections as presented above can attest to a common culture of Roman erudition in which the historiographical oeuvres of John Lydus, John Malalas and Cassiodorus functioned, often in dialogue with each other. These commonalities indicate the existence of a more or less socially unified carrier group which was responsible for the cultural negotiation of a discourse on cultural unease. The following section will elaborate on even more connections of the networks of the three authors under scrutiny with high legal officials of Justinian's administration – a further proof that the network under Anastasius continued to thrive under Justinian, in spite of the cultural unease of the Justinianic "dark age", as constructed in their own texts.

### 3.2.2. A Broad Common Culture of Roman Erudition

---

[275] Clarke (1971: 23-24).

[276] For a description of the structural and organisational principles behind the *De Mensibus*, see Maas (1992: 56-66). Maas, ignoring parallels with educational texts such as the works of Priscian, also stressed the uniqueness of the structure of the *De Mensibus*: "No precise models for this arrangement survive. (…) It cannot be proven from silence, but the structure of de Mensibus appears to be highly original." (Maas 1992: 56).

[277] Lydus *Magistr*. I.46 (Schamp 2006b: 56-62), *Magistr*. III.70 (Schamp 2006c: 131), and Priscian *De Figuris Numerorum* (Passalacqua 1987: 12-13).

[278] Kelly (2004: 34).

[279] On the social and intellectual differences between Cassiodorus and Lydus, see Carney (1971b: 77-79, 91, 99, 110-111, 121-122). This argument has been used by Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 16-18) in order to connect Cassiodorus with Jordanes without placing them in the same social milieu. In my opinion, both authors overemphasise the status of Cassiodorus as part of the élite in Constantinople (Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2017: 17). As already mentioned, Cassiodorus was part of the lower aristocracy which used the Palatine service in Ostrogothic Italy to vie with the high aristocracy for power and prestige. His service with the Ostrogoths discredited Cassiodorus in Constantinople - see below, chapter 3.2.2.2. (pp. 72-75 of this dissertation). One can presume that when being politically marginalised in a foreign city, one is less picky about acquiring acquaintances. This makes Cassiodorus associating with Jordanes, or perhaps John Lydus, all the more probable. Furthermore, it has to be said, the humble social origin of grammarians did not preclude their upward social mobility. For example, Priscian was, despite his lowly origins, in contact with aristocrats from the highest echelons, such as Symmachus and Boethius (Nicks 2000: 189-190), (Bjornlie 2013: 84, 135) - contacts which Cassiodorus could only dream of.

Previous scholarship, such as the works of A. Kaldellis and M. Maas, in many cases unwittingly took over a portion of the negative notions which were used by Justinian's contemporaries to cast his policies in the darkest of colours.[280] One example of this negative bias is the interpretation of Justinian's legal project as a deliberate attempt of the Emperor to curb the power of his administration by wresting control of the interpretation of the law from the educated bureaucracy.[281] This section of the analysis of the carrier group which is responsible for the discourse on cultural unease will further unearth the intricate connections between Constantinopolitan intellectuals such as Lydus, John Malalas and Cassiodorus on the one hand, and high officials of Justinian's administration and high aristocrats on the other hand. I will focus on two persons or groups; the legal scholar Tribonian and the western aristocratic émigrés. As in the case of Priscian of Caesarea, both Tribonian and the western aristocrats shall appear as strong nodes in the erudite network which indirectly connects the three authors under scrutiny in this dissertation. The very existence of these connections drastically nuances the image of Justinian and his ministers being in open warfare with their educated and intellectualist administration; the actual atrophy of this intellectual network was the result of natural causes; the plague of the 540s which probably took the lives of two essential nodes in this network: Priscian of Caesarea and Tribonian.

### 3.2.2.1. Tribonian

Tribonian[282] was born before AD 500, possibly around AD 485 in Pamphylia in Asia Minor and hailed from professional circles. He received his legal education possibly in Constantinople, but more probably in Beirut. He was acquainted with works of classical Antiquity, a feature which is perhaps responsible for his accusations of paganism.[283] As a barrister, he pleaded in the court of the praetorian prefect of the east, before being recruited into Justinian's first law commission under the leadership of John of Cappadocia. The pagan purges of the years 528-529 lead to some changes in the composition of the committee, and Tribonian replaced Thomas as quaestor. Eventually, Tribonian became the chairman of the second law committee. His service at the pinnacles of imperial power earned him also the offices and titles of *magister officiorum*, *consularis*, and possibly *patricius*. Tribonian's office as *magister officiorum* made him the successor of Malalas' possible patron and employer Hermogenes, which provides the distinct possibility that John Malalas was for some period in the service of Tribonian.[284] Tribonian died before AD 544, possibly in AD 542 by the plague.[285]

Although next to nothing is known of Tribonian's intellectual biography apart from his legal activities, an entry in the *Suda* (T 957) gives us a unique insight into the intellectual context in which this legal scholar functioned. It is worth quoting in full:

---

[280] Kaldellis (2004; 2005b), Maas (1992).
[281] Bjornlie (2013: 67-72).
[282] Purpura (1976: 51-53), Honoré (1978: 40-69), *PRLE* III.1335-1339.
[283] Honoré (1978: 65-67). On the influence of neoplatonism and classical philosophy on Tribonian, see Lanata (1984, 1988, 1989). For Tribonian as pagan, or part of a pagan, Hellenising network, see (Kaldellis 2003: 312).
[284] Treadgold (2007a: 239 n. 57).
[285] Purpura (1976: 54-55), Greatrex (1995: 4).

"T 957. Tribonian from Side also a barrister in the prefect's court, a poly-math. He wrote: Commentary on the Canon of Ptolemy, in verse; Conjunc-tion of the Cosmic and Harmonic Disposition of Stars at Birth; On the Presiding and Conducting Stars; On the Houses of the Planets, and why each in particular occupies its House; On the 24 units of metre and the 28 units of rhythm; Paraphrase of the Catalogue of the Homeric Ships; Macedonian Dialogue or Treatise on Happiness; Life of the Philosopher Theodotus[286] in three books; prose Treatise on Consuls; dedicated to the Emperor Justinian; Treatise on Kingship to the same; On the Changes of the Months (in verse)."[287]

The Suda actually has two lemmas, T 956, on Tribonian, the legal scholar under Justinian, and the following lemma quoted above, on a namesake and poly-math Tribonian. These two persons have been identified in previous research.[288] Also the on-line commentary on the Suda identifies the two: "Here in the Suda there is a purported distinction between tau 951 ('Tribounian' [sic], quaestor under Justini-an), tau 956 (Tribonian the Hellenised Macedonian), and the present entry. In fact they all concern the same individual. The present entry focuses on the literary (non-juristic) works attributed to him."[289] However, other scholars think it was two differ-ent persons.[290] Both options are treated extensively in Honoré.[291]

I would like to argue in favour of an identification of the two persons men-tioned in lemmas T 956 and T 957 of the *Suda*. Although Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron and Madden discard the possibility of an identification on chronological grounds, and say that the Tribonian of T 957 is probably a generation younger than

---

[286] *PRLE* II.1104. Adler (1935: 588) gives as textual variant of Θεοδότου Θεοδοσίου. An at-tractive candidate would be the polymath Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius, who was known by his contemporaries under the name Theodosius (*PRLE* II.1102-1103), but this identifica-tion remains in the field of speculation.

[287] *Suda* T 957: "Τριβωνιανός, Σιδήτης, ἀπὸ δικηγόρων τῶν ἐπάρχων καὶ αὐτός, ἀνὴρ πολυμαθής. ἔγραφεν ἐπικῶς ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸν Πτολεμαίου Κανόνα, Συμφωνίαν τοῦ κοσμικοῦ καὶ ἁρμονικοῦ διαθέματος, Εἰς τὸν πολεύοντα καὶ διέποντα, Εἰς τοὺς πλανωμένων οἴκους, καὶ διὸ ἑκάστῳ οἶκος ὁ δεῖνα, Εἰς τοὺς κδ᾽ πόδας τοὺς μετρικοὺς καὶ τοὺς κη᾽ τοὺς ῥυθμικούς, Μετάφρασιν τοῦ Ὁμηρικοῦ τῶν νεῶν καταλόγου, Διάλογον Μακεδόνιον ἢ περὶ εὐδαιμονίας, καὶ Βίον Θεοδότου φιλοσόφου ἐν βιβλίοις τρισίν, Ὑπατικὸν καταλογάδην εἰς Ἰουστινιανὸν αὐτοκράτορα, Βασιλικὸν εἰς τὸν αὐτόν, Περὶ Μηνῶν ἐναλλαγῆς, ἐπικῶς." (Adler 1935: 588) trans. Honoré (1978: 67).

[288] Gibbon (ch. 44, n. 733), Holmes (1912: 2.442) – with mentions of the discrepancies – and Kübler, (RE 2.12. 2421-2) (1934: 24-27).

[289] http://www.stoa.org/sol-bin/search.pl?db=REAL&search_method=QUERY&login=guest&enlogin=guest&user_list=LIST&page_num=1&searchstr=tau,957&field=adlerhw_gr&num_per_page=1

[290] Stein (1937: 376), Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron (1966: 8, n. 17), Purpura (1976: 55, n. 16), *PRLE* III.1339-1340, Madden (1995: 6-7).

[291] Honoré (1978: 64-69).

Tribonian the legal scholar,[292] a closer look at the contents of lemma T 957 reveals that the works described fit better in an earlier generation, namely in the period of Tribonian the jurist. The first four works on astronomy and Ptolemy should have been written before the first of Justinian's purges in AD 528-529, which made indulging in literary productions related to astronomy and astrology a more dangerous occupation for a person functioning in the centre of Justinian's government.[293] Second, the *prose treatise on Consuls, dedicated to the emperor Justinian* should have been written before 541, the end of the appointment of consuls by Justinian.[294] Otherwise this would have been an awkward, even dangerous form of criticism of Justinian's abolishing of the consulship. Third, the structure of the two lemmas argues in favour of an identification. The two lemmas apart seem to be incomplete; T 956 provides only a description of a life and character, whereas T 957 is almost exclusively a list of works. Yet taken together they can be a rounded lemma with the life, character and list of works of one character, Tribonian the legal scholar.

The repercussions of this identification for our understanding of sixth-century intellectual networks in Constantinople are tremendous. If Tribonian wrote a *Treatise on Happiness*, dedicated to Macedonius (Διάλογον Μακεδόνιον), this would connect Tribonian to the contributors to the cycle of Agathias, as Macedonius was one of its contributing poets.[295]

---

[292] See note 290. The argument runs thus; as the lemma of the *Suda* on Agathias says that Agathias flourished (συνήκμασε) under Paul the Silentary, Macedonius the Consul and Tribonian, and as Agathias is a generation younger than Tribonian the legal scholar, the Tribonian mentioned must have been a contemporary to Agathias and cannot be identical to Tribonian the legal scholar. However, the existence of a younger Tribonian needs not to exclude the option that the works mentioned in *Suda* T 957 belong in fact to Tribonian the legal scholar; this seems even logical, as in this lemma there is no mention of the poems of the younger Tribonian which were included by Agathias in his cycle. Moreover, Tribonian could perfectly have had dedicated his *Treatise on Happiness* to Macedonius, as the latter has been dated by Madden between before AD 500 and the middle 560s (Madden 1995: 9-10). Besides, it has to be noted that the statement of the *Suda* on the supposed four contemporaries should be treated with the utmost care, as not only Macedonius, it appears, but also Paul the Silentiary were a generation older than Agathias.

[293] Watts (2004a: 172-174). A similar argument is used for dating the *De Magistratibus* of John Lydus after 545; the *De Ostentis* is not mentioned in *De Magistratibus* because it was written after the pagan purges of 545-546, which would make mentioning his work on astronomy and astrology too dangerous for John Lydus (Carney 1971b: 11), (Bjornlie 2013: 114). Domenici (2007: 11): "E forse, sebbene non si possa parlare di vera e propria abiura, non è del tutto casuale il fatto che Lido non faccia più menzione del trattato [*De Ostentis*] nella sua produzione successiva, ignorandolo completamente, come se appartenesse a un passato da dimenticare."

[294] Bjornlie (2013: 80), Haarer (2006: 193).

[295] Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron (1966: 17), McCail (1969: 89). Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron (1966: 8 n. 17) do not identify the Tribonian who wrote the *Dialogue on happiness* with Tribonian the legal scholar, because Agathias presumably only collected the poetry of his contemporaries in his cycle. This idea of Agathias only including contemporaries was, however, already abandoned by McCail (1969). The Cycle of Agathias is furthermore embedded in the legal circles of which Tribonian was a part; for example, Agathias wrote poem *AP* XVI. 41.1-6 possibly on Thomas, Tribonian's predecessor (Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron 1966: 9), (McCail 1969: 89). Julian composed poems on Craterus, the father of the Phocas who, like Tribonian, was also part of the the law commission (McCail 1969: 88).

The contents of lemma T 957 would furthermore intricately connect Tribonian to the university of Constantinople via two of its professors; Priscian of Caesarea and John of Lydia. The treatise *On the 24 Units of Metre and the 28 Units of Rhythm* resembles closely the *De Figuris Numerorum* of Priscian, as both presumably treat the subject of numbers and the designations of different measures. Needless to say, both Priscian and Tribonian share the common cultural agenda of preserving the Latin language in Constantinople and the eastern Roman Empire; Priscian wrote the most monumental Latin grammar in the history of the language, whereas Tribonian went on a personal crusade to preserve Latin as the language of imperial legislation.[296]

When we compare the list of Tribonian's works as presented in *Suda* T 957, we see striking parallels with the oeuvre of the second university professor, John of Lydia. In fact, the whole of the list runs parallel to John's didactic oeuvre. We will analyse the correspondences systematically. 1) *Commentary on the Canon of Ptolemy, in verse; Conjunction of the Cosmic and Harmonic Disposition of Stars at Birth; On the Presiding and Conducting Stars; On the Houses of the Planets, and why each in particular occupies its House.* The *Commentary on the Canon of Ptolemy* reveals an interest in the second-century astronomer Ptolemy, which is also exhibited in John of Lydia's *De Ostentis*. The *Conjunction of the Cosmic and Harmonic Disposition of Stars at Birth* and *On the Presiding and Conducting Stars* suggest the treatment of the causal effect which heavenly bodies have on earthly phenomena. This is one of the tenets of Ptolemy's thought,[297] which is vigorously defended in the *De Ostentis*.[298] Actually, the *De Ostentis* was a defence of Ptolemy in a contemporary philosophical debate on the validity of omens and the underlying question of natural and divine causality.[299] The titles of Tribonian's oeuvre suggest that he also participated in this debate. Significantly, the successor of Tribonian, Junillus,[300] who was also an acquaintance of Cassiodorus,[301] wrote against the validity

---

[296] A subsidiary aim of second law commission under Tribonian was the preservation of Latin in the East by providing a legal incentive to learn Latin (Honoré 1978: 49). Tribonian persevered in this Latin legal project despite hostility to the Latin language (Honoré 1978: 52). Changes in language policy were the result of changes in the power relation between John of Cappadocia and Tribonian. The weakening of Latin in the legislation was a sign of Tribonian's waning influence, and the sudden change from Latin to Greek legislation comes about by the death of Tribonian around AD 542. For Tribonian's crusade for the preservation of Latin against John of Cappadocia, see Honoré (1978: 59, 134-137), Schamp (2006c: clxxvii-clxxviii).
[297] Maas (1992: 106).
[298] "Two general assumptions underlie *de Ostentis*: that the learning of the past is still valid and that general celestial principles can be seen to operate through their earthly manifestations. (…) His concern is to show that portents foretell future events." (Maas 1992: 107-109). See also Domenici (2007: 12-13).
[299] On this contemporary debate, which was also sparked by Justinian's legislation against divination, see Maas (1992: 105-113), Watts (2004a: 172, 173, 173 n.49, 174), Thesz (2016: 38). On the presence of and popularity of occult texts and texts concerning divination in Constantinople, see Weinstock (1950: 49), Wood (1981: 123, n. 61), Briquel (1990: 536, 538), Bernardi (2004: 55, 57), Agusta-Boularot (2006: 112), Turfa (2012: 3, 9), Bernardi and Caire (2016: 128-129).
[300] Purpura (1976: 55, n. 16).
[301] Cassiodorus and Junillus Africanus were in contact between AD 542 and Junillus' death in 548/549. The *terminus post quem* is the publication of Junillus' *Instituta regularia divinae legis*, which Cassiodorus praised in his *Institutiones* (I.10.1) (Van de Vyver 1931: 259-260, 271), (O'-Donnell 1979: 133-134).

of omens.[302] Clearly this philosophical debate was not confined to the academic circles of John of Lydia, but also trickled into the highest levels of Justinian's administration.[303]

     2) *Prose Treatise on Consuls; dedicated to the Emperor Justinian; Treatise on Kingship to the same*.[304] These treatises on an office of the Roman polity resemble Lydus' *De Magistratibus*. Furthermore, John Lydus also discusses the consulship in terms of veiled criticism against Justinian.[305] Clearly the abolishment of the consulship fuelled a contemporary debate in the common Constantinopolitan network of intellectuals, professors and officials. In a similar manner, the *Treatise on Kingship* could have been part of a debate on just leadership, a debate which also echoed in John's theoretical reflections on just kingship in *De Magistratibus*,[306] and which was a central theme in the anonymous *Dialogue on political sciences*. 3) *On the Changes of the Months (in verse)* obviously recalls John of Lydia's prose treatise *De Mensibus*.

     Apart from these intimate connections in erudite oeuvres, Tribonian and Lydus might have been acquainted with each other, as Lydus most possibly had access to the works of Justinian's legal commissions through his connection with Phocas.[307] Furthermore, Tribonian and John Lydus shared the same preferences and animosities. Both were sworn enemies of John of Cappadocia. Their animosity for John of Cappadocia follows the above sketched pattern of departmental identity creation; the interdepartmental competition between Tribonian or John Lydus on the one hand and John of Cappadocia on the other hand attached itself to the ideological question of the use of the Latin language.[308] The intimate connections between the oeuvres of both intellectuals and their shared interests makes it nearly impossible for Lydus not to mention Tribonian. Indeed, John Lydus praised Tribonian in *De Magistratibus* III.20.[309] However, Lydus' mention of Tribonian covers in fact a great silence; Tribonian is praised because of his policies as an administrator, not because of his academic merits. Just as in the case of the silence on Priscian, this sparse reference to Tribonian can also indicate Lydus' intellectual uncertainties. Was there perhaps some case of borrowing or even plagiarism between Lydus and Tribonian? Regrettably, the answers which can be glanced from a list of titles are few indeed, and questions will remain.

---

[302] Honoré (1978: 238-240), Maas (1992: 111-112). Not surprisingly, therefore, Junillus was rebuked by the classicist Procopius (Honoré 1978: 238-240).

[303] Tribonian furthermore shared the same empirical attitude to the past in his legal work as Lydus exhibited in his *De Ostentis* (Honoré 1978: 246-247).

[304] Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2011) attribute a fragment of an oration, which in previous research was erroneously attributed to Themistius, to an author from the sixth century, also mentioning Tribonian as a parallel (Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2011: 416-417).

[305] Kaldellis (2004: 8-9).

[306] For instance, *Magistr.* I.3 and I.5.

[307] Caimi (1984: 196-198, 264-265).

[308] For the administrative and ideological feud between Tribonian and John of Cappadocia, see Purpura (1976: 53-55), Honoré (1978: 13, 46, 59). For the common hate of Tribonian and Lydus for John of Cappadocia because of Latin, see Honoré (1978: 58-59), Schamp (2006c: clxxvii-clxxviii).

[309] Honoré (1978: 43), Kaldellis (2004: 11).

We can connect Tribonian with yet another university professor on the basis of his intellectual predilections. Professor Theophilus was both a teacher of the law at the university and a colleague of Tribonian in the law commission of Justinian.[310] The line between Tribonian and the university becomes even thinner when we consider, for example, the didactical nature of his *Paraphrase of the Catalogue of the Homeric Ships* – paraphrases were a distinct didactic tool throughout Antiquity and the Byzantine period – and the fact that parts of the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* were, in fact, legal handbooks. We can safely assume Tribonian was well embedded into the educational and erudite circles surrounding the university of Constantinople,[311] which makes his acquaintance with both Priscian of Caesarea and John Lydus nearly unavoidable.

Bringing Priscian of Caesarea, Tribonian, and John Lydus in relation to each other also sheds further light on the nature of the changes of the intellectual network under Justinian. Both Priscian and Tribonian died at about the same moment, the latter from the plague, the former most possibly of the same illness. John Lydus started his academic career at the same moment. Contrary to what the accounts of the sixth century want us to believe, the slow demise of the intellectual circles from the reign of Anastasius was not solely brought about by the conscious policies of his successor. The impact of natural factors such as the plague under Justinian on a more or less socially coherent carrier group responsible for the articulation and negotiation of cultural unease also has to be taken into account.

### 3.2.2.2. Western Émigrés in Constantinople

In their actions and writings, the Constantinopolitan intellectuals engaged with an ideologically and politically influential group in Constantinople, the aristocrats who hailed from the former western Roman Empire and who at some point in time exchanged the old Rome for her younger sister on the Bosporus. These western émigrés consisted in general of two groups. There were Italians who commuted because of the Ostrogothic regime or, later on, fled the Gothic wars. Also, people who fled from the Vandalic regime in Africa flocked to the eastern Roman capital.[312] The presence of a large number of western émigrés[313] made them a formidable factor in Justinian's decision making,[314] as they had been before, under Anastasius, responsible for lingering pro-Byzantine sentiments in Rome.[315]

With the necessary caveats, as we only have some testimonies at our disposal, we can assume that the western aristocrats were a force to be reckoned with not

---

[310] Fuchs (1926: 7).

[311] On the erudite, academic, and antiquarian qualities of the legal project of Tribonian and Justinian, see Honoré (1978: 76-80, 246-247, 249, 251-254).

[312] For further reading on these western exiles see Coyne (1991: 167-169), Haarer (2006: 102-103). The first group consisted of exiles of Vandalic North Africa and supporters of Laurentius and Festus, and African elites fleeing the regime of Vandal king Thrasamund 508-523 (Gaudenzi 1886: 64), Ballaira (1989: 31-33). The second group consisted of either dissidents banished by Theodoric (Gabotto 1911: 240-241) or aristocrats fleeing the political instability of the west, predominantly during the Gothic wars (Momigliano 1960: 240), (Bjornlie 2013: 126).

[313] Maas (1992: 33), Bjornlie (2013: 30, 134-138, 144-147).

[314] Bjornlie (2013: 124-127, 144).

[315] Haarer (2006: 102-103).

only on a political, but also on an ideological plane,. As already mentioned, many of these aristocrats were living representatives of the ideal of the unified Roman Empire. As such, the memory of Symmachus and Boethius especially, who were executed by the Ostrogoths a decade before,[316] acquired political currency in Constantinople during the Gothic wars as the memory of martyrdom for the cause of the reunified empire.[317] For instance, Boethius' treatise *De consolatione philosophiae*, written in prison, circulated in small circles and had a posthumous readership in Constantinople.[318]

As the political exigencies required, Justinian showered favour upon members of the western aristocracy associated with Boethius and Symmachus as a part of the imperial propaganda – thereby also continuing the policies of his predecessor Anastasius.[319] We know of many members of the western aristocracy who advanced their careers in Constantinople through an appeal to Justinian.[320] We have the aristocrat Liberius,[321] Anicius Faustus Albinus Basilius,[322] and Decius.[323] Petronius Nicomachus Cethegus[324] resided in the company of senior eastern members of Justinian's court such as Belisarius, Petrus Patricius, Justinus and Marcellinus the quaestor. He was in the company of the above mentioned Decius, and Albinus,[325] the accused whom Boethius defended and who was later responsible for the publication of Boethius' *De consolatione*.

In the competitive network of administrators and intellectuals, the memory and presence of the western aristocrats as a formidable political factor elicited different responses from our three authors under scrutiny.

The author for whom his relationship with the western aristocrats was a matter of the utmost urgency was Cassiodorus. We already mentioned the political resistance his rehabilitation in the Roman administration at Constantinople encountered because of his affiliations with the unpopular Ostrogothic palatine aristocracy and court - the fact that Cassiodorus succeeded Boethius as *magister officiorum* in

---

[316] On the affair of Boethius' and Symmachus' downfall, see Courcelle (1943: 312), Lozovsky (2016: 331-332), Radtki (2016: 137-140).

[317] Bjornlie (2013: 30, 138-144, 147-159; 2017: 438). For further reading on Symmachus and Boethius see Ballaira (1989: 41 n. 46 and 47 respectively).

[318] Troncarelli (1981: 82-97), (2008: 201-237), Bjornlie (2013: 150).

[319] Bjornlie (2017: 436-438). Justinian clearly selected from the Italian expats the persons who were beneficial to his policies, such as Liberius. Also Cassiodorus possibly benefited from this policy, as he probably received the title of patrician from Justinian in Constantinople (Bjornlie 2017: 436). The memory of Boethius and Symmachus was an important form of political currency up until the definitive conquest of Italy by Justinian's armies. After this pivotal moment, the use for and therefore also the influence of this Italian group on the imperial policy faded away, as Cassiodorus' retreat to Vivarium shortly after Justinian's *Pragmatic Sanction* (AD 554) shows.

[320] Bjornlie (2013: 25).

[321] Petrus Marcellinus Felix Liberius 3 *PLRE* II.677-681. Van de Vyver (1931: 255, 260), O'-Donnell (1981), Bjornlie (2013: 144-145).

[322] See below.

[323] Decius 1 *PLRE* III.391. Bjornlie (2013: 146).

[324] See below.

[325] (?Faustus) Albinus iunior 9 *PLRE* II.51-52. Van de Vyver (1931: 256), Momigliano (1966: 187), Bjornlie (2013: 146-147).

AD 523 raises suspicion of the former's complicity in the downfall of the latter.[326] Cassiodorus exhibited therefore a varied set of strategies to deal as best as possible with his awkward position. In the *Variae*, the memory of the executed Boethius and Symmachus is an important issue.[327] He tries in his imaging of both intellectuals to emphasise their complicity in the Ostrogothic regime on the one hand, and to establish a connection between himself and these two intellectuals. Emphasising the participation of both aristocrats in the Ostrogothic regime exculpates this regime, and indirectly Cassiodorus, from any guilt for the untimely end of both. Associating himself with Symmachus and Boethius is part and parcel of Cassiodorus' strategy of political self-preservation – I already mentioned above how he could have used the benefits of associating himself with Anastasius through Pompey the Great.[328] These subtle strategies of representation Cassiodorus also applied to persons connected to the memory of both aristocrats: Albinus is presented in the *Variae* as a potent patron instead of the helpless victim who needed the fateful aid of Boethius.[329] Likewise, Liberius is portrayed in the *Variae* as being in collusion with the Amals.[330]

Cassiodorus' main attempt at establishing a connection between himself and Symmachus and Boethius is exhibited in the *Ordo generis Cassiodororum*,[331] the extant text of which is an abridgement of a pamphlet which Cassiodorus wrote in Constantinople, and in which he established his ties to Boethius and Symmachus – in spite of the lack of any indications of even the slightest ties.[332] As such, this pamphlet is an attempt to mitigate the deleterious effect of the *De consolatione philosophiae* on Cassiodorus' reputation. Cassiodorus addressed the *Ordo generis* to Cethegus.[333] Indeed, Cassiodorus, Cethegus and pope Vigilius were involved in Constantinople in the negotiations surrounding the theological issue of the Three Chapters Contro-

---

[326] Van de Vyver (1931: 249-250), Momigliano (1966: 188), O'Donnell (1979: 28-29, 68), Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 19), Bjornlie (2017: 435, 438). "There is no interpretation of Cassiodorus' actions that fully exonerates him from all suspicion in having participated in the downfall of Boethius, if only by profiting personally from promotion in Boethius' stead." (O'-Donnell 1979: 30).

[327] Boethius is mentioned or addressed in *Var.* I.10, I.45 (Van de Vyver 1931: 246), II.40 and Symmachus in *Var.* II.14, IV.10. and IV.51. Fridh (1965: 18), Momigliano (1966: 189), O'Donnell (1979: 29, 68, 75, 80, 87), Bjornlie (2013: 138-144, 163-184). Also in the *Institutiones*, Cassiodorus associated himself with Symmachus by calling Proba, Symmachus' daughter or niece, *parens nostra* (*Inst.* I.23.1) (Momigliano 1966: 189). Significantly, not a trace of Cassiodorus' career as *Magister Officiorum* is extant in the *Variae* - yet again an attempt at dissociating himself from this compromising episode in his career (Bjornlie 2017: 441).

[328] This technique was not limited to Cassiodorus' repertoire of political tools; also Ennodius associated with Boethius as a means to create a connection with an important family (Bjornlie 2013: 163). In the context of Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator's shrewd associating with Anastasius through his name Magnus, the fact that Cassiodorus shares the name Aurelius with Quintus Memmius Aurelius Symmachus also acquires significance.

[329] Bjornlie (2013: 168-169).

[330] Bjornlie (2013: 167).

[331] Schanz (1920: 99-100), Momigliano (1966: 189), O'Donnell (1979: 13-15, 259-266), Viscido (1992), Gallonier (1996), Vessey (2004: 13-14), Giardina (2006: 15-17), Bjornlie (2013: 145, 159-162), Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 15, 19).

[332] Momigliano (1966: 188-189), Vessey (2004: 17, n. 44).

[333] Fl. Rufius Petronius Nicomachus Cethegus *PLRE* II.281-282. Van de Vyver (1931: 255, 275), Momigliano (1966: 189, 193), O'Donnell (1979: 14, 134), Giardina (2006: 15), Bjornlie (2013: 145-146, 160).

versy.[334] During these negotiations, they encountered, amongst others, a character who is also mentioned in Cassiodorus' *Variae*,[335] Peter the Patrician,[336] whom Lydus praised extensively in his *De Magistratibus*, stressing his acquaintance with him.[337]

In the case of John of Lydia, we see Lydus exhibiting his usual sphinx-like conciseness in the treatment of the western intellectuals, who, like Priscian, must have posed a distinct threat to his intellectual presumptions. He only alludes to the presence of western aristocrats when he pronounced his praise of Justinian. These aristocrats "always care for the pursuit of learning, and that through enduring hardships."[338] Finally, in John Malalas, these aristocrats do not receive any attention, as the vicissitudes of the West are of no concern to his outlook, which already forebodes the later Byzantine outlook on the world.[339]

Before coming to the conclusions of this chapter, I would like to present some extra elements which indicate the existence of a broad shared culture of Roman erudition, even outside the contours of the networks described above. The sixth century had a tradition of literary and intellectual expertise in bureaucracy.[340] This tradition is exhibited in the practice of writing the history of administrative departments, which shall be explored thoroughly in chapter 6 of this dissertation.[341] I already mentioned John of Lydia's work on the praetorian prefecture and Tribonian's treatises on the consuls and on kingship. Another example is Peter the

---

[334] Van de Vyver (1931: 255-256), Momigliano (1966: 193, 196), O'Donnell (1979: 14, 132-134), Bjornlie (2013: 160), Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2017: 17). As can be deduced from a mention of both Cethegus and Cassiodorus in a letter by Pope Vigilius of 550 (*PL.* 69.49A-B): "Sed quia semel et secundo adhortatione nostra per fratres nostros episcopos, id est, Joannem Marsicanum, et Julianum Cingulanum, vel Sapatum filium nostrum atque diaconum, nec non et per gloriosum virum patrician Cethegum, et religious virus item filium nostrum Senatorem, aliosque filios nostros commoniti noluistis audire, et neque ad Ecclesiam, neque ad not reverti, sicut omnia facitis, voluistis detestandis superbia" Garetius (1865: 49).

[335] *Var.* X.19, X.22, X.23, X.24. Jouanaud (1993: 734-737).

[336] From AD 547 to AD 553, Peter the Patrician was instructed to persuade bishops in condemning the Three Chapters. From AD 551 to AD 553 he was involved in the negotiations with Pope Vigilius (Caimi 1984: 277).

[337] *Magistr.* II.26 (Caimi 1984: 279-280).

[338] *Magistr.* III.28.4 "οἷς ἀεὶ μέλει, καὶ τοῦτο ταλαιπωροῦσιν, τῆς περὶ λόγους σπουδῆς." (Schamp 2006c: 78), trans. Bandy (1983: 177). "Even the anonymous visitor from 'old Rome' mentioned by John Lydus seems to have held a senior magistracy and received a corresponding share of Justinian's attention." (Bjornlie 2013: 30, 127). See also Maas (1992: 33), Schamp (2006a: xli-xliii).

[339] Bjornlie (2013: 117-121). Greatrex (2016), however, argues that Malalas' silence on western affairs is brought about by his avoiding to produce overlap with Procopius.

[340] Maas (1992: 29).

[341] Maas (1992: 42-43, 55). An older example proves that this tradition was also rooted in a continuity with the erudition of previous centuries. Aurelius Arcadius Charisius wrote a history of the prefecture, of which an excerpt was found in the Digests (Maas 1992: 91).

Patrician,[342] who, among other works, also wrote a treatise on the *magister officiorum*.[343]

### 3.2.3. Common Networks, Common Culture of Erudition

As this concise overview tried to show, John of Lydia, John Malalas and Cassiodorus were – to different extents – embedded in the same carrier group: a densely connected group of erudite scholars, bureaucrats and politicians, with a shared historiographical culture, the continuity and pervasiveness of which transcends the boundaries created by these intellectuals in their own texts.[344] In the next section (pp. 77-121 of this dissertation), I shall analyse the appearance of textual parallels in the three authors which underscore the commonality of this shared culture - the same carrier group used a common and shared discourse for the articulation and negotiation of cultural trauma. This shared culture was cultivated from Antioch in the east, over the centre at Constantinople, to Italy, Africa and the former western Roman Empire. The carrier group cultivating this shared culture flourished under Anastasius, Justinian's predecessor, but continued to flourish well into the reign of Justinian. The eventual dystrophy of this group came about more by a shift from the earlier reign of Justinian, which was marked by optimism, to the pessimism of the second part of his reign.[345] This shift was enhanced by catastrophic events such as the sack of Antioch in 540[346] and the plague,[347] which was most possibly the cause of the deaths of two central figures in this erudite carrier group; Priscian of Caesarea (ca. AD 540-550) and Tribonian (between AD 542 and AD 544). This dramatic shift, which not by coincidence occurred at the same time as the start of Lydus' academic career in AD 543 can explain John's silence towards Priscian and Tribonian. Lydus' intellectual uncertainty, the unease of a mediocre Latinist,[348] a dwarf standing on the shoulders of two giants, made him silent as to his predecessors. As most possibly, Lydus' promotion was made possible only by the vacancies created by the bubonic plague, it is very ironic indeed that he, in his invective against John of Cappadocia, lamented the very same natural process of administrative replacement on the level of the praetorian prefecture, which earned him his post at the university.

---

[342] As attested by John of Lydia, *Magistr.* II.25. Maas (1992: 29). This aristocrat was also connected to the house of Anastasius (Al. Cameron 1978: 273). A poem by Leontius in the Cycle of Agathias, *AP* VII.579 perhaps has Peter the Patrician as subject (Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron 1966: 15-16). Contra McCail, who said the poem was not on Peter the Patrician (McCail 1969: 91-92). For his life and career see Momigliano (1966: 187), Caimi (1984: 273-283), Antonopoulos (1985, 1990), Schamp (2006a: cdlxxv-clxxxiv), Treadgold (2007a: 264-269), Banchich (2015).

[343] Other testimonies to this common culture of erudition in the sixth century are Stephen of Byzantium, Heychius Illustrius (2005), Theaetetus – who contributed to Agathias' cycle and apparently also wrote some antiquarian works (Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron 1966: 19) – and the anonymous *Carmen De Ponderibus*.

[344] "Wir haben ihre Vorlaüfer schon unter Anastasius und Justin festgestellt und, da die meisten unter Justinian noch lebten, war die Kontinuität nie unterbrochen." (Salamon 1979: 96).

[345] This sense of crisis was also the impetus behind the production of historiography (Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2017: 3-5).

[346] Honoré (1978: 20-21).

[347] Honoré (1978: 60-64).

[348] Carney (1971b: 48).

## 3.3. Common Culture of Roman Erudition: Textual Parallels

The resemblances in the networks of the three authors coincide with striking parallels in their treatment of the distant past. In the following sections, I shall explore the textual parallels between Malalas and Lydus (chapter 3.3.1.), and between Cassiodorus and both Greek authors (chapter 3.3.2.). I shall conclude this section with a case study of a motive which appears in all three authors: the antiquarian history of the hippodrome (chapter 3.3.3.). These textual parallels can be interpreted in two ways: either that all three authors derived their material from and participated in a common and shared culture of antiquarian erudition, or, more controversially, that some of these authors, such as John Malalas and Lydus, knew and engaged with each other's work. Either way, these analyses of textual parallels shall show that the more or less socially unified carrier group as sketched in the preceding sections of this dissertation (3.1. and 3.2.) used a common historical discourse for the expression of and coming to terms with the cultural unease generated by the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople.

### 3.3.1. John Lydus and John Malalas

"I thought it right, after abbreviating some material from the Hebrew books written by Moses … in the narratives of the chroniclers Africanus, Eusebios Pamphilou, Pausanias, Didymos, Theophilos, Clement, Diodoros, Domninos, Eustathios and many other industrious chroniclers and poets and learned historians, and 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 life-time which came to my hearing, I mean indeed from Adam to the reign of Zeno and those who ruled afterwards.".[349]

In the preface to his *Chronographia*, John Malalas made a distinction between the two types of source material that he used in his work. On the one hand, he abbreviated the information he found in written sources, whereas on the other hand he used oral testimonies. In the secondary literature, this distinction has been interpreted as implying also a temporal dimension:[350] the oral accounts on contemporary events, which of necessity came from Malalas' contemporaries, were opposed to Malalas' written sources, which originated from his temporal predecessors - ranging

---

[349] "Δίκαιον ἡγησάμην μετὰ τὸ ἀκρωτηριάσαι τινὰ ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν κεφαλαίων ὑπὸ Μωϋσέως <καὶ τῶν> χρονογράφων Ἀφρικανοῦ καὶ Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Παμφίλου καὶ Παυσανίου καὶ Διδύμου καὶ Θεοφίλου καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ Διοδώρου καὶ Δομνίνου καὶ Εὐσταθίου καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν φιλοπόνων χρονογράφων καὶ ποιητῶν καὶ σοφῶν ἐκθέσαι σοι μετὰ πάσης ἀληθείας τὰ συμβάντα ἐν μέρει ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τῶν βασιλέων ἕως τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς χρόνοις ἐλθό<ν>των εἰς τὰς ἐμὰς ἀκοάς, λέγω δὴ ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἕως τῆς βασιλείας Ζήνωνος καὶ τῶν ἑξῆς βασιλευσάντων." (Thurn 2000: 3), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 1).
[350] Jeffreys (1990b: 168), Carrara and Gengler (2017: 13): "Malalas habe sich für die vergangenen Epochen auf Vorläuferschriften derselben Gattung, eben (Welt-)Chroniken, gestützt (…)", Scott (2017: 217, 219-220).

from the seventh century BC to one generation before Malalas, at the beginning of the sixth century AD.[351]

However, this temporal implication is not necessarily extant in the preface quoted above. It might well be that the "many other industrious chroniclers and poets and learned historians", "καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν φιλοπόνων χρονογράφων καὶ ποιητῶν καὶ σοφῶν", mentioned by Malalas, were his contemporaries in Constantinople. The fact that John Malalas did not mention them by name need not preclude their existence. Indeed, we know of different sources John Malalas used without quoting them, - amongst others, literary sources.[352]

Malalas' using material of contemporaries without mentioning them actually seems to be a recurrent practice in the sixth century. We know that Cassiodorus used Boethius' work on music for a letter on the same subject (*Var.* II.40) without quoting him directly.[353] In the preceding chapter (pp. 54-76 of this dissertation), I also mentioned Lydus' reticence regarding such intellectuals as Priscian of Caesarea. Indeed, there can be many reasons for an antiquarian intellectual in the sixth century not to mention one of his contemporaries and peers. The sometimes vicious social divides among ethnic, departmental and ideological lines created a highly competitive intellectual climate in which jealousy and intellectual anxieties among érudits would have been endemic. Another more straightforward reason for not including the results of contemporary research in the own works is the antiquarian taste for historical authorities from the hallowed past[354] - indeed, in this section, I shall also analyse some cases in which John Malalas exhibited the tendency to name-drop historical authorities from the hallowed past to bolster his account.[355]

In this section, I shall explore the textual parallels between the antiquarianism of John Malalas and John Lydus as exponents of the same carrier group responsible for the traumatic discourse on the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople. The textual parallels between both authors shall warrant the hypothesis of a shared and common historical discourse used by a more or less socially unified carrier group for the articulation of cultural unease. More controversially, the intensity of these parallels and some specific cases will require the reader to consider that John Malalas knew and actively engaged with the work of Lydus. For the aim of this dissertation, the latter hypothesis is not necessary, as only the existence of a common discourse is a prerequisite for the development of cultural trauma. Never-

---

[351] For a chronological list of the sources John Malalas mentioned, see Jeffreys (1990b: 170). She also made a distinction between directly consulted and indirect sources in John Malalas (Jeffreys 1990b: 197), (Carrara and Gengler 2017: 14).

[352] On the sources which John Malalas used without mentioning them, see Jeffreys (1990b: 200-203), Carrara and Gengler (2017: 15). Some of these were literary texts (Jeffreys 1990b: 202-203).

[353] Pizzani (1993), see also chapter 3.3.2. (pp. 105-114 of this dissertation).

[354] "John [Lydus]'s eagerness to cite authorities does not extend to the works of contemporaries, from whom he keeps himself somewhat aloof. After all, an antiquarian might well with propriety concern himself primarily with the older writers who were contemporary to the events with which he dealt." (Carney 1971b: 65).

[355] On Malalas' name-dropping of authorities see Carrara and Gengler (2017: 17). John Lydus also had a proclivity for namedropping (Carney 1971b: 30, 52, 53, 64, 91). For a list of names dropped by Lydus, see Carney (1971b: 57-58).

theless, as the exploration of the acquaintance of John Malalas with Lydus can further elucidate the intellectual scene in sixth-century Constantinople, I shall devote some time to this hypothesis in this section. Malalas' interaction with the historical writings of contemporaries in general, and with Lydus specifically, has regrettably not yet been ascertained in modern research,[356] which focused, for the analysis of Malalas' contemporary sources, only on Malalas' use of documental and archival sources on the one hand,[357] and oral testimonies on the other hand.[358]

In the following, I shall systematically list and analyse the passages in Malalas' *Chronographia* which exhibit textual or content related parallels to passages in the works of John Lydus. The tables will also specify if these passages are analysed more in detail further on in this dissertation.

Book I

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| I.1. "Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Σὴθ (…) κατὰ κέλευσιν θεοῦ ἔθηκεν ὀνόματα τοῖς ἄστροις πᾶσιν καὶ τοῖς ε′ πλανήταις εἰς τὸ γνωρίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. καὶ τὸν μὲν α′ πλανήτην ἀστέρα ἐκάλεσεν Κρόνον, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον Ἥραν, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Ἄρεα, τὸν δὲ δ′ Ἀφροδίτην, τὸν δὲ ε′ Ἑρμῆν. **ὅστις καὶ τὰ ζ′ φωνήεντα ἐκ τῶν ε′ ἀστέρων καὶ τῶν δύο φωστήρων ἐξέθετο.**" | *Mens.* II.3 (Bandy IV.33) "Πάντας τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς ἐκ τῆς τῶν πλανήτων κινήσεως εἶναι συμβαίνει· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Κρόνος τῷ Δωρίῳ, ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς τῷ Φρυγίῳ, ὁ δ′ Ἄρης τῷ Λυδίῳ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς κινοῦνται κατὰ τὸν Πυθαγόραν **πρὸς τὸν ἦχον τῶν φωνηέντων**· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἑρμοῦ τὸν α, ὁ δ′ Ἀφροδίτης τὸν ε, ὁ δ′ Ἥλιος τὸν η, καὶ ὁ μὲν τοῦ Κρόνου τὸν ι, ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἄρεος τὸν ο, καὶ Σελήνη τὸν υ, ὅ γε μὴν τοῦ Διὸς ἀστὴρ τὸν ω ῥυθμὸν ἀποτελοῦσιν·" | 3.3.2. |
| I.6 "**Νεῖλον** ποταμὸν τὸν λεγόμενον **Χρυσορύαν**" | *Mens.* IV.107 (Bandy IV.98) "εἶτα **Χρυσορρόας** καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν **Νεῖλος** ἀπὸ βασιλέως οὕτω καλουμένου·" | |
| I.8 "**Βῆλον** διὰ τὸ **ὀξύτατον** εἶναι τὸν παῖδα" | *Mens.* I.32 (Bandy App. 23) "**Βήλωζ**, **ὀξύς**, ὃς καὶ βεραιδαρικὸς ἔτι καὶ νῦν λέγεται." | |
| I.14 "καθὼς **Ἡρόδοτος** ὁ σοφώτατος συνεγράψατο, ὃς καὶ **ἄλλους Ἡρακλεῖς** ἱστόρησεν γεγενῆσθαι **ἑπτά.**" Source: Herodotus | *Mens.* IV.67 (Bandy IV.72) "οὕτως μὲν οἱ φιλόσοφοι. **ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἱστοριῶν** εὑρίσκομεν **ἑπτὰ Ἡρακλεῖς** γενέσθαι" | |

---

[356] For the *status quaestionis* of Malalian *Quellenforschung*, see Jeffreys (1990b: 167-198, 197-199), Carrara and Gengler (2017: 9-18), Scott (2017: 217-218).

[357] On Malalas' use of contemporary documents and archival sources, see Scott (1981: 19, 22-24), Jeffreys (1990b: 200, 203-205, 213-214), Croke (1990: 11), Carrara and Gengler (2017: 15), Kulikowski (2017).

[358] On Malalas' use of oral sources, see Jeffreys (1990b: 169, 209-211), Carrara and Gengler (2017: 15-16), Borsch and Radtki-Jansen (2017).

| | |
|---|---|
| I.15 "οὐκ ᾔδεισαν γὰρ τότε μετρῆσαι ἐνιαυτοὺς οἱ **Αἰγύπτιοι**, ἀλλὰ **τὴν περίοδον τῆς ἡμέρας ἐνιαυτοὺς ἐκάλουν**." | *Mens.* III.5 (Bandy III.3) "**Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ λέγονται ἀριθμῆσαι τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τεσσάρων μηνῶν**, ὅθεν καὶ χιλιετεῖς τινας βιῶναί ποτε παρ᾿ αὐτοῖς ἀναγράφουσιν · Ἡσίοδος δὲ καὶ Ἑκαταῖος, Ἑλλάνικος καὶ Ἀκουσίλαος καὶ Ἔφορος καὶ Νικόλαός φασι τοὺς μακραίωνας καὶ ὑπὲρ χιλίους διαζῆσαι χρόνους, καὶ οὐκ αὐτοὺς μόνους ὡς ἡρωικὰς ἀνημμένους ψυχάς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπους τινάς, ὡς Διογένης ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἀξιοῖ. οἱ δὲ Ἀρκάδες τριῶν μηνῶν, Σικυώνιοι δὲ ἕξ, Λατῖνοι τριῶν καὶ δέκα τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἠρίθμουν, παρὰ δὲ Ῥωμαίοις τὸ παλαιὸν δέκα μῆνας ἐτετύπωτο τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἔχειν, **ὕστερον δὲ πρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως Νουμᾶ καὶ ἕτεροι δύο προσετέθησαν, τιμῆς μὲν ἕνεκα τῶν νοητῶν ὁ Ἰανουάριος, τῶν ὑλικῶν δὲ ὁ Φεβρουάριος**. " |

In *Mens.* II.3, Lydus stated that all rhythms derived from the planets, whereby he gave three examples; Cronus, Zeus and Ares. He continued by giving an alphabetical list of planets which correspond to the seven vowels of the alphabet, mentioning Pythagoras as a source.[359] In John Malalas (*Chron.* I.1), this scheme is simplified with the mention that Seth derived the seven vowels from the five planets, the sun and the moon. This passage in Lydus will also be compared to Cassiodorus *Var.* II.40.4 in the following section.

In *Chron.* I.8, John Malalas provided the reader with an etymology which seems at first hand incomprehensible,[360] by stating that Belus (*Βῆλος*) was called thus because he was very swift (*ὀξύτατος*). This etymology becomes sensible only through the extra step of the Latin language; Belus, phonetically "Vilos" resembles the Latin word *velox*, which indeed means swift. We could wonder where Malalas, who otherwise only had a very shallow knowledge of the Latin language, acquired the knowledge to generate this etymology. In Lydus, *Mens.* I.32, we happen to have an explanation of the term *velox*, which used the same word as John Malalas used in his etymology: "velox (Βήλωζ) means swift (ὀξύς)".

In *Mens.* IV.67, John Lydus gave an account of seven mythological characters with the name Heracles, mentioning in general some histories as his source, "ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἱστοριῶν". In John Malalas (*Chron.* I.14) we only have a single mention of the fact that there existed seven characters with the name Heracles. John Malalas did mention his source, namely the historian Herodotus.[361] However, Herodotus

---

[359] Lydus also digressed on he seven vowels and the seven variations of vocal sounds in *Mens.* II.12 (Bandy II.27).

[360] In this section, several cases shall be presented of Latin etymologies which are incomprehensible without the intertext of Lydus. One caveat could be mentioned in this cases, namely, that we now only have an abbreviated version of Malalas' original text, which allows for the possibility that John Malalas did provide his etymologies with explanations, and that these explanations were sifted out of the text in later Byzantine redactions. However, it does seems unlikely to me that a later Byzantine redactor would leave out the explanation of a Latin word which he certainly did not understand.

[361] Jeffreys (1990b: 183).

nowhere in his oeuvre mentioned the existence of seven characters called Heracles, in spite of the fact that he devoted ample attention to this mythological character in his *Histories*. For example, in *Histories* II.44, Herodotus discussed the existence of two characters named Heracles. Perhaps John Malalas read Lydus' vague mention of his sources and assumed Lydus meant Herodotus' *Histories* or Ἱστορίαι. Another possibility is Malalas' taking the data from Lydus and reproducing it under the name of Herodotus, the historian and source par excellence - indeed, Malalas' proclivity to namedropping and substituting the data of Lydus and other historians under names such as Herodotus will be a recurrent feature in the analysis.

In *Mens.* III.5, Lydus gave an overview of how many months were considered by which peoples to form a year; the Egyptians considered a period of four months to be a year, the Arcadians a period of three months, the Sicyonians a period of six months etc. Lydus added that the time-reckoning of the Egyptians caused the rumour of some Egyptians living for a thousand years. In John Malalas (*Chron.* I.15) Lydus' passage reappeared in a simplified and exaggerated form in order to explain the duration of the reign of the Egyptian king Hephaestus; John Malalas stated that the Egyptians did not know how to reckon years, and that they called a single day a year.

Book II

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| II.1 "Μετὰ καὶ τὴν τελευτὴν **Ἡφαίστου** ἐβασίλευσεν Αἰγυπτίων ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ὀνόματι **Ἥλιος** (...) οὐ γὰρ ᾔδεισαν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τότε ἢ ἄλλοι τινὲς ἀριθμὸν <ἐνιαυτῶν> ψηφίσαι, ἀλλ' **οἱ μὲν τὰς περιόδους τῆς σελήνης ἐψήφιζον εἰς ἐνιαυτούς, οἱ δὲ τὰς περιόδους τῶν ἡμερῶν εἰς ἔτη ἐψήφιζον**· οἱ γὰρ τῶν ιβ΄ μηνῶν ἀριθμοὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπενοήθησαν" | *Mens.* IV.86 (Bandy IV.39) "κατὰ δὲ ἱστορίαν Μανέθων Αἰγυπτιακῶν ὑπομνημάτων ἐν τόμῳ τρίτῳ φησίν, ὅτι πρῶτος ἀνθρώπων παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἐβασίλευσεν **Ἥφαιστος** ὁ καὶ εὑρέτης τοῦ πυρὸς αὐτοῖς γενόμενος· ἐξ οὗ **Ἥλιος**, οὗ **Κρόνος**, μεθ' ὃν **Ὄσιρις**, ἔπειτα **Τυφῶν**, ἀδελφὸς Ὀσίρεως." *Mens.* III.5 (Bandy III.3) cf. above. *Magistr.* III.30 "**Ἥφαιστος** δὲ ἦν ὁ χρηστός, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐκ μόνης τῆς προσηγορίας τὴν οὖσαν εὐγένειαν αὐτῷ δεικνύς· Ἡφαίστου γὰρ τοῦ πρώτου βασιλεύσαντος Αἰγύπτου κατὰ τὸν Σικελιώτην ἀπόγονος εἶναι διεφημίζετο" Source: Diodorus Siculus | |
| II.2 "Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τελευτὴν **Ἡλίου** βασιλέως, υἱοῦ **Ἡφαίστου**, ἐβασίλευσεν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων **Σῶσις**, καὶ μετὰ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ ἐβασίλευσεν **Ὄσιρις**, καὶ μετὰ Ὄσιριν ἐβασίλευσεν **Ὧρος**, καὶ μετὰ Ὧρον ἐβασίλευσεν **Θοῦλις** (...) ταῦτα δὲ παλαιὰ καὶ ἀρχαῖα βασίλεια τῶν Αἰγυπτίων Μανέθων συνεγράψατο· (...) ἅτινα μετὰ ταῦτα Σωτάτης ὁ σοφώτατος ἑρμήνευσεν." Source: Manetho, Sotatus | *Mens.* IV.86 (Bandy IV.39) cf. above. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| II.3 "καὶ ἔμειναν ἐν Περσίδι οἱ αὐτοὶ Σκύθαι ἐξ ἐκείνου ἕως τῆς νῦν· **οἵτινες ἐκλήθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν Περσῶν Πάρθοι, ὅ ἐστιν ἑρμηνευόμενον Περσικῇ διαλέκτῳ Σκύθαι** (…) καθὼς Ἡρόδοτος ὁ σοφώτατος συνεγράψατο." Source: Herodotus | *Mens.* III.1 (Bandy III.1) "ὅθεν καὶ Πάρθοι ἤτοι Πέρσαι μέγα φρονοῦσιν ἐπὶ παλαιότητι· Σκύθας δὲ αὐτοὺς εἶναι πάντες μὲν μαρτυροῦσιν, Ἀρριανὸς δὲ δείκνυσι· **τὸ γὰρ Πάρθος ὄνομα ὁ Σκύθης καὶ ἔπηλυς κατ' αὐτὸν τῇ Σκυθῶν φωνῇ ἑρμηνεύεται**." | |
| II.8 History of the colour purple | *Mens.* I.21 (Bandy I.12) *Magistr.* I.4 *Magistr.* I.17 *Magistr.* I.23 *Magistr.* I.32 *Magistr.* II.2 *Magistr.* II.4 *Magistr.* II.13 *Magistr.* II.24 | 3.3.2. 4.3.3. |
| II.17 "καὶ χρησμοδοτηθείς, ὅτι τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτοῦ μητρὶ Ἰοκάστῃ συμμιγήσεται, ἐκέλευσεν τοῖς παραμένουσιν αὐτῷ στρατιώταις λαβεῖν τὸν αὐτὸν **Οἰδίποδα** εἰς τὰς ὕλας καὶ **βληθῆναι τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ** ἐν ξύλῳ γλυφέντι καὶ ἔχοντι ὀπὰς καὶ ἡλωθῆναι τὸ ξύλον· **ἐξ αὐτοῦ οὖν ἐπινενόηται ὁ λεγόμενος παρὰ τοῖς στρατιώταις ἕως τῆς νῦν κοῦσπος** " | *Magistr.* I.46 "κουσπάτωρες, φυλακισταί· **κούσπους γὰρ Ῥωμαῖοι τὰς ξυλοπέδας καλοῦσιν**, ὡς ἂν εἰ κουστώδης πέδουμ, οἷον εἰ ποδοκάκας καὶ ποδοφύλακας " | |

In *Chron.* II.1, John Malalas reiterated the motif of the Egyptians not knowing how to reckon a year from *Chron.* I.15, though in this instance he nuanced his statement: some Egyptians considered a single lunar month to be a year, whereas others considered a single day to be a year. He proceeded with the mention that the number twelve for the months (in a year) was decided. In this instance, Malalas' account even further resembled the account of Lydus (*Mens.* III.5); for after the discussion of the different measures for a year, Lydus proceeded with a detailed account of how Numa Pompilius later on instituted twelve months for a year. John Malalas seems to have abbreviated and simplified Lydus' account in this instance - leaving out Lydus' mention of Numa Pompilius as the institutor of the twelve months. Further on, we will see how John Malalas consistently left out Numa Pompilius in his reuse of material from Lydus.

In *Mens.* IV.86, Lydus quoted Manetho, Book Three,[362] when giving an overview of the first five kings of Egypt, namely Hephaestus, Helius, Cronus, Osiris and Typhon. Hephaestus, the first king of Egypt, reappeared later in Lydus' oeuvre (*Magistr.* III.30), when he flatteringly traced the origin of his contemporary Hephaes-

---

[362] Most possibly form his *Aegyptiaca.*

tus to his mythological namesake.[363] In this passage, Lydus mentioned also the source of his knowledge on the mythological Hephaestus, namely Diodorus Siculus (I.13.1). John Malalas mentioned in *Chron.* II.1 Helius, the successor to Hephaestus whom John Malalas discussed in the first book. In *Chron.* II.2, John Malalas alluded to, after Helius, Sosis, Osiris, Horus and Thoulis. Significantly, John Malalas also quoted Manetho as his source later on in this passage, next to Sotatus, even later on.[364]

Lydus commenced his third book (*Mens.* III.1) with a controversy between the Scythians and the Egyptians on which people was the eldest. He asserted that the Scythians are older than the Egyptians, and stated that the Persians are Scythians, for which he found proof in Arrianus.[365] For Arrianus stated that "Parthian" means Scythian or new-comer in the Scythian language. John Malalas appears to have selected this detail on the meaning of the word "Parthian", after which he inserted it in *Chron.* II.3, where he remarked on Scythians who were settled in Persia by the Egyptian king Sostris. However, John Malalas seems to have misinterpreted or changed the mention from Lydus/Arrianus in Lydus, as he stated that the word "Parthian" means Scythian in the Persian language. Yet again John Malalas mentioned Herodotus as his source,[366] and yet again Herodotus only has one passage which remotely relates to Malalas' statement - in Book VII.64 of the *Histories*, we read how the Scythians were named *Sacae* by the Persians. Also in this case therefore, we have the distinct possibility of John Malalas using data from Lydus/Arrianus in Lydus and substituting for his name a hallowed historical authority such as Herodotus.

*Chron.* II.17 is, as in the case of *Chron.* I.8, yet again an example of an etymology in John Malalas which is unintelligible without the intertext of Lydus. John Malalas recounted how Oedipus' feet were mutilated, after which he added the following: "From this is derived the punishment known to the present day among soldiers as the *cuspos*.".[367] The connection between *cuspos*, a word of Latin origin and the mutilation of *feet* is not apparent in the text of Malalas. However, again, in Lydus, we find a passage which explains the etymology of *cuspos*. In *Magistr.* I.46 the etymology of *cuspos,* a fetter, is explained as *custodes pedum*, guardians of the feet.

Book III

The third book of Malalas, with the title, "*ΧΡΟΝΩΝ ΘΕΟΓΝΟΣΙΑΣ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ*", "The Time of Abraham's Knowledge of God",[368] is a book which drew heavily on the Scriptures,[369] and which does not show any resemblance with the oeuvre of Lydus.

---

[363] Fl. Ioannes Theodorus Menas Narses Chnoubammon Horion Hephaestus *PLRE* III. 582-583.

[364] On Manetho see Jeffreys (1990b: 186), who stated that John Malalas would not have consulted this source directly. On Sotatus, see Jeffreys (1990b: 193). Yet again, John Malalas would not have known Sotatus directly.

[365] This is a fragment of the first book of Arrianus' lost work *Παρθικά* (Wünsch 1898: 37).

[366] Jeffreys (1990b: 183) speaks of "vague, bordering on the proverbial" references to Herodotus.

[367] Trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 24).

[368] Trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 28).

[369] Jeffreys (1990b: 182).

Book IV

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| IV.5 "Ἐν δὲ τοῖς καιροῖς ἐκείνοις ἦν καὶ παρ' Ἕλλησι μάντις **Σίβυλλα ἡ ἐν Δελφοῖς** ." | *Mens.* IV.47 (Bandy IV.52) "γεγόνασι δὲ **Σίβυλλαι δέκα** ἐν διαφόροις τόποις καὶ χρόνοις. πρώτη **ἡ καὶ Χαλδαία ἡ καὶ Περσὶς ἡ καὶ πρός τινων Ἑβραία** ὀνομαζομένη, ἧς τὸ κύριον ὄνομα Σαμβήθη, ἐκ τοῦ γένους τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Νῶε, (…) **δευτέρα Σίβυλλα ἡ Λίβυσσα**, **τρίτη Σίβυλλα ἡ Δελφίς**, ἡ ἐν Δελφοῖς τεχθεῖσα· γέγονε δὲ αὕτη πρὸ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν καὶ ἔγραφε χρησμοὺς δι' ἐπῶν ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τῶν κριτῶν, ὁπηνίκα Δεβώρα προφῆτις ἦν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις. **τετάρτη Ἰταλικὴ ἡ ἐν Κιμμερίᾳ τῆς Ἰταλίας**, **πέμπτη Ἐρυθραία ἀπὸ πόλεως Ἐρυθρᾶς καλουμένης ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ**, ἡ περὶ τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ προειρηκυῖα πολέμου. **ἕκτη Σαμία**, ἧς τὸ κύριον ὄνομα Φυτώ, περὶ ἧς ἔγραφεν Ἐρατοσθένης, καὶ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις κριτῶν ἦν. **ἑβδόμη Κυμαία** ἡ καὶ Ἀμάλθεια ἢ Ἡροφίλη· ἡ δὲ Κύμη πόλις ἐστὶν Ἰταλική, ἧς πλησίον ἄντρον ἐστὶ συνηρεφὲς καὶ γλαφυρώτατον, ἐν ᾧ διαιτωμένη ἡ Σίβυλλα αὕτη τοὺς χρησμοὺς ἐδίδου τοῖς πυνθανομένοις. **ὀγδόη ἡ Γεργιθία** πολίχνη δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον τὸ Γεργίθιον. **ἐννάτη Φρυγία**, **δεκάτη ἡ Τιβουρτία** ὀνόματι Ἀλβουναία." | 4.3.1. |
| IV.10 "ἐν ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις ἦν παρ' Ἕλλησι μάντις ἄλλη, **Σίβυλλα ἡ Ἐρυθραία**." | *Mens*. IV.47 (Bandy IV.52) cf. above. | 4.3.1. |
| IV.11 "ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ καιρῷ ἐλαλεῖτο ἡ νίκη τοῦ ἀγῶνος **Πέλοπος τοῦ Λυδοῦ καὶ Οἰνομάου τοῦ Πισαίου**, ἐπιτελεσθεῖσα ἐν τῇ ἡλιακῇ ἑορτῇ· ἅτινα συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφώτατος Φιλόχορος καὶ Χάραξ ὁ ἱστορικός." Source: Philochorus, Charax | *Mens*. I.12 (Bandy I.6) "ἔπαθλον δὲ τῆς ἀγωνίας ταύτης προετίθει **Οἰνόμαος** τῷ νικήσοντι αὐτὸν τὴν ἰδίαν θυγατέρα Ἱπποδάμειαν, τὸν δὲ ἡττηθέντα φονεύεσθαι αὐτίκα. μέλλοντα γοῦν τὸν **Πέλοπα** τῷ Οἰνομάῳ ἀνταγωνίζεσθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς δηλωθεῖσι συνθήμασιν, ἑωρακυῖα Ἱπποδάμεια ἠράσθη τε αὐτοῦ καὶ προδίδωσι τούτῳ τὰ μηχανήματα τοῦ πατρός, δι' ὧν ἐκράτει τῶν συναμιλλωμένων, καὶ οὕτω παρεσκεύασε νικῆσαι τὸν Πέλοπα. κἀκεῖνος νικήσας εὐθὺς ἀνεῖλε μὲν Οἰνόμαον, ἔγημε δὲ Ἱπποδάμειαν καὶ ἐβασίλευσε μὲν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἔτη τριάκοντα ὀκτώ, ἐκάλεσε δὲ ταύτην ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ Πελοπόννησον." | 3.3.3. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| IV.14 "καὶ λοιπὸν μετὰ τὴν νίκην τὴν κατὰ **Οἰνομάου** ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ **Πέλοψ** ἔτη λβ΄, ἐξ οὗ καὶ Πελοποννήσιοι ἐκλήθησαν οἱ Ἑλλαδικοί. ἔκτισεν δὲ καὶ πόλιν, ἥντινα καὶ Πελοπόννησον ἐκάλεσεν· ἔκτοτε καὶ Πελοποννήσιον ἐκλήθη τὸ βασίλειον Ἑλλάδος." | *Mens.* I.12 (Bandy I.6) cf. above. | 3.3.3. |

In *Mens*. IV.47 (Bandy IV.52), Lydus gave an elaborate enumeration of the ten Sibyllae; the Chaldaean, the Libyan, the Delphian, the Cimmerian, the Erythraean, the Samian, the Sibylla of Cumae, the Gergithian, the Phrygian and the Tiburtan Sibylla. John Malalas seems to have selected several of these Sibyllae from Lydus' list, after which he added them in short notices to the passages already extant throughout his *Chronographia*,[370] whereby he preserved the original order of appearance of the Sibyllae in Lydus; number three in the list, the Delphian Sibylla, is added to the beginning of *Chron*. IV.5, number five, the Erythaean, to the beginning of *Chron*. IV.10, and number seven, the Sibylla of Cumae, appears at the end of *Chron*. VII.8. In *Chron*. IV.11, John Malalas mentioned two sources, Philochorus of Athens,[371] whom he did not know directly, and Charax of Pergamum, who will be discussed in section 3.3.3.

Book V

Book V of the *Chronographia*, "*ΧΡΟΝΩΝ ΤΡΩΙΚΩΝ*", "The Time of the Trojans",[372] which drew heavily on sources from the Trojan cycle,[373] has, in the same manner as Book III, no parallels with Lydus.

Book VI

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

---

[370] This practice of cross-referencing was facilitated in the sixth century by the use of membranaceous volumes (Carney 1971b: 65).

[371] Jeffreys (1990b: 189).

[372] Trans. Jeffreys et al (1986: 45).

[373] Namely Dictys of Crete, Domninus, Phidalius of Corinth, Sisyphus of Cos, and Vergil (Wyatt 1976: 114-115, 118-120), (Jeffreys 1990b: 176, 178-178, 189, 192, 196). On the Trojan cycle in Malalas' fifth Book, see Wyatt (1976: 116-118).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| VI.18 "ἐβασίλευσεν δὲ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ὁ αὐτὸς **Λατῖνος** ἔτη ιη΄, **καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου ὀνόματος τοὺς Κιτιαίους καλουμένους ἐπωνόμασε Λατίνους**." | *Mens.* I.13 (Bandy I.7) "Αἰνείας μετὰ πολλὰς ὅσας πλάνας κατάγεται ἐν πόλει τῆς Ἰταλίας λεγομένῃ Λαυρεντίᾳ, ἣν καὶ Ὀππικὴν φασιν ὀνομασθῆναί ποτε, ἐξ ἧς καὶ ὀππικίζειν, καὶ ὡς τὸ πλῆθος, ὀφφικίζειν τὸ βαρβαρίζειν Ἰταλοὶ λέγουσιν. εἶτα ἐπιγαμβρεύσας Λατίνῳ βασιλεύοντι τῆς χώρας αὐτός τε βασιλεύσας τρισὶν ἐνιαυτοῖς οἴχεται. τοσούτων οὖν ἐπιξενωθέντων τῆς Ἰταλίας, ὥσπερ ἐδείχθη, **Λατίνους μὲν τοὺς ἐπιχωριάζοντας**, Γραικοὺς δὲ τοὺς ἑλληνίζοντας **ἐκάλουν, ἀπὸ Λατίνου τοῦ ἄρτι ἡμῖν ῥηθέντος** καὶ Γραικοῦ, τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ὥς φησιν Ἡσίοδος ἐν Καταλόγοις." | |
| VI.24 "ἐν ᾗ κώμῃ καὶ ἔκτισεν ὁ **Πάλλας** οἶκον μέγαν πάνυ, οἶον οὐκ εἶχεν ἡ περίχωρος ἐκείνη, ὅστις οἶκος ἐκλήθη τὸ Παλλάντιν, καὶ **ἀπὸ τότε ἐκλήθη τὰ βασιλικὰ κατοικητήρια παλλάντιον** ἐκ τοῦ Πάλλαντος." | *Magistr.* II.6 "καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς Ῥώμης (ἐφ' ἧς καὶ μόνης **τὴν αὐλὴν παλάτιον καλεῖσθαι** νόμος) ὕπαρχος τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐνόμιζεν" *Mens.* IV.4 (Bandy IV.4) "φασὶ <δὲ> Λατῖνον ἐκεῖνον τοῦ Τηλεγόνου μὲν ἀδελφόν, Κίρκης δὲ παῖδα, πενθερὸν δὲ Αἰνείου, κτίζοντα τὴν τῆς Ῥώμης ἀκρόπολιν πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας Αἰνείου εὑρεῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου δάφνην κατὰ τύχην καὶ οὕτως πάλιν ἐᾶσαι αὐτὴν ἐκεῖσε διαμένειν· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐνταῦθα Δάφνην προσαγορεύουσι τὸ **Παλάτιον**." | |
| VI.29 "Ἀλβανῶν δὲ ἐβασίλευσεν Ἄλβας ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἀσκανίου ἔτη λς΄. καὶ **κτίζει τὴν Σίλβαν πόλιν (ἀπὸ τότε οἱ βασιλεῖς Σίλβιοι ἐκαλοῦντο**)" | *Magistr.* I.21 "Καὶ πρὸ Ῥωμύλου δὲ ἄν τις εὕροι **Σιλβίους τοὺς βασιλέας τῆς χώρας ἐπονομαζομένους ἀπὸ** Σιλβίου Αἰνείου τοῦ ἀπὸ Αἰνείου τοῦ πρώτου. **ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ὕλαις** τὰς οἰκήσεις ἔχοντες οἱ πρὶν καὶ τὸν νομαδικὸν τιμῶντες βίον **Σιλβίους σφᾶς σεμνυνόμενοι προσηγόρευον**, μηδὲ αὐτῶν ἀπαξιούντων νέμειν ἀγέλας καὶ χρήματα συλλέγειν αὐτῶν· ὅθεν καὶ πεκουνίας κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ χρήματα καλοῦσιν." | |

In *Chron.* VI.18, John Malalas derived in a short mention the name of the Latins from King Latinus, an etymology which can also be found in an elaborate discussion in Lydus (*Mens.* I.13).

In *Chron.* VI.24, John Malalas gave a straightforward etymology for the palace or *palatium*, as the abode of Pallas. He also remarked that Pallas' dwelling gave its name to the concept of palace in general. John Malalas seems to have simplified the data extant in Lydus. For Lydus in an aside in *De Magistratibus* (*Magistr.* II. 6) reserved the name of the *palatium* for the palace in Rome only. However, in *Mens.* IV.4, Lydus also used the term *palatium* in the generic sense of a palace to digress on the origin of the name of the palace in Constantinople, the Daphne Palace.

In *Magistr.* I.21, Lydus derived the nickname of the Roman kings, *Silvii*, from the king Silvius Aeneas. The Roman kings styled themselves *Silvii* because they prided themselves on their origin as rural inhabitants of forests (Latin *silvae*). In Malalas, *Chron.* VI.29, the same etymology is added to the text as a learned aside:

"from then on the emperors were called Silvii".[374] However, because of his not knowing the Latin language, John Malalas did not understand the etymology deriving Silvius from the Latin *silvae* in Lydus - this connection is also not explicitly stated but only implied in Lydus, who did not mention the word *silvae*. In order to make the etymology - which he apparently did not understand - fit his narrative, John Malalas had to devise a new context for it. The title *Silvii* of the Roman kings derived from a city Silva, founded by Albas - with both Silva and Albas invented by Malalas.

## Book VII

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| VII.1 "οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ ἀδελφοὶ ἀνενέωσαν **τὸ λεγόμενον Παλάντιον, τὸν βασιλικὸν οἶκον τὸν τοῦ Πάλλαντος**" | *Magistr.* II.6, *Mens.* IV.4 (Bandy IV.4) cf. above. | |
| VII.3 "'Ο δὲ αὐτὸς 'Ρῶμος βασιλεὺς μετὰ τὸ πληρῶσαι τὰ τείχη καὶ κοσμῆσαι τὴν πόλιν ἔκτισε **καὶ τῷ Ἄρηι ναόν**· καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ μηνὶ ἐποίησεν **ἑορτὴν μεγάλην** θύσας τῷ Ἄρει, **καλέσας καὶ τὸν μῆνα αὐτὸν μάρτιον, τὸν πρῴην λεγόμενον πρῖμον**, ὅπερ **ἑρμηνεύεται** Ἄρεως. ἥπερ ἑορτὴν κατ᾽ ἔτος οἱ 'Ρωμαῖοι πάντες ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἕως τῆς νῦν, **καλοῦντες τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πανηγύρεως Μάρτις ἐν κάμπῳ**." | *Mens.* IV.33 (Bandy IV.26) "Μάρτιος. **Τὸν Μάρτιον**, καθὰ καὶ τοῦτο προείπομεν, ἀρχὴν ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐνόμιζον οἱ 'Ρωμαῖοι· ἀνετίθουν δὲ αὐτὸν **τῷ Ἄρει· οὗτος δὲ πρότερον Ζεφυρίτης ὠνομάζετο καὶ Πρῖμος**· ὁ γὰρ τὴν 'Ρώμην κτίσας 'Ρῶμος καὶ **τέμενος τοῦ Ἄρεος** ἐν αὐτῇ τῷ μηνὶ τούτῳ ἀπαρτίσας Μαρτίου αὐτὴν μετωνόμασεν, τουτέστιν Ἄρεος **κατὰ τὴν πάτριον ἐκείνου φωνήν**." <br> *Mens.* IV.34 (Bandy IV.27) "θεραπεύεται δὲ ὁ Ἄρης ἤχοις ὅπλων καὶ σάλπιγζι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτῷ **τὴν πρώτην ἑορτὴν** ἐπετέλουν οἱ 'Ρωμαῖοι, καλοῦντες αὐτὴν Ἀρμιλούστριον οἱονεὶ καθαρμὸν ὅπλων, μὴ χείματος μὴ ἑτέρας τινὸς περιστάσεως εἰργούσης τὴν κίνησιν τῶν ὅπλων **ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Ἄρεος πεδίῳ**." <br> *Mens.* IV.41 (Bandy IV.34) "Κατὰ δὲ τὴν πρώτην τοῦ Μαρτίου μηνὸς (…) ἐκίνουν δὲ τὰ ὅπλα 'Ρωμαῖοι **ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Ἄρεος πεδίῳ ἢ τεμένει**." | |
| VII.4 The whole of the paragraph Source: Callimachus, Charax | *Mens.* I.12 (Bandy I.6) <br> *Mens.* IV.30 (Bandy II.11-13) | 3.3.3. |
| VII.5 The whole of the paragraph | *Mens.* I.12 (Bandy I.6) <br> *Mens.* IV.30 (Bandy II.11-13) | 3.3.3. |

---

[374] Trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 90).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| VII.6 "καὶ ἐξεφώνησεν νόμον, ὥστε λαμβάνειν τοὺς στρατιώτας πρὸς γάμον παρθένους, ἃς ἐκάλεσε **Βρυτίδας**· (…) αἱ θυγατέρες τῶν λεγομένων Σαβίνων"<br>Source: Vergilius, Plinius, Livius, other historians | *Mens.* IV.29 (Bandy IV.25) "αἱ σώφρονες τοῖς Βρούτου δαίμοσιν ἐνήγιζον δι᾽ αἰτίαν τοιαύτην· Λουκρητία, γυνή τις Ῥωμαία περιττῶς εὐπρεπής τε καὶ σώφρων, λέγεται **βιασθῆναί ποτε ὑπὸ Ταρκυνίου** τοῦ τελευταίου τῶν ῥηγῶν ἢ τοῦ αὐτοῦ παιδός· (…) ἐκείνη τοίνυν ἡ Λουκρητία, κρείττονα τὴν σωφροσύνην τῆς βασιλικῆς ὁμιλίας ἡγησαμένη, καὶ οὐκ αὐτῆς μόνης ἀλλὰ καὶ ζωῆς αὐτῆς, μεταπεμψαμένη τοὺς ἑαυτῆς ἀφηγησαμένη τε τήν, εἴγε ἄρα ἐβούλετο, λανθάνειν δυναμένην ἁμαρτίαν, **ἑαυτὴν** παρόντων τῶν τῆς σωφροσύνης μαρτύρων **ἀπέσφαζε. κινεῖται οὖν ὁ δῆμος** πρὸς τοῦτο καὶ τὸ μῖσος τοῦ τυράννου προσεποιεῖτο, ........ ὃς δραξάμενος καιροῦ ἡγεῖται τοῦ Ῥωμαϊκοῦ δήμου καὶ παρωθεῖται τῆς βασιλείας τὸν Ταρκύνιον. ἐτιμήθη οὖν, ὡς ἐλέγομεν, παρὰ ταῖς Ῥωμαίων γυναιξὶν ὁ Βροῦτος μετὰ θάνατον δημοσίῳ πένθει, οἷα ἔκδικος τῆς σωφροσύνης· **καὶ Βροῦτας ἑαυτὰς ἠξίουν ὀνομάζεσθαι πρὸς τιμὴν Βρούτου.** "<br>*Magistr.* I.16, I.19, I.21 | |
| VII.7 "τὰ λεγόμενα **Βρουμάλια**"<br>Source: Licinius Macer | *Mens.* IV.158 (Bandy IV.143) | Berna r d i (2006) |
| VII.8 "'Επὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ ἦν **Σίβυλλα ἡ Κυμαία** μάντις." | *Mens.* IV.47 (Bandy IV.52) cf. above. | 4.3.1. |
| VII.9 "Ἔσχεν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς **Ταρκύνιος υἱὸν ὀνόματι Ἄρρουνς**, δι᾽ ὃν ἐξεβλήθη τῆς βασιλείας, ὅτι **βιασάμενος τὴν Λουκρητίαν** συγκλητικὴν ἐμοίχευσεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ταρκυνίου ὁ Ἄρρουνς· **κάκείνη ἔσφαζεν ἑαυτήν**, ὡς σώφρων. καὶ ἐγένετο **ἐμφύλιος πόλεμος** μέγας ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ χρόνον, καὶ πολλοὶ ἐσφάγησαν. ταῦτα δὲ συνεγράψατο ὁ σοφὸς Σέρβιος ὁ Ῥωμαίων συγγραφεύς."<br>Source: Servius<br>"τὸν στρατὸν τὸν φυλάττοντα τὸ παλάτιον καὶ τὴν πόλιν Ῥώμην τῶν λεγομένων **Κελεριανῶν**, ἀνδρῶν μαχιμωτάτων ἐν πολέμοις."<br>Source: Livius | *Mens.* IV.29 (Bandy IV.25) cf. above.<br>*Magistr.* I.9 "ὁ Ῥωμύλος (…), Κελερίῳ τινὶ οὕτω καλουμένῳ τὴν φροντίδα τούτων παραδούς. **ταύτῃ συνεκδοχικῶς ἅπας ὁ στρατὸς κελέριοι τότε προσηγορεύθησαν**."<br>*Magistr.* I.14 "Ὡς οὖν εἴρηταί μοι, τὴν μὲν πεζομάχον δύναμιν τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχοις, τὴν δὲ ἱππικὴν **Κελερίῳ** τῷ πρὶν τῆς ὅλης ἡ γ η σ α μ έ ν ῳ σ τ ρ α τ ι ᾶ ς παραδέδωκεν" | 6.2.1. 1. |

VII.10 "Μετὰ δὲ χρόνους πολλοὺς **τυραννήσαντες οἱ Γάλλοι ἐκίνησαν πόλεμον Ῥωμαίοις** · καὶ τοῦτο γνοῦσα ἡ σύγκλητος Ῥώμης προεχειρίσατο κατ' αὐτῶν στρατηγὸν δυνατὸν ὀνόματι **Μαλλίωνα Καπετωλῖνον**. Ὅστις ὁπλισάμενος καὶ λαβὼν στρατὸν πολεμικώτατον, ὥρμησεν εἰς τὰς Γαλλίας · καὶ συμβαλὼν πόλεμον ἐνίκησε κατὰ κράτος. καὶ ὑποστρέψας ἐθριάμβευσε τὴν νίκην ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν ἀπονενοημένος κατὰ τῆς συγκλήτου καὶ τοῦ στρατοῦ καὶ δήμου · καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐλυπήθη ἡ σύγκλητος καὶ πάντες. φθονηθεὶς δὲ καὶ ὑπό τινος ἐχθροῦ αὐτοῦ συγκλητικοῦ ὄντος ἐν δυνάμει ὀνόματι Φεβρουαρίου, καταγομένου ἐκ γένους τῶν Γάλλων, κατεσκευάσθη. ἐν κομβεντίῳ γὰρ εἰσελθόντος τοῦ Μαλλίωνος Καπετωλίνου, καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς συγκλήτου καθεζομένου, ἐξαναστὰς **ὁ Φεβρουάριος συγκλητικὸς** λέγει τῷ Μαλλίωνι · 'τοῦ στρατοῦ Ῥωμαίων νικήσαντος τοὺς Γάλλους σὺ τί ὑπεραίρῃ, ὡς μονομαχήσας; ἡ τύχη Ῥωμαίων ἀεὶ νικᾷ τοὺς πολεμίους · οὐ διέλαθεν δὲ ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ἀπονοίᾳ τοσαύτῃ ὑπάρχεις, ὡς βουλόμενος καὶ σὺ τυραννῆσαι τοὺς Ῥωμαίους · ὅπερ οὐκ ἐγγίνεταί σοι.' καὶ ἀκούσασα ταῦτα ἡ σύγκλητος καὶ ὁ στρατὸς καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐπῆλθε τῷ Μαλλίωνι Καπετωλίνῳ · ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπαναστὰς κατὰ γνώμην τῆς συγκλήτου ἐβόησαν ἐκβληθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως Ῥώμης τὸν αὐτὸν Μαλλίωνα Καπετωλῖνον · ὅστις εὐλαβηθεὶς τὸν στρατὸν καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐξῆλθεν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις κτήμασιν, πλησίον τῆς λεγομένης Ἀπουληίας χώρας, κἀκεῖ διῆγεν ἡσυχάζων. ἐκείνου δὲ φυγόντος ἐπῆλθεν ὁ δῆμος Ῥωμαίων τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ διαφέροντα αὐτῷ διήρπασαν."

*Mens.* IV.27 (Bandy IV.19) "**Ὅτι Γάλλων παραλαβόντων τὴν Ῥώμην ὁ Κάμιλλος** συναγείρας πλῆθος ἀθρόον ἐμπίπτει τοῖς πολεμίοις · καὶ μάχης κρατερᾶς γενομένης κλασθέντων αὐτοῖς τῶν ξιφῶν σὺν καὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις— οὔπω γὰρ σιδηροῖς ἐχρῶντο Ῥωμαῖοι θώραξι, χαλκοῖς δὲ κατὰ τὴν παλαιότητα—τὸ λοιπὸν εἰς χεῖρας ἐλθεῖν ἕλκειν τε ἀλλήλους ἔκ τε τῶν λοφιῶν τῶν περικεφαλαιῶν καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μέντοι τῶν τοῦ πώγονος τριχῶν · τέλος δὲ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἀπήλασε καὶ Ῥώμην ἐρρύσατο καὶ δεύτερος Ῥωμύλος ὠνομάσθη. καὶ οὕτως ἀποκείρειν τε τοὺς πώγονας ἐπ' ἄκρου καὶ σιδηροῦς τοὺς θώρακας κατασκευάζειν τέτακται καὶ ἄνευ λοφιῶν τὰς περικεφαλαίας ἔχειν."

4.2.2.

VII.11 "Οἱ δὲ Γάλλοι προχειρισάμενοι αὐτοῖς **ῥῆγα δυνατὸν ἐν πολέμοις ὀνόματι Βρῆνον** ἐπεστράτευσαν εὐθέως κατὰ τῆς Ῥώμης, ἀκούσαντες καὶ διὰ τὸν Μαλλίωνα, ὅτι ἐξεβλήθη ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης. καὶ ὁρμήσας ὁ Βρῆνος ῥὴξ ἐξαίφνης εἰσῆλθεν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ καὶ παρέλαβεν αὐτὴν νυκτὸς ἐν χειμῶνι, τῇ πεντεκαιδεκάτῃ τοῦ ἑξτιλλίου μηνός, προπέμψας λάθρα τοὺς ὀφείλοντας φονεῦσαι τοὺς πορταρίους καὶ ἀνοῖξαι αὐτῷ τὴν πόρταν. καὶ τούτων φονευομένων ἐγένετο πτύρμα· καὶ γνόντες οἱ συγκλητικοὶ τὴν παράληψιν τῆς πόλεως ἔφυγον πάντες, καὶ φανεροὶ τῶν τῆς πόλεως λαμπροὶ σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις **εἰσῆλθον ἐν τῷ Καπετωλίῳ** εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Διὸς μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων χρημάτων. παραλαβὼν δὲ ὁ Βρῆνος ῥὴξ τὴν πόλιν Ῥώμην κατασφάζει πολλοὺς πολίτας καί τινας τῶν στρατιωτῶν καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζει· καὶ ἔμεινε πολιορκῶν τὸ Καπετώλιον διὰ τοὺς ὄντας ἐν αὐτῷ συγκλητικοὺς καὶ διὰ τὰ χρήματα αὐτῶν. δυνηθέντες δὲ οἱ συγκλητικοὶ ἔγραψαν, δεόμενοι τοῦ Μαλλίωνος Καπετωλίνου συνάξαι τὸν κατὰ πόλιν καὶ χώραν Ῥωμαίων ὄντα ἐγκάθετον στρατὸν καὶ ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἐκδίκησιν τῆς Ῥώμης καὶ εἰς βοήθειαν αὐτῶν. καὶ δεξάμενος τὰ τῆς συγκλήτου γράμματα **ὁ Μαλλίων Καπετωλῖνος**, καὶ γνούς, ὅτι ἐλήφθη ἡ Ῥώμη καὶ τὸ Καπετώλιον φρουρεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ Βρήνου, ῥηγὸς τῶν Γάλλων, ἐταράχθη· καὶ συναγαγὼν εὐθέως πάντοθεν πλῆθος στρατοῦ καὶ ὁρμήσας ἦλθε κατὰ τοῦ Βρήνου ῥηγὸς ἐξαίφνης, ἀπροσδοκήτως εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην· καὶ αὐτὸς νυκτὸς κατάξας τὸν ἴδιον στρατὸν ἐν ταῖς ῥύμαις τῆς πόλεως καὶ μεσάσας τὸν Βρῆνον ῥῆγα καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ πάντας, ὡς ξένους, ἀνεῖλεν. καὶ περιγενόμενος συνελάβετο τὸν αὐτὸν Βρῆνον ῥῆγα· καὶ εὐθέως ἀπεκεφάλισεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔπηξεν ἐν κοντῷ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὰ πλήθη δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς κόμητας αὐτοῦ κατακόψας ἐρρύσατο πάντας οὓς συνελάβετο Ῥωμαίους αἰχμαλώτους, ἀφελόμενος καὶ πάντα τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν πραιδευθέντα. καὶ ἐξελθοῦσα ἡ σύγκλητος Ῥωμαίων ἐκ τοῦ Καπετωλίου μετὰ τὴν νίκην τοῦ Μαλλίωνος Καπετωλίνου εὐθέως ἐφηφίσατο αὐτὸν ἅμα τῷ στρατῷ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τῷ περιλειφθέντι αὐτῷ αὐτὸν μόνον διοικεῖν τὰ Ῥωμαίων πράγματα."

*Mens.* IV.27 (Bandy IV.19) cf. above.

*Magistr.* I.50 "Τρίβυρες, ἔθνος Γαλατικόν, ταῖς ὄχθαις τοῦ Ῥήνου παρανεμόμενοι, ὅπου καὶ Τρίβυρις ἡ πόλις (Συγάμβρους αὐτοὺς Ἰταλοί, οἱ δὲ Γαλάται Φράγγους καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπιφημίζουσιν), **ἐπὶ Βρέννου ποτὲ** διὰ τῶν Ἄλπεων σποράδην ἀλώμενοι, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἐξηνέχθησαν διὰ τῶν ἀνοδεύτων καὶ ἀκανθωδῶν ἐρημιῶν, ὥς φησιν Οὐεργίλιος. εἶτα καὶ διὰ τῶν ὑπονόμων ἐπελθόντες τὴν Ῥώμην **καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ Καπιτώλιον ἐκράτησαν** ὅτε, τῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ χηνῶν ταραχθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων ἀκράτῳ νυκτὶ φανέντων, διεγερθεὶς **Μάλλιος ὁ στρατηγὸς** (γείτων δὲ ἦν) τοὺς μὲν βαρβάρους ἐξώθησεν, τοῖς δὲ χησὶν ἑορτὴν καὶ ἱπποδρομίαν ἄγειν Ῥωμαίοις, τοῖς δὲ κυσὶν ὄλεθρον κατὰ τὸν ἐν λέοντι ἥλιον διώρισεν."

cf. 4.2.2.

VII.12 "Καὶ κρατήσας πάλιν τῆς Ῥώμης ὁ Μαλλίων Καπετωλῖνος εὐθέως ἐλυπήθη διὰ τὴν παράληψιν τῆς πόλεως Ῥώμης καὶ τὴν ὕβριν καὶ τὴν ἧτταν Ῥωμαίων. **ἐν δὲ τῷ λεγομένῳ μηνὶ ἐξτιλλίῳ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνὸς τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκολόβωσεν ὡς δυσοιωνίστου γενομένου τῇ πόλει Ῥώμῃ, ἀποχαράξας καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ** μηκέτι καλεῖσθαι οὕτως. συσχὼν δὲ καὶ τὸν συγκλητικὸν τὸν ἐχθρὸν αὐτοῦ, τὸν κατασκευάσαντα αὐτῷ, ὀνόματι **Φεβρουάριον**, τὸν καὶ ποιήσαντα αὐτὸν ἐκβληθῆναι ἔξω τῆς πόλεως Ῥώμης καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀφελόμενος, εὐθέως ἐπ' ὄφεσιν αὐτοῦ ἐρρόγευσε τῷ ἐλθόντι στρατῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς ἐκδίκησιν τῆς πόλεως Ῥώμης, προσφωνήσας τῇ συγκλήτῳ καὶ τῷ στρατῷ, ὅτι· 'οὗτος ἐκ γένους ἐστὶν τῶν Γάλλων, ὡς καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε, κἀκείνους ἐκδικῶν κατεσκεύασέ μοι. ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἐνυβρισμένον βίον· ἔστι γὰρ κίναιδος, καὶ οὐκ ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν οἰκεῖν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ, ἀλλὰ χρὴ ἐκβληθῆναι αὐτὸν ἀτίμως καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ζωῇ ἀφαιρεθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ δοθῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς θυσίαν τοῖς καταχθονίοις θεοῖς.' καὶ συνήνεσεν ἡ σύγκλητος καὶ ὁ στρατός· καὶ εὐθέως ἀφελόμενος αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀξίαν **ἀπέδυσεν αὐτὸν γυμνὸν καὶ περιειλήσας αὐτὸν ψίαθον καὶ περιζώσας αὐτὸν σχοῖνον μάσσινον, ἐπιθεὶς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ αὐτοῦ συγκλητικοῦ δι' ἐγγράφου προστάξεως αὐτοῦ τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἐξτιλλίῳ, ποιήσας λέγεσθαι τὸν αὐτὸν μῆνα ἐξ ἐκείνου φεβρουάριον, ὡς ἀξίου ὄντος τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ δυσοιωνίστου καὶ ἀτίμου**, κελεύσας τοῖς **βερνάκλοις**, τουτέστι περιπόλοις, **βαλισσίνοις βάκλοις τύπτειν** αὐτὸν καὶ κράζειν· 'ἔξιθι, φεβρουάρι', ὅπερ ἐστὶ τῇ Ἑλληνίδι γλώσσῃ 'ἔκβα, περίτιε.' καὶ οὕτως ἐκβληθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως Ῥώμης ὁ αὐτὸς συγκλητικὸς ἐτελεύτα, **θυσιασθεὶς τοῖς καταχθονίοις θεοῖς**. καὶ ἐπιτρέψας τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ὁ αὐτὸς Μαλλίων ποιεῖν θυσίας ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μηνὶ φεβρουαρίῳ, κελεύσας ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει Ῥωμαίων τὸ αὐτὸ σχῆμα τοῦ φορέματος τοῦ φιαθίου γίνεσθαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ κατ' ἔτος, καὶ διώκεσθαι τὸν φεβρουάριον τὸν καὶ περίτιον μῆνα πρὸ τῆς πόλεως τυπτόμενον, τὴν κατὰ τοῦ Βρήνου καὶ τῶν Γάλλων σημαίνων νίκην καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ τοῦ Μαλλίωνος ἐκδίκησιν, ὅπερ γίνεται ἕως τῆς νῦν εἰς ἑκάστην πόλιν Ῥωμαίων. ἥντινα ἔκθεσιν ηὗρον ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ πόλει· καὶ ἀναγνοὺς ηὗρον ἐπιγεγραμμένην τὴν βίβλον Ἔκθεσις Βρουνιχίου Ῥωμαίου χρονογράφου"
Source: Brunichius

*Mens.* IV.49 (Bandy IV.45) "Εἰδοῖς Μαρτίαις ἑορτὴ Διὸς διὰ τὴν μεσομηνίαν καὶ εὐχαὶ δημόσιαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὑγιεινὸν γενέσθαι τὸν ἐνιαυτόν. ἱεράτευεν δὲ καὶ ταῦρον ἐξέτη ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἀγρῶν, ἡγουμένου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν κανηφόρων τῆς Μητρός. **ἤγετο δὲ καὶ ἄνθρωπος περιβεβλημένος δοραῖς αἰγείαις, καὶ τοῦτον ἔπαιον ῥάβδοις λεπταῖς ἐπιμήκεσι Μαμούριον αὐτὸν καλοῦντες.** οὗτος δὲ τεχνίτης ἐν ὁπλοποιΐᾳ γενόμενος, διὰ τὸ μὴ τὰ διοπετῆ ἀγκίλια συνεχῶς κινούμενα φθείρεσθαι, ὅμοια ἐκείνων κατεσκεύασε τῶν ἀρχετύπων· ὅθεν παροιμιάζοντες οἱ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς τυπτομένοις διαγελῶντές φασιν, ὡς τὸν Μαμούριον αὐτῷ παίζοιεν οἱ τύπτοντες· λόγος γάρ, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον Μαμούριον δυσχερῶν τινων προσπεσόντων ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ἀρχετύπων ἀγκιλίων ἀποσχέσει τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις παιόμενον ῥάβδοις ἐκβληθῆναι τῆς πόλεως. **ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν ὁ Μητρόδωρος κακὴν παραδίδωσιν."**

*Mens.* IV.30 (Bandy App. 15) "**Βέρνακλον** τὸν δημόσιον οἰκέτην οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν."

February dedicated to the deceased, the gods of the nether world and to purifying rituals

*Mens.* IV.25 (Bandy IV.24)
*Mens.* IV.31 (Bandy IV.22)
*Mens.* IV.32 (Bandy IV.24)

Romulus
-10 months
*Mens.* I.16 (Bandy I.9)
-March the first month of the year
*Mens.* I.14 (Bandy I.8)
*Mens.* IV.33 (Bandy IV.26)
*Mens.* IV.152 (Bandy IV.135)
—implied: July = Quintilis
*Mens.* IV.102 (Bandy IV.93)

Numa
-12 months, addition of January and February
*Mens.* I.17 (Bandy I.10, I.11)
*Mens.* III.5 (Bandy III.3)

4.2.2.

| | |
|---|---|
| VII.13 "(…) **Ὀκταβιανὸς Αὔγουστος**. ὃς ἐπεμέμφετο τῷ Μαλλίωνι Καπετωλίνῳ, ὡς τάξαντι τὸν κακοιώνιστον φεβρουάριον μῆνα μέσον, καὶ μεταγαγὼν εὐθέως ὁ αὐτὸς Αὔγουστος διὰ θείας αὐτοῦ κελεύσεως **τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ φεβρουαρίου μηνὸς ὕστερον πάντων τῶν μηνῶν ἔταξεν, καὶ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἴδιον ἑαυτοῦ ὄνομα αὔγουστον τὸν ἕκτον ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίμου καὶ τὸν πρὸ τοῦ αὐγούστου μηνὸς ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θείου αὐτοῦ Ἰουλίου Καίσαρος**." | Caesar -reform of the calendar *Mens.* III.5 (Bandy III.3) *Mens.* III.6 (Bandy III.4) -Quintilis renamed July *Mens.* IV.102 (Bandy IV.93) *Mens.* IV.105 (Bandy IV.96) *Ost.* 25 (Bandy 45) Augustus -Sextilis renamed August *Mens.* IV.111 (Bandy IV.101) *Ost.* 25 (Bandy 46) |

Book seven, "*ΠΕΡΙ ΚΤΙΣΕΩΣ ΡΩΜΗΣ*", "Concerning the Building of Rome",[375] exhibits the most parallels to the oeuvre of Lydus. This should not surprise us, as this book in John Malalas is an antiquarian history of the origins and early history of the city of Rome - one of Lydus' main fields of interest.

In the passages of Book 7 which concern us now, John Malalas mentioned several Latin sources such as Vergil, Pliny, Livy, (*Chron.* VII.6), Licinius Macer (*Chron.* VII.7), Servius and again Livy (*Chron.* VII.9).[376] John Malalas did not know these sources directly, so either Malalas' name-dropping of these sources, or a second-hand knowledge of them[377] is possible. In the case of Licinius Macer, Jeffreys has already mentioned the close similarity between Lydus and the material in John Malalas transmitted under the name of Licinius Macer.[378] Apart from that, Lydus was acquainted with the sources mentioned in these instances by Malalas. Lydus mentioned Livy, Pliny and Vergil several times in his oeuvre,[379] and his use of Servius is very probable.[380]

In *Chron.* VII.3 we read how Romulus built in Rome the temple of Ares, founded a festival in honour of the deity, and renamed the month *Primus Mars* in honour of the deity. John Malalas continued by explaining that *Mars* is the Latin translation of Ares. He also stated that the festival in honour of Ares is called "Mars in campo", "Μάρτις ἐν κάμπῳ". The same information in roughly the same order can be found in *Mens.* IV.33 (Bandy IV.26); the month March is the beginning of the year dedicated to Ares. It was called *Zephyrites* and *Primus* before Romulus, who founded Rome, built a temple of Ares, and renamed the month *Mars* - Lydus also mentioned that *Mars* is a Latin translation of Ares. Malalas' final mention of the name of the festival, *Mars in campo*, or Mars on the field, John Malalas could have derived from other passages in Lydus; in *Mens.* IV.34 (Bandy IV.27) Lydus described the festival of Mars which is called *Armilustrium*, and which is held on the field of Mars "ἐπὶ

---

[375] Trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 91).
[376] For Livy, see Jeffreys (1990b: 185), for Pliny, see Jeffreys (1990b: 190), for Vergil, see (1990b: 196), for Servius, see Jeffreys (1990b: 192). John Malalas also mentioned Callimachus (Jeffreys 1990b: 184), whom he probably knew only indirectly.
[377] Jeffreys (1990b: 171).
[378] Jeffreys (1990b: 185).
[379] Livy is mentioned in *Magistr.* I.34 (Maas 1992: 119), Pliny in *Magistr.* I.23, I.42, III.63, *Ost.* 3 (Bandy 3), and 7 (Bandy 7) (Maas 1992: 127), and Vergil in *Magistr.* I.7, I.12, I.25, and *Mens.* IV.73 (Bandy IV.77), and IV.118 (Bandy IV.58) (Maas 1992: 133).
[380] Rochette (1998: 474).

τῷ τοῦ Ἄρεος πεδίῳ.". Also in *Mens*. IV.41 (Bandy IV.34) Lydus stated the festival of Mars was held in the field of Mars or in his temple "ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Ἄρεος πεδίῳ ἢ τεμένει.". Malalas' fondness for Latin terminology made him translate Lydus' descriptions in Latin; "πεδίῳ" becomes "κάμπῳ".

*Chron*. VII.6 mentions the abduction of the Sabine women, which is also alluded to several times in Lydus (Magistr. I.16, I.19, I.21). This passage in John Malalas also further exhibits Lydus' influence. According to Lydus, the Roman women were called *Brutidae* or *Brutae* in honour of Brutus, who avenged the raped Lucretia by chasing the last Roman king Tarquinius Superbus from Rome. This tale, and the etymology of the term *Brutae* is, besides other antiquarian lore, extensively recounted in *Mens*. IV.29 (Bandy IV.25). The term *Brutidae* appears out of its original context in *Chron*. VII.6, where John Malalas mentioned that Romulus ordered his soldiers to marry women whom he called *Brutidae*. Further on in the *Chronographia* (*Chron*. VII.9), the tale of Lucretia, Brutus, and the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus is recounted, without, however, mentioning the origin of the *Brutidae/Brutae* - John Malalas confusedly misplaced this etymology earlier on in his narrative on the early history of Rome and during the times of Romulus, in *Chron*. VII.6.

Also in *Chron*. VII.9, John Malalas briefly mentioned an elite army corps which was involved in the overthrow of Tarquinius Superbus, the *Celeres*. Malalas' short mention of this corps is consistent with Lydus, who elaborated in different passages on this army corps which was active under the Roman kings and which was named after Celer, an army commander under Romulus - in *Magistr*. I.9, in which Lydus quoted Paternus the Roman's first book of *Tactica*, and in *Magistr*. I.14.[381]

The calendar in John Malalas and John Lydus

In the seventh book of Malalas' *Chronographia*, we find in three paragraphs (*Chron*. VII.3, 12, 13) a succinct antiquarian history of the development of the calendar. It does not seem illogical to find a brief antiquarian history of the months in a book of the *Chronographia* which draws heavily on Lydus' *De Mensibus*, which is a treatise on the months. In the following section, I shall compare Lydus' antiquarian history of the calendar with the mentioned passages in Malalas, in order to ascertain Malalas' techniques in representing and distorting material from Lydus.

Lydus traced the development of the Roman calendar to the reforming activities of four rulers of Rome: Romulus, Numa Pompilius, Julius Caesar and Augustus. Romulus instituted ten months to make up an entire year (*Mens*. I.16). He also proclaimed the month of March to be the first month of the year, or renamed the already extant first month *Primus Mars,* March, in honour of this deity (*Mens*. I. 14, IV.33, IV.152) - that March is the first month in the calendar of Romulus is also implied by the fact that the fifth month from March onward, our month of July, was called *Quintilis*, "the fifth" (*Mens*. IV.102). Numa Pompilius made three changes to the Romulean calendar. First, he increased the number of months to twelve by adding the months of January and February (*Mens*. I.17, III.5). Second, he made January the first month of the year (*Mens*. IV.1, IV.102, IV.152). Third, he shortened the days

---

[381] For a list of testimonies on the *Celeres*, see Wiseman (1995: 9 n. 57). This passage in Lydus shall be analysed in depth in chapter 6.2.1.1. of this dissertation.

of the month of February (*Mens*. IV.25). In *Mens*. IV.25, Lydus elaborated on how the month of February was devoted to the deceased and to the gods of the netherworld:

> "for this reason Numa shortened it, judging it to be unholy for the month devoted to the gods of the nether world, who even diminish the universe, to be revered equally with the other months."[382]

After Romulus and Numa Pompilius, Julius Caesar reformed the Roman calendar, introducing the solar months (*Mens*. III.5, III.6), and renaming the month *Quintilis Julius,* July (*Mens*. IV.10, IV.105, *Ost*. 25). Augustus triggered the last reform of the calendar, with the renaming of the month of *Sextilis* to *Augustus,* August (Mens. IV.111, *Ost*. 25).

Lydus' history of the Roman calendar in four phases is presented in a truncated form in Malalas. In *Chron*. VII.3, we have a short mention of the Romulean calendar, with Romulus naming the month *Primus* March in honour of Ares. In *Chron*. VII.12, John Malalas selected from and reworked Lydus' account of Numa's reforms. In the preceding paragraphs (*Chron*. VII.10-11) we read of the feud between Mallius Capitolinus and a so-called Februarius. In *Chron*. VII.10, John Malalas recounted how Mallius had a victory over the Gauls, how the senate envied his victory and how accusations by Februarius caused his banishment.[383] In *Chron*. VII.11, when the Gauls, led by Brennus, laid siege to Rome, the exiled Mallius was summoned to Rome to deliver the city from the Gallic siege and Mallius breaks the siege. The following paragraph, *Chron*. VII.12, recounts Mallius' measures in the city after breaking the siege. Three of these measures are of interest here. First, he shortened the days of the month *Sextilis* and even removed its name, as this month was the ill-omened month of the siege of Rome by the Gauls.[384] Second, he stripped his opponent Februarius of his name, and dedicated him to the gods of the netherworld "ἀφαιρεθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ δοθῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς θυσίαν τοῖς καταχθονίοις θεοῖς." Third, he gave the name Februarius to the month of *Sextilis*, thereby adding a shameful name to an ill-omened month. After that, Februarius was dressed in a ritual garment and ritually beaten out of the city – after which he died. The section ends with Mallius instituting the month of February and the ritual beating throughout Roman territory.

The three measures of Mallius recall the reforms of Numa Pompilius as described by Lydus. Like Numa, Mallius shortened the days of a month. Numa's motive for doing so is echoed in Malalas' account; Numa shortened the days of February because it was dedicated to the gods of the netherworld, whereas the person of Februarius is dedicated by Mallius to the gods of the netherworld. Numa furthermore added the month of February to the calendar and Mallius also produced a month February. Strangely enough, and as in the case of *Chron*. II.1, John Malalas removed Numa Pompilius from the material provided by John Lydus. In this passage, John Malalas mentioned his autopsy of his source, the historian Brunichius. This

---

[382] Trans. Bandy (2013a: 179).

[383] The same account of banishment is recounted in John Lydus *Mens*. Fals. Attr. 5 (Bandy IV. 20). Only in this passage, the Roman general banished by Februarius is not Mallius but Marcus Furius Camillus.

[384] The same measure can be found in *Mens*. Fals. Attr. 5 (Bandy IV.20), where Camillus is said to have shortened the days of the month February because of his feud with Februarius.

mention is significant, as John Malalas only in two cases recounts his consulting a source directly.[385] As in the case of Herodotus and the other mentioned Latin sources in Book VII, this name could be one of the examples of Malalas' penchant for namedropping. In view of John Malalas being able to give the name of the month February to one of the historical characters in his account, we might even wonder whether the name Brunichius is intended as a joke. Some paragraphs earlier, we have Malalas' discussion of the *Brumalia*, a festival which was held in winter. If John Malalas is able to give the name of a winter month to one of his historical characters in his cunning reworking of different sources, we might consider him likewise able to invent the name of a source as a pun on the winter festival he also mentions; *Brumalia*, *Brunichius*.[386]

Removing Numa Pompilius from the data provided by Lydus created confusing implications in the following account. In *Chron.* VII.13, we read how Augustus, finding fault with the reforms of Mallius, removed the name of February from the month formerly known as *Sextilis*, and gave the name of February to the last month of the year. Augustus next gave his name to the sixth month after the month *Primus*, or after the first month, "τὸν ἕκτον ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίμου" and the name of Julius Caesar to the preceding month. This paragraph boiled down Lydus' data on the reforms of Caesar and Augustus - Caesar's reforms of the year are also alluded to further on in *Chron.* IX.3. As John Malalas made no mention of Numa Pompilius, and did not attribute the addition of two months to Mallius, this passage can be confusing: if we read that Augustus gave his name to the sixth month from the first "τὸν ἕκτον ἀπὸ τοῦ πρίμου", this would incorrectly mean that Augustus gave his name to the month of June. We can see how John Malalas selectively boiled down Lydus' history of the calendar, excised - for reasons which will be analysed later on in this dissertation[387] - the character of Numa Pompilius from this account, and produced as a result a rather confusing version of the history of the calendar.

Mallius and Februarius

As regards to *Chron.* VII.10-12, the parallels between the text of John Malalas and John Lydus do not seem to stop with the antiquarian history of the calendar. Indeed, we get the impression that John Malalas selected some more passages from John Lydus to combine into an idiosyncratic narrative. The traditional account of Marcus Manlius Capitolinus (died 384 BC)[388] has it that Manlius was in the city during the siege, and that he averted a Gallic raid on the Capitoline Hill because he was woken by geese. In the account of Malalas, there are some differences; Mallius was summoned from outside Rome, and the story of the geese is conspicuously absent. These differences can be explained by Malalas' conflating of Marcus Manlius Capitolinus and Marcus Furius Camillus (ca. 446 – 365 BC)[389] in his selective reading of John Lydus.

---

[385] Namely, in this case (*Chron.* VII.12) and in *Chron.* X.12 (Jeffreys 1990b: 214). On Brunichius see Jeffreys (1990b: 175).
[386] The hypothesis of John Malalas inventing the names of his sources has already been articulated by Treadgold (2007b: 715). See also Carrara and Gengler (2017: 17). Contra Van Nuffelen (2017), who argues for taking Malalas' mentions of sources serious.
[387] See chapter 4.2.3. (pp. 154-158 of this dissertation).
[388] Cornell (1995: 317).
[389] For a description of Camillus' feats in the war with the Gauls, see Cornell (1995: 316-319).

John Lydus, in fact, has both accounts separately. On the one hand, in *Magistr*. I.50, he recounted how Mallius, living in the neighbourhood of the Capitoline Hill, repelled the Gallic intruders with the aid of the watchful geese. On the other hand, *Mens*. IV.27 (Bandy IV.19) is an account of Camillus' victory over the Gauls. John Malalas combined the two accounts; the story of Camillus (his initial victory, banishment, breaking of the siege and final victory) is acted out by a character called Mallius, who delivered the city of Rome from outside, without mentioning the geese.

As regards the details of Malalas' account in *Chron*. VII.10-12, we can see how John Malalas selected them from a cursory reading of Lydus' chapters on the month of February (*Mens*. IV.25-32), and passages in its vicinity.

To begin with, Malalas' preceding section on the toppling of Tarquinius Superbus (*Chron*. VII.9) can also be found in *Mens*. IV.29 (Bandy IV.25) – with John Malalas not retaining the specific antiquarian details of Lydus' account. The same goes for Malalas' description of the hippodrome in *Chron*. VII.4-5, which is paralleled in *Mens*. IV.30 (Bandy II.11-13), and which will be analysed in chapter 3.3.3. of this dissertation.

Regarding the tale of Mallius, the end of *Chron*. VII.11, which recounts the victory of Mallius over the Gauls, can be paralleled with *Mens*. IV.27 (Bandy IV.19) which is a piece of military history on the decisive victory of Camillus over the Gauls. In this case also John Malalas refrained from taking over Lydus' military details. The parallels continue in *Chron*. VII.12, with Mallius' reforms of the Roman calendar as discussed above. Further in *Chron*. VII.12, John Malalas described how Februarius was ritually beaten out of the city. As to the specific details of the ritual banishment in Malalas, we have to turn to *Mens*. IV.49 (Bandy IV.45), which digressed on the rites performed during the Ides of March. During the rites, a man dressed in a goat skin was ritually beaten out of the city. This sacrificial victim is called Mamurius after the smith who made the replicas of the sacred *ancilia*. The rituals were performed on an inauspicious day. John Malalas apparently used this passage to upholster his account of Februarius' banishment; instead of a goat-skin, Februarius is wrapped in a straw sack and beaten by slaves with cudgels. As in the case of the Mamurius ritual, the beating of Februarius related to the ill-omened character of the month. John Malalas was also very detailed about the slaves who beat Mallius; he called them *vernaculi* and explained the designation. Not by coincidence, we also find an antiquarian explanation of the meaning of the *vernaculi* in Lydus' book on the month of February, in *Mens*. IV.30 (Bandy App. 15). John Malalas stated that Mallius was sacrificed to the gods of the underworld in some sort of ritual purifying an inauspicious month. Malalas could have borrowed these notions from Lydus' chapter on February; John Lydus stated that the month in question was dedicated to the deceased, the gods of the nether world and to purifying rituals (*Mens*. IV.25, 31 and 32 Bandy 18, 22 and 24). In short, the intensity of the parallels between Malalas' narrative of a character named Februarius on the one hand and

Lydus' chapter on the month of February on the other hand seem to suggest that Malalas even took the name of the month of February in order to give a name to Mallius' otherwise anonymous adversary. Yet again, Malalas appears to have a very ironical attitude to his source text in his pastiche of antiquarian lore derived from Lydus. In the previous section we saw how he invented the name Brunichius as a pun on the winter festival of the *Brumalia*. Likewise, his reading and extracting antiquarian lore from Lydus' chapter on the month of February could have given him the inspiration for Mallius' adversary: Februarius.

There are some indications which point to Malalas borrowing these passages specifically from John Lydus and not from other authors. Like John of Lydia, Malalas used the wrong name Mallius instead of Manlius – John Lydus used the form Μάλλιος in *Magistr*. I.50 and Malalas used the forms of Μαλλίων. However, this misspelling of Manlius' name is not uncommon. In fact, the majority of Greek sources use the form Mallius instead of Manlius – forms of Manlius are only found in three instances, two in Diodorus Siculus and one in John of Antioch.[390] A stronger indication is Malalas' account of the ritual beating, which he could have derived only from John Lydus and/or Plutarch. For the only Greek accounts of Mamurius prior or contemporary to Malalas are to be found in Plutarch (*Numa* 13) and John Lydus (*Mens*. IV.49),[391] and it is, as I already mentioned, highly unlikely that Malalas was able to use Latin sources. Furthermore, as Plutarch also has a detailed account of the life of Camillus in his *Parallel Lives*, in which Manlius Capitolinus also appears side by side with Camillus, it is improbable that Malalas used Plutarch directly – since this would imply Malalas explicitly confounded the account of Plutarch. Malalas probably selected from the scattered references in John Lydus to the Gallic assault on Rome in order to construct his idiosyncratic collage.

Book VIII

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
| --- | --- | --- |
| | | |

---

[390] John of Antioch, fragment 71. Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica* XIV.85 and XV.35.
[391] Later accounts of Mamurius are to be found in Photius *Epistulae et Amphilochia*, ep. 323 and Christophorus Mytilenaeus' poem 122, v. 83.

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| VIII.7 "Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ **Πτολεμαίου** τοῦ υἱοῦ Λάγου **ἡρμηνεύθησαν αἱ βίβλοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἑλληνιστὶ** παρὰ τῶν οβʹ διδασκάλων διὰ ἡμερῶν οβʹ. ἦσαν γὰρ γεγραμμέναι ἑβραϊστί· οἷα τοῦ αὐτοῦ Πτολεμαίου βουληθέντος ἀναγνῶναι δι' Ἑλληνικῆς φράσεως τὴν δύναμιν τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν βίβλων." | Mens. IV.47 (Bandy IV.52) "λέγει δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς Φίλων καὶ περὶ τῶν συγγραμμάτων τοῦ Μωυσέως, ὅτι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μὲν τῇ Χαλδαϊκῇ γλώττῃ ἐγράφη, **ὕστερον δὲ ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετεφράσθη**, ὃς τρίτος ἦν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου τὴν Αἴγυπτον παραλαβόντων, Φιλάδελφος ἐπικεκλημένος." | |

In *Chron.* VIII.7, John Malalas elaborated on the translation of the Scriptures, a topic which is also treated more in detail by Lydus (*Mens.* IV.47), who mentioned Philo Judaeus as a source.

Book IX

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| IX.1 "ὃς οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, ἀλλὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ μητρὸς τελευτησάσης **τῷ ἐνάτῳ μηνὶ** ἀνέκειραν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐξέβαλαν αὐτὸν βρέφος· **διὸ Καῖσαρ ἐλέγετο· καίσαρ <γὰρ> λέγεται ῥωμαϊστὶ ἡ ἀνατομή**." | Mens. IV.102 (Bandy IV.93) "**Καῖσαρ δὲ ὠνομάσθη, οὐ καθώς φασιν οἱ παλαιοί, ἐκ τῆς ἀνατομῆς τῆς γαστρὸς Αὐρηλίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ**, ἧς δῆθεν ἀποβιούσης ἐγκύμονος αὐτὸν ἀνατμηθείσης ἐκείνης ληφθῆναι· τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς κεκριμένον τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς περὶ τῆς τοιαύτης αὐτοῦ προσηγορίας τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν" Mens. IV.105 (Bandy IV.96) "Ὅτι οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἱστορικῶν φασι **τὸν Καίσαρα ἑπτάμηνον τεχθῆναι**, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο **τὸν ἕβδομον μῆνα τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν μεταβαλεῖν προσηγορίαν**. οὐδεὶς δὲ ἄλλος ἠνδραγάθισεν ὡς οὗτος." | |
| IX.3 "Ὁ δὲ Καῖσαρ Ἰούλιος ὁ δικτάτωρ, ὅ ἐστι μονάρχης, μετὰ ταῦτα τῶν πάντων ἐκράτησεν ἐν ὑπερηφανείᾳ καὶ τυραννίδι ἐπὶ ἔτη ιηʹ. **ὅστις καὶ τὸ βίσεξτον ἐφηῦρε** καὶ νόμους Ῥωμαίοις ἔδωκεν, **καὶ μῆνας ἐπωνόμασε Ῥωμαίοις** καὶ ὑπάτους δὲ αὐτὸς προεβάλλετο καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος οὓς ἠβούλετο." | Mens. III.7 (Bandy III.12) "Ὅτι **βίσεξτον** λέγεται διὰ τὸ δὶς πρὸ ἓξ Καλενδῶν Μαρτίων ἀριθμεῖν παρὰ τετραετίαν Ῥωμαίους, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸν ζωογονικὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐπιτηροῦντας· Ἀφροδίτης δὲ οὗτος, ἔφορος δὲ Ῥωμαίων Ἀφροδίτη." Caesar -reform of the calendar Mens. III.5 (Bandy III.3) Mens. III.6 (Bandy III.4) cf. above. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| IX.18 "καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄρχειν αὐτῶν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐν πρῶτοις ἄρχοντα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων ὀνόματι **Κορνήλιον Γάλλον·** ᾧτινι **ἔδωκεν ἀξίαν αὐγουσταλίου τοῦ ἰδίου ὀνόματος σήμαντρον."** | *Mens.* Inc. Sed. 3 (Bandy IV.106) "'Ότι ὁ Αὔγουστος καθελὼν Ἀντώνιον καὶ Κλεοπάτραν **Γάϊον Κορνήλιον Γάλλον** τῆς τὸ πρὶν μὲν Ἀερίας εἶτα Ποταμίας νῦν δὲ λεγομένης Αἰγύπτου προέστησεν, **Αὐγουστάλιον αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ οἰκείου ὀνόματος καλεῖσθαι θεσπίσας**, ταύτῃ καὶ Αὐγουσταλίους τοὺς ὑποφήτας τῶν ὑπάρχων καλεῖσθαι νόμος. ὅτι ἐν ταῖς κατὰ τὸ Παλάτιον τάξεσιν ἦσαν καὶ Αὐγουστάλιοι, οὓς Έλληνες σεβαστοφόρους καλοῦσι, τὰς τῶν θεῶν θήκας καὶ τοὺς τῶν βασιλέων τύπους φυλάττοντες καὶ τὴν τίβεννον." |

In *Chron.* IX.1, John Malalas stated that Julius Caesar received his nickname Caesar from the fact that he was born by a cesarian after nine months. In *Mens.* IV. 102, the same etymology is given by Lydus, who, however, rejected this etymology and proceeded to give two other explanations of the name Caesar. Another significant difference can be found in *Mens.* IV.105, where the cesarian of Caesar is also mentioned. In this case, however, Lydus said that Caesar was born in the seventh month of the pregnancy, wherefore his name was given to the seventh month of the year, July. In Malalas, we read that Caesar was born in the ninth month. This difference could be explained by the confusion in Malalas' account on the reforms of the calendar by Caesar and Augustus, discussed above. As John Malalas did not take any heed of Numa Pompilius adding two months to the calendar, and as John Malalas as a result of this omission stated in *Chron.* VII.13 that the name of Caesar was given to the fifth month of the year instead of the seventh, John Malalas might have wanted to leave out this explicit connection of Caesar's birth after seven months and the name *Julius* being given to the seventh month of the year. He therefore mentioned a standard period for being born, namely after nine months.

*Chron.* IX.3 forms a summary of Caesar's reforms of the calendar which are extensively treated in Lydus (*Mens.* III.5 and III.6). This summary is, however, more detailed than Lydus' account, as John Malalas attributed the introduction of the *bissextus* to Caesar, which is not done in Lydus - Lydus only mentioned the term in passing in *Mens.* III.7. Perhaps Lydus did attribute the *bissextus* to Caesar in a now lost part of the partially preserved *De Mensibus*.

In *Chron.* IX.18, John Malalas digressed on Augustus' conquest of Egypt, his appointment of Cornelius Gallus as head of this new province, and the origin of the *Augustales* in Gallus' appointment. The same data can be found in Lydus (*Mens.* Inc. Sed. 3).

Book X

Book X does not exhibit any parallel to Lydus.

Book XI

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| XI.17 "Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Ἀδριανὸς ὀργισθεὶς κατὰ Ἰουδαίων ἐκέλευσεν εἰς τὴν **Ἰερουσαλὴμ** οἰκεῖν Ἕλληνας, **μετονομάσας αὐτὴν πόλιν Αἰλίαν**." | *Mens.* I.18 (Bandy IV.57) "Ἀδριανὸς ἐκ τῆς Αἰλίων ἐτύγχανε φαμιλίας, οἱονεὶ γενεᾶς· **ὅθεν ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ τὸ Αἰλίων ὄνομα** τοὺς ὑπηκόους προγράφειν· **ὅθεν καὶ Αἰλία ἡ Ἰερουσαλήμ**· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς αὐτὴν ἁλοῦσαν ἐπόλισεν." | |

In *Mens.* I.18, Lydus traced the etymology of the new name of Jerusalem, *Aelia Capitolina*, to the cognomen of emperor Hadrian, who originated from the *gens Aelia*. In Malalas' account (*Chron.* XI.17), this etymology is absent. Indeed, the fact that John Malalas writes the cognomen of Hadrian as Ἤλιος in *Chron.* XI.13 instead of Αἴλιος indicates that he did not understand - ignorant of Latin as he was - the etymological connection between *Aelia Capitolina* and *Aelius Hadrianus*.

Book XII

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| XII.20 "(...) **ὁ Σέβηρος** (...) καὶ ἔκτισε δημόσιον λουτρὸν τὸ λεγόμενον **Ζεύξιππον** (...) τὸ δὲ Ἱππικὸν ἔστησεν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ Βυζάντιον ὁ αὐτὸς θειότατος Σέβηρος **ἀγοράσας οἰκήματα, καὶ <κῆπον ἀπό τινων ἀδελφῶν ὀρφανῶν καὶ καταλύσας τὰ οἰκήματα καὶ> τὸν κῆπον {τὸν ὄντα} ἐκδενδρώσας** ἐποίησε τὸ Ἱππικὸν τοῖς Βυζαντίοις·" | *Magistr.* III.70 "τὸ γὰρ δημόσιον βαλανεῖον **Σεβήρειον ἀπὸ Σεβήρου**, Ῥωμαίων ἡγησαμένου, παρωνόμασται, ὃς ἀρθρίτιδι νόσῳ ἐνοχλούμενος ἐδείματο τὸ βαλανεῖον, προσκαρτερῶν τῇ Θράκῃ διὰ τὴν πρὸς Νίγρον διαφοράν." *Mens.* I.12 (Bandy I.6) "χρόνοις δὲ ὕστερον ἱκανοῖς **Σέβηρος** ὁ βασιλεὺς Ῥωμαίων κατὰ Νίγερος ἐκστρατεύσας καὶ εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον παραγενόμενος, τὴν νῦν Κωνσταντίνου πόλιν καὶ βασιλίδα τῶν πόλεων ἁπασῶν, κτίζει μὲν ἐκεῖσε διὰ τὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐπιτερπὲς λουτρὸν παμμέγεθες· εὑρὼν δὲ καὶ τὸν παρακείμενον τόπον τοῖς Διοσκόροις ἀνακείμενον ἐποίησε τοῦτον ἱπποδρόμιον, ἰκρίοις καὶ στοαῖς διακοσμήσας αὐτόν, **καὶ ἄλσος ἐκκόψας δύο τινῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑποκείμενον** δεσποτείᾳ καὶ εἰς τὸ νῦν ὁρώμενον κάλλος τοῦτο μεταγαγών. (...)" | |

In *Chron.* XII.20, John Malalas digressed on the building activities of Septimius Severus in Byzantium, mentioning the public baths and the hippodrome. The specific detail of Severus acquiring and chopping a forest belonging to two brothers is also found in Lydus (*Mens.* I.12), who most probably derived this passage from Hesychius of Miletus.[392]

Book XIII

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

---

[392] Namely, Hesychius, *Patria of Constantinople* 37 (Kaldellis 2013: 364).

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| XIII.8 "κτίσας ἐγγὺς καὶ βασιλικὴν <ἔχουσαν κόγχην> καὶ ἔξω μεγάλους κίονας καὶ ἀνδριάντας, ἥνπερ ἐκάλεσε Σενάτον, **κατέναντι στήσας τῇ ἰδίᾳ μητρὶ Ἑλένῃ στήλην Αὐγούστας ἐν πορφυρῷ μικρῷ κίονι, καλέσας τὸν τόπον Αὐγουστιῶνα.**" | Mens. IV.138 (Bandy IV.121) "Τῇ πέμπτῃ τοῦ Ὀκτωβρίου μηνὸς οἱ ῥεγεωνάρχαι καὶ σεβαστοφόροι ἐχόρευον **ἐν τῷ Γουστείῳ, οἷον ἐν τῷ ὀφοπωλείῳ**, εἰς τιμὴν Τιβερίου· **τὸν δὲ τοιοῦτον τόπον νῦν οἱ ἰδιῶται Αὐγούστειον καλοῦσιν**. εἰς τὸ ἄσκεπον τῆς Δάφνης εἰς τὴν μικρὰν αὐλὴν Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Μέγας ἔστησε **στήλην τῆς ἑαυτοῦ μητρός, ἐξ ἧς ὠνόμασε τὸν τόπον Αὐγούστειον.**" | 4.1.1. |

In his treatment of the etymologies of the *Augusteum* in Constantinople, Lydus first stated that the place was originally a food market or *Gusteum*. He continued with the mention of the folk etymology of the *Augusteum*, deriving the name of the place from a statue in honour of Helena Augusta, the mother of Constantine. As in the case of the etymology of the name Caesar (*Chron.* IX.1), John Malalas chose the etymology which Lydus rejected, when he mentions the statue of Helena Augusta in the *Augusteum* in *Chron.* XIII.8.

Books XIV-XVI

As Malalas' *Chronographia* neared his own days, Lydus' data on the distant past of Rome and Greco-Roman culture became less relevant. Therefore we can see how from Book XIV onward there are no parallels with Lydus' *De Mensibus* and *De Magistratibus*. In the last three books of the *Chronographia*, however, John Malalas seems to have used another part of Lydus' oeuvre, *De Ostentis*, to supply his *Chronographia* with information on phenomena directly relevant in his own day: omens.

Book XVII-XVIII

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| XVII.4 "Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας ἀνῆλθεν <εἰς πέραν> ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ **φοβερὸς ἀστήρ, ὀνόματι κομήτης, ὃς εἶχεν ἀκτῖνα πέμπουσαν ἐπὶ τὰ κάτω, ὃν ἔλεγον εἶναι πωγωνίαν**· καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο." | Mens. IV.116 (Bandy IV.27) "Ὅτι τῶν κομητῶν εἴδη κατὰ μὲν τὸν Ἀριστοτέλην ἐννέα· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Ῥωμαῖον Ἀπουλήιον δέκα· ἱππίας ξιφίας **πωγωνίας** δοκίας πίθος λαμπαδίας κομήτης δισκεὺς τυφῶν κεράστης· (…) ὁ δὲ πωγωνίας **τὴν λοφιὰν οὐ κατὰ κεφαλῆς, ἀλλ᾽ ὑποκάτω** διαρραίνει δίκην πώγονος." Ost. 15 (Bandy 20) "**ΚΟΜΗΤΗΣ** Οὗτος ὁ ἀστὴρ Διὸς μέν ἐστιν, **οὕτω δέ ἐστιν ἐπίσημος, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους διοσημειακοὺς ἀστέρας κομήτας προσαγορεύεσθαι.**" Ost. 10A (Bandy 15) "ὁ δὲ πωγωνίας **ἐκ τῶν κάτωθεν δίκην πώγονος ἔχει τὰς κόμας**." | |

| John Malalas | John Lydus | Thesis |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| XVIII.52 "Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς βασιλείας ἐφάνη ἀστὴρ μέγας καὶ φοβερὸς κατὰ τὸ δυσικὸν μέρος, <**κομήτης**> πέμπων ἐπὶ τὰ ἄνω ἀκτῖνα λευκήν, ὁ δὲ χαρακτὴρ αὐτοῦ ἀστραπὰς ἀπέπεμπεν· ὃν ἔλεγόν τινες εἶναι **λαμπαδίαν**. ἔμεινεν δὲ ἐπὶ ἡμέρας εἴκοσι ἐκλάμπων, **καὶ ἐγένοντο ἀνυδρίαι** καὶ κατὰ πόλιν δημοτικοὶ φόνοι καὶ ἄ λ λ α  π ο λ λ ὰ  ἀ π ε ι λ ῆ ς πεπληρωμένα." | *Mens.* IV.116 (Bandy IV.27) "ὁ δὲ **λαμπαδίας** πυρώδης καὶ δίκην πυρώπιδος λίθου ἢ δένδρου καιομένου πέφυκε διαλάμπειν " *Ost.* 10A (Bandy 15) "ὁ **λαμπαδίας** πρὸς τούτοις ὅμοιος λάμπαδι καιομένῃ " *Ost.* 14 (Bandy 19) "ΚΟΜΗΤΗΣ ΛΑΜΠΑΔΙΑΣ **Λαμπαδίας κομήτης**, οὕτω προσαγορευόμενος ἐκ τοῦ σχήματος, ἔστι μὲν Ἑρμοῦ καὶ αὐτός· ὅταν δὲ ἐπὶ ἀνατολὰς ἴδῃ, (…) **καὶ οὐδὲν ἧττον ὁ αὐχμὸς ἐπιτελεῖ, ὡς καὶ τοὺς ἀεννάους τῶν ποταμῶν ἀναφρυγῆναι**. εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ νότον, **ἔ τ ι  μ ᾶ λ λ ο ν  ξ η ρ ό τ ε ρ ο ν  ἔ σ τ α ι** καὶ λοιμωδέστερον τὸ τοῦ ἀέρος κατάστημα, **τοῦ Νείλου ὑποξηρανθέντος**, ὥστε ἑρπετῶν πάντα πληρωθῆναι. (…)" |
| XVIII.122 "Μηνὶ νοεμβρίῳ ἰνδικτιῶνος εʹ ἐφάνη πῦρ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ **ὡς εἶδος λόγχης** ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν μερῶν ἐκτεταμένον ἕως δυσμῶν." | *Mens.* IV.116 (Bandy IV.27) "ὁ δὲ ξιφίας **δίκην ξίφους ἢ λόγχης μακρᾶς** ἐκτεινόμενος φαίνεται, ὠχρὸς δὲ καὶ νεφελοειδής " *Ost.* 10A (Bandy 15) "ὁ δὲ ξιφίας βραχύτερος μὲν, ὠχρὸς δὲ καὶ ξιφήρεις ἔχων τὰς ἀκτῖνας " *Ost.* 13 (Bandy 18) |

In *Chron.* XVII.4, John Malalas discussed an omen at the beginning of the reign of Justin I: there appeared a star which is called a comet/*cometes*, and which sent its rays down. It was also called *pogonias*. This apparent contradiction is explainable through the writings of Lydus. For, in *Ost.* 15, Lydus explained how the *cometes* is such an impressive comet that it gave its name to comets as a class of natural phenomena. In *Ost.* 10A and *Mens.* IV.116 we have indeed descriptions of the *pogonias* which parallel Malalas' description of a comet sending its rays down. It should be noted that these passages in Lydus are his translations or paraphrases of such Latin sources as Apuleius (for *Ost.* 10A) and Campestris (for *Ost.* 15) - in *Mens.* IV.116 Lydus explicitly preferred Apuleius to Aristotle. As John Malalas did not know Latin, his direct consultation of these sources is highly unlikely. Malalas' consultation of Lydus' compendium of translations *De Ostentis* becomes therefore all the more likely. Similarly, *Chron.* XVIII.52, which mentioned the appearance of the *lampadias*, exhibits its parallels with *De Ostentis* - *Ost.* 10A and *Mens.* IV.116 described the appearance of the *lampadias*, whereas the appearance of droughts as described by John Malalas are also characteristics of the *lampadias* as described in *Ost.* 14. These passages in Lydus are also translations and/or paraphrases from Apuleius (*Mens.* IV.116 and *Ost.* 10A) and Campestris[393] (*Ost.* 14) respectively. In *Chron.* XVIII.122, we have yet again a description of the comet "in the form of a spear", which matches the descriptions of the *xiphias* in Lydus - *Mens.* IV.116, *Ost.* 10A and *Ost.* 13, all deriving from Apuleius.

John Lydus in John Malalas: some conclusions

I conclude this comparative overview with an assessment of the textual relationship between the oeuvres of John Malalas and John Lydus - whether we can speak of John Malalas directly reading and using Lydus, or whether both selected from a common pool of antiquarian lore and content available in Constantinople. Next I will assess the nature of the parallels between both authors. Finally, I will

---

[393] Schamp (2006a: cvi).

formulate some thoughts on the techniques used by John Malalas towards his sources.

Do the parallels discussed above prove that John Malalas directly used the works of Lydus? Some passages in the *Chronographia* indeed are unintelligible without the intertext of Lydus (*Chron.* I.8 on the etymology of Belus and *Chron.* II.17 on the etymology of *cuspos*). In the minority of the mentioned parallel passages - see the table in the appendix (pp. 334-335 of this dissertation) - John Malalas did mention another source than Lydus - and indeed, John Malalas never mentioned Lydus at all throughout his chronicle. However, the analysis has also shown that Malalas' references to sources have to be taken with a grain of salt - whether we deal with the namedropping of pristine authorities such as Herodotus, or the fantastical inventions of sources like Brunichius. In case the sources John Malalas mentioned are correct, this does not exclude the possibility of John Malalas using a source through the medium of Lydus' works. This can certainly be the case for the many Latin authors John Malalas mentioned, since he did not know Latin, and since Lydus did translate several sources, such as Apuleius and Campestris in his works.[394] However, in spite of the indications toward Malalas' using Lydus, we should remain cautious. John Malalas did not need to depend solely on Lydus for the collection of antiquarian data. Whether John Malalas used Lydus or not, these parallels do show that both authors on a textual level shared a common antiquarian discourse for the articulation of cultural unease, a commonality which was also reflected in the shared networks of the erudite authors, or carrier groups for the discourse on cultural unease, which I sketched out in the previous chapter.

Indeed, when we look at the nature of the parallels between John Malalas and Lydus, we can certainly see that the former did not have to rely completely on the latter for the acquisition of historiographical materials. For John Malalas seems to have borrowed very selectively from Lydus, depending on the general theme of the book. Parallels with Lydus are grouped densely in Book VII on the distant past of the city of Rome. The early Books I, II and IV also have their fair share of parallels, whereas in Book III, on biblical history, in Book V, on the Trojan wars, and in Book X, any parallel is absent. If John Malalas used Lydus, he used him for a restricted set of topics, such as mythological lore, the history of the calendar, Latin terminology on the military and the state, and details on the early history of Rome. After Book XIII, the presence of Lydus seems to evaporate - indeed, the works of Lydus seem less relevant when dealing with contemporary or recent history. However, Lydus reappears again in Books XVII and XVIII through his work on omens, *De Ostentis*. John Malalas seems to borrow from every part of Lydus' oeuvre, mostly from *De Mensibus*, but also from the *De Magistratibus* and *De Ostentis*. The sheer systematics of these parallels suggests that they are more than mere coincidences - and if not, that they profoundly attest to a shared and common historiographical culture and discourse for the articulation of cultural unease. John Malalas exhibited the same systematic approach to his omissions - I already analysed how he systematically removed Numa Pompilius from his account on the history of the calendar.

Indeed, the systematics behind the parallels between John Malalas and Lydus, the systematics in Malalas' omissions in his borrowings from Lydus, and his

---

[394] On Lydus' translations of Latin treatises, see Domenici (2007: 8, 28), Turfa (2012: 11).

ironical attitude towards some of the features of Lydus' antiquarian lore point in the direction of an author consciously and actively engaging with the material which he consulted from or shared with Lydus - I already mentioned how John Malalas possibly named his fictitious character Februarius after the month of February, which was the topic of the chapter in Lydus from which John Malalas derived his material, and we have also mentioned how Malalas' named source Brunichius could be a pun on the winter festival of the *Brumalia*.

In the appendix (pp. 334-335 of this dissertation), I give an overview of the passages which have parallels in Lydus, with a mention of the parallel passages in Lydus. This table gives us some hints as to Malalas' techniques in using the materials from Lydus. A significant number of the passages are in bold, meaning that the parallel with Lydus occurred at the beginning or at the end of a section. We can easily imagine John Malalas browsing through Lydus - some of the passages in Lydus, such as *Magistr.* I.46 are quick reference lists of Latin terminology. Afterwards John Malalas added the material he found in Lydus at the beginning or end of sections in his *Chronographia*, perhaps in the margins he could have left open for further research. We already analysed the case of the appearance of the Sibyllae in Malalas; perhaps he found the list of the ten Sibyllae in *Mens.* IV.47, and added the appearances of the Sibyllae at the beginning or ending of parts of his chronicle (*Chron.* IV.5, IV.10 and VII.8) to upholster his chronological account. As such, John Malalas mirrored in his technique Cassiodorus' technique of reworking his *Variae* at the beginning and ending of a book.[395] The table might also give us a clue to the specific moment of Malalas' reworking of his chronicle. Of the 86 possible parallel passages in Lydus, most derive from Book IV of *De Mensibus* (38 passages), and from the First Book of *De Magistratibus* (12 passages). The other passages derive from *De Mensibus* Book I (11 passages), Book III (8 passages), and Book II (one passage). Six passages derive from the Second Book of *De Magistratibus*, and one from its Third Book. Seven passages derive from *De Ostentis*. The fact that John Malalas could have borrowed mostly from the last book of the *De Mensibus* and the First Book of the *De Magistratibus* neatly follows the chronology of both Lydus' publications and Malalas' residency in Constantinople. We know that around AD 543, Lydus obtained his professorship, and that he composed both the *De Mensibus* and the *De Ostentis* during his first years of teaching. The *De Magistratibus* was composed between AD 552 and AD 553. If John Malalas consulted the work of Lydus at the moment when his material was published or taught - the *De Mensibus*, as already noted, appears to have been the residue of lecture notes - this would put Malalas' consultation in the last stage of the period between AD 543 and around AD 553. These dates would fit perfectly with the date of Malalas' arrival in Constantinople, between AD 528 and AD 540. Upon arriving in Constantinople, John Malalas would first have needed a specific period to settle and to focus on his career and livelihood. After some years, in the second half of the 540's, he could have turned his attention to the reworking of the first version of his *Chronographia*.

Although the hypothesis of John Malalas borrowing directly from Lydus must remain in the realm of speculation for a want of conclusive evidence, this overview does show that both authors shared a common discourse for the articulation of

---

[395] See chapter 3.2.1. (pp. 54-65 of this dissertation).

cultural unease and a common historiographical culture from which they selected for their own accounts.

### 3.3.2. Cassiodorus

The same impression of a common historiographical culture shared by a coherent carrier group arises when we compare the antiquarian materials which can be found in the *Variae* of Cassiodorus with similar content in Lydus and Malalas. The fact that Cassiodorus wrote in a different language than John Malalas and John Lydus makes it even more difficult than in the previous section to pinpoint textual resemblances and to weigh their significance for establishing whether Cassiodorus knew and actively engaged with the works of Lydus and Malalas. In several cases, when the three authors treated comparable topics, Cassiodorus also presented the reader with different material than can be found in Lydus and Malalas. However, broad resemblances in the treatment of antiquarian topics can be observed in addition to some specific cases in which a closer connection can be assumed. These resemblances yet again point to a common antiquarian culture shared by the same carrier group for articulating a discourse on cultural unease.

*Variae* I.2

In *Var*. I.2, Cassiodorus elaborated on the origin of the colour purple. The antiquarian history of the colour purple is also treated in John Malalas and in John Lydus,[396] and will be studied in-depth in chapter 4.3.3. of this dissertation.

| Cassiodorus | John Lydus |
| --- | --- |
| *Var.* I.10.3 "Haec enim quae appellatur arithmetica inter ambigua mundi certissima ratione consistit, quam cum caelestibus aequaliter novimus: evidens ordo, pulchra dispositio, cognitio simplex, immobilis scientia, quae et superna continet et terrena custodit. quid est enim quod aut mensuram non habeat aut pondus excedat? omnia complectitur, cuncta moderatur et universa hinc pulchritudinem capiunt, quia sub modo ipsius esse noscuntur". | |

---

[396] For a list of occurrences, see chapter 3.3.1., under Book II (pp. 81-83 of this dissertation).

*Var.* I.10.4 "Iuvat inspicere, quemadmodum **denarius numerus** more caeli **et in se revolvitur** et numquam deficiens invenitur. crescit nova condicione per se redeundo addita sibi semper ipsa calculatio et, cum denarius non videatur excedi, ex modicis praevalet maiora complecti. **hoc saepe repetitum inflexis manualibus digitis et erectis redditur semper extensum**, et quanto ad principium suum supputatio reducitur, tanto amplius indubitanter augetur. quantitate numerabili harena maris, guttae pluviarum, stellae lucidae concluduntur. auctori quippe suo omnis creatura sub numero est et quicquid ad existentiam pervenit, a tali non potest condicione dimoveri."

*Mens.* I.15 (Bandy II.20) "**Ἡ δεκὰς** πλήρης ἀριθμός ἐστιν, ὅθεν καὶ παντέλεια καλεῖται, πάσας τὰς ἰδέας τῶν ἄλλων ἀριθμῶν καὶ λόγων καὶ ἀναλογιῶν καὶ συμφωνιῶν περιέχουσα· γνώμων γὰρ ἐν τοῖς οὖσίν ἐστιν ἡ δεκὰς πάντα χαρακτηρίζουσα, καὶ ἰδίως τὸ ἐν ἑκάστῳ ἄπειρον ὁρίζουσα, καὶ πάντων οὖσα συναγωγός τε καὶ συνακτικὴ καὶ ἀποτελεστικὴ τῶν ὅσα ἥ τε νοητὴ περιέχει φύσις ἥ τε ὑπὸ Σελήνην. οὕτως γὰρ ἡμῖν παραδίδωσιν ὁ Παρμενίδης· πρώτιστα μὲν τὰ νοητά, δεύτερα τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἀριθμοῖς, τρίτα τὰ συνεκτικά, τέταρτα τὰ τελεσιουργά, πέμπτα τὰ διαιρετικά, ἕκτα τὰ ζωογονικά, ἕβδομα τὰ δημιουργικά, ὄγδοα τὰ ἀφομοιωματικά, ἔννατα τὰ ἀπόλυτα, δέκατα τὰ ἐγκόσμια. ὀρθῶς οὖν αὐτὴν ὁ Φιλόλαος δεκάδα προσηγόρευσεν, ὡς δεκτικὴν τοῦ ἀπείρου, Ὀρφεὺς δὲ κλαδοῦχον, ἐξ ἧς ὡσεὶ κλάδοι τινὲς πάντες οἱ ἀριθμοὶ φύονται."

*Mens.* III.4 (Bandy II.21-22) "Κύκλος παντὸς ἀριθμοῦ ἐστιν **ἡ δεκὰς** καὶ πέρας· περὶ αὐτὴν γὰρ εἰλούμενοι καὶ κατακάμπτοντες ὥσπερ καμπτῆρα δολιχεύουσιν οἱ ἀριθμοί. ὅρος γάρ ἐστι τῆς ἀπειρίας αὐτῶν· ἀπὸ γὰρ μονάδος ἄχρις αὐτῆς καὶ μόνης ἀριθμήσαντες καὶ στάντες ἐπ' αὐτὴν αὖθις ἐπὶ τὴν μονάδα ἀναστρέφομεν. ὅτι δὲ παντὸς ἀριθμοῦ συνεκτικὴ ἡ δεκάς, **μάρτυς ἡ φύσις, μὴ πλείους τῶν δέκα δακτύλων ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ἐλάττους ἀνθρώπῳ παρασχοῦσα**. οὕτως ἄρα καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ φύσεως ἔστιν εὑρεῖν, ὅτι συμπληρούμενος αὖθις, ὥσπερ ὁ δέκα ἀριθμός, εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναστρέφει· **καὶ ταύτῃ ἐνιαυτὸς ὠνομάσθη, παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κινεῖσθαι αὐτόν**· κύκλος γάρ ἐστιν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν εἰλούμενος. ὁ <δὲ> κύκλος ἐπίπεδον σχῆμά ἐστιν ὑπὸ μιᾶς γραμμῆς περιεχόμενον, καὶ ταύτῃ κυκλικὸν ὀνομάζεται σχῆμα ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀρχόμενον καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὸ καταλῆγον, ὁ δὴ ἴδιον τοῦ χρόνου εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναστρέφοντος καὶ μηδαμοῦ περατουμένου. ὅθεν καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι καθ' ἱερὸν λόγον δράκοντα οὐρηβόρον ταῖς πυραμίσιν ἐγγλύφουσιν. ἄβυσσον γὰρ ὑποτίθενται καὶ δράκοντα ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐξ οὗ τοὺς αἰσθητοὺς θεοὺς καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ πᾶν αἰσθητὸν γενέσθαι βούλονται. ἔτι μὴν ἔθος αὐτοῖς καὶ κύκλον ἐπ' εὐθείας χιούμενον τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐγγράφειν, διὰ τὸ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἀρχὴν ἑαυτοῦ γίνεσθαι καὶ πέρας. διὰ τοῦτο τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ χρόνου οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι οὐχὶ πρώτην ἀλλὰ μίαν ὠνόμασαν."

*Var.* I.10.5 "Et quoniam delectat nos secretiora huius disciplinae cum scientibus loqui, pecuniae ipsae quamvis usu celeberrimo viles esse videantur, animadvertendum est quanta tamen a veteribus ratione collectae sunt. **sex milia denariorum solidum esse voluerunt, scilicet ut radiantis metalli formata rotunditas aetatem mundi, quasi sol aureus, convenienter includeret**. senarium vero, quem non inmerito perfectum antiquitas docta definit, unciae, qui mensurae primus gradus est, appellatione signavit, **quam duodecies similitudine mensium computatam in librae plenitudinem ad anni curricula collegerunt**."

*Mens.* II.5 (Bandy II.6) "(…) εἰ γάρ τις τὰ τέσσαρα καὶ εἴκοσι στοιχεῖα—τὰ γράμματα λέγω—εἰς ἀριθμοὺς συλλογίσεται, εὑρήσει τρισχιλίους ἐννακοσίους ἐννενήκοντα ἐννέα τοὺς πάντας, **οἷς προστιθεμένης τῆς ἐν ἑξακισχιλιάδι μονάδος**, εἰ πάντες συλλογισθήσονται, ἐννακισχίλιοι ἐννακόσιοι ἐννενήκοντα ἐννέα ἀριθμοί, μεθ᾽ οὓς οὐδὲν παρὰ τὴν μονάδα λελείψεται. ὅθεν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπέχει γραμμὴν ἡ μυριὰς τῇ μονάδι, ὡς ἀρχῆς αὐτῆς ἅμα καὶ πέρατος οὔσης τῶν ἀσωμάτων οὐσιῶν, ὧν εἰσι παραδείγματα οἱ ἀριθμοί. (…)"

*Mens.* I.17 (Bandy I.10) "'Ο Πομπίλιος Νουμᾶς, ἐφ᾽ οὗ Πυθαγόρας ἦν, **δυοκαίδεκα μησὶ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἀριθμεῖσθαι διώρισε κατὰ τὸν ἐν Φαίδρῳ Σωκράτην, ὅς φησι τὰς τῶν ὅλων τάξεις τῇ δωδεκάδι περιειλῆφθαι**· ἐπὶ τὸ πᾶν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῷ ἀριθμῷ τούτῳ κατεχρήσατο διαζωγραφῶν αὐτό, ὥς φησιν ὁ Πλάτων. οἰκεῖον γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦτο τῇ τοῦ παντὸς ἰδέα· καὶ γὰρ κυκλικόν, ἐπεὶ καὶ θαυμαστή ἐστιν ἡ τῆς δωδεκάδος φύσις, διά τε ἄλλα καὶ ἐπειδὴ συνέστηκεν ἐκ τοῦ στοιχειωδεστάτου καὶ πρεσβυτάτου τῶν ἐν οὐσίαις εἰδῶν παραλαμβανομένων, ὥς φασιν οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν μαθημάτων, ὀρθογωνίου τριγώνου· αἱ γὰρ τοῦδε πλευραὶ ἐκ τριῶν οὖσαι καὶ τεττάρων καὶ πέντε συμπληροῦσι τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν δώδεκα τοῦ ζωοφόρου κύκλου τὸ παράδειγμα· διπλασιασθείσης δὲ ἑξάδος τῆς γονιμωτάτης, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀρχὴν τελειότητος ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων συμπληρουμένη μερῶν"

*Var.* I.10.6 "O inventa prudentium! o provisa maiorum! exquisita res est, quae et usui humano necessaria distingueret et tot arcana naturae figuraliter contineret. merito ergo dicitur libra, quae tanta rerum est consideratione trutinata. talia igitur secreta violare, sic certissima velle confundere, nonne veritatis ipsius videtur crudelis ac foeda laceratio? exerceantur negotiationes in mercibus: emantur late, quae vendantur angustius: constet populis pondus ac mensura probabilis, quia cuncta turbantur, si integritas cum fraudibus misceatur."

*Variae* I.10

In *Var.* I.10, a complaint about the debased wages of soldiers (§ 1-2) prompted Cassiodorus to develop a long digression on weights, measures and currency.[397] After a short praise of the science of arithmetic (§ 3), we have an etymological and

---

[397] On this letter see Bjornlie (2013: 176).

symbolic analysis of several types of currency (§ 4-6). We have comments on the cosmic perfection of the number 10 (1 *denarius* = 10 *asses*)[398] and of the number 6000 (1 *solidus* = 6000 *denarii*). The *senarius* is linked to the twelve months of the year (1 *libra* = 12 *senarii*), a connection which also has zodiacal overtones.[399] We also have a cosmic etymology of solidus (based on *sol*, the sun) next to an etymology of *libra*.

Cassiodorus' numerological analysis has many points in common with the works of John Lydus, who also exhibited a genuine interest in number symbolism.[400] As in the case of *Var.* I.10.4, Lydus expounded on the cosmic perfection of the number 10 in *Mens.* I.15 (Bandy II.20). *Var.* I.10.4 exhibits even closer parallels with *Mens.* III.4 (Bandy II.21-22). In this passage, Lydus emphasised the connectedness of the number ten to the cosmic harmony by pointing out that human beings have ten fingers. Likewise, Cassiodorus mentioned the movement of the fingers to underscore his argument on the capacity of the number ten to endlessly create larger numbers. Furthermore, Cassiodorus pointed to the cosmic infinity of the number ten by pointing out how this number, like the cosmos, eternally revolved into itself, "in se revolvitur". This definition of the number ten resembles the etymology which Lydus gave of the word for year, ἐνιαυτός, further on in *Mens.* III.4 (Bandy II.21-22). The year is in itself perfect and eternal, as it revolves in itself just like the number ten, "ὅτι συμπληρούμενος αὖθις, ὥσπερ ὁ δέκα ἀριθμός, εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναστρέφει". From this revolving in itself, the year was called ἐνιαυτός, "καὶ ταύτῃ ἐνιαυτὸς ὠνομάσθη, παρὰ τὸ ἐν ἑαυτῷ κινεῖσθαι αὐτόν".

Cassiodorus' comments on the perfection of the number 6000 in *Var.* I.10.5 have parallels with another passage in Lydus (*Mens.* II.5, Bandy II.6). Whereas Cassiodorus simply adduced the worth of the *solidus* from the fact that it consisted of 6000 *denarii*, the number 6000 indicating the life-span of the material cosmos, or "aetatem mundi", Lydus used a complex calculation to prove the same point. He took the 24 letters of the alphabet, or elements, "στοιχεῖα", as he called them more cosmically, and made the sum of the numeral value of each single letter, which makes 3999.[401] To this number, he added the number 6000 as just one of the manifestations of the Monad, which makes 9999. In order to have the result of 10000, Lydus added another manifestation of the Monad, namely the number 1. The fact that both the

---

[398] The perfection of the number ten stems from Pythagorean tradition. The Pythagoreans considered the cosmic order of the universe embodied in numbers. On the Pythagorean tradition of numbers see Schimmel (1993: 11-16), Meyer (1975: 142-145). For an interpretation of the position of this letter as the tenth letter of the First Book, see chapter 5.3.2 (pp. 222-223 of this dissertation).

[399] Barnish (1992: 13 n. 11). On the zodiacal overtones in the number 12 see Schimmel (1993: 192-202). See also Meyer (1975: 146-148).

[400] Both authors were sensitive to number symbolism. On the numerical symbolism behind the composition of Cassiodorus' *De Anima*, see Di Marco (1993). Especially Book II of Lydus' *De Mensibus* is overladen with numerological analyses (Maas 1992: 58-60).

[401] Namely (A=1 + B=2 + Γ=3 + Δ=4 + E=5 + Z=7 + H=8 + Θ=9 + I=10 + K=20 + Λ=30 + M=40 + N=50 + Ξ=60 + O=70 + Π=80 + P=100 + Σ=200 + T=300 + Υ=400 + Φ=500 + X=600 + Ψ=700 + Ω=800) = 3999.

number 1 and the number 10000 were written by the same Greek character, namely the iota, nicely underscored Lydus' argument on the infinity of the Monad and the universe. Apparently, Lydus exhibited a greater knowledge of the "more mysterious elements of this discipline",[402] "secretiora huius disciplinae", than Cassiodorus would have had or would have liked to exhibit in his state letter.

Cassiodorus' musings on the cosmic perfection of the *libra* (*Var.* I.10.5) consisting of 12 *senarii*, just as the year has 12 months, have parallels with a similar account in Lydus (*Mens.* I.17 Bandy I.10).

*Variae* I.30

> "As you all know, there were before no combats with arms between adversaries, but violent intention provoked itself to battle ever so much with fists (*pugnis*), from which battle (*pugna*) acquired its name. Afterwards Belus for the first time produced the iron sword, from which it was resolved to call it also war (*bellum*)."[403]

At the end of *Var.* I.30, a letter on public violence at the games, Cassiodorus shortly digressed on the etymology of the words *pugna* and *bellum*. The word *pugna*, 'fight' emerged from the primitive age in which mankind fought with their bare fists, *pugni*. This etymological explanation fits the classical scholarship on the etymology of this word.[404]

The picture is entirely different for Cassiodorus' explanation on the origins of the word for war, *bellum*. He derived this from the mythical king Belus who upgraded warfare by introducing iron-made weapons. This explanation is alien to the classical grammatical tradition, which usually analysed *bellum* as an antiphrasis of the diminutive of *bonus*, *bellus*.[405] We can suppose the tradition of the Christian chronicle, in which Belus performed as the father of the Assyrian King Ninus, inspired Cassiodorus to revert to this explanation, however at odds with the classical interpretation - Cassiodorus himself wrote a chronicle in which King Ninus appears.[406]

Cassiodorus' antiquarian material exhibits parallels with the First Book of Malalas' *Chronographia*. In this book, we also have the characters Belus and Ninus, with Belus being the son of Picus Zeus, and with Ninus being his paternal uncle. At

---

[402] Trans. Barnish (1992: 13).
[403] "Inter ipsos quoque adversarios, ut scitis, non erant prius armata certamina, sed pugnis se quamlibet fervida lacessebat intentio, unde et pugna nomen accepit. postea Belus ferreum gladium primus produxit, a quo et bellum placuit nominari." (Fridh and Halporn 1973: 37), my translation.
[404] For example, it also appears in twofold in the *Commentum Terentii*, attributed to Donatus (*Hecyra*, prologus II, versus 33 and *Adelphoe*, actus 2, versus 171).
[405] See, for instance, Donatus, *Ars Grammatica* IV.6, and Priscian, *Partitiones XII versuum Aeneidos principalium* VIII. Cassiodorus' explanation can also be found in Hyginus' *Fabulae* 274.
[406] O'Donnell (1979: 37).

the end of the First Book (*Chron.* I.15), we read how Hephaestus, the grandchild of Picus Zeus and son of Hermes, introduced iron weapons to Egypt. For this innovation they deified him, "since he had legislated for chastity and he had procured food for men by the manufacture of implements and in war had given them power and safety; for before his day men had fought with clubs and stones."[407] We can suppose that in this case Malalas' adjustments of the mythological genealogy of Christian chronicles,[408] and his ignorance of the Latin language made him lose the etymological connection between the character Belus and the Latin word *bellum* - a connection which he did not need to preserve in his Greek text. Indeed, as we have seen in the previous section, John Malalas derived the etymology of the name Belus from the Latin *velox* through a phonetic connection which is only extant when pronouncing Belus in a Greek manner (Βῆλος = "Vilos" = *velox*). Furthermore, John Malalas did not retain the Latins connections between Belus and *bellum*, and between fists as the implements of war and *pugna*. We can now propose an hypothetical reconstruction: both Cassiodorus and John Malalas found the narrative on the origin of war in a source, perhaps a common source. Cassiodorus retained the Latin etymologies in this source, whereas John Malalas lost these connections because he put this passage in another context - the context of Hephaestus in Egypt instead of Belus. This left him with the need to explain the name of Belus, or "Vilos", as he pronounced it. He browsed through the Latin vocabulary lists of Lydus, and chose the word phonetically resembling "Vilos", namely *velox*. He then derived Belus from swiftness, leaving out the Latin word, perhaps in order to appear knowledgeable of the Latin language - although we cannot discount the possibility that the Latin term was left out during the transmission process of Malalas' *Chronographia* in the Byzantine period.

To close this short analysis of *Var.* I.30, we can note also that Cassiodorus' and Malalas' attribution of the invention of iron weaponry to mythical characters from the biblical chronicle tradition is at odds with Lydus' narrative, which attributed the introduction of iron weapons in Rome to Numa Pompilius and the Gauls (*Magistr.* Intr.).[409]

*Variae* II.40

| Cassiodorus | John Lydus |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

---

[407] "ἀπεθέωσαν οὖν αὐτὸν ὡς σωφροσύνην νομοθετήσαντα καὶ τροφὴν ἀνθρώποις διὰ κατασκευῆς ὅπλων εὑρηκότα καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις δύναμιν καὶ σωτηρίαν ποιήσαντα· πρὸ γὰρ αὐτοῦ ῥοπάλοις καὶ λίθοις ἐπολέμουν." (Thurn 2000: 16), trans. Jeffreys et al (1986: 10).

[408] On Malalas' deviations from the chronicle tradition and his motives to do so, see Berthelot (2004), Caire (2004).

[409] On Numa Pompilius' introduction of weapons in Rome, see chapter 5.1.1.2. (pp. 196-197 of this dissertation).

| | |
|---|---|
| *Var.* II.40.4 "(…) hoc totum inter homines **quinque tonis agitur**, qui singuli provinciarum ubi reperti sunt nominibus vocitantur. miseratio quippe divina localiter sparsit gratiam, dum omnia sua valde fecit esse laudanda. **Dorius** prudentiae largitor et castitatis effector est. **Phrygius** pugnas excitat, votum furoris inflammat. **Aeolius** animi tempestates tranquillat somnumque iam placatis attribuit. **Iastius** intellectum obtusis acuit et terreno desiderio gravatis caelestium appetentiam bonorum operator indulget. **Lydius** contra nimias curas animae taediaque repertus remissione reparat et oblectatione corroborat. " | *Mens.* II.3 (Bandy IV.33) "Πάντας τοὺς ῥυθμοὺς ἐκ τῆς τῶν πλανήτων κινήσεως εἶναι συμβαίνει· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Κρόνος τῷ **Δωρίῳ**, ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς τῷ **Φρυγίῳ**, ὁ δ' Ἄρης τῷ **Λυδίῳ** καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς κινοῦνται κατὰ τὸν Πυθαγόραν πρὸς τὸν ἦχον τῶν φωνηέντων· ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἑρμοῦ τὸν α, ὁ δ' Ἀφροδίτης τὸν ε, ὁ δ' Ἥλιος τὸν η, καὶ ὁ μὲν τοῦ Κρόνου τὸν ι, ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἄρεος τὸν ο, καὶ Σελήνη τὸν υ, ὅ γε μὴν τοῦ Διὸς ἀστὴρ τὸν ω ῥυθμὸν ἀποτελοῦσιν· ὁ δὲ ἦχος τῶν ῥυθμῶν ὡς ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἀφικνεῖται διὰ τὴν ἀπόστασιν." |
| *Var.* II.40.5 "Hoc ad saltationes corruptibile saeculum flectens honestum remedium turpe fecit esse commentum. **hic vero numerus quinarius trina divisione consistit. omnis enim tonus habet summum et imum: haec autem dicuntur ad medium**. et quoniam sine se esse non possunt quae alterna sibi vicissitudine referuntur, utiliter inventum est artificialem musicam, id est auctorum operationibus diversis organis exquisitam, modis quindecim contineri. " | *Mens.* II.8 (Bandy II.8) "μεγίστη δὲ ἡ τῆς τριάδος καὶ κατ' αἴσθησιν δύναμις· (…) καὶ αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς πάντα κινούσης μουσικῆς κατὰ τὸν Θεόφραστον **τομαὶ τρεῖς, λύπη ἡδονὴ ἐνθουσιασμός**." |

In *Var.* II.40, the request to Boethius to search for a musician for the Frankish king provided Cassiodorus with the opportunity to write a short treatise on the art of music.[410] After a short introduction (§ 1), Cassiodorus poured effusive praise on the art of music (§ 2-3).[411] In the fourth paragraph, the five musical tones are attributed to five regions of the world. These five tones have three pitches, as we can read in the following paragraph. After a catalogue of mythological examples of famous musicians (§ 6-9), we have a commonplace juxtaposition between the danger of the pagan Sirens (§ 10) and the salutary effects of the Christian Psalms (§11). After digressions on the zither and the lyre, which was invented by Mercurius, Cassiodorus returned to the spiritual value of music, before concluding the letter.

Cassiodorus' description of the five tones of music corresponds partly to an account given by Lydus (*Mens.* II.3, Bandy IV.33), in which he mentions three of the tones. As we have seen in the preceding section (chapter 3.3.1), the following part of Lydus' passage exhibits parallels with John Malalas (*Chron.* I.1). Cassiodorus' division of these five tones into three pitches (*Var.* II.40.5) runs parallel to another passage in Lydus (*Mens.* II.8, Bandy II.8). In this passage, Lydus gave an enumeration of all

---

[410] On this letter, see O'Donnell (1979: 89-92), Pizzani (1993), Condorelli (2007).
[411] His praise alludes several times to the *De Institutione Musica* of Boethius. Afterwards, Cassiodorus parts from Boethius to expound on the theory of several other theorists, mainly Martianus Capella (§ 4-6) and Augustine (Pizzani 1993: 33-45).

triple aspects of the sensible world in order to prove the importance of the number three. One element of this enumeration is the division of the art of music into three parts according to Theophrastus. Lydus also mentioned some of the emotions which can be tempered by music. The notion of the positive effect of music on the emotions was also elaborated upon by Cassiodorus in his praise of the art of music, earlier on in this letter (§ 2-3).

*Variae* III.47

| Cassiodorus | John Lydus |
|---|---|
| *Var.* III.47.2-3 "Careat proinde patrio foco cum exitiabili victurus incendio, ubi viscera terrae non deficiunt, cum tot saeculis iugiter consumantur. flamma siquidem ista terrena, quae alicuius corporis imminutione nutritur, si non absumit, extinguitur: ardet continue inter undas medias montis quantitas indefecta nec imminuit, quod resolvi posse sentitur: scilicet quia naturae inextricabilis potentia tantum crementi cautibus reponit, quantum illi vorax ignis ademerit. nam quemadmodum saxa incolumia permanerent, si semper inadiuvata decoquerent? Potentia siquidem divina sic de contrariis rebus miraculum facit esse perpetuum, ut palam consumpta occultissimis instauret augmentis, quae vult temporibus stare diuturnis. verum cum et alii montes motibus vaporatis exaestuent, nullus simili appellatione censetur: aestimandum, quia gravius succenditur, **qui Vulcani nomine nuncupatur**." | *Mens.* IV.115 (Bandy IV.41) ""Ὅτι πολὺ ἐν τῷ βάθει τῆς γῆς ἐπινοστοῦν τὸ κατάγειον πῦρ τὴν πιμελώδη νέμεται <οὐσίαν>· αὕτη δ᾽ ἐστὶ στυπτηρία ἢ θεῖον· ἡ γὰρ ἄσφαλτος κεκαυμένον ἐν γῇ καὶ ἐναποσβεννύμενον θεῖόν ἐστι· τούτου γὰρ τὸ μὲν ἐπ᾽ ὀλίγου διακαέν, ἅτε παραχρῆμα διασβεννύμενον, ὑγροτέραν τε καὶ πιμελωδεστέραν ἐργάζεται τὴν ἄσφαλτον, οἷα τὰ κατ᾽ Αἴτνην καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ λίμνην ἐπινήχεται· διακαὲν δὲ σφοδρότερον λιθοῦται, οἷός ἐστιν ὁ γαγάτης λίθος ὁ περὶ Βαβυλῶνα. Ἡνίκα γοῦν τὸ ὑπονοστοῦν τοὺς ὑποκειμένους νέμεται τόπους, οὐδὲν ἡμῖν πάθος ἐπιδείκνυσι γῆς· ὁπόταν δὲ ἐργασάμενον πολὺν ἐξαραιώσῃ τόπον, τηνικαῦτα θλιβόμενον ἐν τοῖς κοιλώμασι καὶ σηραγγώδεσι τόποις, εἰ μὲν ἐπιτύχοι διεκδρομῆς, οὐδὲν πλέον βρασμοῦ γῆς καὶ μυκήματος ἐργάζεται σημεῖον· εἰ δ᾽ αὖ μένει σωματούμενον ἤτοι .... ὑπερκείμενον ὄρος ἢ γῆν ἢ θάλασσαν, ὄρος μὲν ὡς τὸ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ Βέσβιον **καὶ <τὸ ἐν> Λιπάραις** καὶ τὸ ὑπερκείμενον τῆς Καταναίων πόλεως ἐν Σικελίᾳ, θάλασσαν δὲ ἣν Παναίτιος μεταξὺ **Λιπάρας** καὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας ἱστορεῖ, γῆν δὲ οἷα τυγχάνει παρὰ τὴν ἐν Λυκίᾳ Κώρυκον. οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀναρρήγνυσιν ὄρη τε καὶ γῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ <θαλάσσης> ἀναφυσήματα ποιεῖ, ὥσπερ γέγονε τὰ περὶ τὴν Θήραν καὶ Θηρασίαν, καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ᾖ τὰ ἀναστομωθέντα συνεχῶς ἀναφυσῶντα πῦρ, πηγαί τε πυρὸς καὶ κρατῆρες ὀνομάζονται, οἷά ἐστι τὰ περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν **Λιπάραν** τε καὶ Στρογγύλην καὶ Βέσβιον· ἣν δ᾽ αὖ μύσῃ .... οἷον τὸ κατὰ Φιλαδέλφειαν τὴν ἐν Λυδίᾳ πεδίον καὶ τοὺς πρόποδας τοὺς ἐπὶ Μαζάκοις —οἱονεὶ Καππάδοκας—, καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ Δικαιαρχίᾳ Ἡφαίστου πεδίον ποτὲ προσαγορευθέν."<br>*Magistr.* II.29 "καὶ φόρον ἴδιον ἀπένειμε πρὸς δικαστήριον καὶ τάξιν ὅλην, ὡς εἰ σπινθῆρά τινα **τῶν ἐν Λιπάρῃ κρατήρων** ἀνάψας ἐκ τῆς ἐπαρχότητος, πολλὰ καθ᾽ ὁμαλοῦ χρηστὰ τοῖς κοινοῖς τεχνησάμενος."<br>*Magistr.* III.70 "καὶ ὄρος ἦν ἡ πόλις καὶ βουνοὶ μέλανες ἀπερρωγότες, **καθάπερ ἐν Λιπάρῃ** ἢ Βεσβίῳ, κόνει καὶ καπνῷ καὶ δυσωδίᾳ τῶν ἀποτεφρουμένων ὑλῶν ἀοίκητος" |

| | |
|---|---|
| *Var.* III.47.4 "Mittatur ergo reus capitis in locum praedictum vivus: careat quo utimur mundo, de quo alterum crudeliter fugavit exitio, quando superstes recipit quod eventu mortis inflixit: **salamandrae secuturus exemplum**, quae plerumque degit in ignibus. tanto enim naturali frigore constringitur, ut flammis ardentibus temperetur. subtile ac parvum animal, lumbricis associum, flavo colore vestitum. vitam praestat soli, quae mortalia cuncta consumit." | *Magistr.* I.42 "**ὡς σαύρα** γὰρ χειμῶνος καὶ αὐτὸς εἰκότως ὁ σκορπίος τῇ γῇ, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τῶν ἑρπετῶν, ὑπονεκρωθεὶς κεῖται, μηδὲν ἕτερον παρ' αὐτὴν ἐσθίων. ἡνίκα οὖν πᾶσαν τὴν περὶ ἑαυτὸν ἐδώδιμον γῆν ἑαυτῷ δαπανήσῃ, τῶν ἰδίων καθάπτεται πλεκτανῶν καὶ πάσας αὐτὰς ἀνεπαισθήτως καταναλίσκει. ἦρος δὲ ἀνακαλοῦντος αὐτὸν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων εἰς φῶς νόμῳ τῆς φύσεως, ἀναποδοῦται καὶ πρὸς καλαμίνθην τὸ φυτὸν ἐρχόμενος μόνῃ τῇ ἀφῇ τῆς βοτάνης ἀναλαμβάνει τὸ δριμὺ καὶ στεγανοῦται, καθάπερ ὄφις τῇ μαράθῳ· ὅθεν καὶ νέπεταν τὴν καλαμίνθην Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν. ταύτῃ σκορπιστὰς νέπωτας ἀποκαλοῦσιν αὐτοί, οἷα τῶν ἰδίων μελῶν διαφθορεῖς." |

*Var.* III.47 is a letter on the banishment of one Iovinus for murder to the island of Lipari, one of the Aeolian Islands. After the juridical exposition on the crime at hand and an explanation of the sentence of banishment (§ 1), we have an elaborate description of the volcano at Lipari (§ 2-3), which is closed by the etymology of the *Vulcanae Insulae* - deriving from the god Vulcan. A digression on the salamander (§ 4) surreptitiously slides into the antiquarian passage, which is concluded by a remark on the eruption of the volcano at the suicide of Hannibal.

This letter has several parallels in the work of Lydus. Similar descriptions of volcanic activity, at Lipari and other places, (*Mens.* IV.115, Bandy IV.41) and of the properties of the lizard (*Magistr.* I.42) can be found in Lydus. More significantly, Lydus used Lipari as a metaphor several times in his *De Magistratibus*. In *Magistr.* II.29, he compared the feats of Justinian to a spark from the craters of Lipari, "σπινθῆρά τινα τῶν ἐν Λιπάρῃ κρατήρων". In *Magistr.* III.70, the image of Lipari is used to describe the desolation of Constantinople after the Nika riots. The appearance of Lipari in the work of both authors highlights their positions as members of the same carrier group. As members of the same carrier group, they utilise the same language in order to articulate cultural unease - be it the volcanic activity of the Aeolian Islands in the sixth century,[412] or, more fundamentally, the transfer of imperial power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople.

*Variae* III.51

In *Var.* III.51, a discussion on the wages of a renowned charioteer is used by Cassiodorus as a pretext to provide the reader with an extensive antiquarian description of the Circus Maximus in the city of Rome. As the antiquarian history of the

---

[412] On the volcanic activity of the Aeolian Islands, and more specifically Lipari, see Stothers and Rampiro (1983: 6363-6364).

hippodrome is also treated by John Malalas and Lydus,[413] I shall elaborate on this case study in the following section (3.3.3.).

*Variae* VII.32

    *Var*. VII.32, a *formula* on the mint, starts with an exhortation not to tamper with the coinage (§ 1-2), after which we have a digression on the origin of money (§3-4). Cassiodorus stressed the importance of the weight of currency over the number of it, by pointing out that the words *compendium* and *dispendium* were derived from the verb *pendo,* to weigh. Next he elaborated on the etymology of *pecunia,* money, which derived from cattle, *pecus*. King Servius Tullius was the first to stamp bronze coins.

    Cassiodorus' etymology of *pecunia* can also be found in Lydus (*Magistr.* I.21), where he expounded on the kings of Rome and their rural origins:

> "Not even kings themselves disdained to tend flocks and to accumulate money from them; for this reason, in fact, they call "money" *pecuniae* in their language.".[414]

    However, Lydus also differed from Cassiodorus' narrative, stating that it was Numa Pompilius, not Servius Tullius, who was the first to stamp coinage - from which ruler the word *nummus* also derived (*Mens.* I.17 Bandy I.1). The etymological connection between money or *pecunia* and cattle appears in a reworked version in John Malalas (*Chron.* XVIII.14). In this passage, John Malalas elaborated on the etymology of the Bosporus, stating that it derived from the payment of cattle, *βοῶν φόρος,* a tax which was instituted by Heracles the Spaniard instead of taxes in money, *ἀντὶ χρημάτων*. In this etymology, the interchangeability of cattle and money echoes the etymology of Lydus and Cassiodorus deriving the Latin word for money from cattle. As in the case of Malalas' not deriving warfare/*bellum* from Belus, John Malalas selected data from a shared antiquarian tradition and reworked this data in order to fit the exigencies of his Greek text.[415]

*Variae* XI.6

    In *Var.* XI.6.5 we find the etymology for the office of *cancellarius,* deriving from the fences or *cancelli* at law courts. This etymology can also be found in Lydus, *Magistr*. III.37.

*Variae* XI.38

---

[413] For a list of occurrences, see chapter 3.3.1., under Book VII (pp. 87-92 of this dissertation).

[414] "μηδὲ αὐτῶν βασιλέων ἀπαξιούντων νέμειν ἀγέλας καὶ χρήματα συλλέγειν αὐτοῖς· ὅθεν καὶ πεκουνίας κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ χρήματα καλοῦσιν." (Schamp 2006a: 30), trans. Bandy (1983: 35, 37).

[415] Significantly, Malalas' etymology is, to the best of my knowledge, unique - it is only reiterated in Theophanes Confessor *Chronographia* 175 de Boor. On the version which derived Bosporus from *Φωσφόριον*, see Focanti (Forthcoming).

In *Var.* XI.38, a request for a payment for the purchase of paper urged Cassiodorus to write a short introduction to the history of writing materials (§ 2-6). The city of Memphis is accredited with the ingenious invention of papyrus, after which we have an elaborate description of the paper plant. In a discussion of the previous practice of writing on bark (§ 3-4), Cassiodorus admits this practice was hugely inferior to papyrus. In this section he gives the etymology of the Latin word for book, *liber*, which was derived from the word for bark. He concludes his digression with a laudatory description of the papyrus. The Latin etymology for the word book/*liber* can also be found in Lydus (*Mens.* I.28, Bandy App. 26). This letter of Cassiodorus will be compared to another passage in Lydus (*Magistr.* III.14) (pp. 259-264 of this dissertation).

*Variae* XII.14

In *Var.* XII.14.1, the etymology of the Italian town of Reggio, deriving from the Greek ῥήγνυμι, or breaking away, as the town broke off from Sicily, can also be found in Lydus (*Mens.* IV.95 Bandy IV.91).

In conclusion to these comparisons we can say that the textual resemblances which Cassiodorus exhibited toward Lydus and, to a lesser extent, Malalas, point yet again to a common and shared culture of Roman antiquarianism. This common pool of antiquarian erudition was subjected to reworking and manipulations in order tot fit the exigencies of each text - John Malalas did not retain the Latin etymology of *bellum* and Belus, whereas he adapted the Latin etymological connection between money, *pecunia* and cattle to a Greek context. This common culture of erudition was the vehicle of a more or less unified carrier group for the articulation of different forms of cultural unease, as the example of Lipari showed. The volcanic activity as described by Cassiodorus is used as a strong metaphor for both excessive feats and total ruin in Lydus. Apparently, both Lydus and Cassiodorus belonged to a group which was receptive to the literary force conveyed by the image of Lipari's volcanoes. I shall conclude this section on textual parallels with an analysis of a motive which appeared in the oeuvres of all three authors under scrutiny: the antiquarian history of the hippodrome.

### 3.3.3. Case Study: The Hippodrome

The existence of a common and shared culture of Roman antiquarianism is not only extant in the textual parallels between the three authors under scrutiny. When we look into the antiquarian history of the hippodrome, we can see that this motif appeared in our three authors and in two other authors in the sixth century - the anonymous author of the poem *De Circensibus* and Corippus. The following section will present a comparative analysis of these five instances of the antiquarian history of the hippodrome in the sixth century. I shall give an overview of their shared sources and a hypothetical reconstruction of the genesis of these erudite descriptions on the hippodrome.

A first extensive treatment of the hippodrome can be found in a poem of the *Anthologia Latina* 188 (197R) with the title *De Circensibus*.[416] According to recent research, the epigrams 78-188 in the *Anthologia Latina* are the product of a single anonymous author, who can be situated in early sixth century Vandal North Africa.[417] In twenty verses, the author compared the hippodrome to the universe, invoking number symbolism to equal the races to the heavens and comparing the arena to the earth.

The second description of the hippodrome was written by Cassiodorus. His antiquarian remarks on the history of the hippodrome are embedded in *Variae* III. 51[418] in which the wages of a renowned charioteer are discussed. After the introduction (§1 – 2), Cassiodorus gave a sketch of the history of the hippodrome (§3 – 4), which centred around three characters; Oenomaus invented horse-racing. Romulus introduced these races in Italy. Augustus founded the *Circus Maximus* in the city of Rome. The lion's share of the letter (§4 – 10) described the Roman circus as an image of the universe, which shared many characteristics with the poem *De Circensibus*. The letter closes with a promise of Theodoric's sustained support for the games.

John of Lydia's history of the hippodrome can be found in *De Mensibus*. He started his account in *De Mensibus* I.12[419] with the nymph Circe, who invented the races in honour of her father, the Sun, and who gave her name to the Latin word for the hippodrome, *circus*. He continued with remarks on Enyalius and Oenomaus, remarks which he labeled as a digression. He concluded with a description of three hippodromes: the hippodrome of Circe in Italy, the hippodrome of Romulus in the city of Rome and the hippodrome of the emperor Septimius Severus (146 – 211) in Byzantium.

John Malalas began his history of the hippodrome (*Chronographia* VII.4 – 5) with Romulus, who founded a hippodrome, called *circus* in Latin, or κερκέσιον, in honour of the Sun.[420] Next we have remarks on the races held by Oenomaus. The account closed with a description centred around three characters. First we have remarks on the races of Enyalius. Second the hippodrome of Oenomaus is described as an image of the universe, the source of which is the historian Charax of Pergamum.[421] Third, we have the hippodrome of Romulus at the city of Rome.

The fifth and last account of the hippodrome can be found in the poetry of Flavius Cresconius Corippus,[422] who was a provincial teacher from Africa, and who

---

[416] Kay (2006: 64).

[417] On the late antique intellectual climate in Vandal Africa, see Cilliers (2004: 344-345), Kay (2006: 1-23).

[418] Giardina et al. (2014b: 64-69), Barnish (1992: 67-71).

[419] Wünsch (1898: 3-7).

[420] Thurn (2000: 133-136).

[421] See below.

[422] Schanz (1920: 78-82), Al. Cameron (1976: 1-2).

composed the first of his poems, the *Iohannis* in eight books of hexameters, in praise of Justinian's general John Troglita, shortly after the conclusion of the Byzantine conquest of Africa in AD 548. Between the composition of his first poem, which he recited in Carthage, and the composition of his second poem, Corippus moved to Constantinople, where he enrolled in the Roman administration – he was attached to the quaestor Anastasius, whom he lauds in the second preface of his second poem, the *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*. This poem was written to celebrate the accession to the throne of Emperor Justin II, on the fourteenth of November AD 565, most probably in AD 566.[423] Corippus' description of the hippodrome can be found at the end of the first book of *In laudem Iustini* (vv. 314-344).[424] After the mention that the races were held in honour of the Sun, the hippodrome is described as an image of the universe. After this allegory, there is a short mention of the myth of Oenomaus and Pelops. The account closed with the coming of Christ which transformed the idolatrous worship of the sun in Rome into a legitimate worship of the emperors in Constantinople, the "New Rome".

A synopsis of the five passages can be found in the appendices.[425] We can discern two distinct 'packets' of subject matter which are combined in several accounts on the hippodrome; 1) material relating to the cosmic resonances of the hippodrome, and 2) digressive material which treats the mythology surrounding the origins and development of the games. This second group of material focuses on mythological characters such as Oenomaus, Pelops, Enyalius, Erichthonius, Circe etc.

As regards the sources of the first group, of subjects relating to the cosmic resonances of the hippodrome, John Malalas gives us a hint when he writes in his account (*Chron*. VII.4):

> "Then, after him, Erichthonios held the same contest with four-horse chariots, for which he became famous, as is described in Charax's histories. Charax also wrote the following, that the structure of the hippodrome was modelled on the regulation of the world, that is, of the heaven, the earth and the sea.".[426]

The source mentioned is Charax of Pergamon, who lived under the Antonine Dynasty.[427] This Greek source would have been accessible to the Greek speaking

---

[423] Al. Cameron (1976b: 2).
[424] Al. Cameron (1976b: 45-46).
[425] Appendix 9.6.
[426] "Ὁ δὲ Οἰνόμαος πρῶτος αὐτὸς ἐπετέλεσε τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἅρμασιτετραπώλοις · διὸ καὶ περιβόητος ἐγένετο, καθὰ ἐν ταῖς τοῦ σοφωτάτου Χάρακος ἐμφέρεται ἱστορίαις · ὃς συνεγράψατο καὶ ταῦτα, ὅτι τοῦ ἱπποδρομίου τὸ κτίσμα εἰς τὴν τοῦ κόσμου διοίκησιν ᾠκοδόμηται, τουτέστι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ·" Thurn (2000: 135), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 93).
[427] *BNJ* 103. Jeffreys (1990b: 171), Kay (2006: 365), Squillace (2016), Van Nuffelen (2017: 270).

John Lydus and obviously to John Malalas, who quoted the source. We can assume that the Latin authors Cassiodorus and Corippus both knew Greek and were therefore also able to read Charax. The anonymous author of *De Circensibus* however, does not seem to exhibit any meaningful knowledge of Greek,[428] and as he is most elaborate in his cosmic descriptions of the hippodrome, must have had either a Latin translation of Charax, or a Latin source with the same cosmic descriptions. Another, although improbable, possibility is that the author of *De Circensibus* devised the allegory himself.

The appearance of the cosmic subject materials in all five accounts as distinct parts of the accounts argues in favour of a source of these materials which dealt exclusively with the cosmic resonances of the hippodrome. When we see John Malalas, therefore, citing Charax for both the exploits of Erichthonius and the cosmic hippodrome, we can assume that John Malalas hinted at two separate works of Charax; his histories which mention Erichthonius, and a separate work on the cosmic hippodrome.

The second group of material dealing with the mythology surrounding the origins and development of the races, derived from a plethora of sources. John Malalas is the only one to name a source (*Chron*. VII.4), namely the *Aetiae* of Callimachus of Cyrene,[429] but we can grasp the number of sources involved by taking a look at another late antique treatise on the hippodrome, namely the *De Spectaculis* of the Christian apologetic author Tertullian (ca. 155 – ca. 240).[430] A table in the appendices compares the learned lore of the *De Spectaculis* with the five sixth century accounts on the hippodrome.[431] The parallels between Tertullian and our five accounts at hand indicate a continuity in the transmission of Roman erudition from the imperial period to Late Antiquity. Furthermore, the account of Tertullian sheds further light on the erudite tradition on the hippodrome which was transmitted to the sixth century.[432]

I propose the following textual genesis of the five descriptions of the hippodrome; 1) at some point in time there was a consolidation of the previously distinct 'packets' of subject material, namely the cosmic material on the one hand and the digressive material on the other hand, into one description. 2) Following the fusion of both traditions on the hippodrome, some author reworked the combined material into a coherent narrative with an idiosyncratic three-pronged structure: i.e. introduction of the main character, digressive material on Enyalius and/or Oenomaus, and enumeration of three characters.

---

[428] Kay (2006: 12).
[429] See chapter 3.3.1. (pp. 77-105 of this dissertation).
[430] Glover (1953).
[431] Appendix 9.7.
[432] Tertullian mentions as sources Timaeus, Varro, Piso, Suetonius and his sources, Hermateles, and Stesichorus. On Varro see Av. Cameron (1976b: 146): "Servius, ap. *Georg*. III.113, explicitly attributes the tradition about Erichthonius to Varro.".

1) The first step of combining the digressive and cosmic material sets apart the poem *De circensibus* from the four other accounts on the hippodrome, as the *De Circensibus* is the only account focusing solely on the cosmic material, whereas Cassiodorus, John Lydus and John Malalas combine both 'packets' of material. Even Corippus combines the two, despite his focus on the cosmic aspect; vv. 334-337 deal with Oenomaus and Pelops. What does this setting apart of the *De Circensibus* from the others mean? Either the *De Circensibus* was an isolated case – but this seems improbable as there are many resemblances between it and the other accounts – or it could mean that the *De circensibus* is the oldest variant.

2) The presentation of the combined material in a three pronged structure with a general pattern – i.e. introduction of the main character, digressive material on Enyalius and/or Oenomaus, enumeration of three characters – sets apart the accounts of Cassiodorus, Lydus and Malalas. We can discern some relations between them.

2.1) As in some of the cases presented in chapter 3.3.1., in the case of the history of the hippodrome, there are indications that John Malalas used the account of Lydus which he reworked to suit his own agenda. We can assume originally Circe was introduced instead of Romulus as the protagonist of the description. First, both mention the Latin word *circus*. In the case of the Lydian, this word etymologically connects the character Circe to the hippodrome. In the case of Malalas, the word has lost its function, as it is impossible to connect Romulus with the word circus through etymology - indeed, we have seen in the previous section 3.3.2. that John Malalas either did not preserve Latin etymologies or adapted them to their new Greek context. Second, both John Lydus and John Malalas mentioned the games being organised in honour of the sun-god. This statement also better fits Circe instead of Romulus, as Circe is known from a previous tradition to be the daughter of the Sun.

For his history of the hippodrome, John Malalas possibly replaced Circe with Romulus. To upholster his account, John Malalas also selected from other sources. We already mentioned the historian Charax, and Callimachus of Cyrene. Another source is the late republican historian Licinius Macer (died 66 BC),[433] who is responsible for a historiographical tradition hostile to Romulus. From this source John Malalas ultimately drew his scathing remarks on Romulus, which are scattered throughout the seventh book of his chronicle.[434]

2.2.) There is a relationship between the accounts of Cassiodorus and Lydus; both accounts are connected to each other by the fact that they interrupt their

---

[433] Later in the book (VII.7), the historian Licinius Macer is mentioned. See chapter 4.2.2. (pp. 143-153 of this dissertation).

[434] Malalas' negative treatment of Romulus will be analysed in chapter 4.2.2. (pp. 143-153 of this dissertation).

cosmic digression on the hippodrome with a digression on the *mappa* or napkin thrown at the beginning of the races.[435] Another resemblance can be found between the passage of Cassiodorus and other parts of Lydus' *De Mensibus*; Cassiodorus derived the word *circus* from going-around, whereas Lydus does exactly the same for the Greek words ἀγών and ἀγωνία in *Mens.* IV.30.[436] As the previous section 3.3.2. has shown, however, it is impossible to tell who influenced whom – although there is slightly more possibility of Lydus having influenced Cassiodorus; Lydus' extensive treatment of the digressive material is in Cassiodorus' account boiled down to a short enumeration of Oenomaus, Romulus and Augustus.

2.3.) In the latest account, the hippodrome of Corippus, the combined material is condensed to a description focusing on the cosmic aspects of the hippodrome with a short mention of Oenomaus and Pelops.[437]

The analysis of this case study on the hippodrome shows that different Roman intellectuals working on the distant past of Rome freely selected from and adapted a common set of erudite, antiquarian subjects and ideas in their treatment of the hippodrome. This appearance of the hippodrome should not be surprising, as the hippodrome was a popular and dominating factor of sixth-century social and political life. However, the fact that different authors used the hippodrome as a mnemonic peg for the exposition of erudite material, and the fact that these erudite materials have several points in common, points to the existence of a shared and common culture of Roman antiquarianism. This case study does not only confirm the previous analyses of possible parallels between Cassiodorus, John Lydus and John Malalas. It furthermore shows that the shared and common culture of Roman antiquarianism was quintessential to the thinking of an extended group of sixth-century authors.

As this third chapter has tried to show, the different connections between the networks of Cassiodorus, Lydus and Malalas, and the coherence of the carrier group as the social entity of which they were a part, coincided with similar parallels on a textual level between the antiquarian material used in the three authors. The existence of a more or less socially unified carrier group and the existence of a shared discourse in order to articulate cultural trauma or unease are necessary prerequisites for the existence of cultural trauma. With the definition of the source of cultural unease in chapter 2, the description of carrier groups responsible for the

---

[435] Also in *Magistr.* I.32, there is a mention of the *mappa* as one of the insignia of the consuls.
[436] "ὅτι ἀγὼν καὶ ἀγωνία ὁ τόπος λέγεται διὰ τὸ κυκλοτερές, παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν γωνίαν, ἧς εἰς τύπον καὶ στέφανοι κυκλοτερεῖς τοῖς νικῶσιν ἐπετίθεντο." Wünsch (1897: 88). In this paragraph, Lydus also digressed on the cosmic aspects of the hippodrome.
[437] On the relationship between the accounts of John Malalas and Corippus, see (Av. Cameron 1976b: 145-146): "Corippus' passage in general is admittedly closer to Malalas than to any of the other accounts. (…) but (…) it does not seem very probable that Corippus had access to the same antiquarian source as Malalas and was simply repeating out of date (and very discordant) information.".

production of a discourse on cultural unease, and the establishment of a common and shared antiquarian discourse in chapter 3, we can proceed to the analysis, in the following chapter, of the different strategies the three authors employed in order to come to terms with the transfer of imperial power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople.

# II

# From Rome to Constantinople

In the first triptych of the analysis (chapter 4), I shall ascertain the different strategies the three authors exhibit in their antiquarian treatment of the cities of Rome and Constantinople. The authors to a certain extent assimilated both cities into their antiquarian imagination, compared them, and construed new transferable emblems of empire in order to come to terms with the loss of the material city of Rome.

# 4

# Cultural Unease: Rome and Constantinople

This chapter will discuss the strategies used by antiquarian authors to engage in the debate on the shift from Rome to Constantinople. In order to assess these different strategies, I will use the concept of *memoryscape* (see below). In the first section, I will analyse how, in the treatment of buildings and artefacts, by authors from the Greek east, Rome was assimilated into Constantinople in the antiquarian imagination (4.1.1. and 4.1.2.).[1] In the Latin west, authors such as Cassiodorus tried to resist such assimilation (4.1.3.). In the second section, I will analyse how the distant past is used as a platform to challenge[2] and discuss the moral legitimacy of Rome in comparison with Constantinople as capitals of the Roman Empire (4.2.). The third section will consider how the broader debate on what it meant to be Roman urged the antiquarians to single out, and claim for Constantinople or Rome, more abstract emblems of empire as vital to the Roman identity and the existence of the empire (4.3.). The third section will also allow the broader theoretical framework of this thesis, the trauma theories of LaCapra, and, to a lesser extent, Alexander, to be applied to some instances of antiquarian prophesy. This chapter will conclude with an assessment of how the sixth-century *memoryscape* was a transitional phase in the perception of Antiquity from an antique *culture of memory* to a restricted set of *lieux de mémoire*.

   In order to analyse how Rome and Constantinople were associated and compared with each other in the writings of the three antiquarian authors, I will use the concept of *memoryscape*. Since the seminal work of Pierre Nora,[3] the concept of *lieu de mémoire* has proven to be a fertile way to study the processes of memory and the formation of collective identities at the crossroads of the material and the immaterial; the *lieu de mémoire* is a tangible place which at the same time also encapsulates

---

[1] Bowersock (2009: 43), Grig-Kelly (2012: 29).
[2] For an overview of several ways in which the late antique challenges to the image of Rome were dealt with in different literary representations, see Grig (2012).
[3] Nora (1984). For a discussion of the merits of Nora's concept *lieu de mémoire* for the study of late antique 'Erinnerungsräume', see Diefenbach (2007: 5, 19-23).

and conveys abstract meaning and memory.[4] Yet in the context of the increasing late antique focus on the immaterial and abstract aspects of Roman *lieux de mémoire*, a redefinition of the concept becomes necessary.[5] For this I shall use the term *memory-scape*.

The concept *memoryscape* has already been applied to different areas in the humanities. In view of the vagueness of this concept in modern scholarly literature, however, a redefinition for the purposes of this chapter becomes necessary. I define a *memoryscape* as an imaginary landscape which acts as a platform. Different landscapes and elements from different real places and times are assembled and combined onto this platform.[6] The *memoryscape* of John Lydus, John Malalas and Cassiodorus acts as an imaginary realm in which the city of Rome is implicitly or explicitly connected with, compared to, and transferred to Constantinople.

The *memoryscape*'s dialectic between the material and the immaterial is especially suitable for an assessment of the late antique perception of Rome and Constantinople, as, in this period, the two cities were increasingly perceived and defined through the lens of intellectual constructs with a material aspect.[7] To name just one of the cases that will be discussed in this chapter, the way in which Constantine defined the civic identity of the city through the collection and assembly of statues stands at the crossroads of the material and the immaterial. As Bassett[8] aptly remarks, this material collection was also an intellectual construct; it posited the city at the intersection of history and myth. Although the collection soon disintegrated due to natural disasters and disinterest from the sixth century onward, the mythic status of the collection assured it of a vivid afterlife in textual references, particularly in antiquarian texts from the sixth century.[9] This complex phenomenon of statuary in reality and on paper could escape notice when viewed from the perspective of the

---

[4] "Les lieux de mémoire appartiennent aux deux règnes, c'est ce qui fait leur intérêt, mais aussi leur complexité : simples et ambigus, naturels et artificiels, immédiatement offerts à l'expérience la plus sensible et, en même temps, relevant de l'élaboration la plus abstraite." Nora (1984: xxxiv).

[5] Diefenbach's assessment and use of the different theories of the field of memory studies is a useful precedent for this thesis. Starting from a healthy scepticism as regards the use of memory as a buzzword or 'Plastikwörter' in current scholarly practice, Diefenbach critically selects from different available theories to form a synthetic framework *in function of* the specific period of Late Antiquity (Diefenbach 2007: 3, 17).

[6] For a definition of the *memoryscape* as a medium for mnemonic practices see Basu (2013: 116). In view of the multiplicity and vagueness of this concept in modern literature, I opted to specify this concept for the purpose of this dissertation.

[7] For an analysis of the dialectic between the reality of perceptual experience and stereotypical ideal in late antique urban vignettes, see Dey (2014). The period of Late Antiquity also witnessed the detachment an 'emancipation' of inscriptions and epigrams accompanying statues from the material context of the statue as textual or intellectual constructs in their own right; see Alto Bauer (2007), Alto Bauer-Witschel (2007: 17), Stewart (2007: 35-39).

[8] Bassett (2004: 15-16).

[9] For the importance of texts and rhetorical training in the interaction between the late antique viewer and statues, see Stirling (2014: 98-101, 111).

*lieu de mémoire*. Yet these statues can be incorporated into the flexible concept of the late antique *memoryscape*. The attitudes of our three authors to statues will be explored in chapter 4.3.1. of this dissertation.

The *memoryscape* is a platform used by the antiquarians to discuss and redefine the heritage and image of Rome as a perennial idea. Therefore, material places in Rome and Constantinople are not the only elements in the collage of the *memoryscape* (4.1.). Cities from mythology can also appear in the *memoryscape*, next to discussions on the mythical origins of Rome and Rome's founders (4.2.). In fact, the *memoryscape* is used by antiquarians to discuss what the significance of Rome, and the Roman Empire was in the sixth century. Thus discussions on the fate of Rome (4.3.) also figure in the *memoryscape*.   Next to material emblems such as statues in the *memoryscape*, antiquarians also focused on and discussed more abstract emblems of the Roman Empire, such as the Latin language and the imperial colour purple, by tying these emblems to the city of Rome through predictions about the fate of the city.

In short, the concept of *memoryscape* allows for a multi-layered conceptualisation of Rome and her image in a period during which this image was subject to hot debate and reinterpretation,[10] thereby evading the one-dimensional approach of the *lieu de mémoire*. The image of Rome is not only connected to her buildings and material presence, but also to her (mythological) origin, her fate and the vicissitudes of emblematically Roman cultural practices on which her fate depends.

---

[10] As such, the *memoryscape* can be interpreted as a label for the diversity of ways through which the city of Rome was conceptualised in, for instance, Favro (2006).

## 4.1. Assimilating Rome and Constantinople in the Antiquarian Imagination

### 4.1.1. Rome and Constantinople: John Lydus

John Lydus himself described his *memoryscape* in his treatise *De Magistratibus* (II.30). There he expounds on the relationship between Rome and Constantinople. He does this in a philosophical digression which has neoplatonic overtones. This passage can be considered programmatic for the description of both cities in John's antiquarian works.[11] Lydus considered the city of Rome to be the archetype or ἀρχέτυπον εἶδος of Constantinople (*Magistr.* II.30):

> "Just as the monad is a primordial form, and an example of a monad is "one", so at its beginning our blessed city was considered in relation to the Rome which formerly had transcended every superiority."[12]

The phrase ἀρχέτυπον εἶδος clearly frames the relationship between Rome and Constantinople on an immaterial, metaphysical and philosophical plane. For instance, John Lydus uses the same and related phrases in his philosophical discussions of number symbolism,[13] in passages on the origin of mankind (*Mens.* III.1, Bandy III.1) and in reflections on political theory (*Magistr.* II.23).

This transcendental relationship between the old and the new Rome is reflected in the names of both cities; John Lydus says, for example, in *De Mensibus* IV. 75 (Bandy IV.77) that Constantinople shares the sacerdotal name of Flora/Anthousa with the city of Rome.[14] In spite of this concept of imitation, Constantinople does not remain a passive mirror-image. At the end of the passage in *De Magistratibus* (II. 30), Constantinople surpasses the city of Rome, which appears in a new and improved form on the shores of the Bosporus:

---

[11] On this passage see Caimi (1984: 12), Ando (2001: 401-402), Schamp (2006a: cxxxi). Significantly, in *Var.* I.1, Cassiodorus used the same Platonic metaphor in order to describe the reign of Theodoric as an imitation of the imperial reign of Anastasius I (Haarer 2006: 98).

[12] "Ὥσπερ ἀρχέτυπον εἶδος ἡ μονάς, παράδειγμα δὲ μονάδος ἕν, οὕτως ἐν προοιμίοις ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς εὐδαίμων πόλις τῆς τότε πᾶσαν ὑπεροχὴν ἐκβεβηκυίας Ῥώμης ἐνομίσθη." (Schamp 2006c: 36), trans. Bandy (1983: 129). This passage is reused in *Mens.* II.6.

[13] Mens. II.6 (Bandy II.5) has the phrase διαφέρει δὲ μονὰς ἑνὸς ᾗ διαφέρει ἀρχέτυπον εἰκόνος in a philosophical digression on the Monad, Mens. II.11 (Bandy II.27) has ἀρχέτυπον εἶδος in a discussion on the number 7.

[14] Ando (2001: 399-401, 403). See also Mens. IV.30 (Bandy II.13).

"Since our Rome, however, was both free of Nemesis and its power was eclipsing the first [Rome], the sovereign resolved that it needed also the appointment of the *praetor urbanus*."[15]

The two concepts of imitation and emulation recur in further descriptions of the sites and monuments of Rome and Constantinople. In this section I shall focus on the aspect of imitation, whereas the aspect of emulation will be analysed in section 4.2. (pp. 141-153 of this dissertation). John Lydus associated Rome systematically with Constantinople by constantly comparing a Roman building with its counterpart in Constantinople.

First, I can mention the descriptions of the Palatine Hill in Rome and the Daphne Palace in Constantinople (*Mens.* IV.4, Bandy IV.4). The two palaces are connected through the laurel plant. The mythical builder of the Roman acropolis, Latinus, discovered and cultivated the laurel plant on the Palatine Hill. The palace in Constantinople is called in Greek Daphne or laurel, in connection with the laurel plant on the Roman Palatine Hill. John Lydus cannot avoid ending his description of the Roman Palatine Hill with just a short reference to the Daphne Palace in Constantinople. In the *memoryscape* of John of Lydia, the new and the old Rome are inextricably connected.[16]

We find the same association of a Roman and Constantinopolitan building in a description of the two hippodromes (*Mens*. I.12, Bandy I.6). The hippodrome in the city of Constantinople immediately follows the Roman hippodrome. Also, in his description of buildings destroyed in the Nika-riot, John Lydus stressed the parallelism between Rome and Constantinople. In *De Magistratibus* III.70, for example, the council hall of Julian is called after the Roman senate in the times of Augustus.[17]

From time to time, John Lydus needed to misconstrue the facts in order to obtain his cherished parallelism between the archetype of Rome and the image of Constantinople. For instance, in *De Mensibus*, John Lydus expounds on a column dedicated to the goddess Fortuna at the city of Constantinople:

"Fortune's column, which used to be located in Byzantium, has been erected by Pompeius the Great, for here, having blockaded Mithridates together with the Goths, he dispersed them and captured Byzantium. And the inscription in Latin letters on the base of the column, which shows these words, *To Fortune who brings one back home safely*, gives testimony regarding his

---

[15] "Τῆς δὲ ἡμετέρας Ῥώμης καὶ Νεμέσεως ἔξω καὶ τὴν πρώτην τῆς δυνάμεως ἀποκρυπτούσης, συνεῖδεν ὁ κράτιστος καὶ τῆς τοῦ οὐρβανοῦ πραίτωρος δεῖσθαι παρόδου." (Schamp 2006c: 38), trans. Bandy (1983: 129).
[16] Janin (1964: 112-113) gives several possible explanations for the name Daphne, but remains silent on Lydus' hypothesis, which might have been his own invention.
[17] Janin (1964: 155-156).

victory over the Goths. Later, however, the site became a tavern. The Goths are Getae."[18]

This column, which is better known as the Column of the Goths, still stands in Gülhane park in modern day Istanbul. In a feat of antiquarian acumen, John Lydus translates the inscription at its base to corroborate his argument: "Τῇ Τύχῃ τῇ Ἐπαναστατικῇ διὰ τοὺς νικηθέντας Γότθους", which accurately captures the meaning of the Latin original: "*Fortunae reduci ob devictos Gothos*", or "To Fortuna Redux, by reason of victory over the Goths." Yet in spite of this semblance of erudition, John Lydus completely misattributes this inscription. He ascribes the monument to the late republican general Pompey, whereas, in modern research, the column has been traced to later periods.[19] The column was possibly erected to commemorate the triumph of Claudius II Gothicus over the Goths in AD 269, or more likely, by the emperor Constantine, who defeated the Goths in AD 331 – 332.[20]

Did John Lydus just make a mistake? This seems highly unlikely, as he had a good command of Roman history. Furthermore, one could presume that the legacy of Constantine, the founder of Constantinople, remained vivid in the city he founded, even in the sixth century AD, and John Lydus was a resident of Constantine's city. The poor state of preservation of the Latin inscription does indeed suggest that it was removed later on, yet this cannot account for John's apparent ignorance. The fact that John Lydus was still able to give a detailed description of the inscription points to a removal of the inscription after the sixth century. According to Peschlow, the monument was most possibly reused in a new political context.[21] As John Lydus only mentions a tavern at the site of the column in his own times, the reuse of the monument in a new political context must have taken place afterwards.

Indeed, in recent research this passage of John Lydus is not interpreted as a mistake. Croke, for instance, interprets John's attribution of the column to Pompey within the context of imperial propaganda.[22] Under his reign, a link between Emperor Anastasius and the Roman general Pompey was actively promoted, as we saw

---

[18] *Mens*. IV.132 (Bandy IV.5). "Ὅτι τὴν ἱσταμένην ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ στήλην τῆς Τύχης Πομπήϊος ὁ Μέγας ἔστησεν· ἐνταῦθα <γὰρ> τὸν Μιθριδάτην συγκλείσας μετὰ τῶν Γότθων καὶ τούτους διασκεδάσας τὸ Βυζάντιον εἷλε. καὶ μαρτυρεῖ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς σπείρας τοῦ κίονος ἐπίγραμμα Λατίνοις γράμμασιν, ὃ δηλοῖ τάδε· Τῇ Τύχῃ τῇ ἐπανασωστικῇ διὰ τοὺς νικηθέντας Γότθους. ὁ δὲ τόπος ὕστερον καπηλεῖον ἐγένετο. οἱ Γότθοι Γέται." (Wünsch 1898: 161), trans. Bandy (2013a: 159).
[19] Late antique historians – in the broadest sense of the word – focused in their accounts of Roman history intensely on the transformation from the Republic to the empire, which may explain the presence of Pompey, also in John Lydus (Felmy 1999). The question, however, remains why specifically Pompey appears frequently, for instance, also in Cassiodorus. I shall try to give a partial answer to this question in the following chapter, which will analyse the local and personal focus of the antiquarians.
[20] Janin (1964: 85-86), McCormick (1986: 39), Peschlow (1991: 218-219), Mango (2000: 177), Freely- Çakmak (2004: 19-20).
[21] Peschlow (1991: 220-223).
[22] Croke (2008).

in chapter 3.1.3. This connection was, as Croke argues, fostered by the existence of memorials to Pompey in the city of Byzantium, which were still present in the sixth century. According to Croke, the Column of the Goths originally was a memorial to Pompey, which was later on reused as a monument to a late antique victory over the Goths. The reattribution of the column to Pompey by John Lydus is a further indication of this climate of imperial propaganda.

Croke's argument, however, is not entirely convincing. The rationale of imperial propaganda cannot solely account for John's selective treatment of the monument's history. The figure of Pompey does not appear only in eastern Roman sources, sources in which the rationale of imperial propaganda can be assumed. For instance, Cassiodorus also repeatedly mentioned Pompey the Great in the antiquarian digressions of his state letters, which were written in the context of the Ostrogoth kingdom.[23] Furthermore, it is unclear why John Lydus would want to praise Anastasius through Pompey by writing well after the death of this emperor. Moreover, Croke's examples for praise on Anastasius make the link between the emperor and Pompey explicit. In the case of John of Lydia, the connection is made implicitly at the best. On top of that, the possible allusion to Anastasius is overwhelmed by the main thrust of this section of John's essay, which focuses primarily on different feasts and lore surrounding the month of September. If John Lydus praised Anastasius in this passage, it certainly went unnoticed.

From the perspective of John's *memoryscape* we can come up with a complementary explanation for John's attribution of the Column of the Goths to Pompey the Great. In the *memoryscape* of John of Lydia, the attribution of a late antique monument to Pompey, a late republican general, becomes highly logical. Not only is a monument from Constantinople more easily linked to ancient Rome by attributing it to a more pristine age, but also by emphasising the distant past of Constantinople in the form of Byzantium, the recent past of the city is easily overlooked and Constantinople takes over the prestige of the old Rome. The edition of *De Mensibus* by Bandy (2013) takes the case of the column of Fortuna even one step further. Bandy proposes another division of the work of Lydus, in which the passage on the column of Fortuna in Constantinople is preceded by a short description of the temple of Fortuna, built by Trajan in the city of Rome (*Mens*. IV.7, Bandy IV.5). At this point in time, we regrettably cannot make any conclusive statements on the original order of these passages. However, if Bandy's conjectured order of passages is correct, we have another case of Lydus' close association of buildings in Constantinople with buildings in Rome.

As these cases of close association between buildings and monuments in both cities show, in the mind of John of Lydia, Rome and Constantinople seem to merge into one eternal city, which is distinguished by its venerable antiquity. The near past of the city is easily overlooked to facilitate the association between the old

---

[23] Namely in *Var*. IV.51 and *Var*. VI.18.

and the new Rome. As in the case of the column of Fortuna, among others, Lydus tried to do away with the Constantinian near past of the city by attributing an older history to buildings.[24] For example, in *De Mensibus*, John Lydus asserted that the *Augusteum* was originally a food market, called *Gusteum*.[25] He furthermore anchors this market in the distant past by mentioning a ritual dance performed in the square in honour of the Emperor Tiberius. The later name *Augusteum* originated in the actions of Constantine, who set up a statue of his mother Helena Augusta in the square and renamed it *Augusteum*.[26] He does not fail to mention that the later name Augusteum was a degeneration by the common people: "but now the common people call such a place *Augusteum*".[27] John Lydus furthermore is the only one to assert this narrative of the degeneration of the place name from *Gusteum* to *Augusteum*; all other sources on the Augusteum, both contemporary and later sources, derive the name directly from Constantine's mother.[28]

John Lydus created a unique *memoryscape* as a means to come to terms with the transfer of Roman legacy from Rome to Constantinople. John's *memoryscape* is a very strange place indeed. First and foremost, it is not even a real place at all. In his descriptions, John Lydus neither depicts the real city of Rome nor the actual city of Constantinople. Not only is the relationship between the two cities described in philosophical terms,[29] but John Lydus does also not have any concern for the materiality of the buildings he describes. His accounts of buildings are scattered throughout his treatises as learned digressions, irrelevant to the main purpose of the text in which they are embedded. For instance, the palaces at Rome and Constantinople (*Mens*. IV.4, Bandy IV.4) are part of a discussion on ceremonial gifts at the calends of January. John's two hippodromes (*Mens*. I.12, Bandy I.6) are only a scholarly aside in his general treatment of Roman chronology. The account on the column of Fortuna (*Mens*. IV.132, Bandy IV.5) is embedded in an overview of the calendar of September, whereas the account on the temple of Fortuna (*Mens*. IV.7, Bandy IV.5) merely figures as an excursus in an allegorical argument on the goddess Fortuna. Furthermore, in the case of the column of Fortuna, a piece of material evidence, namely an inscription, is deliberately misinterpreted to cover up John's selective presentation of the monument at hand.

As I mentioned in the definition of the cultural unease of the transfer from Rome to Constantinople, one of the traumatic aspects of this transfer was the fact

---

[24] Hereby John Lydus actually revokes earlier efforts to suppress the name and identity of the previous settlement of Byzantium (Grik-Kelly 2012: 9).

[25] *Mens*. IV.138 (Bandy IV.121).

[26] John Malalas (*Chron*. XIII.8) describes the same statue as the origin of the name Augusteum, without, however, mentioning the earlier history of the square - see chapter 3.3.1. (pp. 77-105 of this dissertation)

[27] "τὸν δὲ τοιοῦτον τόπον νῦν οἱ ἰδιῶται Αὐγουστεῖον καλοῦσιν" (Wünsch 1898: ), trans. Bandy (2013a: 292).

[28] Janin (1964: 59-62), Bassett (2004: 24 n. 23).

[29] See the analysis of *Magistr*. II.30 at the beginning of this chapter.

that the collective memory of the Romans was previously intricately tied to the material locality of the city of Rome. Lydus devised his own solution for this conundrum. His dematerialising of Roman monuments allowed him to detach the city of Rome from its material context in time and space. John constructed an idealised image or ἀρχέτυπον εἶδος of the eternal city in which the landscapes of both Rome and Constantinople merge. This immaterial, ideal city can consequently be transferred to any material locality. And thus, the spiritualised essence of Rome, the perpetual seat of the Roman Empire, is relocated to Constantinople.

### 4.1.2. Rome and Constantinople in John Malalas

The same association between Rome and Constantinople can be found in John Malalas. The city of Rome, however, is not the only point of reference for Constantinople, as John Malalas also associates Constantinople with the city of Troy. Malalas' treatment of the *Palladium*, the cult statue of the goddess Athena, is a case in point.[30] The *Palladium* is mentioned in different books of Malalas' chronicle (Books V, VI, VII, XIII) as a Leitmotiv for the *Chronographia*,[31] giving coherence to the historical narrative of John Malalas and emphasising the continuity between the mythical past of Troy,[32] the imperial legacy of Rome and the city of Constantinople.[33] In this succession of three cities, Constantinople is presented as the natural ending

---

[30] For an overview of literary testimonies and secondary literature on the Palladium, see Bassett (2004: 205-206). See also Bassett (2007: 193-194). An analysis of the antique and late antique use of and significance given to the Palladium can be found in Ando (2001: 398-399, 403). See also Kelly (2004: 187), Saliou (2006: 70).

[31] In *Chron*. V.12-15 (Wyatt 1976: 112), John Malalas recounted the quarrel between Ajax Telamonius, Diomedes and Odysseus over the Palladium. The Palladium is an image of Pallas, given by the wonder worker Asios to Tros when building Troy. Tros gives the name Asia given to his lands in honour of Asios. During the siege of Troy, the Palladium is stolen on the advice of Antenor by Odysseus and Diomedes during a festival. The Palladium is claimed by Ajax, and Odysseus pleads in favour of him receiving the statue. Because the Greeks do not reach an agreement on the question, the Palladium is taken in custody by Diomedes. Ajax is murdered the same night and riots occur against Odysseus. Diomedes sets off from Troy with the Palladium (*Chron*. V.22). In Book VI, (*Chron*. VI.24), Diomedes meets Aeneas and hands over the statue to him therefore complying with an oracle from the Pythia to give the Palladium to the Trojans. Thereafter Aeneas founds the city of Albania and deposits the Palladium there. Ascanius Iulius, son of Aeneas and Creousa, builds the city of Lavinia, and transfers the Palladium from Albania to Lavinia (*Chron*. VI.25). At the end of Book VI (*Chron*. VI.29) Albas transfers the Palladium from Lavinia to Silva. At the beginning of Book VII (*Chron*. VII.1) the two brothers Romus and Remus take the Palladium to their newly founded city of Rome. The account of the Palladium comes to an end in Book XIII, which digresses on the dedication of Byzantium by Emperor Constantine (*Chron*. XIII.7). Constantine took in secret the Palladium from Rome and buried it under the column at the centre of his forum.

[32] On the ideological connections between Troy and Rome, see Edwards (1996: 63-66). Bowersock (2009: 38-40) analyses how the special relationship between Rome and Troy in the Augustan foundational myth of Rome elicited late antique reports on Constantine's envisaging Alexandria Troas as an alternative location to Byzantium for his new city.

[33] Jeffreys (1990a: 58-59, 61), Moffatt (1990: 98). 'Thus, the Palladion, together with other statues of its ilk, referred to Rome and through it to Troy, rooting the new city's history deep in the soil of the heroic past.' (Bassett 2007: 194).

point; the spectacular wanderings of the *Palladium,* from Troy to Albania, thence to Lavinia, next to Silva, next to Rome, come to an end in *Chron.* XIII.7 with Constantine literally anchoring the object under the pillar in the forum of Constantine in his new city.[34] With this symbolic act, the wanderings of the *Palladium* come to an end in the city which is presented as the end and culmination of history – it is not surprising John Malalas mentions that the statue is believed to lay under the pillar "until today". In *Chron.* XIII.7, the connections between Constantinople and different cities from the past are especially emphasised. The connection between Constantinople and Troy is underlined by the *Palladium* on the one hand and the fact that Constantine put a statue of himself on the column, which he took from the city of Troy on the other hand.[35] Constantinople is also connected to Rome through the building activities of Constantine. The building of a *kathisma* in the hippodrome and the palace of Constantine are said to be explicitly modelled on the city of Rome. In Chron. XIII.7, the name of the *Tyche, Anthousa* is also mentioned, a name which is derived from the name of Rome, as John Lydus mentions.[36]

In Malalas' depiction of Constantinople, different associations combine to form a powerful image of the new capital of the empire. Constantinople is, for instance, also associated with the conquests and reign of Alexander the Great in *Chron.* VIII.1 and XII.20. These two passages mention Alexander's construction and Septimius Severus' reconstruction of the *Strategion* – a place where Alexander practiced his command of the army.[37] In face of these manifold historical echoes, the importance of Rome as the only predecessor to and model of Constantinople decreases – as the wanderings of the *Palladium* illustrate, the city of Rome is only a transitory station on the road of history, and the end of history is reached with Constantine's foundation of the new Rome.[38]

John Malalas nuanced the exclusive relationship between Rome and Constantinople, a relationship such as we could perceive in the works of John of Lydia, by also employing references to the mythical past of the city of Troy and the legacy of Alexander the Great in the creation of a Constantinopolitan *memoryscape*. The non-exclusiveness of the relationship between the two capitals of the empire does

---

[34] John Malalas is the first of three attestations to claim the Palladium for Constantinople. Procopius, *De Bello Gothico* I.15 opposes the Romans, who profess not to know where the statue is, to the Byzantines who profess the statue to be in Constantinople (Bassett 2004: 205-206). On this symbolic transfer of power from Rome to Constantinople, see Cabouret (2006: 184). On the statue of Constantine on the pillar at his forum, see Gehn and Ward-Perkins (2016: 140-142).

[35] Bowersock (2009: 40).

[36] Mens. IV.30 and IV.75.

[37] Janin (1964: 13), Bassett (2004: 242-244).

[38] On the deliberate reuse of statuary by Constantine to underscore the role of Constantinople as transcending the local history to become the heir to the universal Roman history, see Bassett (2007: 194-195). On a similar tension in Latin literature between Rome as the end station of Cybele's wanderings and the possibility of a further transfer of this cult statue, see Pfaff (2004: 270-272).

not only have repercussions for the *memoryscape* of Constantinople; John Malalas also associates the city of Rome with other cities, such as his home town of Antioch. These associations between Rome and the small Rome on the Orontes will be discussed in chapter 5.2.2. (pp. 213-217 of this dissertation).

4.1.3 Resistance to Assimilation: Cassiodorus and the Depiction of Rome in the *Variae*

For Cassiodorus and the Ostrogothic regime in which he functioned, the material city of Rome is still the most important point of reference in the ideological landscape of Late Antiquity. Therefore, Cassiodorus devised several strategies to resist in his *memoryscape* the association between Rome and Constantinople. Rome is presented as a unique city and is implicitly distinguished from Constantinople.

When we compare the depictions of Rome in John Lydus and John Malalas with the image of Rome in Cassiodorus, we can perceive a curious division of subject matter; the buildings of Rome which are described by Cassiodorus are absent in both John Lydus and John Malalas and vice versa. For instance, the theatre of Pompey (*Var.* IV.51), the Colosseum (*Var.* V.42), the Via Sacra with its elephant statues (*Var.* X.30), and the forum of Trajan (*Var.* VII.6) are absent in John Lydus and John Malalas. One could argue that the antiquarian descriptions of Rome in John Lydus and John Malalas are shaped through the lens of Constantinople, the city with which these authors were familiar. Aspects of Rome which are absent in Constantinople are left out of the description of Rome. Cassiodorus seems to focus in his descriptions of Rome on precisely these emblematic buildings, because they assert the uniqueness of Rome in comparison with its copy on the Bosporus.

The only exceptions to this "antiquarian division" are the Capitoline Hill, which is described in Cassiodorus *Var.* VII.6, the sewers and waterworks of the city in the same letter and the Circus Maximus (*Var.* III.51). The first two cases receive only a cursory treatment in John Lydus and John Malalas. The Capitoline Hill is only mentioned by John Lydus in the context of rituals and features merely as the

setting to historical events.[39] Likewise, in John Malalas, the Capitoline Hill figures only as the background to some events.[40] The same applies for the sewers and waterworks of Rome – in John Lydus the sewers are only mentioned as the setting for the Gallic assault on Rome,[41] and in John Malalas there is only a short mention of the construction of an aqueduct in Rome by Antoninus Pius.[42] In the case of letter VII.6, Cassiodorus uses the sewers and the Capitoline Hill to highlight the superiority of Rome without mentioning Constantinople. Cassiodorus' tactic to use the sewers and waterworks to emphasise Rome's continuing predominance over Constantinople fitted the material reality; in spite of conscious efforts to emulate the ancient city, Constantinople did not succeed in surpassing Rome as regards to her facilities of water supply.[43] The same goes for Cassiodorus' use of the Circus Maximus and the Capitoline Hill as a means to stress the superiority of Rome in comparison

---

[39] In the following passages the Capitoline Hill is mentioned in connection to rituals. *Mens.* IV. 3 (Bandy IV.3) describes the procession called *ovatio* by the consul to the *Capitolium*. *Mens*. IV.89 (Bandy IV.85) has a mention of the festival of Hera on the *Kalendae* of June which is accompanied by prayers on the Capitoline Hill. Apart from that, the Capitoline Hill features as the setting for historical events in four instances. *Mens*. IV.114 (Bandy IV.106) has an account of the Gallic attack on the Capitoline Hill, which Lydus merely mentioned in order to explain the details of a Roman festival; during a festival in commemoration of the geese who alerted the Romans of the Gallic raid, dogs were slaughtered because they did not warn the Romans. The secondary importance of the Capitoline Hill in this instance is furthermore underscored by the fact that Lydus also gave other explanations for the ritual slaughter of the dogs. The dogs were possibly killed because of their nightly noise or for the fear of the spreading of rabies. In *Mens*. IV.52 (Bandy IV.118), Lydus gave an account of a rebellion at the Capitoline Hill which was nipped in the bud by the appearance of a mysterious shepherd. *Magistr.* I.50 has an account of the Gallic attack on the Capitoline Hill, and in *Magistr.* II.2, we have an anecdote on Caesar's rejection of the crown when going from the Capitoline Hill to the senate.
[40] In *Chron*. VII.1, Romulus and Remus built the temple for Zeus called the Capitol. *Chron*. VII.11 has the account of the Gallic siege of Rome and the Capitoline Hill. *Chron*. IX.23 recounts how Augustus built the temple of Zeus and reconstructed the Capitol in Rome, whereas in *Chron*. X.5, the same emperor placed on the Capitol an inscription with an oracle on the first-born God.
[41] *Mens*. IV.114 (Bandy IV.106) recounts how the sewers of Rome were constructed by Servius Tullius and how they later on served the Gauls in their attack on the city. The same attack of the Gauls through the sewers is mentioned in *Magistr*. I.50.
[42] *Chron*. XI.26.
[43] Ward-Perkins (2012: 64-66), Crow (2012). The emphasis on sewers and aqueducts as special features underscoring the marvel of the city of Rome is actually a textual strategy which was used before Cassiodorus by authors such as Pliny, Frontinus, Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Edwards 1996: 105-108). 'There are several reasons why sewers and aqueducts might be felt worthy of unqualified approval. For one thing, unlike so many features of Rome which could be seen as derived from the Greek east, these kinds of public structures were felt to be distinctively Roman.' (Edwards 1996: 106). A parallel strategy can be found in Libanius: 'Libanius' hostility to Constantinople (…) is displayed in a description of the palace at Antioch [in his *Antiochikos*]. (…) The specific mention of the water supply is the rhetorical stiletto thrust. As he knew well from his time spent in the city, (…) a crucial defect that emerged in the decades after Constantine's foundation was that, unlike Old Rome, the site was singularly deficient in local springs and aquifers.' (Crow 2012: 117). In the light of this deficiencies of the city of Constantinople, also Cassiodorus' letter III.53, which digresses on the art of finding water, can be read, like Libanius' *Antiochikos*, as a venomous sting towards Constantinople.

with Constantinople; these two features were some of the only remaining aspects in which the sixth-century city of Rome still outdid Constantinople. Apparently, Cassiodorus, who had seen both cities, knew how to choose the areas in which Rome still could still win the contemporary competition with Constantinople.

Letter XI.39 is a nice example of Cassiodorus' tactics of presenting Rome through the careful selection of features which distinguish it as a city distinct from and superior to Constantinople. The letter digresses on the payment by the province of *Bruttii* of taxes in cattle. The imagery of Rome's population being supplied with cattle from distant provinces (XI.39.1) prompts Cassiodorus to list a number of indications of Rome's greatness (XI.39.2):[44]

> "For the vast extent of the walls bears witness to the throngs of citizens, as does the swollen capacity of the buildings of entertainment, the wonderful size of the baths, and that great number of water-mills which were clearly provided especially for the food supply. For if this last equipment had not been of practical use, it would not have been thought necessary, as it serves neither the beauty of Rome, nor anything else."[45]

Cassiodorus' list of distinguishing features of Rome – its walls, its buildings for entertainment, its baths and its water-mills – is also subjected to the antiquarian division in subject matter. As regards the walls of Rome, only John Malalas has a short discussion of the rebuilding of Rome's walls under Emperor Aurelian (*Chron.* XII.30). Any discussion of the walls of Constantinople remains conspicuously absent in both John Malalas and John Lydus, except for a passing reference to the rebuilding of the walls of Byzas by Constantine (*Chron.* XIII.7). Perhaps the reticence of the eastern sources is prompted by the – albeit relative – superiority of the walls of Rome in comparison with Constantinople. The city of Constantinople was not able to surpass the length of Rome's walls, in spite of the fact that its triple walls, built by Theodosius II around AD 413, were of superior quality. The long walls erected under Emperor Anastasius at the beginning of the sixth century clearly eclipsed the walls of the old Rome. Yet perhaps these long walls did not serve to augment the image of Constantinople, as they were 64 kilometres removed from the city.[46] Cassiodorus' following mentions of buildings for entertainment and baths comply with the distinguishing profile Cassiodorus sketches of Rome in his other letters – we have already mentioned the theatre of Pompey and the coliseum, and the continuing su-

---

44 Similarly, in *Var.* VI.4.5, Cassiodorus mused on the greatness of Rome, which contained the whole of the universe: "Dicioni tuae non solum Roma commissa est, quamvis in illa contineantur universa" (Fridh and Halporn 1973: 229).
45 "Testantur enim turbas civium amplissima spatia murorum, spectaculorum distensus amplexus, mirabilis magnitudo thermarum et illa numerositas molarum, quam specialiter contributam constat ad victum. hoc enim instrumentum nisi fuerit usua le, necessarium non habetur, quando nec ornatui potest proficere nec parti aliae convenire." (Giardina et al. 2015c: ), trans. Barnish (1992: 161).
46 Ward-Perkins (2012: 62-64).

periority of Rome's waterworks. His mention of water propelled mills can likewise be interpreted as a reference to Rome's waterworks, but is also significant for a different reason. By mentioning buildings with a practical use and emphasising their utility, Cassiodorus harks back to a distinctly Roman tradition of profiling Rome as a city of practical comfort.[47] In this letter, we find two forms of the Latin word *mirabilis*; the notion of Rome as a marvellous city will be another tool of Cassiodorus' construction of Rome's *memoryscape*, as we will see below.

Cassiodorus underscores the uniqueness of Rome by characterising the city as a miraculous city.[48] In letter VII.15 he described Rome as a wonder and adds the city to the list of Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. In this letter, Cassiodorus mused on the marvels of the city of Rome, its statues, which were invented by the Etruscans, its equestrian statues and its colonnades.[49] A short catalogue of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World follows the description.[50] This catalogue serves to highlight the splendour of the city of Rome, which as a wonder in its whole surpasses each of these monuments: "*universa Roma dicatur esse miraculum*".[51] The other Seven Wonders of the Ancient World and their countries are implicitly emulated by Rome and Ostrogothic Italy in other letters. In letter X.30, for instance, Rome is credited with the specific honour of representing in a cultural way the natural wonders of distant countries. In letter VII.6, the elaborate description of the waterways of Rome as marvels prompts the assertion of Roman superiority over the Egyptian Nile. The granting of privileges to the town of Squillace in letter XII.15 invites Cassiodorus to indulge in an elaborate description of his beloved hometown.[52] Cassiodorus mentions how the rising of the sun is admirably seen from the shores of Squil-

---

[47] Edwards (1996: 106-107).
[48] The word *miraculum* appears in 18 letters of the *Variae*. The city of Rome is the only city which is associated with this word (in five cases: I.25, III.30, IV.51, VII.6 and VII.15). In the other cases, the word is used to denote the miraculous features of nature (I.39, III.47, VIII.32, VIII.33, IX.6, IX.24 and XI.10), miracles performed in the bible (IV.31), the wonders of technology (I.45), mythology (II.40), and personal features (IV.4, VI.13 and XI.1). Words with the stem *mirabil-* have a more general usage; of the 45 instances of these words, 23 are used for human faculties, virtues, requests, actions etc. Eight instances occur in descriptions of the marvels of nature, and seven instances are used when Cassiodorus expounds on technical and literary achievements. Yet in all seven cases when the *mirabil-* words are used for dealing with a city (in letters IV.51, VII.6, VII.15, X.30, XI.2, XI.39 (two times)), the words are used to denote a feature of the city of Rome. The majority of the letters with forms of the word *spectaculum* pertain to games. In three cases (IV.51, VII.9 and XI.39), the word is used in a letter pertaining on matters in Rome. On the same strategies of describing Rome as a miraculous city in Ammianus Marcellinus and Pliny, see Edwards (1996: 97-102).
[49] On statues as source of amazement in mediaeval Rome, see Machado and Lenaghan (2016: 131).
[50] This catalogue is a rhetorical paraphrase of the *Fabulae* (223) of the second-century author Hyginus, which retains the dimensions of the monuments (Ekschmitt 1984: 10).
[51] Giardina et al. (2015a: 72).
[52] O'Donnell (1979: 17).

lace, so as to outdo the home of Phoebus at Rhodes – a clear hint at the Colossus of Rhodes.[53]

The motif of the Seven Wonders of the World, which appeared as early as the second century BC and remained popular throughout Antiquity and Late Antiquity,[54] is absent in John Lydus and John Malalas - in contrast with Cassiodorus. Neither John Malalas nor John Lydus used the motif to emphasise the role of Rome or Constantinople. John Lydus only made one scathing reference to two of the seven wonders, when he compared the residences of his arch-enemy John of Cappadocia with mausolea and pyramids, the works of such Egyptians as Amasis and Sesostris (*Magistr*. II.21). In this case, however, the mentioned buildings are not even characterised as wonders. John Malalas did make some references to wonders of the world, yet the references are scattered throughout the chronicle and conform to Malalas' own agenda. In the instance where he did refer to wonders of the canonical list of seven wonders, he did not characterise them as wonders.[55] In the cases where he did characterise a building as a wonder, John Malalas was describing buildings which do not pertain to the traditional canon of wonders; in *Chron*. XI.16 a temple of Hadrian in Cyzicus is described as a wonder, in *Chron*. XI.22 two buildings of Antoninus Pius, a large temple to Zeus in Heliopolis, and a forum in Laodicaea, and in *Chron*. XIII. 14 the great church of Antioch itself is labelled "one of the wonders".[56] Clearly Malalas' appreciation of which buildings were to be considered as wonders and which were not was influenced by his local and Christian agenda, promoting buildings from the Near East and the vicinities of Antioch and also Christian churches as

---

[53] In letter IX.6, the seaside resort of Baiae surpasses the Black Sea and the Indian Ocean. Letter XII.24 is famous because it contains the first reference in history to the city of Venice. What us interests in this letter, is the fact that Cassiodorus positively compares the archipelago of Venice with the Cyclades; *Var*. XII.24.3: "ut illic magis aestimes esse Cycladas, ubi subito locorum facies respicis immutatas" (Giardina et al. 2015c: 108). The last letter of the *Variae*, XII.28, compares the province of Liguria positively with Egypt. Liguria is saved from famine while keeping its freedom, whereas Egypt paid the price of losing freedom to evade famine; *Var*. XII.28.9: "Gaude igitur, assuete iam bono Ligur: in usu tuo secunda venerunt: nam collatos tibi Aegyptios magna prosperitate vicisti: evadis tempora necessitatis et libertatis praemia non amittis: immo illo tempore securus es ab hoste redditus, quando et de famis periculo cognosceris esse liberatus." (Giardina et al. 2015c: 118). Similarly, the Gothic monarch outdoes the biblical Joseph in distributing his liberality impartially (§ 10).
[54] The list of Seven Wonders is first attested in a poem of Antipater of Sidon preserved in the *Anthologia Palatina* (IX.58) (Ekschmitt 1984: 9). After Antipater, the motive appeared in the works of Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, and numerous other authors, both writing in Latin and in Greek, throughout Antiquity and Late Antiquity. For a concise overview of the traditions on the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, see Ekschmitt (1984: 9-11).
[55] John Malalas refers to the Colossus of Rhodes in *Chron*. V.43, VII.18 and XI.18. Only in *Chron*. V.43 the statue is described as a "φοβερὸν θέαμα" (Thurn 2000: 116). In *Chron*. IX.9, the lighthouse of Alexandria is mentioned and described as "φοβερόν" (Thurn 2000: 164-165) without, however, any further reference to the building as a wonder.
[56] *Chron*. XI.16: "ἕνα ὄντα τῶν θεαμάτων" (Thurn 2000: 210), *Chron*. XI.22: "ἕνα καὶ αὐτὸν ὄντα τῶν θεαμάτων (…) μέγα θαῦμα" (Thurn 2000: 212), *Chron*. XIII.14 "καὶ ἓν ὂν τῶν θεαμάτων" (Thurn 2000: 248-249).

wonders – Malalas' localist agenda shall be discussed in chapter 5.2. (pp. 207-217 of this dissertation).

We could wonder whether the attitude of the three authors towards the notion of wonder was mutually influenced; perhaps the absence of any association between Constantinople and this canon of wonders in, for example, John of Lydia, prompted Cassiodorus to use this motif in his presentation of Rome as a city distinct from Constantinople. On the other hand, Malalas' treatment of the wonders indicates that this motif was still known in both parts of the empire, and that it proved a common ground for debating on the role of different cities. One could read, for instance, Malalas' local focus in his use of the term wonder as a response to Cassiodorus' openly Romanocentric approach - as already mentioned, cultural unease is subjected to a continuous negotiation in which different opinions can conflict.

To conclude this section, Cassiodorus is keen to highlight the uniqueness of Rome's *memoryscape*; in order to do this, he highlighted Rome's exceptional features, notably her buildings, and her status as eighth wonder of the world – a status which was implicitly contested by John Malalas.

## 4.2. Comparing Rome and Constantinople in the Antiquarian Imagination

### 4.2.1. The Moral Comparison of Rome and Constantinople

After associating the city of Constantinople with Rome, both John of Lydia[57] and John Malalas compare the new Rome favourably to the old Rome in order to come to terms with or justify the fall of the old Rome and the transfer of the imperial centre from the West to the East. In order to do this, they make in their *memoryscape* a specific selection of instances and characters of Rome's mythological and historical repertoire (chapter 4.2.1.). Most notably, they balance a negative portrayal of Romulus (chapter 4.2.2.) against favourable descriptions of Numa Pompilius (chapter 4.2.3.) in order to give expression to their ambivalent attitudes towards Rome.

The moral comparison and transfer of moral authority from Rome to Constantinople is conspicuous in John Malalas, up to the point of providing a structure to the Chronicle as a whole. The Chronicle, which recounts the salvation history of Christianity, is in fact a circle composition, in which the city of Rome mirrors the city of Constantinople.[58] Its centre is Book X which recounts the life of Christ. The Seventh Book recounts the history of the foundation of Rome, and is two books removed from the central Book X. In the same way, Book XIII, which has the foundation of Constantinople, is two books removed from the central Book X. Six books of the Chronicle precede Book VII with the foundation of Rome. Likewise, five books follow the Thirteenth Book with the foundation of Constantinople – we might even wonder whether John Malalas did not intend his *Chronographia* to have nineteen instead of the preserved eighteen books.[59]

I II III IV V VI VII VIII IX X XI XII XIII XIV XV XVI XVII XVIII + ?

The pivotal position of Book X also entails a moral shift: Book VII reads as a very negative antiquarian comment on the city of Rome and its founders – see

---

[57] Carney (1971b: 40).

[58] Moffatt (1990: 98).

[59] Croke (1990: 23-25) argues in favour of the chronicle being concluded with the death of Justinian in AD 565 and therefore comprising only eighteen books. Yet he also mentions the possibility of a nineteenth book and concedes that the evidence at hand precludes any conclusive resolution of the question at hand. The hypothesis of a circle composition of Malalas' chronicle is, therefore, a structural argument in favour of the nineteen books hypothesis. I argued in favour of this hypothesis on the basis of this structural argument, the importance of number symbolism in John Malalas and his contemporaries and the embedding of the chronicle in the context of the palace in Constantinople in a paper given at the 23rd International Congress of Byzantine Studies in Belgrade (22nd-27th of August 2016), and intend to publish this paper.

below, (pp. 143-153 of this dissertation) –, whereas the city of Constantinople is presented in Book XIII as the morally superior counterpart of the old Rome.[60] This moral shift is caused by the coming of Christ in Book X; whereas the old Rome is characterised as a pagan city or heretical city, Constantinople is presented as the capital of Christendom.[61]

The moral superiority of Constantinople is most conspicuous in *Chron.* XIII.7. The section starts with the procession of Constantine from Rome to Constantinople. After a short account on the foundational building activities of Constantine, the section elaborates on the forum of Constantine. As mentioned above, the emperor secretly took the *Palladium* from the city of Rome and put in under the pillar with his statue. This act can be interpreted as the triumph of Christianity over paganism; Constantine literally detained the pagan heritage of the city of Rome under his feet in the forum of Constantine. After the account of the *Palladium*, Constantine dedicated the *Tyche* of the city, which he called *Anthousa*. John Malalas characterised this act as "a bloodless sacrifice in honour of God," and contrasts Constantine's *Tyche* with the other foundational narratives in his chronicle, which entail the sacrifice of a girl.[62]

The account closes with a short digression on the origin of the pre-Constantinian city. The city was founded by Phidalia, who dedicated the virgin Keroe as *Tyche* of the city. On the advice of her father, Phidalia built the walls of the city and married Byzas, who gave his name to the city after the death of Phidalia's father. In *Chron* XIII.7, this pagan prehistory of the city is implicitly contrasted and discredited by the actions of the Christian Constantine. Not only does the sacrifice of the girl Keroe stand in stark contrast to the bloodless sacrifice of Constantine,[63] but at the beginning of *Chron.* XIII.7, Constantine is said to have completed and extended the wall of Byzas, a wall which at the end of the section appears to have been built by Phidalia, Byzas' wife. Constantine finished and perfected the works for which the former founder of Byzantium was only partially responsible.

The foundational act of Constantine is also described through a specific vocabulary. *Chron.* XIII.7 has occurrences of the verbs κτίζω and ἀνανεόομαι, words

---

[60] For an analysis of Malalas' Christian framework informing his historical construction of a succession from pagan empires and the pagan Roman Empire to a Christian Roman Empire, see Scott (1990a: 158-161).

[61] This moral shift also influenced Malalas' treatment of the issue of adultery. See chapter 7.2. (pp. 302-312 of this dissertation)

[62] "τῷ θεῷ θυσίαν ἀναίμακτον" (Thurn 2000: 246), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 174). The sacrifice narratives possibly stem from a Christian polemical history aimed at discrediting the pagan predecessors of Constantine in his favour (Liebeschuetz 2004: 151), (Garstad: 2005). On the opposition in John Malalas between the depraved human sacrifices accompanying the pagan foundations of cities and Constantine's bloodless and therefore morally superior sacrifice during the foundation of Constantinople, see Jeffreys (1990a: 57-58), Saliou (2006: 78-79, 2016: 73). See also Jeffreys (1990b: 208).

[63] Ando (2001: 403).

which recur frequently in John Malalas and refer to the acts of founding/building and restoring respectively. But Constantine is also said to renew the city of Byzantium. The Greek verb used for this expression is ἀνακαινίζω, which is only used in this passage and a passage in Book Seventeen (*Chron*. XVII.16) on the restoration of Edessa by Justin I (AD 450 - AD 527). More significantly, the derived substantives ἀνακαίνισις or ἀνακαινισμός are only used in two cases; in one case it also refers to the restoration of a city, namely the city of Antioch in *Chron*. XVII.16. In the case of *Chronologia* 6, however, it refers to an explicitly biblical context, namely the ἀνακαίνισιν κόσμου or the renewal of the world after the second coming of Christ.[64] By using the related verb ἀνακαινίζω for Constantine's foundational activities, John Malalas gave the actions of Constantine Christian overtones.

The same Christian overtones are completely absent in Malalas' description of the city of Rome. His only reference to the Christian history of the city of Rome, apart from some general history of the apostles, is to be found in *Chron*. X.34, where he describes the death of Simon Magus through the agency of Peter. After Simon Magus fell to his death, his body was buried at the spot where it hit the ground. The place was called the *Simonium*. The selective presentation of Rome's Christian credentials in John Malalas seems on the edge of becoming a parody; the city which depends on Simon Petrus for its religious authority, is only associated with another Simon, one of the arch-villains of early Christianity.[65]

### 4.2.2. Romulus on Trail

"The motley and disreputable origin of some of the first inhabitants is only one of many 'shameful' elements in the story of Romulus and Remus. The predatory (or meretricious!) foster-mother of the twins, the murder of Remus, and the rape of the Sabine women are the most noteworthy of these discreditable features, and all of them were at various times exploited by Rome's enemies and by Christian critics of her pagan traditions."[66]

The celebration of the founders of the city of Rome was a key element in the imperial ideological programme, even in Late Antiquity.[67] However, the unsettling presence of Remus, the murdered brother of Romulus, remained a dissonant note in the story of Rome's foundation. Together with scholars such as Ver Eecke, we could go so far as to interpret the story of Romulus and Remus as an original sin,

---

[64] Dindorf (1831: 6).
[65] The ambiguous association between Simon Petrus as one of the champions of Christianity versus Simon Magus as an early Christian villain was already used as a pun in the writings of, for instance, Gregory of Nazianzus in a poem about the bishops (Carmen 2,1,12, vv. 430-431), in denouncing the accession to an office in the church without the support of God (Meier 1989: 98, 120-121). Also Cassiodorus gives a short reference to the fate of Simon Magus in a letter criticising the practice of simony during papal elections (Var. IX.15).
[66] Cornell (1995: 60). See also Panitschek (1990: 60), Wiseman (1995), Dagron (1974: 338-44), Schamp (2006a: cccxvii-cccxxiv).
[67] See Machado (2009: 343-4).

a form of cultural trauma or unease, which became an interpretative model for Roman history.[68] This sense of cultural unease would account for the prevalence of a general pessimism in interpretations of the history of the two brothers instead of a partisan counter history.[69] Together with this pessimism, we can ascertain an almost neurotic urge in Roman historical writing to exculpate the fratricide founder of Rome in order to remove the moral pollution from Rome,[70] and from rulers such as Augustus, who preferred to be associated with Rome's founder.[71] One of these tactics of exculpation, namely, pinning the blame of the murder of Remus on one of Romulus' subordinates, Celer, will be explored further in this dissertation.[72]

The politicising of the foundational narrative of Rome in the late republican period led to the construction of the image of Romulus as a tyrant. As Augustus cultivated his connection with Romulus, the image of a tyrannical Romulus was mitigated in the Augustan period,[73] but reemerged in a reinforced form in Christian polemicists.[74] In this section, I shall explore how the cultural unease surrounding Rome's foundational myth was revived yet again in the sixth century in the writings of the three antiquarian authors under consideration. As in the case of the representation of Rome and Constantinople, the treatment of the myth of Romulus and Remus as a form of cultural unease was subject to a process of negotiation; John Lydus and John Malalas revived in their writings the cultural unease of Remus' murder, whereas authors from the west, such as Cassiodorus, perhaps in response to authors from the east, preferred to leave Romulus unmentioned.

In their moral comparison between Rome and Constantinople, John Malalas and John Lydus portrayed Rome as the evil counterpart of Constantinople. In their accounts, therefore, we find several ways by which they undermined the role of Rome in comparison with Constantinople. The main targets of these techniques are Romulus and the origin of Rome. Not only do they target Rome and her origins to emphasise the importance of Constantinople, but the history of the origins of Rome also became a specific arena of the *memoryscape* onto which John Lydus and John Malalas projected and discussed their republican criticisms of the imperial monarchy.

John Malalas was the most outspoken exponent of this anti-Roman sentiment. In fact, the whole of Book VII, with the title "On the foundation of Rome" reads as an anti-Roman and anti-imperialist manifesto. One of the sources John Malalas used for this book is the late republican historian Licinius Macer (before or in 107 – 66 BC), who was, possibly because of his political affiliations with the *pop-*

---

[68] Ver Eecke (2008: 195). Meurant (2003: 484) described the foundational murder of Remus by Romulus as "une question aussi délicate".
[69] Ver Eecke (2008: 209-210, 219, 239).
[70] Meurant (2003: 493).
[71] Meurant (2003: 494).
[72] Namely, in chapter 6.2.1.1. of this dissertation. See also Meurant (2003).
[73] For an analysis of the ambivalent treatment of Rome's foundational myth in the Augustan period specifically, see also Edwards (1996: 41-2.)
[74] Ver Eecke (2008: 222-239).

*ulares*, responsible for a historiographical tradition hostile to Romulus.[75] The whole of the Seventh Book is littered with negative remarks on the founder of Rome. The fratricide of Romulus, or Romus, as John Malalas called him (*Chron.* VII.1) was the cause of natural disasters and civil unrest (*Chron.* VII.2-5).[76] In response to these calamities Romulus devised several ways to deal with his unruly subjects. On the advice of an oracle, he ordered the production of golden busts of his brother to foster the illusion of fraternal love (*Chron.* VII.2):

> "From the time when he killed his brother, the whole city of Rome suffered earthquakes and civil wars broke out during his reign. Romus went to the oracle and asked, "Why is this happening now that I am reigning alone?" The response was given to him by the Pythia, "Unless your brother sits with you on the imperial throne, your city of Rome will not stand, and neither the people nor the war will be at rest". Having made from his brother's picture a likeness of his face, that is, his features, a gold bust, he placed the statue on the throne where he used to sit.".[77]

Romulus furthermore issued his decrees in the first person plural, as if his brother were still alive. John Malalas used this habit of Romulus to explain the fact that imperial decrees were issued in the first person plural. The implication of this explanation is clear; an imperial practice has its origins in the Roman cover-up of a fratricide.

Another means for Romulus to deal with Rome's unruly populace was the hippodrome. The racing course turned out to be a Machiavellian devise, designed by Romulus only to divide his populace into factions and to divert them from plotting against their tyrant (*Chron.* VII.4–5):

> "He started work again immediately and built the circus, as the hippodrome was called, in Rome, wishing to divert the mass of the people of Rome because they were rioting and attacking him because of his brother. (…) When Romus saw members of any of the factions supporting the populace or senators who were disaffected and opposed him because of the death of his

---

[75] Jeffreys (1990b: 185), Hodgkinson (1997), Bernardi (2006: 56), Ver Eecke (2008: 206, 219, 226). For an introduction to the life and work of Macer, his *popularis* politics, which comply with Malalas' anti-imperialist views and his use of antiquarian source material and techniques, see Cornell and Bispham (2013: 320-331). For his political action in favour of the *populares*, see Marshall and Beness (1987).

[76] Ver Eecke (2008: 219, 226).

[77] Moffatt (1990: 102). "Ἐξότε δὲ ἀπέκτεινε τὸν ἴδιον αὐτοῦ ἀδελφόν, ἐσείετο ἡ πόλις πᾶσα Ῥώμη καὶ οἱ δῆμοι <αὐτῆς> ἐστασίαζον καὶ ἐγίνοντο πόλεμοι ἐμφύλιοι ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ μόνου βασιλείας. καὶ ἀπελθὼν ὁ αὐτὸς Ῥῶμος εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον ἐπερώτησεν· 'διὰ τί γίνεται ἐπὶ τῆς ἐμῆς μόνης βασιλείας ταῦτα;' καὶ ἐρρέθη αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς Πυθίας, ὅτι 'εἰ μὴ συγκαθεσθῇ σοι ὁ σὸς ἀδελφὸς ἐν τῷ βασιλικῷ θρόνῳ, οὐ μὴ σταθῇ ἡ πόλις σου Ῥώμη οὔτε ἡσυχάσει ὁ δῆμος οὔτε ὁ πόλεμος.' καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ἐκτύπωμα τοῦ προσώπου, ἤτοι χαρακτῆρος, αὐτοῦ, χρυσοῦν στηθάριν, στήλην ἔθηκεν ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ, ἔνθα ἐκάθητο." (Thurn 2000: 132-133), trans. Jeffreys et al (1986: 91).

brother, or for any reason whatsoever, he would decide to support the other faction, and so he secured their favour and their opposition to the aim of his enemies.".[78]

To further discredit Romulus, John Malalas mentioned that his introduction of horse racing was not even an original find, as he derived the practice from the Persians.[79] The slanderous account of Romulus' reign continued with the abduction of the Sabine women. Instead of a premeditated assault on the neighbouring Sabines, the abduction of the women was a ruse to end the squalor reigning at Rome.

John Malalas ended his account of Romulus by stating that Romulus and Remus were born out of wedlock (*Chron.* VII.7). The two brothers were begotten by Ilia, priestess of Ares, and a soldier. According to Malalas, the tradition which considered the two brothers to be sons of Ares is merely a euhemerising explanation. The two brothers were reproached for their lowly origin, namely that they were nurtured by strangers. Romus instituted the *Brumalia*, during which he fed the aristocrats in order to overcome these criticisms:

> "(…) Romus devised what is known as the Brumalia, declaring, it is said, that the emperor of the time must entertain his entire senate and officials and all who serve in the palace (…) Romus did this as he wished to blot out his shame, because the Romans, who were hostile to him and hated and reviled him, used to say that they ought not be ruled by one who had been degraded, since the two brothers had been fed by strangers until they had become full grown and began to reign".[80]

This analysis of the lowly origin of the brothers and the resulting institution of the *Brumalia* in John Malalas was most possibly the product of Licinius Macer, who is mentioned as a source at the end of *Chron.* VII.7. Furthermore, this explanation did not appear in John of Lydia. Lydus considered the brothers to be the genu-

---

[78] Meier (2009: 156-160), Bell (2013: 159). "Καὶ εὐθέως πάλιν ἀρξάμενος ἔκτισε τὸ κερκέσιον, ὅπερ ὠνόμασεν ἱππικὸν ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ, θέλων διασκεδάσαι τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ῥωμαίων, ὅτι ἐστασίαζον καὶ ἐπήρχοντο αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. (…) καὶ ὅτε ἐν οἱῳδήποτε μέρει εἶδεν ὁ Ῥῶμος φιλοῦντας τοὺς λελυπημένους καὶ ἀνθισταμένους αὐτῷ δήμους ἢ συγκλητικοὺς διὰ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν οἱανδήποτε, ἐδόκει ἀντέχεσθαι τοῦ ἄλλου μέρους, καὶ εἶχεν αὐτοὺς εὐμενεῖς καὶ ἐναντιουμένους τῷ σκοπῷ τῶν ἐναντίων αὐτοῦ." (Thurn 2000: 133, 136), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 92, 94).
[79] On Malalas' localist focus deriving cultural practices from Syria and the east, see chapter 5.2.1. (pp. 207-212 of this dissertation).
[80] "τούτου οὖν ἕνεκεν ὁ Ῥῶμος ἐπενόησε τὰ λεγόμενα Βρουμάλια, εἰρηκώς, φησίν, ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὸ τρέφειν τὸν κατὰ καιρὸν βασιλέα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σύγκλητον πᾶσαν καὶ τοὺς ἐν ἀξίᾳ καὶ πάσας τὰς ἔνδον τοῦ παλατίου οὔσας στρατιάς, (…) τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίησεν ὁ αὐτὸς Ῥῶμος, θέλων ἐξαλεῖψαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ὕβριν, ὅτι οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ὄντες καὶ μισοῦντες αὐτὸν καὶ λοιδοροῦντες ἔλεγον, ὅτι οὐκ ἐχρῆν αὐτὸν βασιλεῦσαι ἐνυβρισμένον ὄντα, διότι ἐξ ἀλλοτρίων ἐτράφησαν οἱ δύο ἀδελφοί, ἕως οὗ τελείας ἡλικίας ἐγένοντο καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν" (Thurn 2000: 137-138), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 95-96).

ine sons of Ares (*Mens*. IV.150, Bandy IV.133), and did not make any mention of Romulus or his parentage in his elaborate discussion of the *Brumalia* (*Mens*. IV.158, Bandy IV.143).[81] The specific sting of John Malalas lies in the fact that he pointed out that the *Brumalia* persisted up to his own day, and that he described the host of the festival as "the emperor", thereby associating the imperial reign with a festival used to legitimise an otherwise illegitimate rule – John Lydus likewise mentioned the persistence of the festival without, however, mentioning either the emperor or Romulus.

The atmosphere of illegitimacy surrounding the foundation of Rome is coupled to a notion of continuous civil strife. The original murder of Remus by Romulus set in motion civil unrest and factionalism during the reign of Romulus (*Chron*. VII.1-7), which endured throughout the account of Rome's early history. The following two sections (Chron. VII.8-9) recount the uprising against Tarquinius Superbus (died 495 BC), which resulted in the creation of the Roman Republic. However, the civil unrest continued after the deposition of the last king. *Chron*. VII.10 recounts how the Roman general Manlius Capitolinus (died 384 BC) was driven from the city after an initial victory against the Gauls, on the instigation of Februarius. Manlius was eventually recalled from exile to deliver the city from the ensuing Gallic siege (*Chron*. VII.11), and returned the favour by exiling Februarius (*Chron*. VII.12). The account on Rome closed with two short paragraphs on Augustus and chronology (*Chron*. VII.13-14).[82]

The close association between Rome and fraternal hate or civil strife echoes throughout the rest of the chronicle. For instance, in Book XIII of the chronicle, the reign of Constantine (*Chron*. XIII.1-14), which focuses on Constantinople and Christian moral superiority, is sharply juxtaposed by the following section (*Chron*. XIII.15). In this section, Constantine's son, Constantine II, the new emperor of Rome, was murdered on the order of his brother, presumably Constans - significantly, John Malalas failed to mention the name of Constantine II's brother responsible for his murder, only mentioning that he was murdered by his brother. Apparently the city of Rome incited fratricide.

Another case can be found in *Chron*. XVIII.71, which recounts the Nika-riots and the ensuing death of the unlucky usurper Hypatius. In an elaboration on this passage in the *Chronicon Paschale* (627,18-628,16) Hypatius' body is covered with a plaque bearing the following derisive inscription: "Here lies the emperor of

---

[81] Bernardi (2006) compares the analyses of the *Brumalia* in John Lydus and John Malalas; the analyses represent different ways to emphasise and create continuity between the past and the present for purposes of legitimation.
[82] The same association can explain, for example, passages in John Lydus such as *Mens*. IV.52 (Bandy IV.118), which recounted how a rebellion at the Capitoline Hill in Rome was nipped in the bud by the appearance of a mysterious shepherd.

Louppa".[83] *Louppa* refers to the Latin word *Lupa* or she-wolf, and is therefore an allusion to the country-woman – called Lykaina because she lived amongst the wolves – who reared Romulus and Remus (*Chron*. VII.7). Although it is not certain whether this text was a – now lost – part of Malalas' chronicle, the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* clearly picked up Malalas' agenda of associations; the usurper Hypatius is associated with Romulus and Remus in the same atmosphere of civil discord and fraternal hate.[84]

John Malalas also used the criterion of family strife as an argument in his judgment of a reign as illegitimate also in other parts of his chronicle. In *Chron*. II.15, he gave his version of the myths surrounding Dionysus.[85] Dionysus and Pentheus were cousins with the latter reigning in Boeotia after his grandfather Cadmus. Dionysus tried to usurp power, was defeated by and reconciled with Pentheus, but ended up killing Pentheus nonetheless. Yet he was not able to secure the reign of the city of Kadmeia:

> "The senators and citizens of the city of Kadmeia did not accept Dionysos as administrator of their empire. They said that he killed his own cousin without being emperor; if he became emperor, he would destroy Boiotia."[86]

Dionysus was then ousted from the city by Lycurgus. In this case the rationale behind not accepting the rule of Dionysus is the killing of his own kin. The same association between family conflict and a bad management of the state is maintained in Malalas' account on the city of Thebes.[87]

In *Chron*. II.16, John Malalas recounted the story of Amphion and Zethus, two brothers and founders of the city of Thebes. Their story has striking parallels with the story of Romulus and Remus; both pairs were born out of wedlock, left behind as foundlings and raised by a shepherd. Yet in contrast to Romulus and Remus, Amphion and Zethos founded the city of Thebes in concord. We get the impression John Malalas pictured Thebes as a peaceful alternative to the city of Rome. Yet in *Chron*. II.17, the city came to an end through the same evil of fraternal strife and civil discord; Oedipus acquired control over Thebes in an atmosphere of "civil

---

[83] Dindorf (1832: 628). On the context which led to this inscription, see Al. Cameron (1978: 266).

[84] Meier (2001) gives a detailed analysis of this passage in the context of encoded political communication between Justinian and his political opponents, without, however, noticing the association between "the emperor of *Louppa*" and the shady origins of Rome.

[85] On the Theban cycle in John Malalas (*Chron*. II.14-17), see Bernardi and Caire (2016: 127-129).

[86] "οἱ οὖν συγκλητικοὶ καὶ πολῖται τῆς Καδμείας πόλεως οὐκ ἐδέξαντο τὸν αὐτὸν Διόνυσον διοικῆσαι τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῶν, λέγοντες, ὅτι τὸν ἴδιον ἐξάδελφον ἐφόνευσεν μὴ ὢν βασιλεύς · ἐὰν βασιλεύσῃ, ἀπολεῖ τὴν Βοιωτίαν." (Thurn 2000: 31), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 22).

[87] John Malalas also pursued this reasoning on a micro-level; stating that a lack of interpersonal harmony resulting from adultery results of necessity in political instability. See chapter 7.2. (pp. 302-312 of this dissertation).

war",[88] and the city was destroyed through the fraternal conflict of Eteocles and Polynices: "So the empire of Thebes, or the Boeotians, which had lasted for 369 years, came to an end.".[89] The city of Thebes is not only an example of a possible alternative to Rome, but also a warning; civil strife and fraternal hate will of necessity inflict ruin upon society.

In Malalas' Seventh Book on the city of Rome, the narrative of Marcus Manlius Capitolinus (*Chron*. VII.10-12) also deserves our attention. John Malalas recounted the feud between Mallius Capitolinus and a so-called Februarius. After Mallius defeated the Gauls in open warfare, Februarius plotted against him and had him removed from the city. Next, the Gauls laid siege to the city of Rome in Mallius' absence. Mallius succeeded, however, in liberating the city from the Gauls. The story concludes with a victorious Mallius banishing Februarius and instituting adjustments to the Roman calendar. In a preceding chapter of this dissertation,[90] I analysed how this passage appears to exhibit profound textual affinities with the work of John Lydus. One of the mentioned parallels was between the end of *Chron*. VII.11, which recounted the victory of Mallius over the Gauls, and *Mens*. IV.27 (Bandy IV.19) which is a piece of military history on the decisive victory of Camillus over the Gauls. In this instance, the differences between both accounts are revealing for Malalas' agenda. In the account of John of Lydia, Camillus is named "a second Romulus", a designation which John Malalas did not apply to Mallius in his narrative. In the context of Malalas' anti-Romulus agenda this omission becomes highly logical; as Romulus is the arch-villain of Rome's earliest history in Malalas' account, he refrained from associating the victorious Mallius with such a shady character. Furthermore, as already mentioned, Malalas' account of Mallius is actually a conflation of the narratives of Marcus Manlius Capitolinus and Marcus Furius Camillus (ca. 446 – 365 BC). The question remains why John Malalas merged the tales of Camillus and Manlius Capitolinus to form a tale of Mallius and his adversary Februarius. Camillus is considered to be an exponent of the patriciate, whereas Manlius Capitolinus was a hero of the plebeian cause.[91] We could therefore say that the foregrounding of Manlius Capitolinus by John Malalas is in line with the main thrust of the whole account on Rome's origins, which is not only anti-Roman, but also anti-imperial or republican, as the following analysis shall show.[92]

---

[88] Thurn (2000: 37) "καὶ γενομένου ἐμφυλίου πολέμου".

[89] "καὶ ἐλύθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν Θηβῶν, ἤτοι Βοιωτῶν, κατασχοῦσα ἔτη τζθ´." (Thurn 2000: 38), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 26).

[90] Chapter 3.3.1.

[91] Capitolinus was the first patrician protector of the plebs in the debt crises which terrorised the social fabric of the Republic (Cornell 1995: 330-331).

[92] The same republican attitude towards Augustus and the imperial rule can be found, for instance, in the chronicle of the seventh-century writer John of Antioch (Roberto 2013). On the same negative attitude towards Augustus in Zosimus (end of the fifth century – beginning of the sixth century) and John of Antioch, see Roberto (2015).

As already mentioned, John Malalas stressed the continuity[93] between the illegitimate rule of Romulus and the Roman kings on the one hand and the emperors on the other hand by pointing out how different imperial practices and customs have their origin in the edgy earliest history of Rome. Furthermore, the same word βασιλεύς is used to denote both the Roman kings and the emperors. Indeed the Roman Republic is pictured by John Malalas as only a short interlude of freedom in the history of the Roman Empire – after the account of the troubled war with the Gallic tribes (*Chron*. VII.10-13), only two short passages suffice to summarise more than four centuries of Rome's republican history.[94]

John Malalas hinted at his republican view on Roman history throughout the rest of the chronicle. John Malalas portrayed the accession to power of Julius Caesar in the darkest of colours (*Chron*. IX.1-7). Caesar is consistently called a dictator or monarch – also later in the chronicle, for example in Chron. XII.7. He "rebelled against the Romans" (*Chron*. IX.2)[95] and gained sole control of the empire by "winning over the Romans' enemies" and through fear (*Chron*. IX.2).[96] He slaughtered the whole of the senate (*Chron*. IX.2) and "controlled everything arrogantly and as a usurper" (*Chron*. IX.3).[97] Caesar's rule ends with his murder by the second Brutus (*Chron*. IX.7), who is linked to the republican Brutus the Great of *Chron*. VII.14. The same anti-imperial views underlie the negative description of the accession to power of Augustus; "He rebelled against the senate and ruled on his own authority and was arrogant" (*Chron*. IX.19).[98] As with Romulus and Julius Caesar, the illegitimacy of Augustus' kingly power is the main critique against it.

Malalas' negative treatment of Romulus and the Roman monarchy has its parallels in John of Lydia. For instance, in *Mens*. IV.150 (Bandy 133), John Lydus

---

[93] The same continuity in tyranny between Romulus, the first emperors and contemporary emperors can be found John of Antioch (Roberto: 2011).

[94] For an interpretation of the ideological and religious dimensions of this stress on the continuity of Roman kings and emperors in texts from the fourth century Latin west, such as the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, see Ando (2015: 217-218). According to Scott (1990a: 157-158) John Malalas deliberately omitted the republican history of Rome, the knowledge of which he did share with John of Lydia. Scott explains this omission through Malalas' autocratic focus and Christian bias - see also Liebeschuetz (2004: 148), Bernardi and Caire (2016: 126), Adler (2017: 41). Yet, as this analysis shows, Malalas' focus on the continuity between *tyranny* in the regal and imperial periods of Rome can also be a proof of Malalas' implicit republicanism, or, at least, anti-imperialism.

[95] "ἐτυράννησε Ῥωμαίους" (Thurn 2000: 161), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 113).

[96] "προτρεφάμενος τοὺς κατὰ Ῥωμαίων πολεμίους" (Thurn 2000: 161), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 113).

[97] "τῶν πάντων ἐκράτησεν ἐν ὑπερηφανείᾳ" (Thurn 2000: 162), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 114).

[98] "καὶ τυρρανήσας τὴν σύγκλητον ἐβασίλευσεν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ὑπερηφανείᾳ ὤν" (Thurn 2000: 170), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 118). Roberto (2015), however, ascribes to John Malalas a positive attitude towards Augustus as the tool of divine providence.

sketched the myth of the two brothers.[99] Significantly enough, John Lydus started his account with Remus instead of Romulus; "On the following day Remus and Romulus are commemorated." The account turned to the causes of the brother's upbringing, which lay in an earlier phase of family feuds. Amulius, who was "tyrannically disposed towards Numitor", his brother, killed Numitor's son and forced his daughter Ilia, the mother of Romulus and Remus, into priesthood. The fratricide and tyrannical rule of Romulus is foreshadowed in the acts of his evil uncle Numitor. By focusing on this previous stage of Rome's origins, the civil discord and fraternal hate in Rome's history became a fixed pattern. John Lydus had a fatalist view of Rome's history; Romulus and Remus were fated to clash as previous generations did the same. The passage closed with a short aside: "They also founded Rome." The greatest achievement of Romulus, namely founding Rome, paled in comparison with the fatal crime of fratricide and the resulting illegitimate rule.

John Lydus gave the fratricide of Remus by Romulus a prominent place in his theoretical reflections on the Roman political system at the beginning of his *De Magistratibus*.[100] In *Magistr.* I.3, Rome is founded by Romulus and Remus, after which their rule is characterised as *regium* or tyranny. There follows a theoretical reflection on the distinction between just, constitutional kingship and mere tyranny – the constitutional king acts within the framework of the law, whereas the tyrant follows his own whim.[101] In *Magistr.* I.5, John Lydus specified why the rule of Romulus does not qualify for the first variant:

"Consequently, Romulus was a tyrant; first of all because he had killed his brother, though older, and because he used to do rashly whatever occurred to him. For this reason he was called also *Quirinus*, that is to say, *kyrios* (…)".[102]

---

[99] "<Τ>ῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ μνήμη Ῥέμου <καὶ Ῥωμύ>λου· ὅτε Ἀμού<λιος πρὸς Νομίτο>ρα τυραννικῶς διακείμε<νος> τὸν μὲν υἱὸν <αὐτοῦ ἀνεῖλε, τ>ὴν δὲ θυγατέρα ἱερα<τεύειν προσ>έταξε· τῆς δ<ὲ τεκούσης, ὡς λέγου>σιν, ἐξ Ἄρεος, δεί<σας αὐ>τὸς καταποντωθῆναι προσ<έταξε τὰ βρ>έφη· τῶν δὲ δο<ρυφό>ρων παρὰ τὰς ὄχθας τοῦ Θύβριδος <ἐκθεμ>ένων αὐτά, λ<ύκαι>να προσελθ<οῦ>σα τὰς θηλὰς αὐτ<οῖς> προσένειμε· π<οιμ>ὴν δὲ τοῦτο θεασάμενος ἀν<έλ>αβε τοὺς παῖδας καὶ ὡς ἰδίο<υς ἀν>έθρεψεν, οἳ καὶ κτίζουσ<ι τὴ>ν Ῥώμην. ταὐτὸν καὶ παρὰ Ζωπύρῳ τῷ <Βυζαντίῳ> …" (Wünsch 1898: 168).
[100] Kaldellis (2005b: 2-5).
[101] Debuisson (1991), Pazdernik (2005: 194-195).
[102] "Ὥστε τύραννος ἦν ὁ Ῥωμύλος, πρῶτον μὲν τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἀνελὼν καὶ τὸν μείζο|να, καὶ πράττων ἀλόγως τὰ προσπίπτοντα· ταύτη καὶ Κυρῖνος προσηγορεύθη, οἷον εἰ κύριος (…)" (Schamp 2006b: 12), trans. Bandy (1983: 15). On this passage, see Debuisson (1991: 64-65), Maas (1992: 85), Rochette (1998), Kaldellis (2005b: 4), Pazdernik (2005: 196), Schamp (2006a: cccxvii-cccxxiv), Ver Eecke (2008: 198, 223, 387). A comparison with another extant tradition on the etymology of tyranny is revealing for Lydus' agenda. Verrius Flaccus associated the word *tyranny* with the Etruscans or *Tyrrheni* (Briquel 1990: 483). We can assume two reasons for Lydus not taking over this etymology: 1) his preference to connect words denoting tyranny to Romulus in order to depict him in a negative way, and 2) his localist tendency to depict the Etruscans, as the successors to the Lydians, positively - on Lydus' localism, see chapter 5.1. (pp. 189-206 of this dissertation).

John Lydus provided a theoretical framework for coupling the illegitimacy of Romulus' rule to the impulsive act of killing his own brother. We will never know whether John Lydus was the first to articulate such a theory, yet we can see how John Malalas constructed his view on early Roman history on the premises of this theoretical framework.[103] As we have seen, John Malalas also made the link between the illegitimate rule of capricious Romulus and the origins of the empire in Julius Caesar's and Augustus' '"rebellion" against the senate. John Lydus is – most possibly for reasons of political nature[104] – not as straightforward in asserting this tyrannical link between Romulus and the emperors, yet he did associate Romulus with Augustus, albeit implicitly. For instance, in *Mens.* IV.111 (Bandy IV.101), John Lydus pointed out that Augustus received many nicknames, "for some called him *Quirinus*, as if to say, *Romulus*, but others *Caesar*."[105] In the light of the analysis in *Magistr.* I.5 of the name Quirinus, Augustus' new title acquires an edgy association, to say the least.[106] Also in *Magistr.* II.3, we hear how Augustus used the same insignia of Romulus and his father Julius Caesar. The otherwise glorious association between Romulus, Caesar and Augustus is shaded by the echoes of tyranny, civil strife and fraternal hate.[107]

In the Latin west, the centrality of Rome in the antiquarian imagination precluded any negative treatment of the eternal city[108] and of Romulus its founder. Sources in the West remain tacit on the fratricide of Romulus and exploit other mythological characters when dealing with the notion of fratricide. For example, Cassiodorus did not give any hint as to the foundational murder of Remus by Romulus. Letter II.14 of the *Variae* is in this context of eloquent silence an interesting case. The letter deals with a person by the name of Romulus, who is suspected of having killed his own his father Martinus. The notion of parricide combined with the name

---

[103] Despite his apt analysis of John of Lydia's republican views in connection with John's network, Kaldellis (2005b) does not make any mention of a possible connection between John Lydus and John Malalas. On John's focus on the republican history of Rome, see Carney (1971b: 37).

[104] For an analysis of the art of giving veiled criticism on the emperor in Late Antiquity in general and in the works of John Lydus in particular, see Kaldellis (2005b: 9-12). On the dilemmas behind John's judgment of Justinian, see Carney (1971b: 82), Pazdernik (2005: 193-198).

[105] "οἱ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν ὠνόμαζον Κυρῖνον οἱονεὶ Ῥωμύλον, ἄλλοι Καίσαρα" (Wünsch 1898: 150), trans. Bandy (2013a: 286). This connection between Romulus and Augustus was initially fostered by Augustus himself, to positively assert his authority as the second founder of Rome (Suetonius, *Aug.* VII.2 and Cassius Dio LIII.16.4-8).

[106] Schamp (2006a: cccxx-cccxxii). These associations can also be implied as a sting to Justinian, as he was the emperor who instituted the title *Kyrios* (Maas 1992: 94). Rochette (1998: 473-474) stated that the aim of portraying Romulus as bilingual in *Magistr.* I.5 was a to positively confirm the leadership image of a bilingual Justinian. Yet, as this analysis shows, the association between Romulus and Justinian also carried a negative meaning. On Romulus' bilingualism, see chapter 5.1.1.3. (pp. 189-199 of this dissertation).

[107] See Kaldellis (2005b: 5-8) for an analysis of John of Lydia's association between the emperors and the tyrants of the late Republic in order to construct a "sequence of tyrants". See also Debuisson (1991: 60-67), Schamp (2006a: cccxvii), Kaldellis (2013: 351).

[108] Carney (1971b: 40-41).

of Romulus would give ample opportunity for Cassiodorus to digress on the historical precedent of Romulus and Remus. Yet Cassiodorus did not indulge in any antiquarian digression, but gave an array of examples of love between parents and their offspring from the natural world. In view of the addressee of the letter, namely, the Roman aristocrat Symmachus, this choice of digression seems even more out of place. For Cassiodorus had a distinct tendency to reserve comparisons from the natural world for Gothic addressees, whilst providing Roman addressees with historical lore.[109] Only at the end of the letter is there an ironical hint at the association between the parricide Romulus and his mythological counterpart: "Therefore, you are to bring before your court Romulus, who, polluted by the atrocity of his deed, disgraces the Roman name".[110] The cultural unease over the tainted history of the founder of Rome clearly made the otherwise talkative Cassiodorus rather tacit. In the case of civil discord or fratricide, Cassiodorus referred to other mythological examples to embellish his letters. For instance, in *Var.* IX.1, Theodoric threatened the Vandal king Hilderic with war after the murder of Amalafrida, Theodoric's sister. The end of the letter has a short reference to a mythological precedent of fratricide. Yet in this case, there is no mention of Romulus and Remus, but of Cain killing Abel.

In the same way as the negative associations between Romulus, the notion of internal strife, and the notion of illegitimate rule are absent in Cassiodorus, the republican framework of John Lydus and John Malalas is also missing. Cassiodorus did not oppose the legitimate Republic on the one hand to the illegitimate kingship and empire on the other hand. On the contrary, he described the consulship as a natural predecessor to the empire in *Var.* VI.1.

One case of explicit analysis of Romulus' fratricide in the West deserves our special attention. The poet and contemporary of Cassiodorus, Luxorius, edited in Vandal Africa a book of his epigrams (AD 534). Poem 39 has the title "About a Painting of Romulus Showing Him Killing His Brother on the Walls". It is worth quoting in full:

"Disce pium facinus: percusso, Romule, fratre
Sic tibi Roma datur, huius iam nomine culpat
Nemo te c(a)edis, murorum si decet omen."

"Realize that yours was a virtuous crime, Romulus. When you struck down your brother, Rome was given to you by that act. Let no one now accuse

---

you of this deed as murder, if the omen of the walls proves that what you did was right."[111]

In the poem, the murder of Remus by Romulus is justified by the result, namely the foundation of Rome. Notice the irony at the end of the poem; "the omen of the walls" refers to the fact that Romulus proclaimed after the death of Remus that no enemy will transgress the walls of Rome alive.[112] In a late antique context which saw the city of Rome plundered by Alaric (in AD 410) and Genseric (AD 455) – not to mention the prospective sieges and captures of Rome by Byzantines and Ostrogoths during the Gothic wars – the poem can be interpreted not only as a justification, but also as an accusation; because Romulus implicated the city of Rome in murder, the city walls did not prove invulnerable. Perhaps the double twist of this poem is also underscored by its form; the last verse is a palindrome which means that the poem can literally be read in both directions. This poem is along with the letters of Cassiodorus a nice indication of the anxiety surrounding the reception of Romulus' history in the sixth-century Latin west; if Luxorius made a poetical description of an existing painting, as he claims in the title, the motive of Romulus killing Remus was not simply confined to antiquarian discussions but also present in contemporary pictorial imagination, an indication that the cultural unease of the foundational murder of Remus by Romulus was being negotiated in different media.

As this comparative analysis has shown, the articulation of the cultural unease of the transfer of imperial power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople, and the use of Rome's foundational myth in this articulation, was the subject of a process of cultural negotiation. The authors with a markedly Constantinopolitan viewpoint discredited the city of Rome through her founder Romulus. Authors from the Latin West responded to these discrediting narratives with an uneasy silence. The negative description of Romulus gave rise to a peculiar antiquarian dilemma, and an equally peculiar solution, as we shall see in the next section.

4.2.3. Rome Acquitted: The Role of Numa Pompilius

In the eastern Roman Empire, the excessive criticisms of the origin of Rome by John Malalas and John Lydus gave rise to a peculiar dilemma.[113] On the one hand the origin of Rome had to be sufficiently discredited in order to emphasise the moral superiority of Constantinople. Yet on the other hand, the origins of Rome could not be discarded altogether, as the city of Constantinople derived its authority, as a second Rome, exactly from her connectedness to the old Rome and her heritage. The old Rome was, indeed, a stepping stone to the representation of Con-

---

[111] Rosenblum (1961: 134-135).
[112] As can be found in Livy, I.7.2. See Wiseman (1995: 9-11), Meurant (2003: 484). For a more general interpretation of this passage in Luxorius, see Rosenblum (1961: 207).
[113] Carney (1971b: 41).

stantinople; the use of a stepping stone implies pushing oneself away from it. Yet at the same time, one cannot do away with the stepping stone altogether, as one needs the contact and support of the stepping stone to push off. John Lydus, and, to a lesser extent, John Malalas, addressed this antiquarian dilemma through a careful selection in their *memoryscapes* of which mythological founders of Rome were to be slandered and which were to be praised. In the previous section we have seen how both authors singled out Romulus as a target for their criticisms. As a counter-weight to this discrediting of Rome, and in order to 'save' the origins of Rome from general censure, both authors put emphasis on the merits of the mythological king Numa Pompilius as the second founder of the city.

This attitude of pragmatic selection from a pool of antiquarian subject matter and themes was facilitated by the diversified and multi-faceted nature of the *memoryscape* itself; in the same way as the *memoryscape* is diversified in its comprising buildings, mythological characters and more abstract emblems of empire, the *memoryscape* likewise allows for an assortment of conflicting interpretations on Rome's distant past.[114]

The specific nature of the Roman traditions on the origins of the eternal city furthermore facilitated this selective attitude; in contrast to Greek ideas of the instant foundation of a city with the accompanying foundational legend, the development of Rome was presented in Roman sources as a gradual process.[115] This narrative of a continuous founding of Rome allowed for discrediting Romulus on the one hand whilst praising Numa on the other hand. We therefore already find this selective attitude towards the different founders of Rome in periods before the sixth century[116] —most possibly John Lydus and John Malalas were aware of this tradition and reframed it within the context of their Constantinopolitan agenda.

---

[114] A nice example of this harmonising approach can be found in *Mens.* IV.152 (Bandy IV. 135), where John Lydus explains how the different reckonings of time – Romulus lets the year start from March whereas for Numa the year starts in January – are in harmony from an astrological point of view. A methodological parallel can be found in the analysis of Willi (1998), who expounds on how the Roman historians freely selected from antiquarian traditions in order to resolve the dilemmas imposed on the historical material by their personal agendas - he took the case of the positive or negative views in Roman history on Numa Pompilius.
[115] Cornell (1995: 59).
[116] "Les érudits (…) ont tous admis que le mariage de Numa avec la fille du roi Titus Tatius avait été inventé, à un moment donné, d'une part pour accréditer l'existence d'une descendance du roi collègue de Romulus, d'autre part pour relier à cette première royauté sabine la figure, si peu militaire, à peine politique de Numa.". (Gagé 1974: 282). In Latin literature there existed the topos of Numa Pompilius mitigating the belligerent nature of Romulus' tribe through religious legislation (Panitschek 1990: 53): "Es wurde jedoch insofern auch ein vermittelnder Standpunkt bezogen, als Numas Religionsgesetzen eine politische Absicht, nämlich die Zähmung des kriegerischen Geistes, von dem das römische Volk seit Romulus durchdrungen gewesen sei, zuerkannt wurde.". See for instance Livy (I.20.2), who considered Romulus and Numa Pompilius as two founders for the two aspects of Rome: "There is no difficulty in finding the reason for Livy's ambiguity. In his *History of Rome*, he tends to portray schematized characters: Romulus the militarist; Numa, the peace-loving, religious ruler.". (Willi 1998: 150).

Numa is presented by John Lydus as the true founder of the Roman culture through his institution of cultural practices[117] which are at the core of John's ideological definition of *Romanitas*. In opposition to Romulus, whose foundational activities were closely connected to the material location of Rome,[118] Numa's achievements were centred on cultural practices and institutions which are not tied to a specific location and are therefore transferable to any location, such as Constantinople. Numa Pompilius was the institutor of various religious customs,[119] of religious offices[120] and profane institutions.[121] He was also responsible for specific cultural achievements which have a special significance in the ideological framework of the antiquarians; in *Mens.* I.17 (Bandy I.11), Numa is described as the first to stamp coins – actually the Latin word *nummus* is derived, according to John of Lydia, from Numa's name.[122] In the antiquarian imagination, currency became an important subject which was used to contemplate the spiritual harmony of the universe.[123] As such, Numa is presented by John Lydus as the ideal ruler who participated in and guaranteed the cosmic harmony between nature and culture. In the same passage, Numa is seen establishing the Palatium, an emblematic symbol of Roman power, as the abode of kings. Although the Palatium could refer to the material locus of the Palatine Hill at the city of Rome, Lydus did not mention the city in this passage. Indeed, as we have seen in section 4.1.1. (pp. 129 of this dissertation), John Lydus underscored the similarity between the Palatium as regal abode in Rome and the Daphne Palace in Constantinople. In the light of John's systematic associations between Rome and Constantinople, Numa's establishment of the Palatium can actually be interpreted as yet another transferable institution of the Roman legacy

---

[117] Peglau (2000: 441).

[118] In *Mens.* I.12 (Bandy I.6) Romulus constructed the hippodrome at the city of Rome. *Mens.* I.14 (Bandy I.8) expounds on the date of the foundation of the city by Romulus. In *Mens.* IV. 33 (Bandy IV.26) John Lydus described how Romulus built the temple of Ares in Rome. *Mens.* IV.73 (Bandy IV.77) has a detailed description of the foundational ritual of Rome by Romulus, with, amongst others, the ritual ploughing of the earth around the city walls and the taking of earth clods. *Mens.* IV.150 (Bandy IV.133) and *Magistr.* I.3 have short mentions of the founding of Rome. *Magistr.* I.8 refers to the omen of the twelve vultures during the foundation of Rome. Also in Malalas' account on the foundation of Rome in Book VII, Romulus' achievements consist in the majority of the foundation and restoration of buildings in Rome (the temple of Picus Zeus on the Forum Boarium, the Palantion, the temple of the Capitoline Zeus, the temple of Ares, the hippodrome) in comparison to the institution of transferable cultural practices (golden busts of Remus and decrees in first person plural, the month of March and festival of Ares, the *Brumalia*).

[119] Cornell (1995: 120, 126). Numa commanded priests to clip their hairs with bronze instead of iron scissors (*Mens.* I.35, Bandy I.14) and prohibited on religious grounds the use of the number two on Roman festivals (*Mens.* II.7, Bandy II.6). He also dedicated the month of February to the infernal gods (*Mens.* III.10, Bandy III.11),

[120] He instituted the Vestal virgins (*Mens.* inc. sed. 06, Bandy I.13), (Weinstock 1950: 46), the twelve Salii as priests of Janus (*Mens.* IV.2, Bandy IV.2) who were responsible for the *Ancilia* which were vital to the survival of Rome (*Mens.* IV.55, Bandy IV.63).

[121] In *Mens.* I.21 (Bandy I.12), Pompilius instituted the office of *praetor urbanus*. *Mens.* I.34 (Bandy I.15) describes how Numa devised the name 'Magna Graecia' for the South of Italy. In *Magistr.* Intr., Lydus stated that Numa introduced the insignia of the magistrates from the Etruscans.

[122] Note how Numa is absent in Cassiodorus' account on the origins of currency in *Var.* VII. 32.

[123] See chapter 3.3.2. (pp. 105-114 of this dissertation).

which can be moved from Rome to Constantinople. Numa is also responsible for the institution of the colour purple (*Mens*. I.21, Bandy I.12), which is discussed by all three antiquarian authors as an emblem of the Roman rule par excellence – the antiquarian passages on this colour will be analysed further on in this dissertation.[124] In *Mens*. I.36 (Bandy IV.104) we see how a college of patricians was responsible for the protection of the Sibylline Books and the *ancilia*. The section is preceded and followed by sections on Numa's measures, therefore associating Numa with both the *ancilia* and the Sibylline Books. In *Mens*. IV.55 (Bandy IV.63), John explicitly made the connection between Numa and the *ancilia*, and *Mens*. IV.49 (Bandy IV.45) also digressed on the *ancilia* after a lengthy section on the Sibyls (*Mens*. IV.47 Bandy IV.52). We can see how John Lydus created a cluster of associations connecting Numa Pompilius with the *ancilia* and the Sibylline Books. Later on in this chapter, I shall analyse how both objects relate to a set of guarantors of the Roman legacy, or *pignora imperii*. As guarantors, their connection with Numa Pompilius is not a coincidence; Numa Pompilius is presented by John Lydus as the cultural and religious guarantor of the Roman legacy.

One of Numa's most important achievements is, however, his development of the Roman system of time-reckoning, which was only summarily instituted by Romulus.[125] This is of special significance for the antiquarian John Lydus exactly because his very existence as an antiquarian and historian depends on the reckoning of time. Numa is, as the institutor of time reckoning, also the inventor of historical consciousness which is at the very base of antiquarian activity. In fact, we get the impression Numa Pompilius was the first antiquarian, an arch-antiquarian who sanctioned the activity of John of Lydia; for instance, in *Ost*. 16a (Bandy 23), John Lydus mentions how one of his sources used the writings of Numa.[126] Numa Pompilius is presented by John Lydus as a king doing research on exactly the same topics as John himself - this legitimising connection between the ideal antiquarian as a good bureaucrat and the ideal ruler as a good antiquarian will be explored in-depth further on (pp. 282-284 of this dissertation).[127]

In the chronicle of John Malalas, Numa Pompilius received only one, albeit a significant mention (*Chron*. II.8). As in the account by John of Lydia, Numa is credited with the introduction of the colour purple in the attire of the Roman state officials – the significance of the colour purple as an emblem of empire will be dis-

---

[124] Namely, in section 4.3.3. of this dissertation.

[125] Cornell (1995: 104, 120, 126). Numa divided the year in twelve months in compliance with the perfection of the number twelve (*Mens*. I.17 Bandy I.10), added two months to the original ten months of the year (*Mens*. III.5, Bandy III.5), put the months of January and February before March and instituted January as the first month of the year (*Mens*. I.17 Bandy I.11, *Mens*. IV.1 Bandy IV.1, *Mens*. IV.152 Bandy IV.135). The month of January more specifically is the start of the sacerdotal year and is therefore a sacerdotal month (*Mens*. IV.102, Bandy IV. 93). The month of February is dedicated to the infernal gods (*Mens*. III.10, Bandy III.11) and shortened (*Mens*. IV.25 Bandy IV.18), whereas the fifth month is dedicated by Numa to the elders (*Mens*. IV.88 Bandy IV.83). Numa also instituted the triad of festive days *Kalendae*, *Nonae* and *Idus* (Mens. III.10, Bandy III.9). See chapter 3.3.1. (pp. 77-105 of this dissertation).

[126] Peglau (2000).

[127] Namely in chapter 6.2.2.4. of this dissertation.

cussed, as already mentioned, in section 4.3.3. of this dissertation. As already analysed in a previous chapter, however, John Malalas systematically omitted the character of Numa Pompilius from the antiquarian lore which he possibly borrowed from Lydus.[128] Indeed, as John Malalas was, for the construction of his *memoryscape*, less dependent on Rome as the centre of his antiquarian universe,[129] he had a markedly lower interest in Numa Pompilius as the respectable counterpart of Romulus in the foundation history of Rome.

---

[128] See chapter 3.3.1. (pp. 77-105 of this dissertation).
[129] See chapter 5.2.2. (pp. 213-217 of this dissertation).

## 4.3. The Fate and Emblems of Rome

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the antiquarian *memoryscape* of Rome did not only comprise specific buildings and specific episodes from Roman history. The trauma of the transfer of Roman power from the city of Rome to Constantinople, and the cultural negotiation involved in articulating this cultural trauma, elicited in the sixth century a general discussion on what it meant to be Roman. In the course of this broad debate, the antiquarians also singled out more abstract emblems of the Roman heritage. The antiquarians presented these emblems as vital to the endurance of the Roman legacy by tying them to the preservation of Rome. Therefore, prophesies with the pattern; "*if the Romans stop cultivating emblem X, the Roman Empire will fall*", appeared in antiquarian writings.

The appearance of prophesies in the construction of a discourse on the cultural unease of the transfer from Rome to Constantinople ties in well with LaCapra's theory. According to LaCapra, the main means to accomplish the conversion of a metaphysical absence into a specific loss is the narrative. In a prophesy, the loss, as a specific historical event, triggered the setting in motion of the metaphysical process of decline implied in the prophesy. As such, the prophesy became a powerful tool for the expression of the melancholic inevitability of Rome's decline and the subsequent transfer from Rome to Constantinople. Indeed, the mechanism of the prophesy has been used in the different stages of the construction of the narrative of the cultural unease of Rome's demise, already before the sixth century. For instance, there is a tradition which states that in Rome, people consulted the *fulguratores* in preparation for the confrontation with Alaric in AD 408.[130]

Yet again, this means to express the cultural unease of the transfer of power from Rome to Constantinople was the subject of a cultural negotiation, with the confrontation and implicit dialogue of different interpretations. In the east, John Lydus used this type of prophesy to come to terms with the decline of the western Roman Empire and to give voice to his perception of contemporary decline in the eastern Roman administration. In the west, Cassiodorus' stress on the same emblems singled out by John Lydus attests to the existence of a common ground in the same carrier group for the debate on Rome's heritage – and to the unease in the West at the conclusions drawn in the East from prophesies favouring Constantinople over Rome. Cassiodorus was at pains to show how Rome did not lose the emblems vital to her existence.

### 4.3.1. Statues

"Les statues [offrent] l'image parfaite d'un vieillissement et d'une lente décadence qui conduit la ville [Constantinople] à sa fin. Les monuments ne sont pas des souvenirs historiques, ils illustrent une conception catastrophe

---

[130] Briquel (1990: 538).

de l'histoire. (…) Appliqué au temps, ce symbolisme projette les incertitudes du passé sur l'avenir et en fait des prophéties certaines. (…) ce que nous avons appelé l'obsession des origines se retranscrit en une obsession des derniers moments de la ville, confondus idéalement avec la fin du monde."[131]

One of these emblems of the Roman heritage is the care for antique statues. During the foundation of the city under Constantine, the conscious collection and assembly[132] of statues from all parts of the empire was a vital means to emphasise the civic identity of Constantinople as the new capital and ruling city of the Roman world.[133] Although the practice of sculptural appropriation was common in Antiquity and especially Late Antiquity,[134] the consistency and scope of Constantine's statuary collection was unprecedented.[135] Although Constantine's sculptural project witnessed some minor follow-ups during the Theodosian dynasty, the reign of Justinian saw a sharp decline in the care for and preservation of the Constantinian statuary collection.[136] The indifference towards the statues of Constantinople under Justinian must have been a cause of some cultural unease among the educated civil servants of Constantinople, such as John Lydus, specifically since the collection was closely linked to the civic identity of the city. John Lydus must have been acutely aware of the vicissitudes of Constantinople's statues, especially because he worked in the department of the praetorian prefecture which was re-

---

[131] Dagron (1984: 145-146) gives a good analysis of how the Constantinopolitan collection later on, in the early Byzantine period, became associated with the prophetic decline and end of the city. This section will show how these attitudes towards statues in Constantinople were already present *in nuce* in sixth-century antiquarianism.

[132] For a general overview of the collection, its history and early Byzantine attitudes towards it, see Dagron (1984: 128-143), Bassett (2004).

[133] Mango (1963: 55-59), Bassett (2004: 37, 45-49; 2007), Stirling (2014: 101-105), Alto Bauer-Witschel (2007: 5, 7). "L'étude de la littérature patriographique constantinopolitaine met en évidence l'importance des statues dans l'imaginaire des citadins de l'Antiquité tardive." Saliou (2006: 69).

[134] Machado (2009: 350 n.102, 350-353), Stirling (2014: 96-114). For an introduction to the late antique attitude towards statues with extensive bibliography, see Alto Bauer-Witschel (2007). Archaeological findings confirm that the late antique cultivation of antique statues was also established well beyond the official cultural mainstream of literature and architecture. In the French municipality Dax, for instance, the remains of the workshop of an antique-dealer and restorer of statues have been unearthed (Santrot 1996).

[135] Bassett (2004: 39-40; 2007: 190).

[136] Bassett (2004: 121-136), Coates-Stephens (2007: 183-184). For a general sketch of the decline and end of the antique statuary habitus in Late Antiquity, see Alto Bauer-Witschel (2007: 11-17), Coates-Stephens (2007). There was a marked fall of statue dedications in the early fifth century (Machado and Lenaghan 2016: 123), followed by a sharp withering of the statue habit soon after AD 500 (Smith 2016: 6). By AD 550 the statue habit was dead outside Constantinople (Ward-Perkins 2016: 295). For the late antique textual responses elicited by this transformation of the statuary habitus, see Stewart (2007). Gehn and Ward-Perkins are more nuanced in their overview of new statuary in late antique Constantinople; the statuary habit of the fourth and fifth centuries continued well into the sixth century, outliving the statuary habit in Rome (Gehn and Ward-Perkins 2016: 137-138, 144), (Ward-Perkins 2016: 301).

sponsible for the collection and assembly of the collection under Constantine.[137]
Unsurprisingly, therefore, statues figured prominently in John's speculations on the
fate of Rome. He recounted a prophesy made by the Sibylla related to the care of
statues in Rome (*Mens*. IV.145, Bandy IV.53):

> "An oracle from the *The Sibylline Books* declared that the Romans would pre-
> serve their sovereignty as long as they continuously cared for the statues of
> the city, which oracle clearly also has been fulfilled, for, after Avitus has
> reigned as emperor of Rome for the last time and dared to melt down the
> statues, the imperial seat was removed far from Italia."[138]

As a privileged witness of the history and decline of the collection, John
Lydus' mention of this prophesy on Rome is also a warning to Justinian; the new
Rome can suffer the same fate as the old Rome if her statues are neglected. John
Lydus gave his ominous assertion on the doom of Rome a philosophical basis in his
*De Ostentis* (47, Bandy 93):

> "If [a thunderbolt] descends upon statues, it threatens various and serious
> calamities to public affairs, for, since statues were thought by the ancients to
> be physical representations of ideal forms and ornaments of the cities, in-
> solence to them is a curse to public affairs."[139]

As such, John Lydus yet again provided a theoretical framework for the
*Chronographia* of John Malalas.[140] Malalas' extensive focus on the transfer of the *Pal-
ladium* becomes entirely logical from the theoretical viewpoint of John of Lydia; with
the secretive transfer of the *Palladium*, the statue of Athena, from Rome to Con-
stantinople, Constantine actually transferred the representation of the ideal form of
Rome from the old to the new capital.[141]

The connection made by John Lydus and John Malalas[142] between the fate
of Rome and her statuary did not escape the notice of Cassiodorus; we see him at

---

[137] Bassett (2004: 42-45).
[138] Kaldellis (2003: 308). "Ὅτι χρησμὸς ἐκ τῶν Σιβυλλείων ἐδήλου, μέχρι τότε Ῥωμαίοις
φυλάττεσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν, ἄχρις ἂν τῶν ἀγαλμάτων τῆς πόλεως φροντίζωσιν· ὃς δὴ
χρησμὸς καὶ πεπέρασται· τοῦ γὰρ Ἀβίτου πύματον βασιλεύσαντος τῆς Ῥώμης καὶ ἀγάλματα
χωνεῦσαι τολμήσαντος, πόρρω τῆς Ἰταλίας ἡ βασιλεία." (Wünsch 1898: 165), trans. Bandy
(2013a: 237).
[139] "εἰ δὲ κατ' ἀγαλμάτων κατενεχθῇ, ποικίλας καὶ ἐπαλλήλους τὰς συμφορὰς τοῖς πράγμασιν
ἀπειλεῖ· εἰ γὰρ χαρακτῆρες ἰδεῶν τινῶν καὶ κόσμια πόλεων τὰ ἀγάλματα ὑπωπτεύθη τοῖς
παλαιοῖς, ἀρὰ τοῖς πράγμασιν ἡ περὶ αὐτὰ ὕβρις." (Wachsmuth 1897: 102), trans. Bandy
(2013b: 203).
[140] This theory has a pedigree in the Neoplatonism of Plotinus and antiquarianism with Neo-
platonic overtones. See Van Nuffelen (2016).
[141] On the later Byzantine belief in the animated or even demonic nature of statues, see
Mango (1963: 59-64).
[142] For an overview of all statues mentioned in Malalas' *Chronographia*, see Saliou (2006: 86-95).
See also Gehn and Ward-Perkins (2016: 136).

pains to emphasise the contemporary care for statues in the city of Rome. As already mentioned, Cassiodorus traced the marvellous aspect of Rome, amongst other things, to her statues and equestrian statues in *Var*. VII.15 - see chapter 4.1.3. (pp. 135-140 of this dissertation). Furthermore, the Ostrogoths were presented by Cassiodorus as investing a lot of time and energy in the preservation of ancient statuary.[143] Letter VII.13, for example, digressed on the duties of the Count of Rome, who is charged with the protection of statues at the eternal city.[144] The letters II.35 and II.36 describe a specific case of Ostrogothic heritage management. After the "sacrilegious" theft of a brazen statue at Como, the local authorities are instructed to issue a reward and, if necessary, even to apply torture, in order to retrieve the stolen statue. Cassiodorus' letters on the preservation of statues in Rome can be read as an implicit answer to the antiquarian analysis of John Lydus in the process of negotiation of cultural trauma. As Rome did not neglect her statuary, the city is not to be bypassed as seat of the empire.[145]

There are also specific indications that Cassiodorus has the statuary of Constantinople in mind in his creation of an image of Rome still superior to Constantinople. Letter X.30 is a case in point.[146] In this letter, the Ostrogothic king Theodahad orders the repair of bronze elephant statues along the Via Sacra. Although this letter has been interpreted as a lampoon on the dysfunctional rule of Theodahad by Cassiodorus,[147] we can also see this letter as an implicit response to the statuary in Constantinople. Indeed, there were several statues of elephants extant in the city of Constantinople in the times of Cassiodorus.[148] By emphasising the elephant statues surviving in Rome, Cassiodorus took his response to the antiquarian argument on the fate of Rome and her statues one step further. Not only was the city of Rome not doomed because she did not forsake her statues, but, in comparison

---

[143] "Italy, particularly Rome, has however produced a number of inscriptions recording the repair or relocation of older statuary, several of which can be dated securely to the later fifth century. This in important because it shows a continued attachment in Italy to carving inscriptions on statue bases (…) and to the care and conservation of old statues inherited from the past." (Ward-Perkins 2016: 297). "At the same time the management and care of the city's existing statue heritage gained prominence in the minds of the urban administration. (…) Romans continued to set up statues in public spaces, and, as Cassiodorus reminds us, kept looking after them." (Machado and Lenaghan 2016: 130-131). See also Ward-Perkins and Machado (2013: 354-355).

[144] Ward-Perkins and Machado (2013: 355, n. 15), Machado and Lenaghan (2016: 121, 131).

[145] Stewart (2007: 39) "Increasingly, old portrait statues may have come to be regarded (…) as works of art. This, at any rate, is the assumption that underlies the sixth-century pleas drafted by Cassiodorus for the preservation of Rome's threatened heritage of public sculpture, or for the recovery of a stolen bronze statue at Como".

[146] O'Donnell (1979: 101-102), Ward-Perkins (2016: 297, n. 15).

[147] Bjornlie (2009: 162-166). On Cassiodorus' attention for the preservation of statues, see also Witschel (2007: 128, n. 80).

[148] A first elephant statue, possibly erected by Septimius Severus, stood at the Basilika. Another statue, which was most possibly erected by Constantine, adorned the forum of Constantine. Likewise the golden gate was adorned by a group of brazen elephants which were reported to have been taken to the city by Theodosius the Younger (Gehn and Ward-Perkins 2016: 140). Also the hippodrome had a bronzen statue (Bassett 2004: 152, 204, 212, 216).

with the statuary collection of Constantinople, Rome still outdid her younger sister on the Bosporus.[149]

John of Lydia's antiquarian prediction on statues elucidates how the antiquarian used the distant past to come to grips with transformations in the present. The theoretical framework of LaCapra can be employed to describe this mechanism. The antiquarian describes the historical unease of the perceived decline of the Roman heritage in terms of an elusive, metaphysical process, absence in the framework of LaCapra, which is announced in different prophesies. At the same time, John Lydus singled out a specific historical event, or loss, in the framework of LaCapra, responsible for triggering this metaphysical process of decline. In order to better understand therefore the mechanisms behind Lydus' prediction on the statues of Rome, we will have to make a short digression on the persons responsible for this prediction: the Sibyllae.

> "The term *Sibylla* is a Roman word which is interpreted as prophetess or rather *seeress*, hence the female seers were called by one name *Sibyllae*. There have been ten *Sibyllae* in different times and places. The first was she who was called also the Chaldean or even the Persian or also by some the Hebrew, whose proper name was Sambethe, from the race of the most blessed Noah, (…). She had foretold countless details about the Lord God and His advent (…) The second *Sibylla* was the Libyan. The third *Sibylla* was the Delphian, who had been born at Delphi. She had lived before the Trojan War and wrote down oracles by the use of epic poetry in the times of the Judges when the prophetess Deborah lived among the Jews. The fourth was Italian living in Cimmeria in Italia. The fifth was Erythrean named after the city Erythrae in Ionia, who foretold about the Trojan War. The sixth was Samian, whose proper name was Phyto, about whom Eratosthenes wrote, and she lived in the times of the Judges among the Jews. The seventh was Cymean, who was called also Amalthea or Herophile. (…) The eighth was

---

[149] In this argument, Cassiodorus was refuted by the sixth-century reality, as the statue habit in Constantinople in the sixth century outlived the habit of Rome (Gehn and Ward-Perkins 2016: 138). "The monuments [in Constantinople] of the fifth and sixth centuries in particular stand out in contrast to those of contemporary Rome and Ravenna, a clear expression of the shift in wealth and power to the east." (Gehn and Ward-Perkins 2016: 141). Indeed, before AD 500, the statue habit in Rome was dead: "There is evidence of statues of Theodoric, the Ostrogothic king of Italy (493-528), being set up in Rome, but it is striking, and surprising, that, despite the conservatism of men like Cassiodorus, there is no evidence that the aristocracy of Rome was still being granted statue honours in the early sixth century." (Ward-Perkins 2016: 297).

Gergithian. (…) The ninth was Phrygian. The tenth was Tiburtian, Albunea by name."[150]

In his uncanny prediction on the statues of Rome (*Mens*. IV.145 Bandy IV.53), quoted above, the fate of Rome and her process of decline is announced by the Sibylla. Elsewhere in his *De Mensibus*, John Lydus gave an elaborate treatment of the ten Sibyllae (*Mens*. IV.47, Bandy IV.52). In his description, John Lydus carefully intertwined the appearance of the Sibyllae within the metaphysical fabric of the Christian history of salvation, to which the Sibyllae also attested. The passage starts with a short overview of the ten Sibyllae. In this overview, John Lydus stressed the fact that the first Sibylla Sambethe was of the tribe of Noah. She also predicted the coming of Christ. The third or Delphian Sibylla is implicitly connected to the biblical prophetess Deborah, as she was active "in the times of the Judges when the prophetess Deborah lived among the Jews". Also the sixth Sibylla, Phyto, is connected to biblical history as "she lived in the times of the Judges among the Jews".

After this preliminary overview, John Lydus focused on the first Sibylla. He gave an elaborate discussion of her ethnicity, proving that she was of Hebrew stock. This discussion allows John Lydus to digress on the ethnicity of Moses and the language of his works, which in turn allows for a digression on Ptolemy Philadelphus, his translation of Moses' works and his efforts to befriend the Romans. This sequence of digressions was not made haphazardly by John of Lydia; he implicitly connected the biblical salvation history of Christianity to the transfer of culture culminating ultimately in the Roman Empire. John of Lydia's discussion of the first Sibylla anchors her firmly in Christian salvation history; John recounted her prophesies on the coming of Christ and concluded with a chronological reckoning of the life of the first Sibylla, living exactly 2000 years before Christ.

In the *Chronographia* of John Malalas as well, the appearance of the Sibyllae is conspicuously worked into the Christian chronological framework of the Chronicle, up to the point of providing it with a structural frame for fitting the histories of

---

[150] *Mens*. IV.47 (Bandy IV.52): "Τὸ σίβυλλα Ῥωμαϊκὴ λέξις ἐστὶν ἑρμηνευομένη προφῆτις ἤγουν μάντις, ὅθεν ἑνὶ ὀνόματι αἱ θήλειαι μάντιδες ὠνομάσθησαν Σίβυλλαι· γεγόνασι δὲ Σίβυλλαι δέκα ἐν διαφόροις τόποις καὶ χρόνοις. πρώτη ἡ καὶ Χαλδαία ἡ καὶ Περσὶς ἡ καὶ πρός τινων Ἑβραία ὀνομαζομένη, ἧς τὸ κύριον ὄνομα Σαμβήθη, ἐκ τοῦ γένους τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Νῶε, (…) ἡ περὶ τοῦ δεσπότου θεοῦ μυρία προθεσπίσασα καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας· (…) δευτέρα Σίβυλλα ἡ Λίβυσσα, τρίτη Σίβυλλα ἡ Δελφίς, ἡ ἐν Δελφοῖς τεχθεῖσα· γέγονε δὲ αὕτη πρὸ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν καὶ ἔγραφε χρησμοὺς δι' ἐπῶν ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τῶν κριτῶν, ὁπηνίκα Δεβώρα προφῆτις ἦν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις. τετάρτη Ἰταλικὴ ἡ ἐν Κιμμερίᾳ τῆς Ἰταλίας, πέμπτη Ἐρυθραία ἀπὸ πόλεως Ἐρυθρᾶς καλουμένης ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ, ἡ περὶ τοῦ Τρωϊκοῦ προειρηκυῖα πολέμου. ἕκτη Σαμία, ἧς τὸ κύριον ὄνομα Φυτώ, περὶ ἧς ἔγραψεν Ἐρατοσθένης, καὶ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις κριτῶν ἦν. ἑβδόμη Κυμαία ἡ καὶ Ἀμάλθεια ἢ Ἡροφίλη· (…) ὀγδόη ἡ Γεργιθία· (…) ἐννάτη Φρυγία, δεκάτη ἡ Τιβουρτία ὀνόματι Ἀλβουναία." (Wünsch 1898: 102-103), trans. Bandy (2013a: 231, 233).

different peoples into a coherent whole.[151] Three times John Malalas made a short mention of the existence of a Sibylla in sections where he listed rulers of different peoples in order to synchronise the histories of these different cultures. In *Chron.* IV.5, the Sibylla of Delphi is mentioned before a mention of an Egyptian pharaoh and the Greek ruler. After these chronological pegs, the section continues with its narrative on Greek mythology. Not by coincidence, the preceding section, *Chron.* IV.4, mentioned the Jewish rulers and the Jewish prophetess Deborah, therefore implicitly connecting Deborah to the Sibylla of Delphi, just as in the case of John Lydus (*Mens.* IV.47, Bandy IV.52). In *Chron.* IV.10, the Eritrean Sibylla is mentioned in a passage with the mention of another chronological peg such as the Jewish ruler, before the narrative on Greek mythology continues. The same applies for *Chron.* VII.8, in which the narrative on Rome's earliest history is interrupted by the same chronological pegs; a mention of the exact number of Roman kings and the Sibylla of Cumae.

In his description of the Sibyllae, John of Lydia, just as John Malalas, clearly placed the prophetesses and their prophesies within a metaphysical historical framework of Christian salvation history and the history of providential Roman supremacy. Yet in this same chapter, John Lydus from time to time coupled this metaphysical level – absence in the framework of LaCapra – to specific instances of human activity responsible for the loss of knowledge of the Sibylla's prophesies – losses in the framework of LaCapra. For example, John Lydus coupled the specific negligence of the speedwriters to divine providence in his explanation of the loss of the Sibylla's prophesies:

> "That her lines are found to be unfinished and non-metrical is not the fault of the prophetess but of the speedwriters, who had not kept pace with the continuous stream of the words being said, or even of the scribes, having been uneducated and inexperienced. For the remembrance of the words said by her along with her inspiration had ceased and for this reason unfinished lines and limping thought are found, or this has occurred by the dispensation of God that her oracles might not be understood by the many and unworthy."[152]

Lydus closed his discussion on the Sibyllae with the famous anecdote on how Tarquinius Priscus allowed two books of prophesy to be burned before his eyes by the seventh or Cumean Sibylla:

---

[151] I also explored the possibility of Malalas' borrowing in this instance from Lydus in chapter 3.3.1. of this dissertation.

[152] "ὅτι δὲ οἱ στίχοι αὐτῆς ἀτελεῖς εὑρίσκονται καὶ ἄμετροι, οὐ τῆς προφήτιδός ἐστιν ἡ αἰτία ἀλλὰ τῶν ταχυγράφων, οὐ συμφθασάντων τῇ ῥύμῃ τῶν λεγομένων ἢ καὶ ἀπαιδεύτων γενομένων καὶ ἀπείρων γραμματικῶν· ἅμα γὰρ τῇ ἐπιπνοίᾳ ἐπέπαυτο ἐν αὐτῇ ἡ τῶν λεχθέντων μνήμη, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εὑρίσκονται στίχοι ἀτελεῖς καὶ διάνοια σκάζουσα, εἴτε κατ' οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ τοῦτο γέγονεν, ὡς μὴ γινώσκοιντο ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἀναξίων οἱ χρησμοὶ αὐτῆς." (Wünsch 1898: 102), trans. Bandy (2013a: 231).

"Fourth king of Rome after its coloniser Romus was Tarquinius Priscus. A certain woman Amalthea went to him, bringing with her three books, oracles of the Cumin *Sibylla*, and was seeking to give them to him for thirty gold coins. Since he had slighted her, the woman became vexed and burned one of the books and, when she had gone to him again, she continued requesting to receive the thirty gold coins even for the remaining two books. Since he had disregarded her still more, she burned also the second book. Thereafter, then, she continued requesting the same price for the other one book. The king, therefore, surmised that it was necessary for his kingdom and gave her the thirty gold coins, takes it, and, when he had found written in it particularly the fortunes and these alone of the Romans, he handed over the custody of this book to a body of sixty *patricii*."[153]

Also in this anecdote, John Lydus tied the specific act of Tarquinius Priscus in refusing to pay the Sibylla to the general framework of Sibyllan prophesy in order to explain the loss of past knowledge central to the antiquarian rhetoric of decline. In this anecdote, the importance of the specific level of human agency and responsibility is foregrounded by a mention of how the remaining Sibylline Books were preserved. For Tarquinius entrusted these books to a college of sixty patricians, who were also responsible for the preservation of other relics vital for the survival of Rome, namely the *ancilia*, as John Lydus mentioned elsewhere (*Mens*. I.36, Bandy IV. 104). In the antiquarian discussion of what is vital to the Roman legacy, the antiquarians foregrounded a set of material objects whose fate is tied up to the fate of Rome. The specific human agency in preserving or neglecting these relics sets in motion the metaphysical process of decline of the Roman legacy.

As in the case of the preservation of the Sibylline Books, also in the case of statues, the coupling of the specific action of a specific historical character - loss - to the metaphysical sphere of absence accounts for the fall of Rome. In his prediction on the statues of Rome (*Mens*. IV.145, Bandy IV.53), John Lydus singled out the specific action of Avitus melting down Rome's statues as the cause for the removal of the seat of the empire from Italy. The same entwining of specific historical losses with a metaphysical level of absence can account for the antiquarian discussion on another emblem of the Roman legacy within the Roman *memoryscape*, namely the Latin language.

---

[153] "ὅτι τέταρτος ἀπὸ Ῥώμου τοῦ οἰκιστοῦ βασιλεὺς ἐν Ῥώμῃ γέγονε Ταρκύνιος Πρίσκος · γυνὴ δέ τις Ἀμάλθεια ἦλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπιφερομένη τρεῖς βίβλους, χρησμοὺς Σιβύλλης τῆς Κυμαίας, καὶ ἐζήτει αὐτῷ δοῦναι εἰς τριάκοντα χρυσοῦς · τοῦ δὲ καταφρονήσαντος ἀγανακτήσασα ἡ γυνὴ ἔκαυσε τὸ ἓν τῶν βιβλίων, καὶ αὖθις προσελθοῦσα ἠξίου καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν λειπομένων δύο τοὺς τριάκοντα λαβεῖν χρυσοῦς · τοῦ δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον αὐτὴν ὑπεριδόντος καὶ τὸ ἕτερον ἔκαυσε · λοιπὸν οὖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑτέρου ἑνὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπεζήτει τιμήν. στοχασάμενος οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀναγκαῖον αὐτὸ εἶναι τῇ βασιλείᾳ λαμβάνει δοὺς τοὺς τριάκοντα χρυσοῦς · καὶ εὑρὼν ἐν αὐτῷ τὰς Ῥωμαίων τύχας κατ' ἐξαίρετον καὶ μόνας ἐγγεγραμμένας, ἑξήκοντα πατρικίων συστήματι τὴν τούτων παρέδωκε φυλακήν." Wünsch (1898: 104-105), trans. Bandy (2013a: 237).

## 4.3.2. Latin

In his antiquarian discussions on what constitutes the essence of the Roman legacy, John Lydus singled out another abstract notion, namely the Latin language, the preservation of which he coupled to the existence of the Roman Empire as such.[154] Indeed, in the second book of his *De Magistratibus* (*Magistr.* II.12), John Lydus recounted a grim prediction on the fate of the praetorian prefecture, which also returns later on in the work (*Magistr.* III.42):[155]

> "If one should accept to take into account also the speculations from the predictions which some call oracles, whatever had been proclaimed at one time by Fonteius the Roman attained fulfilment, for he mentions some verses manifestly given to Romulus at one time in his ancestral words which clearly foretold that Fortune would desert the Romans at that time when they forgot their ancestral language. And, while I have inserted the so-called oracle in what I wrote *On Months*, oracles of this sort in truth were fulfilled. For, when a certain Cyrus, an Egyptian, who even today continues to be admired for poetic art, was administering both the city prefecture and that of the *praetoria*, although he knew nothing but poetry, ventured to transgress the ancient practice and produced his decrees in the Greek language, the

---

[154] For John of Lydia's use of Latin in order to distinguish between and connect with the Roman past, see Dmitriev (2010: 31-33). For similar attitudes towards the Latin language in sixth-century legislation to reasserting the *Romanitas* of the eastern Roman Empire after 476, see Roueché (1998). Dagron (1984: 146) makes mention of an instance from the *Patria* in which the two prophetic emblems of empire – namely statues and Latin – combine to form a powerful prediction on the doom of Constantinople: "Sur la colonne portant une croix au Philadelphion, Constantin fit sculpter non seulement les événements de son règne mais des lettres latines qui indiquent les derniers temps (τὰ ἔσχατα σημαίνοντα).". *Magistr.* II.16, in which Lydus described the practice of keeping time by spheres with Latin letters on them, points to a similar use of Latin as a talisman as the case mentioned by Dagron (Kelly 2004: 80).

[155] Weinstock (1950: 46), Carney (1971b: 39), Scott (1972: 445), Baldwin (1982: 88; 1985: 239), Maas (1992: 87), Rochette (1997a: 135-139; 1997b; 1998: 474), Kaldellis (2003: 308), Kelly (2004: 33), Schamp (2006c: lxxii-lxxvii; 2008: 48), Bjornlie (2013: 116). Dmitriev (2010: 40-41): "The dichotomy between the cultural and the political, however, also concealed a potential danger, which Lydus demonstrates by relating a prophesy once given to Romulus (…). Lydus used this story – which he probably had made up – to illustrate the fall of the praetorian prefecture (…). But those who, like him, distinguished between Greek and Roman works on the basis of their language could apply this prophesy to Justinian's empire as a whole: the loss of Roman culture and, first and foremost, the language of the Romans, was equal to the loss of the Roman political inheritance.".

magistracy threw away along with the language of the Romans also its Fortune."[156]

John Lydus explicitly bewailed the progressive disuse of the Latin language in his own times.[157] In fact, only a generation later, the Latin language was replaced by Greek as the official language of the eastern Roman Empire under Emperor Heraclius. From a retrospective point of view, John Lydus was therefore right to lament the loss of the Latin language. The question, however, remains whether there was a real crisis of the Latin language during the life of John of Lydia. Earlier there was a general tendency in scholarship to minimise the presence of Latin in the eastern part of the Roman Empire altogether. Rochette, for instance, asserts Latin was actually never deeply rooted in the east.[158] The division of the empire into two halves (AD 395) proved a catalyst for the decline of Latin in the East. By the sixth century, Greek was the dominant administrative language, despite the legal project of Justinian.[159] The use of Latin became increasingly marginalised until it remained

---

[156] "Εἰ δέ τις καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν προρρήσεων στοχασμούς, οὓς τινες καλοῦσι χρησμούς, ἐν ἀριθμῷ λόγων παραλαβεῖν ὑπομένοι, πέρας ἔλαβε <τὰ> Φοντηΐῳ τῷ Ῥωμαίῳ ῥηθέντα ποτέ· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ στίχους τινας δοθέντας δῆθεν Ῥωμύλῳ ποτὲ πατρίοις ῥήμασιν ἀναφέρει τοὺς ἀναφανδὸν προλέγοντας, τότε Ῥωμαίους τὴν Τύχην ἀπολείψειν ὅταν αὐτοὶ τῆς πατρίου φωνῆς ἐπιλάθωνται. καὶ τὸν μὲν λεγόμενον χρησμὸν τοῖς Περὶ Μηνῶν γραφεῖσιν ἐντεθείκαμεν, πέρας δὲ μᾶλλον ἔσχε τὰ τοιαῦτα μαντεύματα. Κύρου γάρ τινος Αἰγυπτίου, ἐπὶ ποιητικῇ καὶ νῦν θαυμαζομένου, ἅμα τὴν πολίαρχον ἅμα τὴν τῶν πραιτωρίων ἐπαρχότητα διέποντος, καὶ μηδὲν παρὰ τὴν ποίησιν ἐπισταμένου, εἶτα παραβῆναι θαρρήσαντος τὴν παλαιὰν συνήθειαν καὶ τὰς ψήφους Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ προενεγκόντος, σὺν τῇ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ καὶ τὴν Τύχην ἀπέβαλεν ἡ ἀρχή." (Schamp 2006c: 16, 94-95), trans. Bandy (1983: 100, 102, 199). Fl. Taurus Seleucus Cyrus 7 PLRE II.336-339. On this character see also Schamp (2006c: lxxii-lxxvii).
[157] For John of Lydia's knowledge of the language as a professor of Latin, see Carney (1971b: 3, 48-49, 48, 61, 129), Caimi (1984: 80), Debuisson (1991: 56), Rochette (1997a: 253-254; 1998: 471, n. 3; 2012: 330), Kaldellis (2005b: 8), Schamp (2006a: lxxiii-lxxvi), Bowersock (2009: 43). Schamp (2008: 37) goes even as far as to characterise Lydus' knowledge of Latin as 'Latinomanie', as he is one of the Greek authors with the most conspicuous use of Latin, whereas Carney (1971b: 48) characterised Lydus' Latin as "shaky". The readers of John's works were deemed to know Latin (Baldwin 1995).
[158] Rochette (2012: 318-324), see also Horrocks (1997: 150), Rapp (2008: 141). For a balanced overview of Latin learning in late antique Egypt, see Cribiore (2007: 57-63). Also in her nuanced analysis, Cribiore asserts the superficiality of Latin learning in late antique Egypt amidst the dominance of the Greek language.
[159] Rochette (1997a: 141-142), Maas (2005: 22), Rapp (2008: 140-141). According to Scott (1981: 12), Greek sources did not have any interest in Justinian's laws because they were published in Latin. Moreover, Justinian's legal project was partially impeded because of hostility to the Latin language in which it was executed (Honoré 1978: 52). For a list of secondary literature on translations and paraphrases in Greek of Justinian's Latin laws, see also Scott (1981: 21). On the language policies in general of emperors in their legislation, see Honoré (1978: 39, 42, 58-59, 124, 134-137). For an analysis of the restricted presence of Latin in the sixth-century East and the sixth-century conceptualisation of the empire as divided in cultural halves along the Latin-Greek division, see Dmitriev (2010: 33-35). He traces the start of the growing official use of Greek as early as the late fourth century (Dmitriev 2010: 42). On the administrative reforms to the detriment of Latin in the east, see Kelly (2004: 32-33).

only an antiquarian residue. During the reign of Heraclius, finally, Latin was abolished as the official language of state.

In more recent scholarship, however, the status of Latin in the late antique eastern half of the empire has benefited from a true revival – in defiance of the otherwise attractive narrative of "decline and fall". Scholars as Geiger and Dickey assert the scholarly field has been all too reluctant in acknowledging the presence of Latin in the eastern part of the Roman Empire during Late Antiquity.[160] Geiger gives an overview of the numerous Latin authors in the Greek East. These authors remain inconspicuous because they were badly or not at all preserved. The work of Al. Cameron has shown there were far more Latin authors in the East than originally assumed.[161] Geiger concludes with the hypothesis that an exhaustive study of papyrological, epigraphic and didactical evidence would show a wide diffusion of the Latin language. The Latin authors which he mentions are only the tip of the iceberg, which rests on a broad base of speakers of the Latin language.[162] The work of Dickey has, indeed, revealed abundant materials which attest to the learning of Latin in the east.[163] In view of these recent surveys,[164] disclosing the continuing presence of Latin in the Greek east, we might wonder why John Lydus put such an emphasis on the use of Latin, especially when he himself chose to write in Greek.

We can first perceive how John Lydus used the knowledge of Latin as a rhetorical tool in his description of persons. Knowledge of Latin was a positive feature in the depiction of the true intellectual and politician. For instance, in his description of the Emperor Augustus (*Mens*. IV.112, Bandy IV.102), the knowledge of Latin combined with other features as moderation and regard for liberty to make a positive sketch of the first emperor:

---

[160] Geiger (1999: 606), Dickey (2012: 4).
[161] Al. Cameron (1965), Geiger (1999: 612-613).
[162] Geiger (1999: 616-617).
[163] Dickey (2012: 4-15).
[164] For an overview of the teaching of Latin in Constantinople, see Schamp (2008: 45-47), who also speaks against Rochette's hypothesis of an underdeveloped culture of Latin in Constantinople (Schamp 2006a: clx). See also Baldwin (1982: 88-93, 1985) for an overview which stresses the continuous presence of Latin in the Greek East. For the presence of specifically Latin literary authors, see also Baldwin (1976, 1982). For the presence of Latin in specifically the city of Constantinople, see Hemmerdinger (1966), who goes even as far as suggesting that the *dominance* of the Latin culture in Constantinople precluded any growth of Hellenic culture in the city under Justinian (Hemmerdinger 1966: 177): "De même que la politique de grandeur de Justinien, orientée vers la reconquête de l'Occident latin, fut en definitive ruineuse pour l'Empire byzantin, de même le maintien artificiel à Constantinople de la culture latine semble avoir appauvri intellectuellement la capitale. Il en resulte que, vers 500, ce n'est pas la deuxième Rome, mais la Syrie et l'Egypte, qui sont les principaux foyers de l'hellénisme". On the continued use of Latin during Lydus' own career, see Kelly (2004: 33-34). According to Bjornlie (2013: 123), Latin literature was a prime means to act out political activity.

"Augustus translated the *Aias* of Sophocles into his ancestral language. Then, after his active life of good works and his excellence in literature were at their peak, discerning his own tragedy to be without merit compared with Sophocles, he erased it. Then, when asked by Cicero, at whose side he was eagerly being educated, *Where is the Aias which you are writing?*, he replied wittily and at the same time thoughtfully that his own *Aias* had fallen upon a sponge, just as that of Sophocles had fallen upon a sword. He also had such great regard for learning that, when an uneducated magistrate had ventured to write a letter to him pertaining to public matters, he became so vexed as to dismiss the uneducated man from his magistracy. And he set also a measure and limit to both banquets and to dowries, having been the first to do this in the case of his own daughter. He cared so much for the liberty of his subjects that, when someone of his flatterers in the Senate had addressed him *Master*, just as by way of his superiority, he himself arose and said, *I am accustomed to converse with free men but not with slaves*."[165]

Not by coincidence, Priscian praised the Emperor Anastasius in the same terms as John Lydus lauded Augustus. Anastasius had a high regard for learning, and therefore promoted Latin intellectuals into the ranks of his administration (*De Laude Anastasii* 239-253).[166] John Lydus also associated himself with this positive cultural profile by asserting that he also performed his bureaucratic duties in Latin (*Magistr.* III.27):[167]

"(…) I likewise also composed *suggestiones*, whose explanation is as follows. From the beginning all who served as assistants in the current *scrinia* in the once highest of the magistracies used to be resplendent with much learning, yet they kept striving to excel in respect in the language of the Romans, for it was of necessity useful to them."[168]

---

[165] "Ὅτι Αὔγουστος τὸν τοῦ Σοφοκλέους Αἴαντα εἰς τὴν πάτριον φωνὴν μετήνεγκεν· εἶτα ἀκμαζούσης αὐτῷ μετὰ τὴν πρακτικὴν καὶ τῆς ἐκ λόγων ἀρετῆς, ὡς ἀναξίαν ἐκ παραβολῆς πρὸς Σοφοκλέα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διεγίνωσκε τραγῳδίαν, ταύτην ἐξήλειφεν. εἶτα ἐρωτηθεὶς πρὸς τοῦ Κικέρωνος, παρ' ᾧ μετὰ σπουδῆς ἐπαιδεύετο· 'ποῦ τυγχάνει ὁ παρὰ σοῦ γραφόμενος Αἴας;' ἀστείως ἅμα καὶ νουνεχῶς ἀπεκρίνατο, σπόγγῳ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Αἴαντα, καθάπερ σιδήρῳ τὸν τοῦ Σοφοκλέους, ἐπιπεσεῖν. καὶ τοσαύτη τις αὐτῷ φροντὶς οὖσα περὶ λόγους ἐτύγχανεν, ὡς ἄρχοντος ἀπαιδεύτου γράψαι πρὸς αὐτὸν δημοσίαν τολμήσαντος ἐπιστολὴν οὕτως ἀγανακτῆσαι, ὡς παραλῦσαι τῆς ἀρχῆς τὸν ἀπαίδευτον. καὶ μέτρον δὲ καὶ ὅρον ταῖς τε εὐωχίαις καὶ ταῖς προιξὶν ἔθηκε, πρῶτος ἐπὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ θυγατρὶ τοῦτο ποιήσας. τῆς δὲ τῶν ὑπηκόων ἐλευθερίας τοσοῦτον ἐφρόντιζεν, ὥστε τινὸς τῶν κολάκων ἐπὶ τῆς βουλῆς δεσπότην αὐτὸν ὥσπερ ἐν ὑπεροχῆς τρόπῳ καλέσαντος, αὐτὸς ἐξαναστὰς· 'ἐγὼ δέ', ἔφη, 'ἐλευθέροις, ἀλλ' οὐ δούλοις ἔμαθον διαλέγεσθαι'." (Wünsch 1898: 151-152), trans. Bandy (2013a: 287).
[166] Chauvot (1986: 65-66).
[167] Baldwin (1982: 89, 1985: 239), Dmitriev (2010: 41).
[168] "σουγγεστίωνας ἐτιθέμην, ὧν ὁ λόγος ὧδε· πάντες μὲν ἀνέκαθεν οἱ παρὰ τῇ ποτε πρώτῃ τῶν ἀρχῶν βοηθοῦντες τοῖς τρέχουσι σκρινίοις διὰ πολλῆς ἐξέλαμπον παιδείας, περὶ δὲ τὴν Ῥωμαίων φωνὴν τὸ πλέον ἔχειν ἐσπούδαζον·" (Schamp 2006c: 76), Bandy (1983: 174).

Conversely, John Lydus used the lack of knowledge of the Latin language in his construction of a negative description. At the end of *De Magistratibus*, the antiquarian Leitmotiv slips into a strange mix of autobiography, contemporary history and outright invective. The main victim of John's venomous remarks is John of Cappadocia (*Magistr*. III.57-68), whose biography will be studied in-depth in chapter 6.2.2.2. (pp. 265-272 of this dissertation). John of Cappadocia appears as the ultimate opposite of Augustus. He combined an immoderate lifestyle with tyrannous conduct. He also debased the use of Latin, which heralded a general decline of the administration (*Magistr*. III.68):[169]

> "There was an ancient law that all matters being transacted in any way whatsoever by the prefects, and perhaps by the other magistracies as well, be expressed in the language of the Italians. When this law had been sidestepped, as I have stated, since it could not have been otherwise, the process of reduction began to advance. All matters, however, that were being transacted in Europe preserved out of necessity the ancient practice on account of the fact that its inhabitants, though they were Greeks for the most part, spoke in the language of the Italians, and especially those who conducted public business. The Cappadocian changed that into a haggish and base idiom (…)."[170]

Second, the framework of LaCapra can, as in the case of the statues, account for the mechanism behind the gloomy prophesy of the loss of the Latin language and the ensuing demise of the Roman Empire in *Magistr*. II.12 and III.42. In the prophesy, the level of absence is represented by the elusive tale of decline and fall of the Roman Empire, triggered by the demise of the Latin language. The level of loss is represented by the specific historical act of a specific historical person, namely Cyrus the prefect issuing his decrees in Greek.[171] According to LaCapra, the main means to accomplish the conversion of a metaphysical absence into a specific loss is the narrative. A loss is a specific historical event, which can be presented in the form of a narrative sequence. Absence can be associated with loss through the presentation of absence in a narrative.[172] John Lydus used the narrative sequence of prophesy to convert the absence of Latin into a specific loss. Prophesy became a handy tool to single out John's personal enemies, for instance, John of Cappadocia, in *Ma-*

---

[169] Scott (1972: 445), Caimi (1984: 251-252), Rochette (1997a: 135-139), Dmitriev (2010: 41).
[170] "Νόμος ἀρχαῖος ἦν πάντα μὲν τὰ ὅπως οὖν πραττόμενα παρὰ τοῖς ἐπάρχοις, τάχα δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τῶν ἀρχῶν, τοῖς
Ἰταλῶν ἐκφωνεῖσθαι ῥήμασιν. οὗ παραβαθέντος, ὡς εἴρηται, οὐ γὰρ ἄλλως, τὰ τῆς ἐλαττώσεως προΰβαινεν. τὰ δὲ περὶ τὴν Εὐρώπην πραττόμενα πάντα τὴν ἀρχαιότητα διεφύλαξεν ἐξ ἀνάγκης διὰ τὸ τοὺς αὐτῆς οἰκήτορας, καίπερ Ἕλληνας ἐκ τοῦ πλείονος ὄντας, τῇ τῶν Ἰταλῶν φθέγγεσθαι φωνῇ, καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς δημοσιεύοντας. ταῦτα μετέβαλεν ὁ Καππαδόκης εἰς γραώδη τινὰ καὶ χαμαίζηλον ἀπαγγελίαν" (Schamp 2006c: 128), trans. Bandy (1983: 238).
[171] Rochette (1997a: 135-139).
[172] LaCapra (1999: 701).

*gistr.* III.68,[173] as responsible, as scapegoats[174] for the decline of the praetorian prefecture. Inversely, the prophesy gave an opportunity for the persons who cultivated Latin to profile themselves as the saviours of the Roman state.[175] It was not by coincidence that John Lydus styled himself as a proponent of the Latin language. Furthermore, according to LaCapra, a historical loss can imply the absence of a lost object, whereas an absence does not automatically imply a loss.[176] It is therefore possible for John Lydus to bewail the absence of the Latin language in society *without actually experiencing* a real decline of Latin in this society, as recent scholarship on Latin in the late antique East showed. Lydus' creation of a discourse on a traumatic event which did not necessarily take place conforms also to the main tenet of Alexander's work on cultural trauma, namely, that the creation of cultural trauma does not need to depend on the actuality of a traumatic event.[177]

In the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, antiquarian prophesies on the Latin language as such are absent, which might be logical, as the letters were written in Latin themselves. Yet in his treatment of Latin and Greek, Cassiodorus seems, as was also the case with the statues, to enter into dialogue with the antiquarian anxieties on Latin as expressed by John of Lydia. For Cassiodorus stressed in his letters the bilingualism of the true intellectual. In several of his elaborated letters, treating different sciences and arts, Cassiodorus upholstered his account with bibliographical references. The majority of these references are to Greek works, but Latin works are also considered.[178] The Greek presence in the bibliography seems overwhelming at first sight, but gradually makes way for a more balanced model, based on Greek and Latin as counterparts in the former Roman Empire. The case of letter III.53, on the art of finding water, is particularly interesting. At the beginning of paragraph 4, Cassiodorus gave a bibliographical reference which seems incomplete:

"This knowledge was passed on to her practitioners in Greek by this one, in Latin by Marcellus".[179]

Apparently Cassiodorus explicitly wanted to enhance the bilingual parallelism in his bibliography during the reworking of his state letters. To add the Greek reference, he had to check the Greek writings on the art of finding water, which he

---

[173] Rochette (1997a: 135-139, 2012: 323).
[174] LaCapra (1999: 707).
[175] LaCapra (1999: 712).
[176] LaCapra (1999: 700).
[177] Alexander (2004: 8-10).
[178] Letter I.45 has a praise on the *quadrivium* in general and mechanics in particular. In this letter, Cassiodorus mentioned Pythagoras, Ptolemy, Nicomachus, Euclid, Plato, Aristotle and Archimedes, Greek authors translated into Latin by Boethius. Letter II.40 is devoted to the art of music and refers to the Latin writings of Terentianus. Letter III.52, on surveying, has a reference to the Greek mathematician and engineer Heron of Alexandria. Letter III.53 describes the art of finding water and refers to Marcellus in Latin and an unmentioned Greek source. Letter VII.5 digresses on architecture and mentions the Greek writers Euclid, Archimedes and Metrobius. Letter VIII.12 has a reference to the otherwise unknown author Helenus.
[179] "Hanc scientiam sequentibus pulchre tradiderunt apud Graecos ille, apud Latinos Marcellus" (Giardina et al. 2014b: 70), own translation.

failed to do. In letter I.45, the Request to Boethius to produce a sun-dial and a water-clock for the king of Burgundy allowed Cassiodorus to pour effusive praise on the addressee. Most conspicuously, Cassiodorus praised the bilingual erudition of Boethius which allowed him to translate works of Pythagoras, Ptolemy, Nicomachus, Euclid, Plato, Aristotle and Archimedes. When we read Cassiodorus' rose-tinted pictures of a thriving bilingual intellectual culture at the Ostrogothic court, next to Lydus' grim pictures of a decline of the Latin language in the eastern Roman Empire, we could interpret Cassiodorus' statements as an implicit reply to John of Lydia's thinking about Rome's vital emblems of empire. Not only did Rome obviously not lose the heritage of the Latin language; in the face of the eastern Roman Empire's declining Latin, the bilingual Rome appears as the true heir to the heritage of the bilingual Roman Empire.[180]

In the *Chronographia* of John Malalas, any antiquarian focus on Latin as such is conspicuously absent. Not only did John Malalas not make any mention of the prophesy of John Lydus (*Magistr.* II.12 and III.42). In *Chron.* XIV.16 John Malalas also took a fairly positive view on Cyrus of Panopolis, who is otherwise responsible for the demise of the praetorian prefecture in John of Lydia's prophesy. Also, despite Malalas' tendency to portray Justinian in a positive way, in *Chron.* XVIII.1, John Malalas explicitly stated that Justinian was not very proficient in speaking Latin:

> "When conversing in Latin he used to make mistakes, but he wrote in the language with ease."[181]

This description of Justinian is yet another indication that, contrary to Lydus' image of the ideal ruler, the knowledge of Latin was not a prerequisite to be a good ruler for Malalas. His reticence on the Latin language is most possibly a sign of disinterest and ignorance. Although he used some Latin sources which he also mentioned from time to time, his knowledge of these sources was most possibly second-hand, since he himself did not know Latin.[182]

When we compare the antiquarian discussions on Latin with the debates on statues as emblems of empire, we can perceive how a common carrier group subjected the common ground for discussing the identity of the Roman Empire to a process of cultural negotiation, resulting in commonalities and divergences; whereas all three authors do appear to engage in a common debate on statues as essential to the identity of Rome, in the case of Latin there is no such common ground. Whereas Cassiodorus and John Lydus might debate on the essentiality of Latin for the identity of Rome, John Malalas remains silent on this issue, already foreshadowing the future of the monolingual Greek Byzantine Empire. We continue this section with the analysis of an emblem of empire on which the three authors lay a common emphasis, namely the colour purple.

---

[180] Dmitriev (2010: 34) interprets Cassiodorus' statements in terms of asserting both the political unity of the empire and the cultural division of it in a Greek and Latin halve.

[181] "τὴν δὲ Ῥωμαϊκὴν γλῶσσαν ὁμιλῶν ἐσφάλλετο, ἀλλ' ἔγραφεν αὐτὴν εὐχερῶς." (Thurn 2000: 354), own translation.

[182] On Malalas' knowledge and use of Latin see chapter 3.1.1. (pp. 36-43 of this dissertation). Dmitriev (2010: 33) analyses how John Malalas participated in a general tendency to distinguish in the sixth-century East between Greek and Latin cultural spheres.

### 4.3.3. Purple

Although the colour purple was a status symbol in many ancient civilisations,[183] it became explicitly an emblem of Roman imperial reign from the second century onward.[184] Most possibly, the Emperor Diocletian instituted the ritual kissing of the purple garments of the emperor, the *adoratio purpurae*. Around AD 337, the kissing of the purple was an established custom.[185] By the sixth century, the colour was a powerful, almost mystical symbol of the eternity of imperial rule, detached from the transitional human entity who happened to have donned the purple garments.[186] The gradual growth of the symbolic significance of the colour appears to have been a natural evolution which should not give rise to any serious antiquarian explanation or debate: "The evolution of the court ceremonial from simple *adoratio* to *adoratio purpurae* probably came so naturally that little if any rationalisation was wasted on an explanation of the significance of the new rite."[187]

In the sixth century, however, the colour purple did receive ample attention in the writings of Cassiodorus, John Lydus and John Malalas. In this section, I shall analyse why this abstract emblem received a thorough treatment in the three antiquarian authors: the antiquarians used the colour to indicate whom they considered to be the true heir to the Roman Empire – and what were the possible threats to these claims. One case study of the antiquarians' analysis on the origin of the colour will show the different agendas of the antiquarians – a topic which will be explored in more detail further on. Furthermore, this case study demonstrates how the three authors depended on each other for their own accounts or, at least, selected from a common pool of antiquarian ideas constituting a common discourse for the articulation of cultural trauma.

---

[183] For a history of the use of the colour purple as a status symbol, see Reinhold (1970). "The most enduring status symbol of the ancient world was the color purple. Indeed, it was in continuous currency in antiquity and the medieval age for over 3000 years." (Reinhold 1970: 71).
[184] Avery (1940: 66, 73), Reinhold (1970: 59-61). For a discussion of the use of the colour in the later Roman Empire, see Reinhold (1970: 62-70).
[185] Avery (1940: 69-73).
[186] Avery (1940: 75-97). "The robe had clearly become a fetish and was looked upon as a sacred object which alone conferred upon its wearer supreme sovereignty over the Roman world. (…) The purple remained the symbol of the absolute dominion over the Roman State regardless of who wore it. One emperor might die and another succeed him; the purple robe endured and conferred upon its next "momentary wearer," to use the expression from Alföldi, the quasi-mystic power by right of which he ruled." (Avery 1940: 78-79). For instance, "In 470 Leo emphasized to his *magister officiorum* that the imperial signature was always to be written in a specially manufactured purple ink." (Kelly 2004: 218). These associations between the colour and (imperial) power also endured in the post-Roman West. For instance, in the description of Clovis' coronation by Gregory of Tours, the colour purple plays an important role as imperial insignia (Haarer 2006: 95-96).
[187] Avery (1940: 79).

In the works of John of Lydia,[188] the colour purple is present throughout his account of Roman history up to his own day. The colour was instituted in the period of the kings by Numa Pompilius (*Mens*. I.21, Bandy I.12) and was part of the attire of different offices of the Roman republic, such as the consuls (*Magistr*. I.32), patricians (Magistr. I.17) and cavalry commanders. Both Julius Caesar (*Magistr*. II.2) and Augustus (*Magistr*. II.4) wore purple as part of their insignia, and the colour became part of the customary attire of the emperors (*Magistr*. I.4) and the praetorian prefect in the imperial period, who inherited the colour from the insignia of the cavalry commander (*Magistr*. II.13). In *Magistr*. II.2, John Lydus used the colour purple as a Leitmotiv to specifically connect the practices of the hallowed past to his own day; the purple attire of Julius Caesar became the customary clothing for emperors during a triumphal procession, and was therefore also worn by Justinian when he celebrated his triumph over the last Vandal king Gelimer in AD 534. As such, the colour purple served as a Leitmotiv to legitimate the contemporary eastern Roman Emperors as heirs to the Roman legacy, by connecting them to the royal, republican and early imperial history of Rome. As in the case of John of Lydia's emphasis on antique statues, his emphasis on purple could also be read as an implicit warning to the emperor Justinian. For Justinian is known to have issued changes in the court ceremonial portfolio. He also liberalised the use of purple outside the imperial court, by rescinding the decree of AD 424 by Theodosius II.[189] The preservation of the Roman imperial rule was, in the opinion of John of Lydia, tied to the meticulous cultivation of the colour purple in imperial dress and court ceremony.

Justinian's love for reforms was not the only possible threat to the use of the colour purple. The claims of other players in the late antique political patchwork to the Roman legacy and the colour that expressed it was also a potential challenge to the eastern Roman Empire. Cassiodorus' *Variae* are an example of such a threat. In his state letters, Cassiodorus stressed the use of the colour purple. Yet in the case of Cassiodorus, the colour is closely associated with Theodoric and the Ostrogothic dynasty of the Amals, clearly in defiance of the eastern Roman claims to the Roman legacy.[190]

---

[188] Reinhold (1970: 39 n.2), Kelly (2004: 21).

[189] Avery (1940: 79-80). Procopius, for instance, used Justinian's changing of the court ceremonial as an argument against the emperor in his *Anecdota* XXX.21-23. For Justinian's rescinding of the restrictions on the use of purple see Reinhold (1970: 66-69).

[190] Apart from letter I.2 (O'Donnell 1979: 82), which shall be analysed further onward, Cassiodorus has fourteen instances of the colour purple in his *Variae*. In letters I.26, VI.12, XI.22 and XI.31, the colour neutrally referred to the (Ostrogothic) state. In letter XII.4, the colour is used to describe wine as a royal beverage. In letter XI.1, the colour is used in connection with the Roman Empress Placidia and her son Valentinian III. Yet in the vast majority of instances, the colour is used in connection with the Amal royal dynasty (letters VI.39, VIII.1, VIII.5, IX. 1, IX.23, IX.25, X.1). In letters VIII.1 and X.1, this use of the colour purple as a marker of the Amal house is especially significant, as the two letters are addressed to the Roman Emperor Justinian and have a conspicuous position, at the beginning of books VIII and X respectively.

For the case study on the origin of the colour purple, I start with the account of John Malalas, in *Chron.* II.8.[191] The account is divided into two parts. The first part treats the discovery of the colour purple; the philosopher Heracles of Tyre saw how a dog ate a murex shellfish and how a shepherd wiped off the snout of the dog with a piece of wool. Heracles noticed the colour of the wool and brought it to King Phoenix of Tyre. The king consequently used the colour for his own clothing and forbade his subjects to use the colour so that it may become a distinctive sign of kingship. This practice was imitated by subsequent rulers; John Malalas mentioned how later kings and emperors "devised for themselves robes, or else golden brooches and mantles, which they dyed purple or red with dye from certain plants; and they wore these so they could be recognised by their own people, as the most learned Palaiphatos has written."[192] The second part of Malalas' account immediately turns to how the Romans implemented the colour purple in the insignia of their own rulers; the purple attire used by the consuls was called a toga, and King Numa Pompilius, the respectable second founder of Rome,[193] established the dress code for ruler and ruled alike after an embassy of Pelasgians, who wore cloaks with red stripes (ταβλία).[194] The emperor had to wear a purple cloak with gold stripes, whereas the senators and civil servants had to wear cloaks with purple stripes.

As in the case of Cassiodorus and John of Lydia, John Malalas explicitly described the colour as an emblem of imperial rule.[195] In the first part of the account, for instance, John Malalas contrasted the lack of distinction between ruler and ruled before the use of the colour with the distinguishing effect on Emperor Phoenix and "emperors in each area, or rulers and toparchs"[196] after him. Numa explicitly conceived his dress code as a means to perpetuate the imperial hierarchy, as the purple stripes "were a symbol of imperial apparel and showed their [= the senators' and Roman officials'] rank in the Roman state and their loyalty to it".[197]

---

[191] Jeffreys (1990a: 60), Moffatt (1990: 98). "Mais, du règne de Phoenix, Malalas ne retient que la découverte de la pourpre par Héraclès tyrien, ce qui le conduit à une digression sur l'usage de la pourpre dans l'habit impérial. Cette digression mêle la conquête de la Phénicie par les Romains, l'introduction de la pourpre à Rome à l'époque de Numa Pompilius et l'histoire du vêtement consulaire jusqu'à son propre temps." (Caire 2006: 42).

[192] "λοιπὸν οὖν οἱ κατὰ τόπον βασιλεῖς, ἤτοι ῥῆγες καὶ τοπάρχαι, ἀκηκοότες τοῦτο, οἱ μὲν περιβόλαια, οἱ δὲ φίβλας χρυσᾶς καὶ μανδύας ἐπενόησαν ἑαυτοῖς, πορφύρεα ἢ ῥούσεα βάπτοντες αὐτὰ ἀπὸ βοτανῶν τινων, καὶ ἐφόρουν διὰ τὸ γινώσκεσθαι τῷ ἰδίῳ πλήθει, καθὼς Παλαίφατος ὁ σοφώτατος συνεγράψατο." (Thurn 2000: 24), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 16).

[193] For an analysis of Numa Pompilius as the respectable alternative to Romulus as founder of Rome, see chapter 4.2.3. (pp. 154-158 of this dissertation).

[194] Reinhold (1970: 39 n.2).

[195] The same association between the colour and rule can be found in Malalas' description of the setting up of golden and porphyry statues by Heracles' descendants in his honour (Moffatt 1990: 102).

[196] "οἱ κατὰ τόπον βασιλεῖς, ἤτοι ῥῆγες καὶ τοπάρχαι" (Thurn 2000: 24), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 16).

[197] "δηλοῦντα ἀξίαν Ῥωμαϊκῆς πολιτείας καὶ ὑποταγήν" (Thurn 2000: 24), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 16).

A conspicuous feature of Malalas' account is his stress on the fact that the invention and use of the colour purple was an achievement of the Tyrians, which was later on taken over by the Romans. Both the philosopher Heracles and King Phoenix are designated as Tyrian, and John Malalas explicitly mentioned that Phoenix "was the first to wear a robe of purple".[198] The purple colour, an emblem which is vital to the image of Roman rule, is, according to Malalas, actually a derivation from the Near East. Throughout his *Chronographia*, John Malalas consistently traced different cultural practices and achievements to origins in the Near East. This phenomenon will be analysed further on in the chapter on the personal and local focus of the three antiquarian authors.[199]

When we look into Malalas' possible sources and similar accounts on the origin of the colour purple in John Lydus and Cassiodorus, we can conclude that the account of John Malalas is – like his report on Mallius – an idiosyncratic conflation of different traditions. The first part of *Chron*. II.8, with the tale of the dog and Heracles, has parallels in accounts of the discovery of purple by Julius Pollux (second century AD), Achilles Tatius (second century AD), Gregory Nazianzus (fourth century AD), Nonnus of Panopolis (fourth to fifth century AD) and Cassiodorus.[200] Pollux, Tatius, Nonnus and Cassiodorus mentioned the Tyrian context of the tale, whereas Gregory Nazianzus used the anecdote in his invective against Emperor Julian to theorise on the imperial aspect of the colour as an emblem of Roman rule. Julius Pollux said Heracles directly discovered the colour on the lips of a dog and offered a garment in this colour to the nymph Tyros in exchange for a reciprocation of his amorous feeling towards her. Achilles Tatius merely mentioned the shepherd discovering the colour on the snout of the dog. Both Gregory and Nonnus only succinctly mentioned the dog without touching on the person behind the discovery. John Malalas conflated the two versions represented in Pollux and Tatius, for he mentioned neither Heracles alone nor only a shepherd, but *Heracles seeing a shepherd*. In comparison with Tatius, who stated how Heracles used the colour purple to bribe a nymph into having sex, the account of John Malalas has a more virtuous touch; Heracles appeared as a philosopher, who directly presented his discovery to King Phoenix. Malalas' mild censorship of the original myth is less explicit than Cassiodorus' account, who only mentioned the dog. Not by coincidence, the same demythologised account appeared in the account of the church father Gregory Nazianzus, who, in his invective against Julian, explicitly made the point of the colour purple being a religiously neutral, non-pagan emblem of empire.

The second part of *Chron*. II.8, with the account of how later rulers and especially Numa utilised the colour purple, appears to be a conflation and simplifica-

---

[198] "καὶ ἐφόρεσεν αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἐκ πορφύρας περιβόλαιον" (Thurn 2000: 24), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 16).

[199] Namely in chapter 5.2.1. of this dissertation.

[200] Julius Pollux, *Onomasticon* I.45-48, Achilles Tatius, *The Adventures of Leucippe and Clitophon* II. 11, Gregory Nazianzus *Or. 4 Against Julian* 108, Cassiodorus *Var.* I.2.

tion of different detailed descriptions of Roman attire in the works of John of Lydia. John Malalas mentioned how rulers after Phoenix "devised for themselves robes, or else golden brooches and mantles, which they dyed purple or red with dye from certain plants".[201] This part of the account seems to have been borrowed from John of Lydia, *Mens.* I.21 (Bandy I.12), who digressed on the etymology of the *trabea*: "It has been named *trabea*, namely, *thrice-dyed*, for it is composed of three colors, purple, scarlet and that of the woad plant called by many *lulacium*, which is peculiar to Ares".[202] We can easily imagine John Malalas giving only a cursory look at the detailed account of John Lydus and only retaining the essence; namely that the garments were dyed in purple, red or with the dye of some plant – his omissions also fit his profile; Malalas' omission of the Latin name of the plant reflects his already mentioned lack of interest in the Latin language, whereas the omission of Ares neatly fits his euhemerising. His depiction of Numa's dress code for the Romans is distilled from detailed descriptions in John of Lydia. The imperial cloaks "of purple with gold stripes"[203] can be found in a more detailed description of the garment of Augustus in *Magistr.* II.24. The purple-striped garments of Numa's subject officials are mentioned in two passages of John of Lydia. In *Magistr.* I.17 there is a description of the cloaks of the patricians with mentions of purple stripes and Latin terminology. *Magistr.* I.23 also has purple stripes and Latin terminology in a detailed description of the consuls' clothing. Both these passages were summarised by John Malalas with omission of the Latin terminology: "others [= cloaks] for his senators and men of civil and military rank with purple stripes".[204] Another indication of Malalas' simplifying John Lydus can be gleaned from a comparison with *Magistr.* II.13. In this passage, which offers a description of the praetorian prefect's clothing, John Lydus is at pains to distinguish between the stripes for the garments of the praetorian prefect, the ταβλία, and the stripes for the garments of the emperor, *sementa* or *segmenta*. This detailed terminological nuance is lost in Malalas; both the imperial and other cloaks have stripes which are called ταβλία.

The analysis of *Chron.* II.8 showed how John Malalas cleverly collected and selected from a wide array of sources and traditions in order to form an idiosyncratic narrative on the journey of the colour purple from the Near East to Rome. In order to create this narrative, John Malalas combined different traditions on the discovery of purple in Tyre with John of Lydia's account on the institution of the colour by

---

[201] "οἱ μὲν περιβόλαια, οἱ δὲ φίβλας χρυσᾶς καὶ μανδύας ἐπενόησαν ἑαυτοῖς, πορφύρεα ἢ ῥούσεα βάπτοντες αὐτὰ ἀπὸ βοτανῶν τινων" (Thurn 2000: 24), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 16).

[202] "τραβαία δὲ εἴρηται ὡσανεὶ τρίβαφος · ἐκ τριῶν γὰρ ἀποτελεῖται χρωμάτων, πορφύρας, κόκκου καὶ ἰσατίδος βοτάνης ἢ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς λουλάκιον λέγεται, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄρεος." (Wünsch 1898: 11–12), trans. Bandy (2013a: 65).

[203] "τὰς μὲν βασιλικὰς πορφυρᾶς, ἐχούσας ταβλία χρυσᾶ" (Thurn 2000: 24), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 16).

[204] "τὰς δὲ τῶν συγκλητικῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐν ἀξίαις καὶ στρατείαις χλαμύδας ἐχούσας σήμαντρον τῆς βασιλικῆς φορεσίας ταβλία πορφυρᾶ" (Thurn 2000: 24), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 16).

Numa Pompilius. John Malalas furthermore upholstered his account of Numa's dress code with materials from John Lydus which betray a rather cursory reading of John of Lydia.

The cultural unease generated by the foundation of Constantinople and the ensuing demise of Rome triggered a broad process of cultural negotiation on what it meant to be Roman. This debate urged the antiquarians to single out, aside from emblematic buildings and mythological characters connected to Rome, also more abstract emblems of the Roman Empire which were connected to the fate of Rome and the empire. By the sixth century already, the contours of the different redefinitions of Roman identity after the demise of the empire as a political reality had materialised. In the centre of the Roman legacy, Cassiodorus and John Lydus created an image of Rome which is similar to the traditional western image of the Roman legacy today. Rome is viewed through the lens of its artistic heritage and the Latin language with several characteristic visual emblems such as the colour purple. In the eastern orbit of the empire, John Malalas painted a slightly different picture of the image of Rome which approximates the later Byzantine definition of *Romanitas*; indeed, the later Byzantine Empire will reinvent itself as a new Roman Empire without Latin as a former emblem of empire.

### 4.3.4. From *Pignora Imperii* to Emblems of Empire.[205]

From a diachronic point of view, the appearance of emblems of empire in the sixth century does not seem as farfetched as one might think. We can see how the mechanism of coupling the continuing existence of Rome, the Second Rome and the empire to different emblems was actually deeply rooted in Roman culture in preceding centuries. In this section, I shall compare the sixth-century emblems of empire with another canon of talismans responsible for the survival of the empire, namely the *pignora imperii*.

The *pignora imperii*[206] were a set of material objects – talismans or tokens with a connection to the mythological origins of Rome – which functioned as some sort of guarantors of Rome's survival and triumph. Although several *pignora* already appear in earlier instances of Roman history,[207] the canonical list of seven *pignora* was compiled by the late antique grammarian Maurus Servius Honoratus (early fourth – beginning of the fifth century):

---

[205] This section derives from an in-depth study I conducted of the *pignora imperii* in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine period (Praet 2016).
[206] Apparently, the concept of *pignora imperii* has not been subjected to a formal theorising and definition. Partial definitions and characteristics have to be glanced from Ando (2001: 394-395), Littlewood (2002: 186-187).
[207] For instance, the *ancilia* are mentioned in Ovid (*Fasti* III.345-346, 379-382). See Littlewood (2002).

"There were seven *pignora* that maintained the Roman empire: the stone of the Mother of the Gods, the terracotta chariot of the Veientines, the ashes of Orestes, the sceptre of Priam, the veil of Iliona, the *palladium*, and the *ancilia*." [208]

After the fifth century, and with the effective "fall of Rome" in AD 476, the *pignora imperii* seem to vanish into the mists of history. For instance, as we have seen, only John Malalas made extensive use of the motif of the *Palladium* whereas John Lydus referred only a couple of times to the *ancilia*.[209] At first sight, one might therefore wonder whether the *pignora imperii* were indeed coupled to the survival of the city of Rome?

In the light of the existence of an antiquarian discussion on emblems of empire in the sixth century, one could say that that the *concept* of the *pignora imperii* did survive the "fall of Rome" in the fifth century and was re-anchored in the cultural memory of the early Byzantine Empire. In spite of the fact that the original canon of seven talismans did only survive partially in the sixth century, the concept of the *pignora imperii* was re-anchored through a foregrounding of specific characteristics *which were already present* in the late antique canon and which therefore had only to be adapted to suit the specific ideological exigencies of the sixth century.

These ideological exigencies, which also underlie the *memoryscape* of the antiquarians, were created by the transfer of the seat of the empire from Rome to a conspicuously Christian Constantinople; the new canon of sixth-century *pignora imperii* had to be transferable, preferably immaterial and profane or devoid of conspicuously pagan characteristics.

The necessity of transferability accounts for the disappearance of the majority of the traditional *pignora*, which were, as material talismans, tied to a specific locality. Only the *Palladium* is wholly retained as an emblem of empire in John Malalas exactly because it thematised the transfer of authority from Rome to Con-

---

[208] *Ad Aen*. VII.188, "septem fuerunt pignora, quae imperium Romanum tenent: + aius matris deum, quadriga fictilis Veientanorum, cineres Orestis, sceptrum Priami, velum Ilionae, palladium, ancilia" (Thilo 1923: 141), "septem fuerunt paria, quae imperium Romanum tenent: acus Matris deum, quadriga fictilis Veientorum, cineres Orestis, sceptrum Priami, velum Ilionae, palladium, ancilia" (Ramires 2003: 31), trans. Ando (2001: 394). Even if one accepts with Ramires the reading *paria*, "similar objects" for *pignora*, this remains a list of *pignora*. The preceding commentary describes the *ancile*, an object that was designated in the tradition as a *pignus imperii*, and the six other objects as similar to it. This part of the commentary pertains to the so-called Servius auctus or Servius Danielis, of which the textual origin and its relation to Servius' works is uncertain. Hypotheses on the Servius auctus range from the work being a genuine part of Servius' work, a lost commentary of Donatus serving as a source to Servius, a compilation of Servius and a source prior to Servius, to the work being a combination of scholia with the work of Servius from a later date (Jeunet-Mancy 2010: xxi-xxvii). In spite of these textual difficulties, I consider this passage to be a genuine expression of Roman aristocratic concerns in the early fifth century, as the analysis will show.

[209] Namely in *Mens*. I.36 (Bandy IV.104), *Mens*. IV.49 (Bandy IV.45), *Mens*. IV.55 (Bandy IV.63).

stantinople. The case of the *Palladium* also illustrates how a *pignus* of the traditional canon was adapted to the sixth-century set of emblems of empire by foregrounding a characteristic already present; the transferability of the *Palladium* was already at the core of its definition, as the object was allegedly transferred from Troy to Rome. Next to the *Palladium*, the *ancilia* were retained in several passages of John of Lydia. In this case, we can explain the partial persistence of the *ancilia* from its connection with Numa Pompilius,[210] the second founder of Rome who was agreeable to the antiquarians exactly because he was responsible for transferable facets of the Roman legacy. Next to the *Palladium* and the *ancilia*, new transferable emblems of empire complete the sixth-century canon of *pignora*; a transfer of statues lay at the heart of the Constantinopolitan sculpture collection, whereas the Latin language and the colour purple were – by their virtue of immateriality – also transferable.

Apart from the spiritualising and Christianising tendencies in sixth-century antiquarianism, the exigency for transferability accounts for the immaterial aspect of the sixth-century *pignora imperii*. As already mentioned above, the colour purple and the Latin language are immaterial emblems of empire. But also in Malalas' account on the *Palladium*, we see how the *Palladium* as a *pignus imperii* is detached from its material context. In *Chron*. XIII.8, John Malalas described the rituals surrounding the anniversary of the foundation of Constantinople. A wooden statue of Emperor Constantine with the *Tyche* of the city Anthousa in its hand is paraded in the hippodrome. The custom has been maintained, according to Malalas, until his own day. This passage is a nice witness to the gradual shift in meaning of the *Palladium* as protector of the city; we see how the Emperor Constantine, as emperor and founder of the city *himself became a Palladium* or talisman for the city's survival. This shift of the *Palladium* from a material statue to the person of the emperor also explains the sixth-century focus on the colour purple as emblem of empire. The specific material entity of the individual emperor was not the guarantee for the perpetuation of the sixth-century empire; the immaterial *idea* of the emperor, the ἀρχέτυπον εἶδος, in the words of John of Lydia, and the colour purple which symbolised it, became the new *pignus imperii* in the early Byzantine Empire – notice, for instance, the use of the term *porphyrogenniti*, or "those who are born in the purple" for emperors in the Byzantine period. This immaterial aspect was also latently present in the preceding canon of *pignora imperii*; for instance, in antiquity the stone of the Mother of the Gods already vexed the religious imagination of the Romans because it eluded the traditional anthropomorphic representations of deities.[211]

The spiritualising and Christianising tendencies of sixth-century antiquarianism also had their impact on the new canon of emblems of empire. The new emblems of empire, such as statues, the Latin language and the colour purple were con-

---

[210] In *Mens*. I.36 (Bandy IV.104) the section on the *ancilia* is preceded and followed by sections on Numa Pompilius. *Mens*. IV.55 (Bandy IV.63) explicitly connects the *ancilia* to the religious innovations of Numa.
[211] Ando (2001: 349-395).

spicuously profane in the sense that they need not automatically convey a pagan or Christian message. The most conspicuously pagan parts of the canon of *pignora* were removed from the canon, unless they could be used to comment on the shift from paganism to Christianity; as we have seen, the *Palladium* was used as a literary tool in John Malalas to underscore the shift from a pagan, depraved Rome to a Christian and morally superior Constantinople.

## 4.4. Rome and Constantinople: Conclusion

In this chapter, we have seen how Cassiodorus, John Lydus and John Malalas in their antiquarian writings created, as a response to the cultural unease of the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople, an image of both cities, a *memoryscape*, the flexibility of which engaged with the challenges to the image of Rome in the sixth century. These challenges informed the characteristics of their *memoryscapes* and the elements contained in it, resulting in a *memoryscape* which focused on the transferable, the immaterial and an internal balancing of antiquarian elements.

The transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople urged John Lydus and John Malalas to transpose the image of Rome and other prestigious cities such as Troy onto the image of Constantinople, whereas Cassiodorus resisted to this transfer by underscoring the marvellous uniqueness of the eternal city on the river Tiber. The cultural unease was indeed subjected to a cultural negotiation which involved the implicit dialogue and the clash of different opinions. In order to facilitate the transfer from the old to the new Rome, the antiquarians coupled the very essence and survival of Rome to emblems which were transferable, such as the Latin language and the colour purple.

The transfer of the image of a city from one material city to the other required a certain measure of detachment of Rome's legacy from its material locus. We have seen how the *city of Rome* in John Lydus was actually neither Rome, nor Constantinople, but an *ideal of the Eternal Rome*, an ἀρχέτυπον εἶδος, which conflated elements of both cities. The same goes for the *memoryscape* of John Malalas which also added resonances to other powerful elements of the Greco-Roman cultural memory, namely the city of Troy and the empire of Alexander the Great. In compliance with this detachment from the material city of Rome, the antiquarians focused on immaterial, more abstract emblems of empire, such as the Latin language and the colour purple.

The flexibility of the *memoryscape* is most conspicuous in the balancing of the different, contradictory traditions and elements from the "swamp" of Rome's cultural memory; the antiquarian dilemma forced John Lydus and John Malalas to balance between discrediting Rome's earliest history and amassing prestige for Constantinople on the basis of its connection with Rome. In order to address this challenge, they shrewdly opposed a negative image of Romulus, the first founder of Rome, connected to the material locus of the city, to a positive depiction of Numa Pompilius, Rome's second founder and institutor of transferable cultural practices.

From a diachronic point of view, we could say that the sixth-century *memoryscapes* of Rome constituted a transitory phase in a profound transformation of the image of Rome from Antiquity to the Middle Ages. In Antiquity, the image of Rome was characterised most notably by the absence of an image; Rome was, as the all-

encompassing *caput mundi*, an an-iconic entity which eluded and precluded any icon-ography.[212] The *memoryscapes* presented in this chapter combine this an-iconic, elusive *ideal of Rome* with a specific, describable selection of buildings, mythological/histor-ical characters and emblems.[213] In these specific selections the sixth-century *memory-scapes* already foreshadow the medieval and modern conceptions of Antiquity and Rome; Rome will be, in the Middle Ages and later on, reduced to the fossilised sum of a selection of buildings and marvels, which will be compiled in easily accessible lists.[214] In this sense, the *memoryscape* constituted a transition from a classical *culture de mémoire* to a set of *lieux de mémoire*. As already pointed out by Nora, this transition from *culture* to *lieux* comes about via a growing distance to the past.[215] The same dis-tance to the past was created by the traumatic late antique shift from Rome to Con-stantinople, a shift which proved one of the motors behind this chapter.

---

[212] Grig (2012: 32-37, 52), Favro (2006: 30-38).

[213] Grig (2012: 38-39).

[214] Edwards (1996: 3-4). See, for instance, the *Mirabilia urbis Romae*, *De Mirabilibus Urbis Romae*, and other such lists.

[215] Nora (1984: xvii): "La curiosité pour les lieux où se cristallise et se réfugie la mémoire est liée à ce moment particulier de notre histoire. Moment charnière, où la conscience de la rup-ture avec le passé se confond avec le sentiment d'une mémoire déchirée ; mais où le déchire-ment réveille encore assez de mémoire pour que puisse se poser le problème de son incarna-tion. Le sentiment de la continuité devient résiduel à des lieux. Il y a des lieux de mémoire parce qu'il n'y a plus de milieux de mémoire."

# III
# Replacing Rome

In the first part of the analysis (chapter 4), we have seen how in their treatment of the cities of Rome and Constantinople, John Lydus, John Malalas and Cassiodorus contrived of several strategies to deal with the cultural unease at the demise of Rome and the transmission of imperial power from the West to the East. In this second triptych, I shall expound on three ways by which the antiquarian authors partially replaced Rome as the all-encompassing centre of Roman antiquarian writing. First, the antiquarians reverted to localism and a focus on their own region of origin as a replacement for Rome as a framework for the generation of historical meaning (chapter 5). Second, the bureaucratic context of their own department was furthered as a replacement for Rome (chapter 6). Third, the decline of Rome allowed for the emancipation in antiquarian writing of a sphere of human interest which was heretofore invisible in historiography and only marginally represented in antiquarianism: an antiquarian interest in women and children which was fuelled by personal concerns of the authors (chapter 7).

# 5

# Replacing Rome:
# Localism and Genealogies of Culture

Although instances of localism have been noticed before for the period of Late Antiquity,[1] to my knowledge, the use of localism as a consistent strategy to cope with the demise of a centre of ideological importance such as Rome, has never been described extensively.[2] Indeed, we will see how the intellectual localism of John Lydus, John Malalas and Cassiodorus allows for partially putting into perspective the importance of the former heart of the Roman Empire by placing it in a greater context. This greater context will consist of what I would like to call a 'genealogy of culture' constructed by the three intellectuals, which derives from Greco-Roman culture, through a succession of cultures, ultimately to the region of origin of the intellectual in question − the origin of culture will coincide with the personal background of the intellectual as the lens through which the distant past of the empire is perceived. John Lydus will derive the practices of the Romans from the Lydians through the Etruscans. John Malalas will trace all cultural achievements of mankind to Syria. Perhaps in response to the Lydian and Syrian claims of his contemporaries, Cassiodorus will uphold the bilingual cultural ideal of the Roman Empire, as espoused by Priscian, Symmachus and Boethius, in miniature form, by presenting the *Variae* as a cultural compendium of the Ostrogothic realm. He also exhibits a focus on his home region in the South of Italy. These late antique instances of localist

---

[1] On the importance of local ties for furthering one's career in the administration, see Kelly (2004: 173-174, 184-185). For the presence and danger of cliques in the bureaucracy which were based on local ties see Kelly (2004: 48-49). Local prides were sometimes exploited by the central authorities. For an analysis of local antiquarianism in Justinian's Novels, for instance, see Roueché (1998).

[2] Sviatoslav (2010: 38). Most research is limited in scope and focused on earlier and later periods. Examples are Wiegels (2007) for the second century, Young (2004) with a case study in the third century, Nelson (1970) for Visigothic Spain, and Guillou (1969, 1981) for the seventh century.

chauvinism and their expression in historiography have their precedents in the different competing local histories of the Hellenistic age.[3]

---

[3] Burgess and Kulikowski (2012), Van Nuffelen (2015: 15, 17). For these tendencies in the works of Berossus and Manetho, see Dillery (2015: 123-192). For these tendencies in Jewish historians of the Hellenistic period see Berthelot (2004: 46-48), Adler (2017: 32-33). For a general overview of these Hellenistic "cultural apologetics", see Burgess and Kulikowski (2016: 100-101). For the traditions deriving Rome from Greece see Cornell (1995: 124-125).

## 5.1. John of Lydia

Previous research has hinted at disparate appearances of successions of cultures in the works of John of Lydia, with particular focus on John's treatment of the Etruscans and Lydians.[4] In my opinion, however, John Lydus sketches through his works a consistent cultural genealogy of the Romans, which appears to be derived not from one but from two branches, a Gallic and an Etruscan. Both branches are either indirectly or directly derived from and associated with the Lydians. This cultural genealogy emphasises the role of Lydia, the region of origin of John, and puts the importance of Roman cultural achievements into perspective.[5] Indeed, John does not fail to mention other cultures and peoples such as the Greeks who also contributed to the Roman culture. John's deconstruction of the Roman legacy serves the purpose of coming to terms with the perceived decline of the Roman Empire during his days. Yet, this deconstruction again creates an antiquarian dilemma, as the whole thrust of John's antiquarian argument revolves around the Roman past furnishing authority to institutions in the present. John Lydus resolves this dilemma by accentuating the fact that this deconstruction of Rome's cultural achievements was in the first place a construct of the Roman erudite tradition itself; he explicitly mentions Roman sources for his cultural genealogy, and it was Numa Pompilius, the respect-

---

[4] Briquel (1990) provides an overview of the history on the traditions surrounding the cultural origins of the Etruscans in Lydia. In chapter 17, "La légende à l'époque romaine : son succès et ses limites" (Briquel 1990: 479-488), Briquel analyses how the cultural genealogy did not have much importance in the Roman imperial period; without any emphasis on the Lydian character of the Etruscans, the genealogy is used exclusively in function of the explanation of Roman cultural phenomena. As this analysis will show, the theory of the Etruscans descending from the Lydians, which had become a dreary erudite anecdote in the Roman period, was revived by John Lydus for his own agenda. In doing so, he reverted the emphasis; the Lydians and Etruscans will receive full attention in order to diminish the role of Rome in favour of Lydia. Although Briquel treats the version of John Lydus chapter 18, "La version de Jean le Lydien ou la légende vidée de son sens originel", (Briquel 1990: 489-554), he does not take into account the cultural genealogy underlying John's version. He furthermore analyses the sources and traditions represented in John Lydus as if he produced a faithful copy, without considering the late antique layers and agenda's. This results in several problems in interpretation. See also Maas (1992: 30-31). Also Domenici in her contribution alludes to the cultural genealogy presented in John of Lydia; Domenici (2007: 19): "Ma forse c'è anche qualcosa di più "personale", per cui Lido si sente vicino agli etruschi: egli, infatti, è nato in Lidia, la regione dalla quale, secondo la vulgata, avrebbe avuto origine il popolo etrusco. (…) Da questa tradizione, abbracciata, seppur con alcune varianti, anche da Lido, nasce nell' autore al convinzione di un forte legame tra lidi ed etruschi. E non è escluso che egli sfruttasse questo collegamento per dare maggior autorevolezza ai propri studi.". Some scholars erroneously interpret John's local focus exclusively as a feat of crypto-paganism. Bjornlie (2013: 115) interprets John's *interpretatio Etrusca* of the Roman offices of state as Etruscan divination as a pagan element. The same goes for Kaldellis (2003: 305-306), who interprets the John's passages on Philadelphia as a form of pagan antiquarianism.
[5] Carney (1971b: 29).

able second founder of Rome, who was responsible for Rome's derivative culture.[6] This section will end with a short description of the importance of Lydia in John's works as the new centre of his antiquarian universe.

### 5.1.1. A Cultural Genealogy

"No one at all has failed to recognise that those who were later magistrates of the state of the Romans had formerly been priests, because Tyrrhenus, when he had migrated to the West from Lydia, had taught the mystic rites of the Lydians to those who were called at that time Etruscans (their race was Sicanian), who, from their *thyoskopia*, happened to be renamed Tuscans; and I know that I mentioned them in detail in the first treatise which I wrote *On Months*. For Numa the king got the insignia of the magistrates from the Tuscans and introduced them to the state, just as also from the Gauls their hard-to-fight-against weapons. And attesters, indeed, of these facts are both Capito and Fonteius, to whose number belongs also the most instructive Varro, all Romans, after whom the celebrated Sallust, the historian, clearly teaches [these things] in his *Early History*. Consequently, there remains to give an account about the civil powers, though it is clear that they had evolved from a priestly character to the civil form. (…)".[7]

In the introduction to his *De Magistratibus* (*Magistr.* Intr. 1-5), John states that the magistracies of the Romans derived from the priesthoods of the Etruscans, who, in turn, were taught Lydian mystic rites from Tyrrhenus.[8] Numa Pompilius is singled out as the person who introduced the Etruscan insignia for the Roman magistracies. Furthermore, Numa derived the Romans' force of arms from the Gauls. The pas-

---

[6] John of Lydia's stress on the cultural achievements of leaders such as Numa Pompilius, Tyrrhenus, and, as we will see later on in this chapter, Evander, tie in well with his emphasising the cultural role of Numa Pompilius above the role of Romulus, as we have seen in chapter 4.2.3. (pp. 154-158 of this dissertation). On the portrayal of Tyrrhenus as a cultural hero, see Briquel (1990: 490, 553). Briquel (1990: 490): "la version de Jean le Lydien ramène l'arivée de Tyrrhènos à une simple péripétie de l'histoire du peuple tyrrhénien, ayant un sens culturel et non plus ethnique.". Also Domenici (2007: 19, n. 31): "Inoltre, secondo la sua versione, Tirreno non è un vero e proprio conquistatore, quanto piuttosto un capo religioso: in questo modo, più che un fatto etnico, l'apporto dei lidi agli etruschi diventa un fatto culturale.".

[7] *Magistr.* Intr. 1-4 "Ἱερέας γενέσθαι τὸ πρὶν τοὺς ὕστερον ἄρχοντας τοῦ Ῥωμαίων πολιτεύματος οὐδενὶ τῶν πάντων ἠγνόηται, Τυρρηνοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν ἐκ τῆς Λυδίας μεταναστάντος τοὺς τότε καλουμένους Ἐτρούσκους (ἔθνος δὲ ἦν Σικανόν) τὰς Λυδῶν τελετὰς διδάξαντος, οὓς ἐκ τῆς θυοσκοπίας Θούσκους συμβέβηκε μετονομασθῆναι· καὶ τούτων εἰς πλάτος ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῆς Περὶ Μηνῶν γραφείσης ἡμῖν πραγματείας ἴσμεν μνημονεύσαντες. τὰ γὰρ ἐπίσημα τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀπὸ Θούσκων λαβὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς Νουμᾶς τῇ πολιτείᾳ εἰσήγαγεν, ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ὅπλων τὸ δύσμαχον ἀπὸ Γαλατῶν. καὶ μάρτυρες μὲν τούτων ὅ τε Καπίτων καὶ Φοντήϊος, ἐξ ὧν καὶ ὁ διδασκαλικώτατος Οὐάρρων, Ῥωμαῖοι πάντες, μεθ' οὓς Σαλλούστιος οὗτος, ὁ ἱστορικός, ἐπὶ τῆς Πρώτης Ἱστορίας σαφῶς ἀναδιδάσκει. ὥστε ὑπόλοιπον περὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν ἀφηγήσασθαι ἐξουσιῶν καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ ἱερατικῆς τάξεως ἐπὶ τὸ πολιτικὸν μετεφύησαν σχῆμα." (Schamp 2006b: ), trans. Bandy (1983: 3).

[8] "Il proemio (…) non assolve funzioni chiaramente individuabili: per metà Lido imbastisce una garbata e un po' narcisistica commemorazione di sé stesso e del suo popolo, i Lidi (…)." (Caimi 1984: 125). See also Schamp (2006a: cxxi, ccxcii).

sage closes by mentioning the sources of this tradition: Capito, Fonteius[9] and Varro. Actually, according to John of Lydia, these views were shared by all the Romans and also explicitly mentioned by Sallustius. This passage, which is of significance as it introduces the work, clearly frames the rest of John's treatise on Roman magistracies within the derivative cultural construct of Numa Pompilius.[10] The passage appears indeed to be crucial to Lydus' approach to Roman culture, as it is repeated elsewhere in his oeuvre, namely in *De Mensibus* I.37 (Bandy /).[11]

Lydus' derivative view on Roman culture has its repercussions for his view of the Latin language. In *Magistr.* II.13,[12] Lydus mentions that the Latin language was the product of a blend of four languages, namely the Aeolic,[13] Gallic, Tuscan and Etruscan languages. In this case as well, Varro is quoted as a proponent of this theory:

"The Romans call the pin *fibula* in their native language and the belt *balteus*, but the Gauls call the entire girdle outfit *cartamera*, which the common people call *cartalamum* out of ignorance. That this peculiar word is not Roman, the Roman Varro attests in Book V of his work *On the Roman Language*, in which it is precisely defined what sort of word is Aeolic and what sort is Gallic; and that a word deriving from the Tuscans is of one sort, while that deriving

---

[9] The two names in all probability referred to one and the same author, C. Fonteius Capito, see Weinstock (1950), Schamp (2006a: clxiii-clxvii). Carney (1971b: 62) erroneously considered that Fonteius lived in the fourth century AD.

[10] Using the derivative nature of the Roman culture as a means to put this culture into perspective, or even to put into doubt its cultural credentials, has a precedent in the traditions surrounding Numa Pompilius himself. From Dionysius of Halicarnassus onward, there existed an anti-Roman tradition, espoused by Greek historians, which stated that Numa Pompilius was a Sabine, and his religious institutions therefore mere Sabine derivations (Panitschek 1990: 60-62). "Die oben zitierte Iustinstelle (…) zeigt jedoch, dass eine Auffassung des Numa als eines sabinischen Haruspex durchaus einmal dazu angetan war, den römischen Nazional-stolz an empfindlicher Stelle zu treffen." (Panitschek 1990: 60-61).

[11] "Ἱερέας γενέσθαι τὸ πρὶν τοὺς ὕστερον ἄρχοντας τοῦ Ῥωμαίων πολιτεύματος οὐδενὶ τῶν πάντων ἠγνόηται, Τυρρηνοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν ἐκ τῆς Λυδίας μεταστάντος, τοὺς τότε καλουμένους Ἐτρούσκους— ἔθνος δὲ ἦν Σικανόν—τὰς Λυδῶν τελετὰς διδάξαντος, οὓς ἐκ τῆς θυοσκοπίας Θούσκους συμβέβηκε μετονομασθῆναι· καὶ τούτων εἰς πλάτος ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῆς περὶ μηνῶν γραφείσης ἡμῖν πραγματείας ἴσμεν μνημονεύσαντες. τὰ γὰρ ἐπίσημα τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀπὸ
Θούσκων λαβὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς Νουμᾶς τῇ πολιτείᾳ εἰσήγαγεν, ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ὅπλων τὸ δύσμαχον ἀπὸ Γαλατῶν. καὶ μάρτυρες μὲν τούτων ὅ τε Καπίτων καὶ Φοντήϊος, ἐξ ὧν καὶ ὁ διδασκαλικώτατος Οὐάρρων, Ῥωμαῖοι πάντες, μεθ' οὓς Σαλούστιος οὗτος ὁ ἱστορικὸς ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης ἱστορίας σαφῶς ἀναδιδάσκει." (Wünsch 1898: 16-17).

[12] Schamp (2006a: lxxv).

[13] On the theory of the Aeolic origin of the Latin language, see Rochette (1998: 472-473), Schamp (2006a: lxxiii-lxxv, clviii-clx). John Lydus was clearly fond of this theory (Rochette 1998: 473).

from the Etruscans is of another, from the blending of which was formed the now prevailing language of the Romans.".[14]

In the following, I will analyse the two main branches and some subsidiary branches which informed Roman culture according to John Lydus.

### 5.1.1.1. A Cultural Genealogy: The Etruscan Branch

"I believe that it is fitting for him wishing to write about such matters to tell both whence the comprehension of such matters began and from what source it got its origins, also how it advanced so far as to surpass, if it is right to say, even the Egyptians themselves. For manifestly of the latter, next after the much-famed Zoroaster, Petosiris plaited the general materials with the special ones and makes every effort to hand down many teachings in his day, but he hands these down not to all but only to his own contemporaries or rather just to as many of them as were more suited for speculations. After him, however, Antigonus differentiated and articulated the tradition, but, having been inclined towards the density of the delineations in astronomy, he set down at the same time in his writing an untold mass, which also was full of every obscurity. The statements of Aristoteles are surely very clear, but Heliodorus and Ascletario, besides als Odapus of Thebae, Polles of Aegium, and before them the most divine Ptolemaeus, were not always able to dispel the subject's ancient obscurity, although, indeed, they had been also exceedingly eager to do this.

Since Tages has been the originator of the subject for us, I mean those of Italia, it is fitting to use his words or rather their sense, for, since those words are composed with rather ancient expressions, they are somewhat difficult to follow and are not exceedingly clear. We shall make use also of the others, both the inspector of entrails Tarchon and the conductor of sacred rites Tarquitus, also the priest Capito, so as to plait an elegant harmony on the subject from the statements made by all these men. It is needful, therefore, to relate both who this Tages was and who the others were and how such matters were committed to writings in consequence of their prevalence in the sacred rites.

Tarchon (thus he was named) was an inspector of entrails, as he himself has introduced himself in his writings, being one of those who had been taught by the Lydian Tyrrhenus, for, in fact, manifestly these matters were made clear by the writings of the Tusci. Since, however, Evander of Arcadia had not yet appeared at that time in those regions, the form of their letters was considerably different and not altogether commonly used by us. Verily, in fact, none of their esoteric and rather necessary teachings as well were to have remained hidden up to the present.

---

[14] "φίβουλαν αὐτὴν πατρίως οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ βάλτεον τὸν ζωστῆρα λέγουσιν, τὴν δὲ ὅλην κατασκευὴν τοῦ περιζώματος οἱ Γάλλοι καρταμέραν, ἣν τὸ πλῆθος καρτάλαμον ἐξ ἰδιωτείας ὀνομάζει. ὅτι δὲ οὐ Ῥωμαϊκὸν τουτὶ τὸ ῥημάτιον, μάρτυς ὁ Ῥωμαῖος Βάρρων ἐν βιβλίῳ πέμπτῳ Περὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς Διαλέκτου, ἐν ᾧ διαρθροῦται ποία μέν τις λέξις ἐστὶν Αἰολική, ποία δὲ Γαλλική· καὶ ὅτι ἑτέρα μὲν ἡ Θούσκων, ἄλλη δὲ Ἐτρούσκων, ὧν συγχυθεισῶν ἡ νῦν κρατοῦσα τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀπετελέσθη φωνή." (Schamp 2006c: 18), trans. Bandy (1983: 105).

Tarchon then, in his treatise, which sone suspect was that of Tages, and yet in it in a conversation in dialogue form Tarchon manifestly asks questions, whereas Tages answers, as he constantly used to devote himself to the sacred rites, says that an amazing thing such as no one has even heard to have occurred in the whole of time happened to him by chance at one time when he was plowing. For a young boy was delivered out of the furrow, seeming to have been just born but not lacking teeth and the other characteristics of mature age. The young boy, then, was Tages, who the Greeks thought was clearly the same as infernal Hermes, as also the successor Proclus somewhere says. This event has been veiled allegorically in accordance with the sacerdotal custom since the teaching about more divine matters has not been handed down openly because of the uninitiate but sometimes mythically and sometimes figuratively, for, instead of saying that a soul, being most perfect and without lack of its own activities, came to materiality, it says that a newly born infant was delivered out of the furrow. The elder Tarchon, for manifestly there has been also a younger one who had served in the army during the years of Aeneas, picked up the young child and laid it down in the sacred precincts and thought it fit to learn from him something of his esoteric doctrines. After he had obtained his request, he composed a book from his statements, in which Tarchon makes inquiries in the familiar customary lan-

guage of the Italians, whereas Tages answers, adhering to his answers to the letter which are both ancient and not very intelligible to us at least."[15]

The first branch of cultural influence was the Etruscan branch.[16] The Roman state was, according to John of Lydia, founded on Etruscan religious

---

[15] *Ost.* 2-3 "Ἁρμόδιον δὲ εἶναι νομίζω τῷ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων γράφειν ἐθέλοντι, πόθεν τε ἡ τῶν τοιούτων κατάληψις ἤρξ[ατο, λέγ]ειν, καὶ ὅθεν ἔσχε τὰς ἀφορμάς, καὶ ὅπως ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον προ[ῆλθεν], ὡς καὶ αὐτούς, εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, Αἰγυπτίους ὑπερβαλεῖν. τούτων [γὰρ δή, μετὰ] Ζωροάστρην τὸν πολύν, Πετόσιρις τοῖς εἰδικοῖς τὰ [ἐν γένει διαπλέ]ξας πολλὰ μὲν κατ᾽ αὐτὸν παραδοῦναι βιάζεται, οὐ πᾶ[σι δὲ παρα]δίδωσι ταῦτα, μόνοις δὲ τοῖς καθ᾽ αὐτόν, μᾶλλον δὲ ὅσοι καὶ [αὐτῶν] πρὸς στοχασμοὺς ἐπιτηδειότεροι. Ἀντίγονος δὲ μετ᾽ ἐκεῖνον δι[έκριν]ε μὲν καὶ διήρθρωσε τὴν παράδοσιν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πυκνὸν [τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀστρ]ονομίᾳ γραμμῶν ἀποκλίνας ἀμύθητον ὄχλον [καὶ ἀσαφείας πάσης ἀ]νάμεστον τῇ γραφῇ συγκατέθετο. τὰ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλει εἰρημένα γνωριμώτατα. Ἡλιόδωρος δὲ καὶ Ἀσκλατίων, ἔτι καὶ Ὠδαφὸς ὁ Θηβ[αῖος καὶ ὁ Αἰγιεὺς] Πολλῆς καὶ ὁ θειότατος πρὸ αὐτῶν Πτολεμαῖος, οὐ μέχρι παντὸς ἴσχ[υσ]αν τὴν παλαιὰν     ἀσάφειαν τοῦ πράγματος ἐκβαλεῖν, καίτοι γε σφόδρα καὶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι σπεύσαντες. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἡμῖν, τοὺς ἐξ Ἰταλίας φημί, Τάγης ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ πράγματος γέγονεν, ἀκόλουθον τοῖς αὐτοῦ ῥήμασι χρήσασθα[ι, μ]ᾶλλον δὲ τῇ τούτων ἐννοίᾳ · τοῖς γὰρ ἀρχαιοτέροις ὀνόμασιν ἐκεῖνα συγκείμενα δυσπαρακολούθητά πώς ἐστι καὶ οὐ σφόδρα σαφῆ. [χρησόμεθα δὲ καὶ τοῖς] λοιποῖς, Τάρχοντί τε τῷ θυοσκόπῳ καὶ Ταρκύτῳ τῷ [τελεστῇ καὶ Κα]πίτωνι ἱερεῖ, ὥστε ἐκ τῶν πᾶσι τούτοις εἰρημέ[νων γλαφυρά] τινα διαπλέξαι τοῦ πράγματος ἁρμονίαν. δεῖ [τοίνυν ἀφη]γήσασθαι πρῶτον τίς τε οὗτος ὁ Τάγης καὶ τίνες οἱ λοιπ[οί, καὶ ὅπως] γράμμασιν ἐνεπιστεύθη παρὰ τὸ κρατοῦν ἐν τοῖς ἱερ[οῖς τὰ τοιαῦ]τα. Τάρχων, ταύτῃ ἔχων τὴν προσηγορίαν, ἀνὴρ γ[έγονε μὲν] θυοσκόπος, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰσενήνεκται, εἷς [τῶν ὑπὸ] Τυρρηνοῦ τοῦ Λυδοῦ διδαχθέντων. καὶ γὰρ δὴ τοῖς Θούσκ[ων γράμμα]σι ταῦτα δηλοῦται, οὔπω τηνικαῦτα τοῖς τόποις ἐκείνοις Εὐάνδρου τοῦ Ἀρκάδος ἐπιφανέντος. ἦν δὲ ἀλλοῖός τις ὁ τῶν γραμμάτων τύπος, καὶ οὐδὲ ὅλως καθημαζευμένος ἡμῖν · ἦ γὰρ ἂν τῶν ἀπορρήτων τε καὶ ἀναγκαιοτέρων οὐδὲν ἔμεινεν ἄχρι τοῦ παρόντος λανθάνον. φησὶ τοίνυν ὁ Τάρχων ἐπὶ τοῦ συγγράμματος, ὅπερ εἶναί τινες Τάγητος ὑποπτεύουσιν, ἐπειδήπερ ἐκεῖ κατά τινα διαλογικὴν ὁμιλίαν ἐρωτᾷ μὲν δῆθεν ὁ Τάρχων, ἀποκρίνεται δὲ ὁ Τάγης ὡς προσκαρτερῶν ἑκάστοτε τοῖς ἱεροῖς, ὡς [τυχὸν] συμβέβηκεν αὐτῷ κατά τινα χρόνον ἀροτριῶντι θαυμάσιόν τι, οἷον οὐδὲ ἀκήκοέ τις ἐν τῷ παντὶ χρόνῳ γενόμενον · ἀνεδόθη γὰρ <ἐκ> τοῦ αὔλακος παιδίον, ἄρτι μὲν τεχθῆναι δοκοῦν, ὀδόντων δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐν ἡλικίᾳ γνωρισμάτων ἀπροσδεές · ἦν δὲ ἄρα τὸ παιδίον ὁ Τάγης, ὃν δὴ καὶ χθόνιον Ἑ[ρμῆν] εἶναι τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἔδοξεν, ὥς που καὶ Πρόκλος φησὶν ὁ διάδοχος. τοῦτο δὲ ἀλληγορικῶς παρὰ τὸν ἱερατικὸν παρακεκάλυπται νόμον, ἐπεὶ οὐ προφανῶς ὁ περὶ θειοτέρων πραγμάτων λόγος διὰ τοὺς ἀνιέρους, ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν μυθικῶς νῦν δὲ παραβολικῶς παραδέδοται · ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ εἰπεῖν ψυχὴν τελειοτάτην καὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἐνεργειῶν ἀπροσδεῆ ἐπὶ τὴν ὕλην ἐλθεῖν, βρέφος ἀρτιγενὲς ἐκ τοῦ αὔλακος ἀναδοθῆναί φησι. Τάρχων δὲ ὁ πρεσβύτερος (γέγονε γὰρ δὴ καὶ νεώτερος, ἐπὶ τῶν Αἰνείου στρατευσάμενος χρόνων) τὸ παιδίον ἀναλαβὼν καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐναποθέμενος τόποις ἠξίου τι παρ᾽ [αὐτοῦ] τῶν ἀπορρήτων μαθεῖν. τοῦ δὲ αἰτουμένου τυχὼν βι[βλίον] ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων συνέγραφεν, ἐν ᾧ πυνθάνεται μὲν ὁ Τάρχων τῇ τῶν Ἰταλῶν ταύτῃ τῇ συνήθει φωνῇ, ἀποκρίνεται δὲ ὁ Τάγης γράμμασιν ἀρχαίοις τε καὶ οὐ σφόδρα γνωρίμοις ἡμῖν γε ἐμμένων τῶν ἀποκρίσεων. πλὴν ἀλλ᾽ ὅσον μοι γέγονε δυνατόν, ἔκ τε τῶν Θούσκων ἔκ τε τῶν ἄλλων ὅσοι τούτους ἡρμήνευσαν, Καπίτωνός τέ φημι καὶ Φοντηίου, καὶ Ἀπουληίου Βικελλίου τε καὶ Λαβεῶνος καὶ Φιγούλου, Πλινίου τε τοῦ φυσικοῦ, πειράσομαι ταῦτα πρὸς ὑμᾶς διελθεῖν." (Wachsmuth 1897: 6-8), trans. Bandy (2013b: 53, 55, 57).

[16] The Etruscans are mentioned in *Mens.* IV.2 (Bandy IV.2), *Ost.* 3 (Bandy 3), *Ost.* 27 (Bandy 51), *Ost.* 43 (Bandy 87), *Ost.* 70 (Bandy 131), *Magistr.* Intr. (Wünsch I.37) and *Magistr.* I.8.

practices.[17] In his description of the religious practices of the Etruscans, John focuses on the Etruscan art of divination. In the introduction to his *De Ostentis*, John describes the origin of the Etruscan art of divination, after explicitly stating that this tradition surpasses the Egyptian, Persian and Greek traditions on divination (*Ost.* 2).[18] The priest Tarchon, who was taught by Tyrrhenus the Lydian,[19] noted down the answers he received to his questions on divination from Tages,[20] a boy who miraculously appeared from a furrow. Wood states that John Lydus attributes in the introduction to the *De Magistratibus* the origin of Tages' haruspicy wrongly to Tyrrhenus.[21] Instead of interpreting this attribution as a mistake by John of Lydia, however, we might see in this attribution a deliberate attempt by John Lydus to impose his cultural genealogy on the myth surrounding Tages.[22] The account of Tarchon was written both in the Latin and the Etruscan alphabet (*Ost.* 3).[23] The specific version of the myth of Tages and Tarchon as recounted by John Lydus is unique to the traditions on these mythological characters. In view of John's tendency to invent myths, such as the prophesy given to Romulus which we discussed in the previous chapter,[24] we can presume that John Lydus manipulated this myth specifically to suit his cultural genealogy.[25] Throughout the rest of the treatise, he explicitly indicates

---

[17] Weinstock (1950: 45). On the Etruscans being considered as a religious people *par excellence*, see Briquel (1990: 490-491, 527-528). See also Domenici (2007:15): "Gli etruschi erano, per il loro conquistatori romani, "gente sopra ogni altra dedita alle pratiche religiose" (LIVIO, 5, 1, 6): ciò che risulta confermato anche dalle connessioni paretimologiche che antiquari, eruditi e grammatici (Varrone, Festo, Servio, Isidoro e lo stesso Lido) instituiscono tra il nome della nazione, Tusci, e il termine greco *thysiazein*, sacrificare."

[18] Schamp (2006a: ciii), Domenici (2007: 18-19).

[19] On the use Tyrrhenus to connect the Etruscan and Oriental or Lydian branch of the cultural genealogy, see Briquel (1990: 527).

[20] On the myth of Tages see Weinstock (1950: 45-46), Wood (1980), Domenici (2007: 17-19, 20-27). A list of testimonies to the myth of Tages an be found in Wood (1980: 325, n. 1), Domenici (2007: 20, n. 34). On the resemblances between Tages and Numa Pompilius see Panitschek (1990: 61-62).

[21] Wood (1980: 330).

[22] Also Briquel (1990: 511, 516-519) is not convinced by Wood's hypothesis, but fails to take into account the cultural genealogy which John Lydus imposed on the myth of Tages. "On pourrait ainsi envisager que l'idée soit celle d'une révélation par Tyrrhènos de l'haruspicine, et par Tagès des autres éléments de doctrine - nombreux - qui lui étaient rapportés. Mais une telle solution n'est pas vraiment satisfaisante." (Briquel 1990: 518). Indeed, in a later article, Wood does not repeat the hypothesis that John Lydus made an error: "The legend that *Tyrrhenus taught Tarchon the Etruscan alphabet* is unique in attributing the Etruscan alphabet to a 'pre-Greek' source (…)" (Wood 1981: 122).

[23] Wood (1981). "On peut donc parfaitement admettre (…) que l'auteur byzantin fasse bien allusion ici à un texte bilingue, dont une partie était rédigée en écriture et langue étrusques - le reste étant en latin. Et nous noterons qu'il n'y a pas d'impossibilité foncière à ce que des documents (…) étrusques aient encore été accessibles à cette date tardive : rappelons que les *fulguratores* étrusques auxquels on a fait appel contre Alaric en 408 semblent encore avoir disposé de textes étrusques." (Briquel 1990: 538).

[24] See chapter 4.3.2. (pp. 167-173 of this dissertation).

[25] For an analysis of the version of the myth by John of Lydia, see Domenici (2007: 25-27). The myth of Tages receives its most extensive treatment in John Lydus (Domenici 2007: 18). On the unicity of John's version, see Domenici (2007: 23).

the Etruscan origin of his sources.[26] Indeed, the sequence of translations to which John's sources were subjected, from Etruscan to Latin, and from Latin to John's Greek, underscores the cultural transfer from the Etruscans to the Romans and the Romans of John's own day.[27] Yet in the case of these translations we could also assume the hand of Lydus was at work; Weinstock posited the attractive hypothesis that the texts which Lydus attributed to Etruscan and Latin sources in reality derived from Egyptian sources.[28] This hypothesis would render the whole of Lydus' cultural genealogy from Etruscan to Latin to Greek writings a construct of the author.

John's mention of the teacher of Tarchon, the Lydian Tyrrhenus, frames, as in the introduction to the *De Magistratibus*, the Roman offices of state as a product generated from the Etruscans who,[29] in turn, derived their religious knowledge from the Lydians. This cultural genealogy from Romans to Etruscans to Lydians is clearly central to Lydus' concept of Greco-Roman culture, as it returns in the introduction of each of his works. Although the introduction to the *De Mensibus* is not preserved, we can reasonably presume this cultural genealogy also featured there, as John Lydus refers to the first book of *De Mensibus* when he expounds on the genealogy at the beginning of *De Magistratibus* (*Magistr.* Intr. 1).[30] Actually, the editor of *De Mensibus*, Wünsch, stated the hypothesis that the whole of the first book was designed to prove how the Roman religious practices pertaining to the calendar were derived from Lydia through the Etruscans.[31] This would frame the whole of the treatise, as all John's other works, firmly within his premeditated cultural scheme.

### 5.1.1.2. A Cultural Genealogy: The Gallic Branch

The second branch which informed Roman culture was the Gallic branch,[32] as Numa Pompilius took over the "force of arms", τῶν ὅπλων τὸ δύσμαχον, from the Gauls (*Magistr.* Intr. 2).[33] Indeed, in *De Mensibus* (I.12, Bandy I.6 and IV.30, Bandy II.12), the Gauls are also credited with another addition to Greco-Roman culture, in the form of the blue colour and faction in the circus races, which was ad-

---

[26] Domenici (2007: 8, 14). *Ost.* 27 (Bandy 51): "Daily Divination by thunder, regional, with respect to the moon, according to the Roman Figulus from the writings of Tages in translation verbatim (…) From this inspection the Tusci have handed down the local observations of the regions upon which the thunderclaps erupt." (Bandy 2013b: 133), see Weinstock (1950: 48). *Ost.* 43 (Bandy 87): "(…) according to the tradition of the Tusci (…)" (Bandy 2013b: 193). *Ost.* 54 (Bandy 107): "For from the verses of Tages, the Roman Vicellius himself, (…) with these very words in translation says the following." (Bandy 2013b: 213), see Weinstock (1950: 47). *Ost.* 70 (Bandy 131) "Clodius, then, says these things word for word from the sacred writings of the Tusci" (Bandy 2013b: 247), see Weinstock (1950: 47-48).
[27] Domenici (2007: 28), Turfa (2012: 11).
[28] Weinstock (1950: 47-48).
[29] On the cultural genealogy between the Etruscans, Romans and the sixth century eastern Roman Empire in *De Ostentis* see Domenici (2007: 19).
[30] Caimi (1984: 125).
[31] Maas (1992: 56).
[32] The Gauls and/or Celts are mentioned in Mens. I.12 (Bandy I.6), Mens. I.37 (Bandy /) = Magistr. Intr., Mens. III.11 (Bandy III.15), Mens. IV.27 (Bandy IV.19), Mens. IV.30 (Bandy II. 12), Mens. IV.114 (Bandy IV.106), Ost. 4 (Bandy 4), Magistr. Intr. = Mens. I.37 (Bandy /), Magistr. I.12, Magistr. I.23, Magistr. I.50, Magistr. II.13 (Wünsch I.39), Magistr. III.32, Magistr. III.56 and Magistr. III.74.
[33] Weinstock (1950: 45).

ded on demand of the Gauls. In this aspect, also Lydus' account of Camillus' battle with the Gauls is of interest (Mens. IV.27, Bandy IV.19):

> "When the Galli had gained control of Rome, Camillus, after he had collec-
> ted an army, suddenly attacked its foes and, when a fierce battle had ensued,
> because their swords along with also their arms had been broken, for the
> Romans were not yet using iron but bronze breastplates in antiquity, they
> engaged thereafter at close quarters and dragged one another by both the
> crests of their helmets and , indeed, by the hairs themselves of their beard.
> In the end he drove off the barbarians, rescued Rome, and was named a
> second Romulus. And thus it was prescribed that they both clip off their
> beards at the end and make their breastplates out of iron and have their
> helmets without crests.".[34]

In this passage, Camillus is called a second Romulus because of his defeat of the Gauls. Apparently, in the mind of John of Lydia, the Roman interaction and conflict with the Gauls has the significance of a foundational experience. Rome experienced a second foundation through a display of her military prowess in association with the Gauls.

We might wonder why John Lydus likes to emphasise the role of the Gauls in shaping the culture of the Romans. One aside in *De Magistratibus* could indicate the purpose of this interest. When discussing the benefactions of Phocas in Pessinus in Galatia (*Magistr.* III.74), John Lydus mentions how the region was called Galatia after the Gauls who fought and settled there under the leadership of Brennus - in this case he cites as authorities the Romans Sisenna and Fenestella, who were, in turn quoted by Varro:

> "Near Pessinus, the city in Galatia (the place happened to be so named from
> the fact that countless numbers of Gauls who dwelt around the Rhone had
> fallen there when, under the leadership of Brennus, they had invaded the
> region and were exercising force to claim the land bearing their name, as the
> Romans Fenestella and Sisenna say, whose passages Varro quoted in his *Hu-
> man Affairs*, but I for my part have not yet seen the books) - now, the immacu-

---

[34] "Ὅτι Γάλλων παραλαβόντων τὴν Ῥώμην ὁ Κάμιλλος συναγείρας πλῆθος ἀθρόον ἐμπίπτει τοῖς πολεμίοις · καὶ μάχης κρατερᾶς γενομένης κλασθέντων αὐτοῖς τῶν ξιφῶν σὺν καὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις—οὔπω γὰρ σιδηροῖς ἐχρῶντο Ῥωμαῖοι θώραζι, χαλκοῖς δὲ κατὰ τὴν παλαιότητα—τὸ λοιπὸν εἰς χεῖρας ἐλθεῖν ἕλκειν τε ἀλλήλους ἔκ τε τῶν λοφιῶν τῶν περικεφαλαιῶν καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μέντοι τῶν τοῦ πώγονος τριχῶν · τέλος δὲ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἀπήλασε καὶ Ῥώμην ἐρρύσατο καὶ δεύτερος Ῥωμύλος ὠνομάσθη. καὶ οὕτως ἀποκείρειν τε τοὺς πώγονας ἐπ' ἄκρου καὶ σιδηροῖς τοὺς θώρακας κατασκευάζειν τέτακται καὶ ἄνευ λοφιῶν τὰς περικεφαλαίας ἔχειν." (Wünsch 1898: 86), trans. Bandy (2013a: 179).

late host of the holy angels devoted to the Ineffable God had a sanctuary there.".[35]

This aside connects the Gallic culture as one of the sources of the Roman culture to the region of Galatia in Asia Minor, which lay in the vicinity of Lydia. Apparently, Lydus' view on the genesis of Roman culture is deeply determined by a personal and regional outlook which focuses in first instance on his home region of Lydia, and second on the greater region of Asia Minor.

### 5.1.1.3. A Cultural Genealogy: Other Cultures

The cultural legacy of Rome is further put into perspective by John of Lydia. For instance, in *Mens.* III.1 (Bandy III.1) he discusses the antiquity of different peoples, without, however, mentioning the Romans. He further relativises the cultural achievements of the Romans when he remarks on the cultural pedigree of other cultural practices. The alphabet is one case in point; John Lydus mentions the existence of a distinct Etruscan alphabet before the introduction of the Greek and later Latin alphabets in Italy at the beginning of *De Ostentis*:

> "(…) manifestly these matters were made clear by the writings of the Tusci. Since, however, Evander of Arcadia had not yet appeared at that time in those regions, the form of their letters was considerably different and not altogether commonly used by us.".[36]

John Lydus also digresses on the cultural pedigree of the Roman alphabet. In *Mens.* I.8 (Bandy I.2) we read how Evander introduced the letters of Cadmus to Italy, and how these letters were later adapted for the Latin language by the grammarian Marcus Flavius. The following paragraph (*Mens.* I.9, Bandy I.3), singles out the Phoenicians for the invention of letters:

> "Evander was the first to bring from Greece to Italia the so-called letters of Cadmus, not as many as there are now, for antiquity has not handed them down thus, but only 16, *xi, zeta,* and *psi* having additionally been devised later as double consonants, *theta, phi,* and *chi* as aspirated consonants, *eta* and *omega* as ling vowels. The vowels of old surely were five, the letter *epsilon* providing the function of *eta*, and the letter *omikron* that of *omega*, a fact which still even now exists among the Romans, for, in  fact, they alter their phonetic value

---

[35] "Πρὸς Πεσινοῦντι τῇ πόλει τῆς Γαλατίας (οὕτω δὲ τὸ χωρίον ὀνομασθῆναι συμβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ πεσεῖν ἀπείρους ἐκεῖ
Γαλατῶν περὶ 'Ροδανὸν ἐπιπεσόντων τῇ χώρᾳ, Βρέννου ἡγησαμένου, καὶ τὴν ὁμώνυμον αὐτοῖς χώραν ἐκδικεῖν βιαζομένων, ὡς Φενεστέλλας καὶ Σισέννας οἱ 'Ρωμαῖοί φασιν, ὧν τὰς χρήσεις ὁ Βάρρων ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀνθρωπίνων Πραγμάτων ἀνήγαγεν· ἐγὼ δὲ τὰς βίβλους οὔπω τεθέαμαι) ἐκεῖ τοίνυν τέμενος ἦν τῇ ἀχράντῳ στρατιᾷ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀγγέλων τῷ ἀρρήτῳ θεῷ καθωσιωμένων·" (Schamp 2006c: 137), trans. Bandy (1983: 253). Schamp (2006a: cxxviii, 2006c: cxcv-cxcix). On the use of Sisenna and Fenestella in John of Lydia, see Schamp (2006a: clv-clvi, clxii-clxiii).
[36] The pre-Greek, Tyrrhenian nature of the Etruscan alphabet is emphasized by Lydus only (Wood 1980: 328). "καὶ γὰρ δὴ τοῖς Θούσκ[ων γράμμα]σι ταῦτα δηλοῦται, οὔπω τηνικαῦτα τοῖς τόποις ἐκείνοις Εὐάνδρου τοῦ Ἀρκάδος ἐπιφανέντος. ἦν δὲ ἀλλοῖός τις ὁ τῶν γραμμάτων τύπος, καὶ οὐδὲ ὅλως καθημαξευμένος ἡμῖν·" (Wachsmuth 1897: 7), trans. Bandy (2013b: 55).

with respect to temporal quantity alone. Later, however, an Italian grammarian Marcus Flavius followed the Greeks and wrote the remaining letters for the Romans, for time is wont to alter things. The Phoenicians, who were the first to be usurers and weighers of obols, invented letters of the alphabet, weights, and simply the art of making profit, hence also the poets call them shopkeepers. But let us return whence we digressed."[37]

Evander's introduction of Aeolic Greek is reiterated in *Magistr.* I.5, where John Lydus even suggests that Romulus knew, in addition to Latin, Aeolic Greek:

"For Romulus, or his contemporaries, is not shown at that point of time to have been ignorant of the Greek language, I mean the Aeolic, as both Cato in his work *On Roman Antiquities* and the most erudite Varro in his *Introduction to Pompey* state, because Evander and the other Arcadians, when they had gone to Italy in olden times, had disseminated the Aeolic speech among the barbarians."[38]

In this case, Varro is again mentioned as a source, as well as Cato.[39] Actually the character of Evander is not only associated with the introduction of the Greek alphabet and language in Italy. In *Mens.* I.11 (Bandy I.4), John Lydus states that Evander is the son of the prophetess Carmenta. Further on in the work, (*Mens.* Inc. sedis 9, Bandy I.5), John says: "The Romans call oracular verses *carmina* and also prophecy *carmentia*.".[40] Possibly Evander or his mother Carmenta also introduced the art of divination into Italy.

In addition to the alphabet and possibly the art of divination, the Roman division of society into three classes was also drawn by the Romans from another culture, this time from Athens. In Athens this division was enacted by Solon, who, in turn, derived this division from the Egyptians (*Magistr.* I.47):

---

[37] "Ὁ Εὔανδρος πρῶτος γράμματα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος, τὰ λεγόμενα Κάδμου, εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἐκόμισεν, οὐ τοσαῦτα μέν, ὅσα νῦν ἐστιν—οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτως ἡ παλαιότης παραδέδωκε—μόνα δὲ ἓξ πρὸς τοῖς δέκα, τοῦ ζ καὶ τοῦ ζ καὶ τοῦ φ ἀντὶ διπλῶν, τοῦ θ καὶ τοῦ φ καὶ τοῦ χ ἀντὶ δασέων, τοῦ η καὶ τοῦ ω ἀντὶ μακρῶν ὕστερον προσεξευρημένων. πέντε γὰρ ἦν τὰ πάλαι φωνήεντα, τοῦ μὲν ε στοιχείου τὴν τοῦ η παρεχομένου χρείαν, τοῦ δὲ ο τὴν τοῦ ω, ὅπερ ἔτι καὶ νῦν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἐστὶ καὶ μόνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ τὴν δύναμιν ἀμείβει. ὕστερον δὲ Μάρκος Φλάβιος, γραμματιστὴς Ἰταλός, τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἀκολουθήσας, τὰ λοιπὰ στοιχεῖα τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἐπέγραφεν. φιλεῖ γὰρ ὁ χρόνος ἐναμείβειν τὰ πράγματα. Φοίνικες πρῶτοι τοκογλύφοι καὶ ὀβολοστάται τυγχάνοντες, γράμματα καὶ σταθμοὺς καὶ ἁπλῶς τὸ κερδαίνειν ἐπενόησαν, ὅθεν καὶ καπήλους αὐτοὺς οἱ ποιηταὶ καλοῦσιν. ἀλλ' ἐπανίωμεν ὅθεν ἐξεκλίνομεν." (Wünsch 1898: 2), trans. Bandy (2013a: 49-51).

[38] "οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀγνοήσας ὁ Ῥωμύλος, ἢ οἱ κατ' αὐτόν, δείκνυται κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνήν, τὴν Αἰολίδα λέγω, ὥς φασιν ὅ τε Κάτων ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ῥωμαϊκῆς Ἀρχαιότητος Βάρρων τε ὁ πολυμαθέστατος ἐν Προοιμίοις τῶν πρὸς Πομπήϊον αὐτῷ γεγραμμένων, Εὐάνδρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἀρκάδων εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἐλθόντων ποτὲ καὶ τὴν Αἰολίδα τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐνσπειράντων φωνήν." (Schamp 2006b: 12), trans. Bandy (1983: 15).

[39] Rochette (1998: 472), Shamp (2006a: cxxvii). On the use of Cato in John of Lydia, see Schamp (2006a: cliv-clv).

[40] "ὅτι Κάρμινα παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις λέγεται τὰ ἔπη καὶ Καρμεντία ἡ μαντεία" (Wünsch 1898: 180), trans. Bandy (2013a: 53).

"Diodorus, in fact, in Book II of his *Libraries* says that Solon enacted for the Athenians a law which he had learned in Egypt to the effect that their state be drawn up into three classes      (…). For, since the Romans had emulated the Athenians in all things, they also themselves classified their people in this way.".[41]

5.1.2. Cultural Genealogies and the Antiquarian Dilemma

Deconstructing the Roman heritage as a patchwork of different cultural influences puts the importance of the Roman legacy into perspective,[42] and can be used in turn as a means to come to terms with the perceived decline of the Roman legacy in one's own times, as John Lydus attested to. Indeed, when we confront different passages of John's cultural genealogy, it is difficult to escape a sense of relativising irony. For instance, when we turn again to the passage on Camillus' victory over the Gauls (*Mens.* IV.27, Bandy IV.19), we read how the battle initially went awry for the following reason:

"(…) when a fierce battle had ensued, because their swords along with also their arms had been broken, for the Romans were not yet using iron but bronze breastplates in antiquity (…)".[43]

One might be astounded at this aside, as John Lydus explicitly stated that Numa Pompilius introduced the Gallic "force of arms". In *Mens.* IV.30 (Bandy II.12) John Lydus also associates the Gauls with iron; the attires of the blue faction at the hippodrome, which was added because of the Gauls, are called σιδηροβάφους or of ferruginous colour - a word which is only found in John of Lydia. Yet one passage gives us a clue to why the Romans did not yet use the iron weapons of the Gauls in spite of their king having borrowed military knowledge from this culture. In *Mens.* I. 35 (Bandy I.14), John Lydus expounds on a religious practice which was installed by Numa, under the influence of Pythagoreanism:

"At the time of Numa, even before him, the priests of old used to have their hair clipped with bronze but not iron scissors, for according to the Pythagoreans iron is ascribed to matter, for it itself also is black and for this reason it is almost formless, both much laboriously wrought and much useful but not impassive."[44]

---

[41] "Διόδωρος γ' οὖν ἐν δευτέρᾳ Βιβλιοθηκῶν φησι Σόλωνα ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μαθόντα νόμον Ἀθηναίοις γράψαι τοιοῦτον, ὥστε εἰς τρεῖς μοίρας τὴν πολιτείαν διατάττεσθαι · (…) Ἀθηναίους γὰρ ἐν ἅπασιν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ζηλώσαντες οὕτως καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸν δῆμον διέθηκαν." (Schamp 2006b: 64), trans. Bandy (1983: 77).

[42] Sviatoslav (2010: 38).

[43] "καὶ μάχης κρατερᾶς γενομένης κλασθέντων αὐτοῖς τῶν ξιφῶν σὺν καὶ τοῖς ὅπλοις—οὔπω γὰρ σιδηροῖς ἐχρῶντο Ῥωμαῖοι θώραξι, χαλκοῖς δὲ κατὰ τὴν παλαιότητα—" (Wünsch 1898: 86), trans. Bandy (2013a: 179).

[44] "Ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦ Νουμᾶ καὶ πρὸ τούτου οἱ πάλαι ἱερεῖς χαλκαῖς φαλίσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ σιδηραῖς ἀπεκείροντο · ὁ γὰρ σίδηρος κατὰ τοὺς Πυθαγορείους τῇ ὕλῃ ἀνάκειται · μέλας γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐγγὺς ἀνείδεος, πολύκμητός τε καὶ πολύχρηστος ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπαθής ἐστιν." (Wünsch 1898: 16), trans. Bandy (2013a: 65, 67).

Apparently, John Lydus wished to show that the religious scruples of Numa impeded him from taking over the appropriate features of the Gallic military, a miscalculation which almost proved fatal for the survival of Rome in a pivotal moment of its history. One cannot escape the impression that John of Lydia's relativising deconstruction of Rome's cultural credentials is not entirely bereft of mild satire.

Yet this deconstructivist approach to Rome's cultural history again imposes a dilemma on the antiquarian, as the whole thrust of his rhetoric is based on the hallowed continuity between cultural practices in his own day and the Roman legacy. In this case, John Lydus tries to overcome this dilemma by pointing out how this deconstructivist view on Rome's origins was a product of the Roman erudite tradition itself. Time and again, John Lydus mentions the Roman sources who provided him with the material for the construction of his cultural genealogy.[45] The *Romanitas* of these authors serves to shield John Lydus from criticism of overtly deconstructing the Roman legacy.[46] John Lydus consistently mentions Marcus Terentius Varro.[47] The intellectual of the late republic, is, as the symbol of ancient Roman erudition, the best authority behind which Lydus chooses to hide in his deconstructivist approach to Roman culture. Yet even the great Varro does not escape the mild satire of John of Lydia. In *Magistr.* I.12, John Lydus subjects Varro, the great lover of etymologies himself, to etymology, when he states:

"(…) the cognomen Varro means "the brave one" in the language of the Celts; but "the Jew," according to the Phoenicians, as Herennius says".[48]

Apparently, this etymology carries some importance for John of Lydia, as it is reiterated later on in the treatise (*Magistr.* I.23).[49] The etymology of the name Varro concludes the list of a whole series of etymologies in this paragraph. There are some interesting differences between this list of etymologies and the etymology of Varro; all other names mentioned only have one etymology, and in most of the cases, the etymology is a Latin one. Varro is the only one with two etymologies, both of which stem from a language other than Latin. We could interpret these etymologies of Varro as a mild form of satire. The great proponent of etymologies is being

---

[45] On the Roman sources of John's *De Ostentis*, see Turfa (2012: 282-286). Schamp (2006a: clviii) on *Magistr.* I.5: "La mention de Varron et de Caton ajoutait de la crédibilité si c'étaient des Romains eux-mêmes, et de surcroît des historiens, au moins pour une bonne part de leur oeuvre, et non de linguistes patentés, qui étaient obligés de reconnaître que le latin d'une variété de grec.".

[46] Rochette (1998: 473) discusses the rationale behind John's explicit choice for Latin sources over Greek: "C'est dans ces traités en langue grecque que Jean aurait trouvé des arguments permettant d'étayer la thèse qu'il présente. Or, il préfère deux auteurs latins. En opérant un choix parmi les ouvrages qui lui sont accessibles en en favorisant, pour certains problèmes, les *auctoritates* latines, le Lydien se comporte certainement en parfait serviteur de la politique justinienne. (…) Que ce soit des auteurs latins qui disent que Romulus parlait encore le grec a évidemment plus de chance d'apparaître pour une donnée authentique et non pour un essai de récupération des origines - grecques - de Rome qu'auraient voulu faire des auteurs grecs.".

[47] On the Varronian layer in John of Lydia's cultural genealogy, see Briquel (1990: 511). On the use of Varro in John of Lydia, see Carney (1971b: 64), Flintoff (1976), Schamp (2006a: clvii-clxii).

[48] "τὸ δὲ Βάρρωνος ἐπώνυμον τὸν ἀνδρεῖον κατὰ τὴν Κελτῶν φωνήν, κατὰ δὲ Φοίνικας τὸν Ἰουδαῖον σημαίνει, ὡς Ἑρέννιός φησιν" (Bandy 1983: 24), trans. Bandy (1983: 25).

[49] Schamp (2006a: clx).

*etymologised* himself, and the name of the authoritative proponent of the derivative view on Roman culture is being *derived* from foreign languages. Furthermore, the hypothesis of a Celtic origin of Roman culture is being proposed by an author with a name of Celtic origin, and the name of Varro is the only name which receives different etymologies. In case one is not tempted to see these etymologies as satire, we can ask John's opinion, which he gives at the closing of this paragraph:

> "And one could be collecting at leisure many such examples if perchance one should happen to be living carefree, not having anything to do and childishly playing with such amusements as those over which I, though involved in countless cares, am vigilant."[50]

Apparently, the different conflicting agendas behind the antiquarian construction of Rome's cultural pedigree, such as coming to terms with the perceived decline of Rome, promoting one's own region as a meaningful framework for historiographical research, and hallowing the present in the olden legacy of Rome, create an atmosphere of mild and intellectual detachment, relativism and even satire.

5.1.3. A New Centre of the Antiquarian Universe: Lydia

By putting the importance of Rome's cultural heritage into perspective through an elaborate and intricate cultural genealogy, John Lydus creates room for a new centre of his antiquarian universe: his home region of Lydia.[51] The Lydians, as we have seen, were responsible for the religious institutions of the Etruscans, which proved the foundation of the Roman state that John venerates. This same focus on the religious preeminence of the Lydians can also be perceived in other passages of his works. In *Mens.* I.3 (Bandy IV.55), John Lydus states that the Lydians discovered the fig-tree and the cultivation of wine. Although these are fundamental agricultural products, the thrust of this mention becomes apparent in the next section (*Mens.* I.4, Bandy IV.55), where, via the association of wine with a specific type of wine, the *mustum* or μοῦστον, the inhabitants of Sardis in Lydia are said to be the first to speak of *mysterium*. The Lydians are apparently not only responsible for the Etruscan religion, but also for mystery cults in which wine was involved.

The cultic precedence of the Lydians focuses, in John's imagination, on the city of Sardis. In *Mens.* IV.71 (Bandy IV.75), John Lydus gives different opinions on the origin, etymology and allegorical value of Zeus. After some of these opinions, we have the following:

---

[50] "καὶ πολλὰ ἄν τις τοιαῦτα συνάγοι κατὰ σχολὴν εἰ τυχὸν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔχοντα ὅ τι πράττοι ἀφρόντιδα συμβαίνοι διαβιοῦν καὶ τοιούτοις ὁποίοις ἐγὼ καίπερ μυρίαις συμπεπλεγμένος φροντίσιν ἐναγρυπνῶ μωραίνοντα ἀθύρμασιν." (Bandy 1983: 38), trans. Bandy (1983: 39).
[51] Lydia and the Lydians are mentioned in *Mens.* I.3 (Bandy IV.55), *Mens.* I.4 (Bandy IV.55), *Mens.* III.20 (Bandy III.32), *Mens.* III.21 (Bandy III.33), *Mens.* IV.2 (Bandy IV.2), *Mens.* IV.58 (Bandy IV.2), *Mens.* IV.71 (Bandy IV.75), *Ost.* 3 (Bandy 3), *Ost.* 53 (Bandy 105), *Magistr.* Intr. (Wünsch I.37), *Magistr.* III.26, *Magistr.* III.58 and *Magistr.* III.64. Also, Lydus' inclusion of sources from Asia Minor in his works can be ascribed to a form of local patriotism (Carney 1971b: 50).

"(…) but Eumelus of Corinth[52] maintains that Zeus has been born in our Lydia and he speaks the truth rather, so far as history is concerned, for still even now at the western part of the city of the Sardians on the mountain ridge of Mount Tmolus is a place long ago called *Gonae Dios* the rain-bringer but today *Deusion*, its name having been altered in the course of time.".[53]

John explicitly speaks out in favour of the opinion of Eumelus of Corinth, something he does not often do.[54] Indeed, it matters for John Lydus to be able to place the territory of origin of the supreme god of the pagan pantheon in his home region. Another passage (*Mens.* III.20, Bandy III.32)[55] sheds further light on the centrality of Sardis and Lydia in the antiquarian imagination of John. It is worth quoting in full:

"It is evident from the royal city of the Lydians that they revered the year as a god. For Xanthus[56] calls it *Sardis* and *Xyaris*. If one will compute numerically the name *Sardis*, one will find that one sums up 365 monads so that even from this fact it is evident that the city was named *Sardis* in honour of the sun, which by that many days sums up the year. It is acknowledged still even now by the masses that the new year is called new *sardis*. There are, however,

---

[52] Eumelus of Corinth, *BNJ* 451. Toye, David L., "Eumelos of Corinth (451)", in: *Brill's New Jacoby, Second Edition*, Editor in Chief: Ian Worthington (University of Missouri). Consulted online on 05 April 2017 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj2_a451>

[53] "Εὔμηλος δὲ ὁ Κορίνθιος τὸν Δία ἐν τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς Λυδίᾳ τεχθῆναι βούλεται, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀληθεύει ὅσον ἐν ἱστορίᾳ· ἔτι γὰρ καὶ νῦν πρὸς τῷ δυτικῷ τῆς Σαρδιανῶν πόλεως μέρει ἐπ'ἀκρωρείας τοῦ Τμώλου τόπος ἐστίν, ὃς πάλαι μὲν Γοναὶ Διὸς ὑετίου, νῦν δὲ παρατραπείσης τῷ χρόνῳ τῆς λέξεως Δεύσιον προσαγορεύεται." (Wünsch 1898: 123), trans. Bandy (2013a: 265).

[54] The majority of assertions of truth (ἀληθ-) in John's works are neutral assessments of the truth of a statement: *Magistr.* I.15, *Magistr.* I.30, *Magistr.* I.47, *Magistr.* II.7, *Magistr.* III.45, *Magistr.* III.46, *Mens.* II.7 (Bandy II.6), *Mens.* III.22 (Bandy III.36), *Mens.* IV.42 (Bandy IV.35), *Mens.* IV.76 (Bandy IV.78) two times, *Mens.* IV.158 (Bandy IV.143) three times, *Ost.* 13 (Bandy 18). Another well represented category of assertions of truth are the assertions of the veracity of his research: *Magistr.* I.2, *Magistr.* I.6, *Magistr.* I.43, *Magistr.* I.50, *Magistr.* I.67, *Mens.* IV.26 (Bandy IV.21), *Mens.* IV.121 (Bandy IV.108). Only in four cases John Lydus singles out which version presented is in his opinion the most truthful: *Mens.* IV.40 (Bandy IV.23), *Mens.* IV.71 (Bandy IV.75), *Mens.* IV.102 (Bandy IV.93), *Mens.* IV.107 (Bandy IV.98). The exact wording of John's assertion in *Mens.* IV.71 (Bandy IV.75), "καὶ μᾶλλον ἀληθεύει ὅσον ἐν ἱστορίᾳ" (Wünsch 1898: 123), is also significant; the verb ἀληθεύω is used in some instances where John Lydus makes strong personal statements on his research, such as in *Magistr.* III.25, "καὶ μάρτυρα τὴν Δίκην ἀληθεύων οὐκ ἐρυθριῶ ἐπικαλούμενος" (Bandy 1983: 170), and *Magistr.* III.75 "καὶ μάρτυρα τὴν Ἀλήθειαν αἰδοῦμαι καλεῖν ἀληθεύων" (Bandy 1983: 252). There are three other instances of strong assertions in *Magistr.* III.66, *Ost.* 1 and *Mens.* IV.89 (Bandy IV.85). The two final appearances of words with the stem ἀληθ- are not directly relevant to the analysis as they are quotes from other authors: *Mens.* IV.38 (Bandy IV.30), Plotinus, *Enn.* II.3.9, *Ost.* 21 (Bandy 36) Epicurus (Usener *Epicurea* 386, cf. Diog. Laert. X.100,103).

[55] Maas (1992: 30).

[56] Xanthus the Lydian, FGrH 765 F 23. Jacoby, Felix, "Xanthos der Lyder (765)", in: *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Part I-III*, General Editor: Felix Jacoby. Consulted online on 05 April 2017 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_boj_a765>

some who say that in the ancient language of the Lydians the year was
called *sardis*.".[57]

In this passage, the year, a measure of time central to the historian, is -
rather incorrectly[58] - likened to the numeric value of the place of Sardis, as if Lydia
and Sardis were places where not only was the god Zeus born, but also where time,
as the ontological category indispensable to the historian, originated. Also at the be-
ginning of Book Four of *De Mensibus* (*Mens*. IV.2, Bandy IV.2) the location of Lydia is
scene to an intertwining of time and the origins of the universe.

This passage stands at the beginning of book IV of *De Mensibus*, which gives
an overview of the calendar of the year. This fourth book of *De Mensibus* constitutes
the vast majority of the whole of the treatise, and could therefore be considered as a
separate treatise in its own right. The beginning paragraphs of this book therefore
have a value equivalent to the introductions of each of John of Lydia's works. In-
deed, as is the case for these other introductions, in these opening paragraphs of the
Fourth Book, John's cultural genealogy, with a central place for Lydia, is also present,
although implicitly.

*Mens*. IV.1 (Bandy IV.1) starts with the mention that Numa prescribed the
month of January as the beginning of the sacerdotal year. The passage continues
with a set of etymologies, allegories and analyses of the iconography of the god
Janus, the god after whom the month of January was named. Of special interest is
the following mention:

"And some mythologize him as biformed, sometimes carrying keys in his
right hand, as if a doorkeeper, and sometimes three hundred pebbles in his
right hand and sixty-five in his other, as if counting the year (…)".[59]

As in the passage on the city of Sardis, we find here the same emphasis on
the number 365 as a symbol for the year. In *Mens*. IV.2 (Bandy IV.2), we find similar
descriptions of allegories and religious customs surrounding Janus and the month of
January. The section is divided into two parts by the mention καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Ῥωμαίων
ἱεροφάνται·, dividing the opinions of Roman priests from other opinions. In the first
part of this section, echoes of John's cultural genealogy of Rome as we have
sketched above are apparent. It starts with a mention of a religious practice insti-
tuted by Numa Pompilius, continues with an Etruscan interpretation of Janus, again

---

[57] "Ὅτι δὲ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ὡς θεὸν ἐτίμησαν, δῆλον ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς Λυδῶν βασιλίδος πόλεως.
Σάρδιν γὰρ αὐτὴν καὶ Ξυάριν ὁ Ξάνθος καλεῖ, τὸ δὲ Σάρδιν ὄνομα εἴ τις κατὰ ἀριθμὸν
ἀπολογίσεται, πέντε καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίας εὑρήσει συνάγων μονάδας· ὡς κἀντεῦθεν
εἶναι δῆλον, πρὸς τιμὴν ἡλίου τοῦ τοσαύταις ἡμέραις τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν συνάγοντος Σάρδιν
ὠνομασθῆναι τὴν πόλιν. νέον δὲ σάρδιν τὸ νέον ἔτος ἔτι καὶ νῦν λέγεσθαι τῷ πλήθει
συνομολογεῖται· εἰσὶ δὲ οἵ φασι, τῇ Λυδῶν ἀρχαίᾳ φωνῇ τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν
καλεῖσθαι σάρδιν." (Wünsch 1898: 59), trans. Bandy (2013a: 141, 143).
[58] The numeral value of ΣΑΡΔΙΣ amounts to Σ=200 + Α=1 + Ρ=100 + Δ=4 + Ι=10 +
Σ=200 = 515. Only with the abbreviated form ΣΑΡΔΙ do we have 315, which still only re-
motely recalls the number 365 which John Lydus mentions.
[59] "καὶ οἱ μὲν δίμορφον αὐτὸν μυθολογοῦσι, νῦν μὲν κλεῖς τῇ δεξιᾷ φέροντα ὡσανεὶ θυρεόν,
νῦν δὲ τῇ μὲν δεξιᾷ τριακοσίας τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ ἑξήκοντα πέντε ψήφους ἀριθμοῦντα ὥσπερ τὸν
ἐνιαυτόν." (Wünsch 1898: 64), trans. Bandy (2013a: 149).

on the basis of Varro, and has some other opinions of Roman authorities - among whom Fonteius reiterates the association between the god Janus and time or Chronus.[60] After Numa Pompilius and Varro's Etruscans, yet again Lydia appears on the scene:

> "And in our Philadelphia[61] still even now a trace of antiquity is preserved, for on the day of the *Kalendae* Ianus himself, fashioned manifestly with a bi-formed face, is carried in procession and they call him *Saturnus*, that is, Cronus".[62]

We might doubt John's attribution of the identification of Janus with Chronus to the Lydians, as he already stated in the same paragraph that Fonteius was responsible for this allegory. Indeed, perhaps John Lydus has again imposed his premeditated scheme of cultural genealogy on the erudite subject matter he was working with. Yet again, the emphatic wordings of John Lydus are revealing; the sentence "a trace of antiquity is preserved", ἴχνος τῆς ἀρχαιότητος σώζεται ·, with the word ἴχνος, "trace" is not very common throughout his work, and might be a loan from neoplatonic jargon. The metaphorical use of the word as "a trace of light", indeed appears in this quotation and is used elsewhere in John's work.[63] In this passage, we see how a trace of the religious knowledge of antiquity is preserved in the hometown of John of Lydia. The god Janus is carried in a procession, and likened to Saturnus, the supreme god of the pagan pantheon and to Chronus. This last likening of Janus to Chronus or *Time* by the Lydians, at the beginning of a survey of the year, is particularly significant. The accumulation of allusions to the Lydians' supreme insight into time and the religious morphology of the universe turns Lydia into the centre of the antiquarian universe that John Lydus creates in his works.

A few lines later, the first part of *Mens.* IV.2 (Bandy IV.2) concludes with the natural end point of the cultural genealogy which started in Lydia:

---

[60] "Φοντήϊος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ ἀγαλμάτων ἔφορον αὐτὸν οἴεται τοῦ παντὸς χρόνου τυγχάνειν, καὶ ταύτῃ δωδεκάβωμον εἶναι τὸν αὐτοῦ ναὸν κατὰ τὸν τῶν μηνῶν ἀριθμόν." (Wünsch 1898: 65). Turfa (2012: 288). Weinstock (1950: 45) believed that all descriptions of statues, such as the one mentioned in *Mens.* IV.1 and quoted above, and as occurring throughout the *De Mensibus* derived from the work Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων of Fonteius.

[61] On Philadelphia see Maas (1992: 30), with a list of passages: *Magistr.* III.26, III.58, *Mens.* IV. 58, *Ost.* 53.

[62] "καὶ ἐν τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς Φιλαδελφείᾳ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἴχνος τῆς ἀρχαιότητος σώζεται · ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν Καλενδῶν πρόεισι ἐσχηματισμένος αὐτὸς δῆθεν ὁ Ἰανὸς ἐν διμόρφῳ προσώπῳ, καὶ Σατοῦρνον αὐτὸν καλοῦσιν οἷον Κρόνον." (Wünsch 1898: 65), trans. Bandy (2013a: 151). Maas (1992: 30).

[63] John uses the word ἴχνος for "traces of a tradition or office" in *Magistr.* I.20, II.13, II.16, II. 22, III.39, *Mens.* IV.2 (Bandy IV.2) and IV.31 (Bandy IV.22). The same phrase as in *Mens.* IV.2 (Bandy IV.2) "ἴχνος τῆς ἀρχαιότητος" (Wünsch 1898: 65) is only reiterated in *Magistr.* II.22, "τοῖς ἴχνεσι τῆς ἀρχαιότητος" (Bandy 1983:118). The two remaining uses of the word ἴχνος can be found in *Mens.* IV.38 (Bandy IV.30): "ἡ σώματος φύσις ψυχῆς τι ἴχνος λαβοῦσα" and "ὁ δὲ ἡ τοῦ παντὸς ψυχὴ ἡ μὴ ἐν σώματι, ἐλλάμπουσα δὲ ἴχνη τῇ ἐν σώματι" (Wünsch 1898: 97). In the last case, the metaphor of the light is implicitly taken over by John Lydus in *Magistr.* I. 20 "ἴχνος ἀμαυρὸν" (Bandy 1983: 34) and *Magistr.* III.39 "ὡς ἴχνος ἀμυδρὸν" (Bandy 1983: 192).

"The high priest Praetextatus, who had participated with both the conductor of the ceremony Sopater[64] and the emperor Constantinus at the founding of this blessed city, maintains that Ianus is a power set in each of the two Bears and that he sends off the more divine-like souls to the lunar company". [65]

Although at first sight the mention of Praetextatus' presence at the foundation ritual of Constantinople is not necessary for John's argument, as it consists of remarks on the god Janus, this mention completes the implicit cultural genealogy which John espouses; Lydia gave through the Etruscans and the Romans the foundations for the religious and cultural practices of contemporary Constantinople.[66]

This paragraph, at the beginning of the overview of the year, provides a seemingly objective antiquarian enumeration of trivia. Yet throughout these antiquarian notes, the ἴχνη or traces of the fundamental plan behind John's antiquarian universe are revealed. John sketches the vicissitudes of a cultural genealogy in which Rome, as a transient station, is put into perspective, and the beginning and end of this genealogy - Lydia and Constantinople - are emphasised.[67] The same cultural genealogy appears from time to time with accumulated details throughout the discourse of John of Lydia, details which he marks with emphatic authorial statements. Numa Pompilius as the respectable second founder of Rome is central to this genealogy as he instituted transferable religious practices; the transferability of culture is vital to this genealogy which is designed to emphasise the region of origin of the author and to put into perspective the role of Rome as a material locus for the Roman legacy.

We might wonder what intended audience was receptive to Lydus' *interpretatio Lydia* of Rome's cultural history. In this case, we might think of the local network of Lydians and citizens of Philadelphia in the administration of Constantinople, on which John Lydus depended for the furthering of his career, and who he warmly mentions in his own works, such as his patron Zoticus and his cousin Ammianus.[68]

---

[64] Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, PRLE I.722-724. Sopater, PRLE I.846.
[65] "ὁ δὲ Πραιτέξτατος ὁ ἱεροφάντης, ὁ Σωπάτρῳ τε τῷ τελεστῇ καὶ Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ αὐτοκράτωρι συλλαβὼν ἐπὶ τῷ πολισμῷ τῆς εὐδαίμονος ταύτης πόλεως, δύναμιν αὐτὸν εἶναί τινα βούλεται ἐφ' ἑκατέρας Ἄρκτου τεταγμένην καὶ τὰς θειοτέρας ψυχὰς ἐπὶ τὸν σεληνιακὸν χορὸν ἀποπέμπειν. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν οἱ Ῥωμαίων ἱεροφάνται·" Wünsch (1898: 65-66), trans. Bandy (2013a: 153).
[66] Turfa (2012: 10); she does not take into account, however, the Lydian part of John of Lydia's cultural genealogy.
[67] Carney (1971b: 29).
[68] See chapter 3.1.1. (pp. 36-43 of this dissertation). Zoticus is mentioned in *Magistr*. III.26-28, Ammianus in *Magistr*. III.26 and III.28. John's assumed familiarity of his readership with the region of Lydia indeed points to an intended audience hailing from his home region (Carney 1971b: 30).

## 5.2. John Malalas

Where John Lydus rather subtly provided the reader with ἴχνη or traces to establish his plan of a cultural genealogy behind his antiquarian works, John Malalas has a far more outspoken cultural genealogy, which derives many facets of the Roman culture from the Syrians through the Greeks and the Persians. This genealogy has been, to different extents, the object of scholarly attention in the past decades.[69] This cultural transmission is underscored by mentions of the literal transfer of and recycling of artefacts. As in the case of John of Lydia, the cultural genealogy of John Malalas has the double aim of putting on the one hand the relatively young history of the Roman Empire into perspective, while on the other hand emphasising the region of origin of Malalas, Syria, and, more specifically, the city of Antioch, as the new centre of the *memoryscape* of the antiquarian.[70] Unlike Lydus, whose cultural deconstruction of Rome is at odds with his dependence on Rome as the source of legitimacy and prestige, John Malalas has far less consideration for Rome as the ideological *caput mundi* of the late antique world.

### 5.2.1. A Cultural Genealogy

Throughout the first half of his chronicle, John Malalas presents the reader with short passages on the development and transfer of different cultural practices. These give the impression of a general transfer of culture from the East to the West of the Mediterranean, with a distinct focus on the role of Syria and the Syrians.

One of the first cultural achievements which we encounter is the science of astronomy and astrology. In *Chron*. I.1 Adam gives names to the animals, whereas his son Seth gave names to the stars, the five planets, sun and moon, hereby establishing a rudimentary base of astronomical inquiry.[71] The names of the five planets, sun and moon, in total seven, are connected to the seven vowels, and Seth also introduced the Hebrew alphabet, which I will discuss further on.

---

[69] Bernardi (2004: 54) analyses how Malalas' distortions of myth originate in his localist agenda, although she only interprets parts of these distortions as resulting from his localist tendencies. To my opinion, far more cases of Malalas' diversions from mainstream myth can be explained from his consistent regionalist agenda. "Dans ce contexte, les distortions introduces par Malalas dans le traitement des mythes prennent un relief particulier. Certaines peuvent s'expliquer par la focalisation antiochéenne : ainsi Io ou Oreste parviennent au mont Silpios et sont, " encore aujourd'hui ", honorés à Antioche (II, 6, p. 21-22 et V, 37, p. 111). D'autres singularités sont plus difficilement explicables, comme la généalogie des dieux olympiens, descendants de Sem (I 8, p. 9) (…)." (Bernardi 2004: 54). Indeed, the prominence of the house of Shem, which Bernardi cannot explain, will be analysed in the context of Malalas' localism further on. Caire (2006: 50): "La méthode de Malalas consiste, semble-t-il, à juxtaposer plutôt qu'à confronter les différentes sources dont il dispose, tout en opérant une sélection que guident ses centres d'intérêt personnels, au détriment de la continuité autant que de la cohérence du récit historique.".

[70] Malalas' focus on the East is also revealed *ex negativo* by his lack of real knowledge or interest in the topography of the west, for instance of Thrace and Illyricum (Métivier 2006: 164). We should, off course, be aware that the reticence on the West of the text of John Malalas *as we have it today* can be the result of later Byzantine compilations of the text (Greatrex 2016).

[71] Jeffreys (1990a: 61, 63), Bernardi (2004: 61).

The next stage in the development of astronomy is recorded in *Chron.* I.5.[72] There we read that Seth's offspring recorded his teachings on two stelae, one of stone in case the earth would be struck by a deluge, one of brick in case the earth would face a firestorm. The stone stele was discovered after the Deluge by Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, the grandson of Shem, and the great-grandson of Noah, who developed the science of astronomy.[73] In this case John Malalas underscores his argument with the mention of material evidence; the motif of the transfer or discovery of material artefacts to underscore a cultural transfer recurs indeed several times in Malalas. In *Chron.* I.6, John Malalas recounts the biblical division of the world into three areas under the sons of Noah:

> "Then the tribes of the sons of Noah, I mean of Shem, Ham and Japeth, the three brothers, were divided. The tribe of Shem took as the length of its territory the land from Persia and Bactria as far as India and, as for the breadth, as far as Rhinokourouroi, that is, from the East as far as the region of the South, including Syria and Media and the river called the Euphrates, The tribe of Ham, (…).".[74]

Although this motif is a commonplace in biblical chronicles, and John Malalas rather carelessly represents this motive,[75] he makes sure to mention the region of Syria as part of the realm of Shem's tribe.[76] This mention frames the formal development of astronomy firmly within the sphere of his home region of Syria.

In *Chron.* I.7, we read how another scion of Arphaxad and the tribe of Shem, Gandoubarios, was the first to develop astronomy for the Indians.[77] The implications of these mentions are clear; the invention and development of astronomy and astrology was achieved in the eastern part of the Mediterranean, in an area as-

---

[72] On this passage see Caire (2004: 23), Agusta-Boularot (2006: 99-100).

[73] Adler (2017: 32). "ὅστις μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν συνεγράφατο τὴν ἀστρονομίαν, εὑρηκὼς τὴν τοῦ Σὴθ τοῦ υἱοῦ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ τέκνων ὀνομασίαν τῶν ἄστρων ἐν πλακὶ λιθίνῃ γεγλυμμένη" (Thurn 2000: 7). Here we find the first mention of astronomy, ἀστρονομία, as a scientific discipline.

[74] "Λοιπὸν διεμερίσθησαν αἱ φυλαὶ τῶν υἱῶν Νῶε, λέγω δὴ τοῦ Σὴμ τοῦ Χὰμ τοῦ Ἰάφεθ τῶν τριῶν ἀδελφῶν. καὶ ἔλαβεν ἡ φυλὴ τοῦ Σὴμ ἀπὸ Περσίδος καὶ Βάκτρων ἕως τῆς Ἰνδικῆς τὸ μῆκος καὶ τὸ πλάτος ἕως Ῥινοκουρούρων, ὅ ἐστιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἕως μέρους τῆς μεσημβρίας, καὶ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ Μηδίαν καὶ ποταμὸν τὸν καλούμενον Εὐφράτην. ἡ δὲ τοῦ Χὰμ (…)" (Thurn 2000: 8), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 5). On the, predominantly biblical, sources of this motive see Caire (2004: 20).

[75] Caire (2004: 26), Berthelot (2004: 43).

[76] Caire (2004: 26): "Parmi les pays peuplés par les descendants de Sem, si on laisse de côté les régions frontalières sur lesquelles nous reviendrons, seules sont mentionnées par Malalas la Syrie et la Médie.". Berthelot (2004: 43): "La version que proposent les Jubilés est sans parallèle dans la littérature juive de l'époque hellénistique ; elle représente une innovation majeure, destinée à une grande postérité dans la littérature chrétienne (…) Malalas semble en être tributaire, à travers Hippolyte et d'autres sources, puisque sa description de la répartition des terres entre les fils de Noé (en I 6), pour confuse qu'elle soit, semble bien inclure la Syrie et la Palestine, jusqu'au nord du Sinaï (avec " Rhinocoroure "), dans le territoire de Sem."

[77] Adler (2017: 35). "Ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις δὲ τούτοις ἐκ τοῦ γένους Ἀρφαζὰδ ἀνήρ τις Ἰνδὸς σοφὸς ἀνεφάνη ἀστρονόμος ὀνόματι Γανδουβάριος, ὃς συνεγράφατο πρῶτος Ἰνδοῖς ἀστρονομίαν." (Thurn 2000: 9).

sociated with Syria. Only three books later, in *Chron.* IV.3, we read how these cultural achievements were introduced in Greek culture, as we will see later on.

Malalas' emphasis on astronomy and astrology makes him implicitly participate in the contemporary debate on the validity and origin of these sciences, which we sketched in chapter 3.2.2.1. (pp. 67-71 of this dissertation). Apparently, in spite of vehement criticisms of astronomy and astrology, these sciences remained prestigious assets which one wanted to originate in his own region. Malalas' derivation of astronomy and astrology from the East and, more specifically Syria, stands in stark contrast with Lydus' explicit denouncement of the validity of eastern traditions on astronomy and astrology at the beginning of his *De Ostentis* (*Ost.* 2, Bandy 2):

> "I believe that it is fitting for him wishing to write about such matters to tell both whence the comprehension of such matters began and from what source it got its origins, also how it advanced to surpass, if it is right to say, even the Egyptians themselves. For manifestly of the latter, next after the much-famed Zoroaster, Petosiris plaited the general materials with the special ones and makes every effort to hand down many teachings in his day, but hands these down not to all but only to his own contemporaries or rather just as many of them as were more suited for speculations. After him, Antigonus differentiated and articulated the tradition, but, having been inclined towards the density of the delineations of astronomy, he set down at the same time in his writing an untold mass (…)".[78]

Malalas' cultural genealogy also has its political implications; we read how the scions of the house of Shem, who originated from Syria and the East did not only excel in cultural achievements.[79] Cronus and his son Picus-Zeus, conquer Italy from the East and therefore are the Syrian predecessors of the later rulers of the Italian peninsula and the Roman Emperors.[80] The imperial resonance of this myth is emphasised by the parallelism between Picus-Zeus' division of his territories into a

---

[78] "Ἁρμόδιον δὲ εἶναι νομίζω τῷ περὶ τῶν τοιούτων γράφειν ἐθέλοντι, πόθεν τε ἡ τῶν τοιούτων κατάληψις ἤρξ[ατο, λέγ]ειν, καὶ ὅθεν ἔσχε τὰς ἀφορμάς, καὶ ὅπως ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον προ[ῆλθεν], ὡς καὶ αὐτούς, εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, Αἰγυπτίους ὑπερβαλεῖν. τούτων [γὰρ δή, μετὰ] Ζωροάστρην τὸν πολύν, Πετόσιρις τοῖς εἰδικοῖς τὰ [ἐν γένει διαπλέ]ξας πολλὰ μὲν κατ' αὐτὸν παραδοῦναι βιάζεται, οὐ πᾶ[σι δὲ παρα]δίδωσι ταῦτα, μόνοις δὲ τοῖς καθ' αὐτόν, μᾶλλον δὲ ὅσοι καὶ [αὐτῶν] πρὸς στοχασμοὺς ἐπιτηδειότεροι. Ἀντίγονος δὲ μετ' ἐκεῖνον δι[έκριν]ε μὲν καὶ διήρθρωσε τὴν παράδοσιν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ πυκνὸν [τῶν ἐν τῇ ἀστρ]ονομίᾳ γραμμῶν ἀποκλίνας ἀμύθητον ὄχλον [καὶ ἀσαφείας πάσης ἀ]νάμεστον τῇ γραφῇ συγκατέθετο." (Wachsmuth 1897: 6), trans. Bandy (2013b: 53, 55).

[79] Berthelot (2004: 38-39): "Enfin, les premières inventions, et en particulier la philosophie et l'astronomie/astrologie, sont toutes dues à des membres de la tribu de Sem. Le rattachement de Nemrod - qui fait partie lui aussi des hommes ayant, les premiers, inventé ou découvert des choses ou des arts utiles aux hommes, en l'occurrence la chasse - à la lignée de Sem et, par voie de conséquence, l'annexation à celle-ci de son père Koush pourrait donc s'expliquer par l'orientation du propos de Malalas dans le livre I."

[80] Jeffreys (1990a: 62), Caire (2004: 34-35, 2006: 50), Adler (2017: 38-41). Berthelot (2004: 38): "C'est son fils, Pikos-Zeus, qui règne sur l'Assyrie après son départ, puis sur l'Occident, et en particulier en Italie - ce qui pourrait faire des empereurs romains des lointains successeurs ou imitateurs d'un descendant de Sem.". See in particular Chron. I.7-10 (Jeffreys I.7-10) and I.13 (Jeffreys I.13).

western and eastern part, and a similar conceptual division of the Roman Empire by Theodosius I in AD 395.[81] John Malalas deviates from the mainstream traditions on the partition of the world between Noah's progeny in his attributing different rulers, such as Cush in *Chron*. I.7 and Cronus in *Chron*. I.8, to the eastern house of Shem instead of to the house of Cham.[82] Clearly John Malalas is ready to remould the biblical and other traditions he processes in his chronicle to suit his localist agenda.[83] In the *memoryscape* of Malalas, the Roman Emperors originated from Syria.

In *Chron*. II.8, the discovery of the purple colour and its implementation as a distinct sign of kingship is recounted. As I have mentioned in the previous chapter,[84] John Malalas very conspicuously stresses the Tyrian origin of the invention, before recounting straightaway the Roman use of the colour. This emphasis of a cultural transfer of the colour purple as an emblem of empire from the Tyrians to the Romans clearly underscores Malalas' localist agenda.

In *Chron*. II.11 we learn how Perseus renames Assyria to Persia and the Assyrians to Persians after he conquered the region. This etymology is, in my opinion, not a mere intellectual game for Malalas. The association between Persians and Syrians allows John Malalas to anchor the Syrians deeper in the transfer of cultural developments from the far east, and Persia to the west.[85] This association is developed in the following paragraph (*Chron*. II.12), where John Malalas states that the fire cult which Perseus imparted to the Persians derived from a miracle that took place in the city of Antioch.[86]

Besides astronomy and the colour purple, John Malalas also focuses on the development of the alphabet. In *Chron*. I.1 Seth is said to derive the seven vowels from the names of the five planets, sun and moon. He also invented the Hebrew alphabet.[87] Although John Malalas does not mention the origin of the Phoenician alphabet,[88] it does appear early in the stage of the cultural development of the world, as in *Chron*. II.9 Syrus, the son of Agenor, is said to have developed mathematics in the Phoenician script.[89] Some paragraphs later, in *Chron*. II.14 Cadmus, another son of Agenor, introduced the Phoenician alphabet in Boeotia, for which the Boeotian people awarded him with the kingship.[90] Later we learn how Hesiod from the tribe of Japeth invented the Hellenic alphabet and explained it to the Hellenes

---

[81] Jeffreys (1990a: 61).
[82] Caire (2004: 33-34).
[83] For an analysis of the particularities and deviations of John Malalas away from previous traditions in order to consciously innovate on the tradition, see Caire (2004: 20, 25, 35). These deviations and particularities are part of a coherent, localist agenda (Berthelot 2004: 39).
[84] See chapter 4.3.3. (pp. 174-178 of this dissertation).
[85] Indeed, in John Malalas the terms Syria and Persia are interchangeable, with Assyria, Persia and Babylonia being equivalent (Jeffreys 1990a: 65-66, 1990b: 203), (Berthelot 2004: 40).
[86] Jeffreys (1990a: 61, 65), Bernardi (2004: 58, 60).
[87] Adler (2017: 32, 34).
[88] We have the possibility that this mention was omitted in a Byzantine redaction of the chronicle.
[89] Caire (2006: 42).
[90] Bernardi and Caire (2016: 127).

(*Chron*. III.5).[91] Then, in *Chron*. IV.3, Prometheus is credited with developing the art of writing. Although this accumulation of announcements risks blurring the whole account - for instance, what is the relation between the Phoenician alphabet introduced in Greece by Cadmus, the invention of the Greek alphabet by Hesiod and the invention of writing by Prometheus - the tenet behind these notices is obvious; John Malalas wants to stress that the Greek alphabet, writing and literature was developed in Greece later than in the East and in his home region of Syria.

Indeed, this is, in my opinion the function of paragraph IV.3,[92] which recounts a series of mythological inventors of sciences in Greece; aside from Argos, who invented what is very vaguely described as "arts", or τὴν τεχνικὴν, and Epimetheus, who invented music, John Malalas reports on the Greek invention of cultural achievements that were clearly developed earlier on by other cultures. Atlas invented astronomy and Prometheus invented the art of writing. We get the impression that this paragraph is, far from stressing the cultural achievements of the Greeks, rather inserted here by Malalas, as late as book IV, to emphasise the belatedness and derivative nature of cultural achievements "in the west", ἐπὶ τὰ δυτικὰ μέρη.[93]

A peculiar case of cultural transfer is the introduction of monogamy.[94] In *Chron*. I.15, we learn that Hephaestus, as king of Egypt, was the first to introduce monogamy in this region, "this was the first law on chastity they received", διότι πρῶτον νόμον σωφροσύνης <τοῦτον> ἐδέξαντο.,[95] for which the Egyptians were grateful. In *Chron*. IV.5 we read how Cecrops from Egypt instituted the same law in Athens. The cultural transfer from Egypt to Attica is emphasised by John Malalas mentioning Cecrops' Egyptian origin twice, before and after a description of the lewd situation in Attica which Cecrops resolved by his law. As in the case of Hephaestus, the Athenians honoured their ruler for this cultural innovation. The issue of monogamy as a

---

[91] Beaucamp (2006: 24).
[92] "Ἐν δὲ τοῖς τούτων χρόνοις ἦν παρ' Ἕλλησιν ὁ Προμηθεὺς καὶ ὁ Ἐπιμηθεὺς καὶ ὁ Ἄτλας καὶ ὁ πανόπτης Ἄργος, ὃν ἑκατοντόφθαλμον ἐκάλουν διὰ τὸ περίβλεπτον εἶναι τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ γοργόν, καὶ Δευκαλίων, ὁ υἱὸς Ἕλληνος τοῦ Πίκου. ὁ δὲ Ἄργος αὐτὸς εὗρεν τὴν τεχνικὴν ἐπὶ τὰ δυτικὰ μέρη · ὁ δὲ Ἄτλας ἑρμήνευσεν τὴν ἀστρονομίαν · διὰ τοῦτο λέγουσιν, ὅτι τὸν οὐρανὸν βαστάζει, διότι τὰ οὐρανοῦ ἔχει ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ · ὁ δὲ Προμηθεὺς τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐξεῦρε φιλοσοφίαν · περὶ οὗ λέγουσιν, ὅτι ἀνθρώπους ἔπλαττε, καθ' ὃ ἰδιώτας ὄντας ἐποίησεν ἐπιγινώσκειν διὰ φιλοσοφίας καὶ τῷ πρώην χρόνῳ εἰδέναι τὰ συμβάντα · ὁ δὲ Ἐπιμηθεὺς τὴν μουσικὴν ἐξεῦρεν ·" (Thurn 2000: 49).
[93] Also the instances which seem to belie this cultural genealogy by situating cultural achievements in the West are in fact later or derivative developments. *Chron*. I.14 (Jeffreys I.14) mentions how metallurgy was developed in the West by Hermes. However, Hermes is a descendant of the eastern house of Shem through Picus Zeus, and his achievements are emulated by Hephaestus, king of Egypt in *Chron*. I.15 (Jeffreys I.15). The mention in this passage that men fought before Hephaestus' invention with clubs and stones, πρὸ γὰρ αὐτοῦ ῥοπάλοις καὶ λίθοις ἐπολέμουν. (Thurn 2000: 16) clearly shows that John Malalas intended the Egyptian Hephaestus and not the western Hermes as the inventor of metallurgy. Perhaps he made a mistake. Also in the case of Hercules (*Chron*. I.14, Jeffreys I.14) who is said to be the first to introduce philosophy in the west, this cultural achievement was preceded by the philosopher Aphrodite (*Chron*. I.9, Jeffreys I.9) who also originated from the house of Shem.
[94] Jeffreys (1990a: 61), Liebeschuetz (2004: 152).
[95] Thurn (2000: 16), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 10).

personal concern of John Malalas will be analysed later on in chapter 7.2. (pp. 302-312 of this dissertation).

The cultural transfer from the east to the west brought developments to the Romans. Next to the introduction of the colour purple, we read in *Chron*. VII how Romus adopted the practice of horse racing in honour of the sun from the Persians, or indeed the Syrians, as John Malalas considered both peoples to be one and the same.

As we can see, John Malalas weaves throughout his chronicle a broad picture of the transfer of cultural innovations from the East to the West. By associating the Syrians with the Persians through the tale of Perseus in *Chron*. II.11, John Malalas furthermore anchors his region of origin firmly in this cultural genealogy in a position of importance. As in the case of John of Lydia's deconstructivist cultural genealogy, John Malalas' tale of cultural transfer is used mainly to emphasise the posterity of the Greeks, and later the Romans, on the stage of human development.[96] We already mentioned, in the previous chapter,[97] that John Malalas accords importance to the different transfers of the Palladium in order to emphasise the transience of Rome as just one of the intermediate stations of the Palladium's voyage towards its destiny in Constantinople. In the same way, Malalas' cultural genealogy is used to stress the derivative and belated nature of Rome's cultural achievements, and, as a result, to put Rome into perspective as the ideological centre of the late antique world. In accordance with this strategy is Malalas' mention of the history of Rome before Rome. In *Chron*. VI.24 John Malalas mentions Aeneas' visit to the city of Pallas and Evander, Valentia, which later became Rome. Indeed, according to a Greek linguistic theory, the name *Roma* derived from the Latinisation of the Greek translation of *Valentia*, namely ῥώμη.[98] The contrast between John Lydus and John Malalas is revealing; John Lydus emphasises the role of Evander to develop his cultural genealogy, yet leaves out the detail of the sequence of translations which would reduce Rome, and, implicitly, Constantinople as a "New Rome",[99] to a totally derivative product. Malalas, on the other hand, does the inverse. He ignores the cultural role of Evander as it does not suit his Syriac/eastern cultural genealogy, but retains the detail of Valentia; for Malalas, Rome has become a distanced, derivative, unnecessary centre.

A special characteristic of Malalas' cultural genealogy is the repeated mention of rulers being honoured or receiving power as a reward for their cultural inno-

---

[96] Proving the antiquity of a culture as an argument in its favour, and invalidating the worth of other cultures by stressing their relative young age was a common practice of the so-called "cultural apologetics" of Hellenistic historians (Burgess and Kulikowski 2016: 100-101).

[97] See chapter 4.1.2. (pp. 133-134 of this dissertation).

[98] Rochette (1998: 472).

[99] John Lydus calls Constantinople "the Rome of our times", τὴν καθ᾽ ἡμᾶς Ῥώμην in *Magistr.* I. 20 (Schamp 2006b: 29), own translation.

vations.[100] This underlying thrust of Malalas' cultural genealogy, namely people receiving honour and power for cultural innovations, and all cultural innovations deriving from the East or Syria, must have been pleasing to the Syrians who competed in Constantinople with other networks for offices, funding, power and prestige, and with whom John Malalas was also possibly connected. Malalas' deriving the originators of Roman rule in Italy from mythological heroes of the Syrian tribe of Shem must also have been music to the ears of the Syrian minority in Constantinople's bureaucracy. As in the case of John of Lydia's Lydian antiquarianism, Malalas' Syrian cultural genealogy was written with a specific local interest-group in mind.

### 5.2.2. A New Centre of the Antiquarian Universe: Antioch and the Near East

Previous research has abundantly analysed Malalas' focus on Antioch as the centre of his historical *memoryscape* as he constructs it in his chronicle.[101] John Malalas connects the city of Antioch to the triumphant house of Shem, by stating that family members of Picus-Zeus were related to the Argives, whose King Inachus fathered Io who founded the mythological predecessor to Antioch, Iopolis.[102] Malalas' chronicle is informed by a Syrian localist agenda, and the city of Antioch is anchored in this localist scheme as its main focal point. John Malalas furthermore gives information on different rulers, kings and emperors mainly in relation to their building activities

---

[100] The Egyptians were grateful to Hephaestus for introducing monogamy in Egypt in *Chron*. I. 15, Cadmus is rewarded with the kingship for introducing the Phoenician alphabet in Boeotia in (*Chron*. II.14), and Cecrops is honoured for introducing likewise monogamy in Attica in *Chron*. IV.5. On the connection between the bringing of culture and rulership in Malalas, see Berthelot (2004: 39, n. 4).

[101] Examples are Croke (1990: 4, 6-11); Jeffreys (1990a: 55-59, 64); Liebeschuetz (2004: 143); Beaucamp (2006: 20) with a case study of book XVIII; Saliou (2006: 69): "L'importance accordée par Jean Malalas à l'histoire et aux monuments d' Antioche de Syrie dans sa Chronographie témoigne de son attachement à cette ville (…)."; Saliou (2006: 70) also states that John Malalas highly privileges Antioch in his treatment and record of statues; according to Agusta-Boularot (2006: 134-135) almost half of the inscriptions mentioned in John Malalas are located in Antioch or the nearby town of Daphne, and the majority of the mentioned inscriptions are connected to the past of Antioch; Agusta-Boularot (2006:135): "Une fois de plus, c'est "l'amour-propre civique du chroniqueur" qui le fait s'attarder sur des anecdotes dont la fonction étiologique éclaire l'histoire de sa cité et l'ancre dans un passé lointain et glorieux."; Cabouret (2006: 182, 184) analyses how John Malalas carefully recorded the titles and honorary names of Antioch; Saliou (2016: 59, 62); on the presence of local Antiochean historiographical material in John Malalas see Bernardi and Caire (2016: 128-131); Greatrex (2016: 176); John Malalas had, as a key exponent of the Antiochean historiographical tradition, a considerable Nachleben in John of Antioch (Roberto 2016: 280). On Malalas' local focus on Antioch in his account of the third-century crisis, see Mecella (2017: 87-88). On Malalas' programmatic mentions of sources with an Antiochene focus in his preface, see Van Nuffelen (2017: 263, 266).

[102] Jeffreys (1990a: 58), Bernardi (2004: 54), Caire (2006: 51).

and munificence in the city of Antioch.[103] Emperors and other rulers are also judged primarily on the basis of the criterion of whether or not they put effort into developing the city of Antioch and other cities in the Near East. This criterion of judgment outweighs the measure of the rulers' religious behaviour; both pagan emperors who otherwise persecuted Christians or heterodox emperors who had conflicts with orthodox Christianity are judged positively if they improved Malalas' beloved Antioch.[104] As in other cases, John Malalas upholds the foundational lore and accounts surrounding Antioch with material evidence.

Furthermore, we can observe how John Malalas further emphasises Antioch as the centre of his antiquarian *memoryscape* by linking it to different ideologically important cities. Antioch becomes the central node in the network of cities which informs the *memoryscape* of Malalas. We need to stress here the fact that John Malalas connects Antioch to different cities, such as Athens, Jerusalem, Thebes and Constantinople, and not only to the city of Rome. As indeed mentioned above, the city of Rome in Malalas' *memoryscape* lost the central place it has in Cassiodorus, and to a certain extent in John Lydus as the predecessor of Constantinople. Rome is just one of the many cities which is connected to Antioch, and Antioch, being connected with many cities, becomes the new centre of Malalas' *memoryscape*.

---

[103] Croke (1990: 7), Jeffreys (1990a: 56). "The majority, certainly the longest, of the notices concerning Antioch describe the benefits conferred by Roman emperors on the city. Augustus, Tiberius, Trajan, Commodus, Septimius Severus, Diocletian and Valens, all figure as major benefactors of Antioch (…)." (Liebeschuetz 2004: 150). Cabouret (2006) analyses how John Malalas presents the reigns of Emperors in function of their attitudes towards and edification of Antioch and the Near East. John Malalas only mentions the foundations of the Emperors Hadrian and Constantine in the east, foregoing their urban achievements in other parts of the empire (Cabouret 2006: 178, 180). More dramatically, John Malalas passes over in silence the foundational activities of the Severan dynasty because the city of Antioch supported the usurper Pescennius Niger, for which it was subsequently punished by Emperor Septimius Severus (Cabouret 2006: 179). For a case study in Chron. XI.3-6 (Jeffreys XI.3-6) on Malalas' focus on Trajan's presence in Antioch, see Bernardi and Caire (2016: 124-125). See also Saliou (2016: 62).

[104] "In this context it is noteworthy that emperors who figure as " bad " in Roman tradition, rulers like Nero, Domitian, Commodus and Heliogabalus, do not do so in Malalas, but are rather portrayed as benefactors." (Liebeschuetz 2004: 150). Here follows a non-exhaustive list of examples. In *Chron*. X.17 (Jeffreys X.17) emperor Caligula receives a positive depiction, followed by an account of his building activities in Antioch (*Chron*. X.18, Jeffreys X.18). In *Chron*. XII.37-44 (Jeffreys XII.37-44) Diocletian is pictured positively, in spite of his persecutions of Christians which are nevertheless mentioned at the same time. Also in this case John Malalas mentions his building activities in Antioch. Also the Olympic games in Antioch trigger the mechanism of the Tetrarchy whereby Diocletian renounced his power (*Chron*. XII.44, Jeffreys XII.44). This mention places Antioch at the centre of the imperial decision making process and can therefore also explain Diocletian's favourable depiction in Malalas. The same textual mechanism applies to the depiction of the persecutor of Christians Maximian (*Chron*. XII.45-46, Jeffreys XII.45-46) who also renounced his power on occasion of the Olympic games at Antioch (*Chron*. XII.46, Jeffreys XII.46). In *Chron*. XIII.30 (Jeffreys XIII.30) emperor Valens is treated positively because of his building activities at Antioch, in spite of his belonging to the Arian creed. Malalas' ambivalent attitude is nicely summed up in the following passage (*Chron*. XIII.34-35, Jeffreys XIII.34): (…) ὁ θειότατος Βάλης (…) καὶ πάνυ ἐκάκωσε τοὺς χριστιανοὺς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ. "The most sacred Valens (…) thoroughly maltreated the Christians during his reign." Thurn (2000: 264-265), trans. Jeffreys et al (1986: 185-186).

In different parts of his chronicle, John Malalas connects the city of Antioch to the city of Athens.[105] As all three authors exhibit a specific interest in Athens and its connections to their own home region, these connections and the contemporary bureaucratic context which fostered these connections, will be treated in chapter 5.4.2 of this dissertation.

Next to the city of Athens, John Malalas connects Antioch to the city of Jerusalem in *Chron.* X.45.[106] This paragraph recounts the third sack of the city of Jerusalem by Titus. Following the defeat of the Jews, Titus' father Vespasian set up the Cherubim and Seraphim statues from the temple of Solomon in Jerusalem up in Antioch, in commemoration of his son's victory. A stele dedicated to Selene and a theatre with an inscription also commemorated Titus' victory. The transfer of statues from the heart of Jerusalem to Antioch connects both cities in a fundamental way, with Antioch as the implicit superior to Jerusalem. In this case also, John Malalas uses material evidence to underscore his underlying agenda.

Although John Malalas puts into perspective the importance of Rome, at the same time he still associates the city of Antioch with Rome in order to further the prestige of the latter. In comparison with John Lydus, however, the difference becomes more obvious; whereas John Lydus depends solely on the city of Rome to foster the prestige of Constantinople, John Malalas uses the city of Rome as just one of the many possible avenues for enhancing the city of Antioch as the centre of his *memoryscape*. Yet again, statues are the main means to establish the connection between Rome and the city of Antioch as a better mirror image of Rome.

In *Chron.* VIII.30,[107] we read how Byblus, after founding the city of Byblus in Phoenicia, sent the statues of Athena and of Zeus Ceraunius in Antioch to the Capitoline Hill in Rome, where they were set up with an honorary inscription. These two statues were placed in Antioch by Seleucus I Nicator during the foundation of the city:[108]

> "Byblos, a powerful general, discovered a village on the coast of Phoenice, and made it into a city by fortifying it, and called it Byblos after himself. He asked the Antiochenes as a favour for the statue of Athene that had been made by Seleukos and was tremendous, and for the statue of Zeus Keraunios that had been made by Seleukos and was tremendous too; he took them away and sent them to Rome for the Capitol, since they were a magnificent sight and since they had become subject to the Romans. The statues remain

---

[105] Namely in *Chron.* VIII.14, VIII.29, VIII.30, X.10 and XIII.39.

[106] Saliou (2006: 71, 2013, 2016: 68, 73-74). "Elle [la mention red.] permit d'établir un lien entre Jérusalem et Antioche et rend compte de la fonction mystique du lieu, attestée dans la littérature hagiographique." (Saliou 2013: 129). Saliou (2016: 73-74) speaks of a "Jerusalem cycle" connecting the temple in Jerusalem to the city of Antioch through the mention of the *Kerataion* church (*Chron.* VIII.23), and the passage on the Cherubim (*Chron.* X.45).

[107] Saliou (2006: 73), Agusta-Boularot (2006: 110-111).

[108] Saliou (2006: 81-82).

to the present day. The inscription is, "The people of Antioch the Great honoured the Romans by presenting statues in gratitude"."[109]

The strong connection made by setting up statues connected to the foundation of Antioch in the ideological and religious heart of Rome is, according to Malalas, active even in his own days, *ἅτινα ἀγάλματα ἕως τῆς νῦν εἰσί*. This profound connection is developed further on in *Chron.* IX.5, where we learn that Julius Caesar set up a statue of the *Tyche* of Rome in Antioch. Not only is Antioch present in the heart of Rome, but also the essence of Rome, as represented by its *Tyche*, is present in Antioch.

The strong connection between Rome and Antioch makes both cities mirror images of one another. Yet, in Malalas' *memoryscape*, the city of Antioch not only resembles the city of Rome, but also emulates her on a moral level. In the previous chapter,[110] we have noted how John Malalas used the motive of Romulus' fratricide of Remus to discredit the political credentials of Rome and Roman rule. As a counter-example to the fratricide, fraternal hate and civil strife which plagued Rome from her earliest history onward, John Malalas digressed on the story of the brothers Amphion and Zethus (*Chron.* II.16), who founded the city of Thebes in brotherly concord.[111] These notions of imitation and emulation inform *Chron.* X.10,[112] where the building activities of Emperor Tiberius in Antioch are summed up. The paragraph begins with the mention of Tiberius erecting a temple of the Capitoline Zeus in Antioch. With its own Capitol, the city of Antioch mirrors the city of Rome. Yet the imitation of Rome is also followed by its emulation; Tiberius also set up a temple of Dionysus with two statues of Amphion and Zethus. These two symbols of fraternal love put Antioch as a city of civil concord on a morally higher level than Rome - note that the contrast between Romulus and Remus on the one hand and Amphion and Zethus on the other hand is emphasised by another statue set up by Tiberius and mentioned later on in the same paragraph; a statue of the she-wolf suckling the two discordant brothers. Also in *Chron.* XI.9,[113] a statue of the she-wolf nurturing

---

[109] "Βύβλος δέ τις στρατηγὸς δυνατός, ὃς καὶ ἐν τῇ παραλίᾳ Φοινίκῃ ηὗρε κώμην καὶ ἐποίησε πόλιν τειχίσας αὐτήν, ἣν ἐκάλεσε Βύβλον εἰς ὄνομα αὐτοῦ · οὗτος γὰρ τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἀθήνης τὸ παρὰ Σελεύκου γενόμενον, φοβερὸν ὄντα, καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Κεραυνίου Διός, παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Σελεύκου γενάμενον, καὶ αὐτὸ φοβερόν, αἰτησάμενος χάριν τοὺς Ἀντιοχεῖς ἐπῆρε καὶ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἔπεμψεν εἰς τὸ Καπετώλιον, ὡς μεγάλης ὄντα θέας καὶ ὡς ὑποταγέντα Ῥωμαίοις · ἅτινα ἀγάλματα ἕως τῆς νῦν εἰσί · καὶ ἐπιγράφει · 'δῆμος Ἀντιοχείας τῆς μεγάλης ἐτίμησε Ῥωμαίους τὰ ἀγάλματα εὐχαριστῶν.'" (Thurn 2000: 159-160), trans. Jeffreys et al (1986: 111).
[110] See chapter 4.2.2. (pp. 143-153 of this dissertation).
[111] Bernardi and Caire (2016: 128): "As already noted by E. Jeffreys, the importance given to Amphion's and Zethos' gests in Chapter 16 may also be explained by a local tradition, as the presence of a statue of the Dioskouroi is mentioned by the chronicler in Book X, Chapter 10, p. 158.".
[112] Jeffreys (1990a: 58), Saliou (2006: 72, 2016: 70).
[113] Saliou (2016: 72).

Romulus and Remus by Emperor Trajan serves to connect Antioch to its lesser mirror image of Rome.[114]

In addition to associating Antioch with Jerusalem and Rome, John Malalas also associates the city of Antioch with the New Rome on the Bosporus, Constantinople. In *Chron*. X.51, the prophet and magician Apollonius of Tyana creates talismans for the protection of both Constantinople and Antioch.[115] Although it is said that Appolonius visited other cities after his stay in Antioch, only Antioch and Constantinople received talismans from Apollonius, and were therefore associated by their shared protection. Further on in the chronicle (*Chron* XIV.13) Emperor Theodosius II explicitly associates Antioch with Constantinople by gilding the Daphne gates in imitation of - καθ᾽ ὁμοιότητα - the Chalke gate in Constantinople.

---

[114] Saliou (2016: 72) asserts that the passages of Tiberius and Trajan placing the statues of the she-wolf are a means to affirm the Roman character of the city of Antioch, without, however, observing the negative echoes of fratricide and civil strife which these mentions evoke. On the evoked Romanness of the statues of Romulus and Remus, also in Constantinople, see Bassett (2007: 193).
[115] Jeffreys (1990a: 57, 59, 64), Bernardi and Caire (2016: 130).

## 5.3. Cassiodorus

In the *Variae* of Cassiodorus,[116] first, the *memoryscape* of the Roman Empire was replaced by the intellectual horizon of the Ostrogothic realm, which still operated from the vantage point of the city of Rome - as we have seen in the previous chapter (pp. 135-140 of this dissertation) - yet with a more restricted reach than the Roman Empire. Second, Cassiodorus presents the Ostrogothic realm favourably in cultural terms by elaborating his letter collection into a cultural compendium, which espouses the bilingual cultural ideal of the unified Roman Empire of Priscian, Symmachus and Boethius. Third, the disappearance of the Roman Empire is also compensated by a localist focus on the Italian peninsula, and more specifically, the South of Italy and the region of Bruttii, Cassiodorus' region of origin.[117]

These three textual strategies partially overlap but differ in scope and aim as they originate in different functions of the *Variae* as a letter collection.[118] First, the mapping of the Ostrogothic realm was conducted by Cassiodorus as a spokesman of the Ostrogothic kings. It therefore served the propagandistic aims and needs of the young Ostrogothic state.[119] Second, Cassiodorus' reworking of the *Variae* as a cultural compendium aimed at enhancing his own cultural prestige in Constantinople. The fact that this cultural compendium was in accordance with the cultural ideal as espoused by Priscian, Symmachus and Boethius can be interpreted as one of Cassiodorus' many strategies to associate himself with the memory of Symmachus and Boethius, as analysed in a previous chapter.[120] It can also be interpreted as part of what M.S. Bjornlie coined as 'the cultural apologetics' of Cassiodorus[121] in favour of the possible reinstatement of the Italian bureaucracy which administered the Ostrogothic realm after the conquest of Italy by Justinian. Third, Cassiodorus' localist focus on his home region is, as in the cases of Lydus and Malalas, a personal strategy to respond to the question of shifting power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople. In response to Lydus and Malalas, who move the centres of Greco-Roman culture to Asia Minor or the Near East, Cassiodorus clings to the traditional predominance of Italy as the centre of the Roman *oikoumene*. Cassiodorus' Italian localism as exhibited in his *Variae* is also well attuned to the political and ideological wishes and exigencies of an audience of Italian expatriates in Constantinople.

### 5.3.1. Mapping the Ostrogothic Empire

In the *Variae*, the traditional Roman focus on Rome and its empire is, as we have seen, silently transformed to a more specific focus on Rome as the centre of

---

[116] Carney (1971b: 122, 128).

[117] Italy in general is described in letters XII.4. Letters II.39, III.48, XI.14, XII.24 and XII.28 cover places in the North of Italy. Letters III.47, VIII.31 (O'Donnell 1979: 79-80), VIII.32 (Momigliano 1966: 188), (O'Donnell 1979: 79-80), VIII.33 (O'Donnell 1979: 79-80), IX.6, XI.10, XII.12 and XII.22 have subject matter on places in the South of the Italian peninsula, and the town of Squillace is presented in letters VIII.32 and XII.15 (O'Donnell 1979: 17).

[118] Bjornlie (2017: 434).

[119] Carney (1971b: 112).

[120] See chapter 3.2.2.2. (pp. 72-75 of this dissertation).

[121] Bjornlie (2009, 2013).

Italy, and Italy as the centre of the Ostrogothic rule.[122] Several sequences of letters make clear which parts of the former Roman Empire are part of the Ostrogothic realm, in spite of other powers in the Mediterranean. The beginning of Book VIII, for example, comprises a series of announcements of Athalaric's rise to the throne.[123] This sequence of letters carefully evokes the impression of an autonomous Ostrogothic realm, which takes up a distinct part of the former Roman Empire, and which aspires to an equal position with the eastern Roman Empire, in spite of the emperor in Constantinople. A curtailed form of the same series occurs in the diplomatic letters at the beginning of Book X announcing the reign of Theodahad.[124] Rome, Italy and to a lesser extent Gaul appear from these sequences as the core areas of the Ostrogothic realm. The main partner of the Ostrogothic realm, as a successor to the legacy of the Roman Empire, is the eastern Roman state.[125]

These subtle ways of delimiting the Ostrogothic territory can also be viewed throughout the whole of the *Variae*. With due caution we can perceive how Book II of the *Variae* has a distinct number of letters pertaining to matters in Italy. The same can be said for the predominance of letters in Books III and IV which have as their subject the newly acquired Ostrogothic territories in Gaul. The troubles with Constantinople during the Gothic War explain the letters on diplomacy with the eastern Roman Empire in Book X. The last two books have a genuine focus on the South of Italy. Throughout the *Variae* the letters on the city of Rome as the ideological centre of the realm surpass those on the city of Ravenna by a great margin.

Cassiodorus carves out of the map of the former Roman Empire a specific portion, which constitutes the new and distinct Ostrogothic realm. From this new centre looking outward, the other parts of the world or of the former Roman Empire are viewed. These other parts of the world are thought subservient to the Ostrogothic centre by means of emulation. Ostrogothic Italy seemed to surpass the places and wonders of the ancient classical world. The city of Rome is the new ideological centre of the realm, and therefore surpasses the rest of the empire, as we have seen in the previous chapter (pp. 135-140 of this dissertation).

Not only the city of Rome, but also the whole of the Italian peninsula houses natural and cultural wonders which surpass the whole of the known world, as we will see in the next section. We can easily see how Cassiodorus singles out mainly places and marvels in the east of the former Roman Empire as surpassed by the Os-

---

[122] Theodoric explicitly frames his conquests, not as additions to his own realm, but as phases in the recovery of lost territory to the Roman Empire (Amory 1997: 8-9).

[123] VIII.1 is addressed to the emperor at Constantinople, the second and third letters to the senate and the people of Rome. Letter 4 and 5 are aimed at the populace in Italy (and Dalmatia), whilst letters 6,7 and 8 exhibit the lavish attention poured on the Ostrogothic territory in Gaul.

[124] The first two for the emperor at Constantinople and number 3 to 4 for the senate of Rome.

[125] These letters announce the formal swearing of allegiance to the new king. On the importance of swearing allegiance to the Ostrogothic monarch as a means to legitimise the Ostrogothic king, see Barnish (2008: 12-13).

trogothic realm. This is a textual strategy to posit the Ostrogothic realm as an equal counterpart of the eastern Roman Empire. The same textual strategy urges Cassiodorus to compare the Ostrogothic realm favourably with scenes from the biblical world, which happened to occur mainly in the eastern half of the former Roman Empire.

The mapping of the Ostrogothic realm is exemplified in the image of the *mensa regalis* or the royal dinner table: we have several passages in which the reach of the realm is symbolised by the delicacies from the different parts of the empire.[126] An example is *Var.* XII.4, on wine deliveries, in which Cassiodorus indulges in an elaborate digression on wine. The beginning of the letter explicitly interprets the *ornatus* of the royal dinner table as a symbol for the possessions of the monarch:

> "A very abundant decking of the royal table is pleasing to the state as not a small ornament, since a lord is believed to possess as much as the rare goods he feasts on."[127]

The letter continues with a list of delicacies at the Ostrogothic dinner table and, more important, their provenance (§ 1-2). The Danube and Rhine first are mentioned as the borders of the Ostrogothic reach. Next comes the core of the Ostrogothic realm with a mention of foods from Sicily, the Ionian Sea and more notably, wine from Italy. The second paragraph closes with an etymology of a local wine. *Fecunda Italia* (§ 2) appears to be the main point of focus, since it is positively compared with *ingeniosa Graecia*, a part of the East Roman sphere of influence. Cassiodorus continues with a description of wine with political resonances. For instance, the colour of wine is likened to the purple of the imperial regalia; *colore regium* - an association which is not innocent, as we have seen in the previous chapter on the antiquarian use of the colour purple (pp. 174-178 of this dissertation). After a description of the production process of the wine (§ 4-5), the letter closes with practical notes on the actual wine delivery.

The same scheme is implicitly repeated at the beginning of letter XII.12. Cassiodorus and the monarch were discussing the delicacies of all the provinces of the realm when the conversation came to delicacies from the South of Italy (*Var*. XII. 12.1):

> "When we were dining with the sovereign of state - as is our solemn custom - and the different provinces received praise for their own delicacies, the

---

[126] Namely in *Var.* XII.4, XII.11, XII.12, XII.18 (O'Donnell 1979: 64, 82).
[127] "Mensae regalis apparatus ditissimus non parvus rei publicae probatur ornatus, quia tanta dominus possidere creditur, quantis novitatibus epulatur." (Giardina et al. 2015c: 76), own translation.

conversation came - as usual - to the wines of Bruttii and the sweetness of the cheese of Sila."[128]

We can see here how the Ostrogothic realm is portrayed as a distinct political entity through allegedly harmless digressions on foods. The focus of this portrayal is (the South of) Italy, enclosed by the 'barbarian' North and the East Roman state, but clearly distinct from them. The *mensa regalis* also pregnantly emphasises the personal scope of Cassiodorus' antiquarianism as the intellectual basis for the mapping of the Ostrogothic empire; the contours of the realm are determined in the personal setting of the Ostrogothic monarch dining with a circle of entrusted advisors and courtiers, of which Cassiodorus is a prominent member.[129]

5.3.2. Saving the Greco-Roman Model: The *Variae* as a Cultural Compendium.

The Ostrogothic realm, as it is portrayed throughout the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, is also and most predominantly presented as a realm in which culture and different sciences flourished. Indeed, Cassiodorus elaborated on his letter collection in order to construct a personal and ad-hoc compendium of knowledge, incorporating, aside from the historical knowledge as exhibited in his antiquarian digressions, political and administrative knowledge, scientific knowledge and bibliography.[130]

From an administrative point of view, the *Variae* are an example of the didactic genre of formulary collections of legal and chancery documents. This genre was common in the west during the Early Middle Ages, and the *Variae* can be considered as an early example.[131] The core of this political and administrative knowledge of the *Variae* is centred in the *formulae*, a series of sample letters of appointment in Books VI and VII.

The main focus of Cassiodorus' compendium of knowledge, however, is on scientific knowledge. Judging by the effusive praise poured on Boethius by Cassiodorus for his work on four of the seven liberal arts grouped in the *quadrivium* in letter I.45, this topic seems to have been a major preoccupation for the author of the

---

[128] "Cum apud dominum rerum sollemni munere pranderemus et diversae provinciae de suis deliciis laudarentur, ad vina Bruttiorum et Silani casei suavitatem current, ut assolet, sermone perventum est", (Giardina et al. 2015c: 88), own translation.
[129] Bjornlie (2013: 28). For an analysis of late antique dining practices as a means for legitimation see Malmberg (2003).
[130] Bjornlie (2017: 439, 442-443). For a systematic overview of encyclopaedic digressions, see Bjornlie (2009: 157 n. 60).
[131] Barnish (1992: xiv-xv). On the *Variae* as a political manual see Jouanaud (1993: 739-741) and Gillett (1998: 45-46, 50).

LOCALISM AND GENEALOGIES OF CULTURE / 222

*Variae*.[132] As a matter of fact, we have four Cassiodorean letters which represent in the first part of the *Variae* a short introduction to the *quadrivium*. I.10 is a letter on arithmetic, II.40 a letter on the art of music, whereas the letters III.51 and III.52 represent the arts of astronomy and geometry respectively.[133] The letters on arithmetic, music and geometry openly and explicitly name the subjects they treat. Letter III.51 at first sight only offers an antiquarian description of the Circus Maximus, on the occasion of the grant of a loan to a famous charioteer. The core of the letter, however,[134] describes the circus allegorically as the universe.[135]

The order of appearance of the *quadrivium* in the *Variae* approximates the canonical order of appearance (i.e. arithmetic, music, geometry, astronomy),[136] which is also observed in Cassiodorus' later compendium of knowledge, the *Institutions*.[137] The last two letters form an exception to this rule as astronomy precedes geometry. All these letters are situated near the beginning or ending of a book.[138] It is therefore probable that Cassiodorus subjected these letters to an elaborate reworking during his compilation of his letter collection.

The sole exception is the letter on arithmetic, which has the tenth place in the first book of letters. One might be tempted to interpret the position of this letter as a meaningful departure from the observed rule, since a lengthy digression on the perfection of the number ten is found in this letter.[139] Cassiodorus also comments at length on the number ten, the Pythagorean *tetractys*, in his *Commentary on the Psalms* - a work which he started at the same time as his reworking of the *Variae* in Constantinople.[140] Does Cassiodorus want to create a micro-image of the cosmos in his *Variae*

---

[132] Pizzani (1993: 29-30) shortly comments on this passage to further elucidate Cassiodorus' knowledge of Boethius' works on the *quadrivium*. The *quadrivium* was a popular scientific topic in Ostrogothic Italy. There were, for instance, different initiatives at translating Greek texts concerning the *quadrivium* into Latin (Heather 1993: 336). On Boethius' work on the *quadrivium* and especially mathematics, see Molland (2013: 513-514). Another survey of Boethius' work on the *quadrivium* is to be found in Marenbon (2003: 14-16).

[133] On the arts and sciences as one of the unifying ideas behind the letters posited at the beginning and end of a book of the *Variae*, see O'Donnell (1979: 79-80). Bjornlie (2009: 150) uses three of these four letters to expound on Cassiodorus' representation of Boethius in the *Variae*: "The prominent position of these letters in the collection communicated to the audience of the *Variae* Boethius' intimacy with the Ostrogothic court".

[134] Paragraphs 4-7.

[135] Another short astrological catalogue on celestial bodies and their orbits can be found in letter XI.36.

[136] Pizzani (1993: 48).

[137] Vessey (2004: 64), Hadot (2005: 204-205).

[138] Only the letters III.51 and III.52 are followed by one single letter before the conclusion of the third book.

[139] Bjornlie (2009: 152, 2013: 174) even goes a step further by suggesting letter I.10 was a completely fictive intervention, added later on out of political motives. This hypothesis in my opinion gains ground when we consider, apart from politics, the symbolical aspects of the position of this letter. On the numerical symbolism exhibited in this letter ands its affiliations with the works of Lydus, see chapter 3.3.2. (pp. 105-114 of this dissertation).

[140] *Commentary on the Psalms*, Ps. 91, 4. For a short discussion see Pizzani (1993: 47).

by putting a letter which muses on arithmetic and the cosmic perfection of the number ten as the tenth letter of the letter-book? It seems that Cassiodorus is not only mapping the image of the Ostrogothic Empire in his *Variae*. The letter-book seems more and more a map of a new didactic *memoryscape*, one which coincided with the political landscape of the Ostrogothic realm.

The neat straitjacket of the liberal arts does not, however, account for the other sciences and disciplines which are expounded on in Cassiodorus' letter-encyclopaedia. Even some of the already mentioned letters exhibit traces of a more general outlook.[141] In letter III.52, for example, the line between the practical art of geometry and its theoretical counterpart becomes increasingly blurred.[142] After a short introduction to the legal matter at hand (§ 1), Cassiodorus mentions the inundations of the Nile as a major cause of the developments in geometry, both theoretical and practical; *geometricas formas et gromaticam disciplinam* (§ 2). He does not seem to make any distinction between the two sciences, and the same impression is confirmed in the next sections. In paragraphs 3-6, we have a short history of geometry as a whole in three phases, but the digression seems to treat both theoretical and practical geometry. The Chaldeans are responsible for the theoretical framework, whereas the Egyptians and especially the Romans under Augustus are to be credited for its practical perfection. Contrary to John Malalas, who stressed the derivative and belated nature of Greco-Roman cultural achievements, Cassiodorus emphasised how the Romans perfected the knowledge they inherited from older cultures.

In paragraph three of *Var.* III.52, Cassiodorus enumerated several disciplines exercised by the Chaldeans, of which geometry, the subject of the letter, is followed by astronomy and music, two other parts of the *quadrivium*. The enumeration, however, continues with the practical arts of mechanics, architecture and medicine, concluding with the utmost theoretical science of logic. The distinction between theoretical and practical appears to disintegrate in this ad hoc inventory by Cassiodorus, but it reappears sharply at the end of paragraph seven. There, all four parts of the *quadrivium* are mentioned as inferior because of their mere theoretical value. Cassiodorus continues in the same fashion with a praise of the practical surveyor (§ 8), before concluding the letter (§ 9). This letter, one of the last three letters of the third book, is part of a series which exhibits a shift from more theoretical speculations on astronomy and the cosmos (III.51), through the theoretical treatment of geometry (III.52), to its more practical uses in III.52 (the measurement of patches of land) and III.53 (how to find water).

In Cassiodorus' *Variae*, the neat distinction between *quadrivium* and other sciences on the one hand, and between theoretical and practical disciplines on the

---

[141] The same goes for Cassiodorus' treatment of the liberal arts in the *Institutions*: Vessey (2004: 66): 'Cassiodorus' method is eclectic and harmonizing'.
[142] A discussion of this letter in the same light of the opposition theoretical-practical can be found in Cracco Ruggini (2008: 34-36).

other hand, has been replaced by an ad hoc treatment, which was informed mainly by a practical concern. This blurred line between practical and theoretical sciences appears to have been a general characteristic of late antique and early mediaeval science.[143]

This concern for practicality makes way for a thorough treatment of several applied disciplines. In letter I.45, for instance, the mechanical art is treated. Architecture and medicine are also prominent features of Cassiodorus' knowledge landscape.[144] The two disciplines appear both in letter II.39.[145] The art of medicine is also treated in letter VI.19;[146] the discipline of architecture in letters VII.5 and VII.15. Cassiodorus even describes the utmost practical skills such as the finding of water in III.53, mining in VIII.3, paper production in XI.38, and viniculture in letter XII.4.

This synthesis of both practical and theoretical arts is considered to be a recipe for good government.[147] Cassiodorus compiles several theoretical and practical arts into an idiosyncratic whole, with the purpose of providing the Roman gentleman-scholar a short guide to the different skills he has to manage to fully function in the administration of Italy after its conquest by Justinian. This treatment of the sciences only partly conforms to the classical orderings of science into theoretical, liberal arts and practical disciplines. It is an forerunner of the blurred line between the practical and the theoretical spheres of knowledge in the Early Middle Ages. On the other hand, the renewed interest in several practical sciences is a tendency common to Late Antiquity.[148]

Apart from historical, administrative and scientific knowledge, Cassiodorus also added bibliography to his compendium of knowledge. From time to time, he gives explicit references to the sources which form his intended *memoryscape* of

---

[143] Both medicine and architecture were sometimes a practical discipline and sometimes a theoretical science; Cadden (2013: 243). The more theoretical science of mathematics was mostly valued in the face of its practical uses. The connection between mathematics and land surveying was often made; Molland (2013: 512-513). For a general discussion of the fluidity and dialogue between different ways of organizing the sciences in the early Middle Ages see Cadden (2013: 242-248). A very short introduction to natural knowledge in Ostrogothic Italy is to be found in McCluskey (2013: 286-287).

[144] See Cracco Ruggini (2008: 30-31) on Cassiodorus' preoccupations with architecture and medicine.

[145] Marano (2011: 198).

[146] Lozovsky (2016: 319-320).

[147] Marano (2011: 200): '*Variae* 2, 39 riassume questa duplice prospettiva, che coniuga la *philosophia* pratica e la *philosophia* teorica, entrambe finalizzate e necessarie al "buon governo".'.

[148] Marano (2011: 198) perceives a tendency from the fourth century onwards to reassess the practical arts, which were traditionally inferior to the theoretical arts. For example, the practical arts of architecture and medicine were increasingly becoming the object of imperial patronage. Also the arts of mechanics and geometry were the subject of favourable legislation.

texts.[149] Through these sources the resplendent image of Rome as an universal empire of knowledge still shines forth. The reading of these sources is used as a tool to gauge present against past achievements.[150] We have already discussed the balance between Latin and Greek sources which Cassiodorus mentioned, and the bilingual ideal of the former Roman Empire which these sources espouse, in the previous chapter (pp. 167-173 of this dissertation). Most of the authors are considered in connection with the theoretical liberal arts. The authors Hero of Alexandria (III.52 on calculating surfaces), Marcellus (III.53 on finding water), and Metrobius (VII.5 on architecture) are more closely connected to practical arts. Nevertheless, the boundary between theory and practice remains blurred, as we have already mentioned. The theoretic authors Euclid and Archimedes are, for instance, also mentioned in the bibliography of letter VII.5, on the practical art of architecture.

As in the case of the ἴχνη of John of Lydia, Cassiodorus subtly indicates the content and scope of his cultural ideal throughout different passages and letters in the collection of his *Variae*. This cultural ideal presumes a thorough comprehension of historical, bureaucratic, and scientific knowledge, both from Greek and Latin authors, in order to be able to function in the government of the Roman administration - a cultural ideal which Cassiodorus, for reasons of political self-protection while in Constantinople, attuned to the cultural ideal of a bilingual and reunited Roman Empire of Priscian, Symmachus and Boethius.

5.3.3. A New Centre of the Antiquarian Universe: Italy

In response to the increasing claims of Constantinople and the eastern half of the former Roman Empire as new centres of the Roman *oikoumene*, Cassiodorus continues to emphasise the importance of Italy, and especially his home region in the South of Italy.[151] We can see how he suggests an order of importance throughout his *Variae*, by comparing different parts of the world. In several letters he compares Italy favourably to several parts of the Greco-Roman world. He also compares the South of Italy favourably to the North of Italy. Finally, in several letters he pours praise on the South of Italy, his own home region of Bruttii, and Squillace, his town of origin.

Throughout the *Variae*, Italy appears as the ideal part and centre of the Greco-Roman world, in comparison with other places in the Mediterranean. For instance, in *Var.* VIII.33, the report on abuses at a site of pilgrimage in Lucania (§ 1-2) prompts Cassiodorus to compose an elaborate description of the various activities

---

[149] Letters I.45 (Pythagoras, Ptolemy, Nicomachus, Euclid, Plato, Aristotle and Archimedes), II.40 (Terentianus), III.52 (Heron of Alexandria), III.53 (Marcellus) and VII.5 (Euclid, Archimedes and Metrobius) give bibliographical references.

[150] Cracco Ruggini (2008: 34): 'Cassiodorus underlines repeatedly two necessities. First, the duty to match inasmuch as possible the techniques and results achieved in the past (*nimis ingeniosa priscorum*, the extraordinarily clever works of the ancient) (…) As a second and consequential requisite, Cassiodorus – particularly in *Var*. 7.5 – underlines the necessity of studying anew texts and *institutiones* [instructional methods] of the ancient'.

[151] Carney (1971b: 97, 119), O'Donnell (1979: 87-88).

during the feast of Saint Cyprian (§ 3-4). He goes on by elaborating on a magical source from which the site derives its status (§ 5-6). The magical source equates to the holy river Jordan:

> "May this heavenly spring be venerated in the speech of all men. May Lucania have its own Jordan. The one gave us the model of baptism; the other guards the sacred mystery with annual devotion."[152]

The concluding remark of the spring in Lucania equalling the river Jordan places the South of Italy on par with an important place in the sacred geography of Christianity. Further on, in *Var.* IX.6 the bath complexes at Baiae emulate both the Black Sea and the Indian Ocean.[153] As already mentioned above, in *Var.* XII.4, the wine of Italy surpasses other dishes on the royal table, i.e., other parts of the Ostrogothic realm. In *Var.* XII.24, Cassiodorus compares the settlements around the later city of Venice with the Cyclades. The settlements around Venice are compared favourably to the Cyclades, as in the case of the Cyclades the archipelago is a work of nature, whereas in Venice the archipelago is the work of human labour:

> "(…) you might think that here, instead, are the Cyclades, where you suddenly see the shapes of places changed. Indeed, like those islands, houses can be seen stretching far away among the waters, not the work of nature, but built by human labour. For there, solid ground is heaped together by wattling flexible withies, and there is no hesitation in opposing so frail a bulwark to the sea's flood, since the shallows of that coast are unable to throw up a great weight of waters, and, unaided by depth, the waves have no force."[154]

The last letter of the *Variae*, letter XII.28, compares the province of Liguria positively with biblical Egypt. Liguria is saved from famine while keeping its freedom, whereas Egypt under Joseph paid the price of losing freedom to evade famine; *Var.* XII.28.9:

> "Rejoice therefore and accustom yourself to the good, o Ligurian; favourable goods have come for your use; for you have acquired in great prosperity the Egyptian goods collected for you. You escape times of scarcity and you do not loose the fruits of your freedom. Yes indeed, you returned safe and

---

[152] "Fiat omnium sermone venerabilis fons iste caelestis: habeat et Lucania Iordanem suum. ille exemplum baptismatis praestitit, hic sacrum mysterium annua devotione custodit." (Giardina et al. 2015b: 66), trans. Barnish (1992: 111).

[153] "Cedat corallici pelagi laudata semper opinio: adsurgat Indici maris de albarum candore fama locupletior. quid mihi cum pretiis, si animus non fruatur optatis? baianis litoribus nil potest esse praestantius, ubi contingit et dulcissimis deliciis vesci et impretiabili munere sanitatis expleri." (Giardina et al. 2015b: 80).

[154] "ut illic magis aestimes esse Cycladas, ubi subito locorum facies respicis immutatas. Earum quippe similitudine per aequora longe patentia domicilia videntur sparsa, quae natura protulit, sed hominum cura fundavit. viminibus enim flexibilibus illigatis terrena illic soliditas aggregatur et marino fluctui tam fragilis munitio non dubitatur opponi, scilicet quando vadosum litus moles eicere nescit undarum et sine viribus fertur quod altitudinis auxilio non iuvatur." (Giardina et al. 2015c: 108), trans. Barnish (1992: 178).

sound from the enemy at the same time that you realised that you have been saved from the perils of famine.".[155]

Similarly, the Gothic monarch outdoes the biblical Joseph in distributing his liberality impartially (§ 10). As in the case of the reference to the river Jordan in *Var.* VIII.33, Italy emulates eastern parts of the former Roman Empire in the biblical sphere.

Although Cassiodorus privileges Italy above other parts of the Greco-Roman world throughout his *Variae*, he also makes a distinction between the North and the South of Italy, prioritising the southern part of the peninsula. In *Var.* XII.22, for example, Cassiodorus indulges in one of his elaborate descriptions of a region, this time the region of Istria. Noteworthy in this description is the fact that Cassiodorus describes the pleasantness of the region in terms of the countryside of Campania. Istria is, according to Cassiodorus, an agreeable region in so far as it resembles Campania:

> "Not undeservedly, it is called the Campania of Ravenna, the store-room of the royal city, an only too pleasant and luxurious retreat. With its northward location, it enjoys a wonderfully mild climate. It also has Baiaes of its own - I am not talking nonsense - where the rough sea enters the hollows of the coast, and is calmed to the smooth and lovely surface of a lake. These places also supply many *garum* factories, and glory in their wealth of fish. Not one Lake Avernus is found there.".[156]

Together with letter IX.6, this letter, which also mentions the baths of Baiae, nicely illustrates the local priorities of Cassiodorus' mental map of the world; places outside Italy such as the Black Sea and the Indian Ocean are inferior to Italy, and the northern regions of Italy are a dim mirror image of the real centre of Italy in the South.

Indeed, Cassiodorus devotes ample attention to the South of Italy and his home town of Squillace in several of his letters. The three last letters of Book VIII are a case in point; *Var.* VIII.31, which orders the locals of Bruttium to live in their cities instead of in the countryside, is accompanied by elaborate praise of Cassiodorus' region of origin. In *Var.* VIII.32, we find an idyllic description of the properties of the fountain of Arethusa near Cassiodorus' hometown of Squillace. Letter

---

[155] "gaudete igitur, assuete iam bono Ligur: in usu tuo secunda venerunt: nam collatos tibi Aegyptios magna prosperitate vicisti: evadis tempora necessitatis et libertatis praemia non amittis: immo illo tempore securus es ab hoste redditus, quando et de famis periculo cognosceris esse liberatus." (Giardina et al. 2015c: 118), my own translation.

[156] "quae non immerito dicitur Ravennae Campania, urbis regiae cella penaria, voluptuosa nimis et deliciosa digressio. fruitur in septentrione progressa caeli admiranda temperie. Habet et quasdam, non absurde dixerim, Baias suas, ubi undosum mare terrenas concavitates ingrediens in faciem decoram stagni aequalitate deponitur. haec loca et garismatia plura nutriunt et piscium ubertate gloriantur. Avernus ibi non unus est." (Giardina et al. 2015c: 106), trans. Barnish (1992: 176).

VIII.33, as already mentioned, eulogises the feast of Saint Cyprian in Lucania. Furthermore, in *Var.* XII.12 the cheese and wine of Bruttii are seen to emulate the wines of the Sabine territory and of Gaza, as we saw above.

The granting of privileges to the town of Squillace in letter XII.15 invites Cassiodorus to indulge in an elaborate   description of his beloved hometown (§ 2-5).[157] The rising of the sun is admirably seen from the shores of Squillace, so as to outdo the home of Phoebus at Rhodes (§ 2). Cassiodorus elaborates on the excellent climate of Squillace by framing the town into a general climate theory.[158] The Mediterranean has a propitious balance between the extremes of the cold North and the scorching South (§ 2-3). With the mention of the climate theory, Cassiodorus grounds his localist preferences in a scientific framework. Not only is the Mediterranean an ideal climatic zone, but also Squillace is associated with this propitious climate as the *natural* centre of the Greco-Roman world.

Cassiodorus' local focus also accounts for another anomaly. In general, he has only a superficial knowledge of mythology, which, amongst other things, is exhibited by his mentioning most mythological characters only once, or, very rarely, twice throughout the whole of the *Variae*.[159] The sole exception to this rule is the character of Ulysses,[160] who appears in four letters, letter I.39, II.40,[161] VII.5 and XII.15. Ulysses is subject to a positive depiction throughout the *Variae*. In letter I.39, Cassiodorus digresses on the wisdom Ulysses acquired during his many voyages:

---

[157] O'Donnell (1979: 17).
[158] A similar exposition on the propitious climate of Italy in connection with thunderbolts can be found in Lydus, *Ost.* 43 (Bandy 87).
[159] I give here a list of mythological characters in the antiquarian passages of the *Variae*: IV.34 Aeacus, II.40 Amphion, V.17 the Argonauts, VI.18 Ceres, VII.5 Cyclops, I.45 Daedalus, V.42 Diana, II.40 Galathea, V.17 Harpocrates, IV.51 Hercules, IV.34 Indus, III.31 Ionus, V.17 Isis, VII.18 Juno, VI.6 Jupiter, VIII.33 Leucothea, II.40 and VIII.12 Mercurius, III.31 Midas, II.40 Musaeus, II.40, VII.5 and XII.15 Odysseus, III.51 Oenomaus, II.40 Orpheus, VI.18 Pan, IV.51 Philistion, XII.15 Phoebus, VII.18 Phoroneus, IV.51 Polymnia, VII.5 Polyphemus, VI.21 Priapus, II.40 Sirens, IV.51 and VI.21 Venus, III.47 Vulcanus. For these mythological references, the *Fabulae* of Hyginus appear to be the main source, since of this list, the following are mentioned in Hyginus' Fabulae: IV.34 Aeacus, VI.18 Ceres, V.17 Harpocrates, IV.34 Indus, V.17 Isis, VII.18 Juno, VIII.12 Mercurius, III.31 Midas, VI.18 Pan, VII.18 Phoroneus. Cassiodorus' mythological knowledge derives from a quick consultation of Hyginus, and only a limited amount of paragraphs appear to have been used by him, namely the two inventory-like paragraphs 274 (*Quis quid invenerit.*) and 277 (*Rerum inventores primi.*). Another indication of Cassiodorus' superficial treatment of mythology is the fact that, from time to time, he strips the larger mythological framework from an antiquarian anecdote, such as our analysis of his account on the discovery of the colour purple (*Var.* I.2), in chapter 4.3.3. of this dissertation, has shown.
[160] Cassiodorus' focus on the baths of Baiae could also be interpreted as resulting from his fascination with Ulysses, as the origins of the place have a distinct Ulyssean character. For the name Baiae is derived from Baius, the helmsman of Ulysses who died and was buried there. One of the sources for this etymology is Servius, *Ad Aen.* III.441 and VI.107 (Roscher 1884-6: 745), a source Cassiodorus could have used, as also his mention of Ulysses founding Squillace is also retained, and only so, in Servius, *Ad Aen.* III.553. See below.
[161] Pizzani (1993: 42), Condorelli (2007).

"If Ulysses remained in his own abode, he had probably been unknown. For Homer asserts in his renowned poem, that his wisdom mostly derived from the fact that he went about many cities and peoples. Therefore those, who are proven to be versed in the conversations of many men, are always considered wiser.".[162]

In a digression on the origin of architecture in *Var.* VII.5, Cassiodorus briefly mentions the unfortunate encounter of Ulysses with the Cyclops Polyphemus. Ulysses also figures in *Var.* II.40, which is in fact a short treatise on the art of music. After a catalogue of mythological examples of famous musicians (§ 6-9), we hear how Ulysses, styled as *vir prudentissimus*, escaped the lures of the Sirens' song. Cassiodorus interprets this passage from the Odyssey philosophically, with Ulysses acting as the wise man who, through his use of reason, can overcome the sensual aspects of music.[163] Although there are precedents for this positive allegorical explanation of this passage in the Odyssey in Late Antiquity,[164] the positive treatment of this mythological character and the degree of attention granted to him is still strange for Cassiodorus, who otherwise only superficially indulges in mythology. Furthermore, the cultivation of the destroyer of Troy and enemy of Aeneas, the forefather of the Romans, by someone with a distinct interest in Rome, such as Cassiodorus, can be considered very strange at the least. However, the key to Cassiodorus' interest in Ulysses can be found in letter XII.15, in which Ulysses is designated as the founder of Squillace:

"It is reported that Squillace, the chief city of Bruttium, whose founder, we read, was Ulysses, the bane of Troy, is being afflicted beyond reason by the arrogant."[165]

The local pride of Cassiodorus might explain the attention given by him to the character Ulysses as the founder of Squillace. Furthermore, describing the founder of Squillace as "the bane of Troy", *Troiae destructor*, brings an extra twist; Ulysses and implicitly Squillace, emulate Troy and its descendants, the cities of Rome and Constantinople.

Cassiodorus' focus on Italy and Rome as the centres of the Greco-Roman world must have been pleasing to the Italian aristocrats who were present in Constantinople after the toppling of the Ostrogothic regime, such as Pope Vigilius and

---

[162] Condorelli (2007: 186). "Ulixes Ithacus in laribus propriis forte latuisset, cuius sapientiam hinc maxime Homeri nobile carmen asseruit, quod multas civitates et populos circumivit, dum illi prudentiores sunt semper habiti, qui multorum hominum conversationibus probantur eruditi." (Fridh and Halporn 1973: 44), my own translation.

[163] Condorelli (2007: 186-187). "L' Ulisse cassiodoreo di Var. 2, 40 rappresenta insomma il *sapiens* che, grazie all'uso della ragione, è in grado di godere liberamente della *dulcedo* della musica, senza lasciarsi traviare dagli aspetti più sensuali e sensibili, e dunque rovinosi, di essa." (Condorelli 2007: 187).

[164] Condorelli (2007: 187).

[165] Condorelli (2007: 186). "Scyllaceum prima urbium Bruttiorum, quam Troiae destructor Ulixes legitur condidisse, irrationabiliter dicitur praesumentium nimietate vexari" Giardina et al. (2015e: 94), trans. Barnish (1992: 169). Also Servius, *Ad Aen.* III.553 reports on Ulysses as the founder of Squillace (Giardina et al. 2015e: 268-269).

Cethegus, with whom Cassiodorus was collaborating during negotiations surrounding the Three Chapters Controversy.[166] Indeed, his reassertion of the importance of Italy on a biblical plane ties in well with the religious preoccupations of his Italian companions in Constantinople.

---

[166] See section 3.2.2.2. (pp. 72-75 of this dissertation). In Jouanaud's (1993) analysis of the implied audience of the *Variae*, we can also perceive the Italian origin and interests of Cassiodorus' implied readers, such as Liguria (Jouanaud 1993: 726, 728) and Lucania (Jouanaud 1993: 730). See also Gillett (1998: 50). A similar audience is intended for Cassiodorus' *Gothic History* (Momigliano 1966: 195).

## 5.4. The Social Dimension of Intellectual Localism: Echoes of Athens

### 5.4.1. The Social Dimension of Intellectual Localism

We have seen in the sections above how Lydus and John Malalas traced the cultural achievements of the Greco-Roman world through a genealogy of cultures to their home regions, Lydia and Syria respectively. Perhaps in response to these presumptuous attacks on the cultural legitimacy of Rome and Italy, Cassiodorus developed an ambitious cultural programme in his *Variae*, focusing on the Italian heritage of the Roman Empire. He also exhibited a localist focus on Italy in general, and his home region in the South of Italy.

These different instances of intellectual localism are thoroughly determined by the bureaucratic outlook of the three authors. We can see how they tried to establish the superiority of their region of origin by tying to their home region the origin of different practices which were omnipresent in their daily duties at the department. It is not a coincidence that, in a bureaucratic culture in which writing was highly valued and even sacralised,[167] Malalas, Lydus and Cassiodorus[168] discuss the origin of the alphabet. Likewise, tracing the origins of the Roman magistracies of state to one's home region, in the case of Lydus, or tracing the origin of an important trapping of state such as the colour purple to one's home region, in the case of Malalas, are clear attempts at cultivating the bureaucratic culture in which they functioned.

These attempts at cultural appropriation of the shared bureaucratic culture of the late Roman Empire by one specific local or ethnic group must have felt presumptuous to the other ethnic groups who vied for prestige, power and funding in the different departments of the administration. These instances of intellectual localism are therefore, in my opinion, the literary expression of the bureaucratic competitions between these ethnic groups. Each author writes for and is backed by a specific public; Lydus writes his antiquarian analyses for the Lydians present in Constantinople - and his texts also describe the vicious feuds between Lydians on the one

---

[167] Kelly (2004: 22-23, 31-32). The results of this sacralising tendency can be observed in treatises from the end of the sixth century, such as the *Περὶ τοῦ μυστηρίου τῶν γραμμάτων* of Ps.-Sabas (Bandt 2007).

[168] Cassiodorus also treats of the origin of the alphabet in *Var.* VIII.12. In this letter is stated that the god Mercurius derived the letter forms from the formations of flocks of birds. The reference to Mercurius is also to be found in Hyginus' *Fabulae* (277).

hand and Syrians or Cappadocians on the other hand.[169] John Malalas aimed with his *Chronographia* at patronage from and promotion through the Syrians in the government. The same applies for Cassiodorus, who combines the bilingual ideal of the unified Roman Empire with a fair degree of Italian localism to gather support from the Italian expatriates present in Constantinople.

Furthermore, the central imperial authority distributing power and prestige to the different ethnic groups in its administration acknowledged that these instances of localist antiquarianism were a genuine form of political currency. This is shown by the use of localist antiquarianism in the prefaces to Justinian's *Novels*, which bestow privileges on a specific region. In *Novel* 25, "Concerning the praetor of Lycaonia" (AD 535), Justinian announces his intent to create a praetor for the region of Lycaonia.[170] Justinian justifies his policy by mentioning the antiquity of the Lycaonians and their connection to the Romans. An antiquarian digression on Lycaon is marshalled in order to prove the claim of the Lycaonians:

> "We have deemed it advisable to give a more important magistrate than the present one to the Lycaonians, bearing in mind the beginning when, as related by the writers and interpreters of antiquity, these people were established, and because they are related to the Romans and came into existence nearly in the same manner. For Lycaon, once King of Arcadia, in Greece, also lived in Roman territory, gathered the cenotrii about him and established the beginning of the Roman power—speaking, of course, of the older time, much preceding that of Aeneas and Romulus—sent a colony to this region, which occupied part of Pisidia, gave it his name and called it Lycaonia after him. Hence it is fitting that this land should be graced by a magistrate honored with the ancient insignia of Roman rule, combine the present

---

[169] On Lydus' Lydian connections and network see Kelly (2004: 44, 184-185). His vicious *antibiography* of John of Cappadocia (*Magistr.* III.57-70) is notorious. On Lydus' description of John of Cappadocia's offences see Kelly (2004: 59-60). Most noteworthy, John of Cappadocia is condemned for *being a Cappadocian* (Maas 1992: 87-88). John gives some snide remarks on the Cappadocians as an ethnic group in *Magistr.* III.57, with an epigram against the Cappadocians, a version of which can also be found in the *Anthologia Graeca* XI.238 (Beckby 1958: 660-661), and in *Magistr.* III.62. For some vicious asides against the Syrians see *Magistr.* III.49 and *Mens.* IV.76 (Bandy IV.78). For a list of Lydus' ethnic stereotypes against Syrians and Cappadocians, see Carney (1971b: 30, n. 13).
[170] Maas (1992: 38), Roueché (1998: 85).

civil and military magistracies into one, and give its incumbent the name of praetor.".[171]

The same mechanism can be observed in *Novels* 29 (AD 535)[172] and 30 (AD 536), on Justinian's reorganisations of the provinces of Paphlagonia and Cappadocia.[173] The antiquity of a people is established through antiquarian lore in order to claim moral authority for this people. This moral authority is an argument for the granting of power and prestige to this people by the imperial authority. Not only do the *Novels* exhibit the same mechanism which is used by Lydus, John Malalas and Cassiodorus in their antiquarian writings, but also, when specifying the intended audience of these antiquarian arguments, such as "the writers and interpreters of antiquity", "οἱ τὰ παλαιὰ συγγράφοντές τε καὶ διηγούμενοι" in *Novel* 25,[174] and "the students of antiquity", "οἱ τῆς ἀρχαίας πολυμαθείας (…) ἐρασταί" in *Novel* 30,[175] Justinian and his ghostwriter Tribonian[176] explicitly aim at educated bureaucrats who use the same arguments in their antiquarian writings.[177] Apparently, antiquarian localism was a valid form of political currency, which was used both in the writings of the ethnic groups vying for power and prestige in the imperial bureaucracy and in the enactments of the imperial power granting the same powers and prestige.

I shall close this section on intellectual localism and its social ramifications with a case study in which the bureaucratic interests of the authors yet again collide with their localist tendencies in their antiquarian analyses, namely the treatment of Athens.

### 5.4.2. Echoes of Athens

---

[171] "Τὸ Λυκαόνων ἔθνος μείζονι τῆς νῦν οὔσης ἀρχῆς κατακοσμῆσαι δίκαιον ᾠήθημεν, ἀποβλέποντες εἰς τὰς πρώτας ἀρχὰς ὅθεν αὐτὸ συστῆναι παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ τὰ παλαιὰ συγγράφοντές τε καὶ διηγούμενοι, καὶ ὅτι συγγενέστατόν ἐστι Ῥωμαίοις καὶ σχεδὸν ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν συνῳκισμένον προφάσεων. Λυκάονι γὰρ τῷ πρώην Ἀρκαδίας τῆς ἐν Ἑλλάδι βεβασιλευκότι καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων οἰκῆσαι γέγονε γῆν, καὶ τοὺς πρώην Οἰνώτρους προσλαβόντι τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῇ δοῦναι προοίμιον (φαμὲν δὲ ταῦτα δὴ τὰ παλαιὰ τὰ πολλῷ τῶν Αἰνείου τε καὶ Ῥωμύλου χρόνων πρεσβύτερα), καὶ ἀποικίαν ἐπὶ τὰ τῇδε στείλαντι μέρη μοῖράν τινα τῆς Πισιδίας ἀφελέσθαι, ταύτῃ τε δοῦναι τὴν αὐτοῦ προσηγορίαν Λυκαονίαν τε ἐξ αὐτοῦ καλέσαι τὴν χώραν. Δίκαιον τοίνυν ἂν εἴη καὶ αὐτὴν ἀρχῇ κατακοσμῆσαι τὰ παλαιὰ τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς τάξεως ἐπιγραφομένη σύμβολα, καὶ τοὺς νῦν αὐτῆς ἡγουμένους, τόν τε ἄρχοντα φαμὲν τὴν πολιτικὴν ἀρχὴν τόν τε ἐφεστῶτα τοῖς ὅπλοις, εἰς ἕν τι συναγαγεῖν καὶ τῇ τοῦ πραίτωρος κοσμῆσαι προσηγορίᾳ." Kroll and Schöl (1895: 195-196), trans. Blume.

[172] Schamp (2006a: cxlvi-cl).

[173] Roueché (1998: 86).

[174] Kroll and Schöl (1895: 195).

[175] Kroll and Schöl (1895: 224).

[176] Roueché (1998: 86-87).

[177] Roueché (1998: 88-89) points to the assemblies of the provinces reformed by Justinian's *Novels* as the prime audiences of these antiquarian digressions. My analysis shows that not only these provincial assemblies were the target of Justinian's communication, but also and primarily so the educated bureaucrats who functioned as the representatives of their provinces in Constantinople.

"To contemporaries, the closing of the Athenian school was an unremark-able occurrence that represented neither a tyrannical use of imperial power nor an attack upon the valued cultural tradition of philosophical teaching. Like all else in the later Roman world, it occurred within the confines of a political system that, when working properly, matched imperial initiative to the specific needs of a province or city."[178]

Recently, scholars such as E. Watts have greatly downplayed the contemporary importance accorded to the closing of the Academy at Athens[179] in AD 529. For instance, John Malalas provides the only contemporary testimony to the closing of the Academy.[180] However, although the closure of the Academy as a distinct educational institution did not receive much direct attention in contemporary sources, we should not think lightly of the influence of the city of Athens as a prestigious ideological centre altogether. The Academy at Athens was a thriving educational centre in the first decades of the fifth century, prior to its definitive closure.[181] It was, as such, an important hub for the education of the many bureaucrats and administrators which were required by the Roman state apparatus in Constantinople.[182] Furthermore, alumni of the Academy at Athens are known to have maintained their ties to their *alma mater*, serving as a powerful network of patronage and protection.[183] As such, Justinian's move against the Academy at Athens has been interpreted by M.S. Bjornlie as a measure to curb this network of intellectual bureaucrats in favour of imperial control - more than that it was a measure against pagan culture.[184]

In this section, it will be argued that all three authors tried to cultivate a link between their home region and the city of Athens. This interest in the city of Athens in all three authors is the silent echo of Justinian's closing of the Academy at Athens as one of the many steps to assert imperial control over the bureaucracy. As such, these echoes of Athens are not vociferous complaints on the decline of (pagan) philosophical teaching. These resonances exhibit the remaining prestige of Athens as an intellectual and bureaucratic hub regardless of, or, in spite of the pagan associations this city evokes.

As already mentioned, the only direct testimony to the closing of the Academy of Athens can be found in the *Chronographia* of John Malalas, XVIII.47.[185] This passage could indicate an interest of John Malalas in the city of Athens, which is indeed corroborated by other passages in the *Chronographia*. John Malalas emphasises in these passages the connection between the city of Athens and the city of An-

---

[178] Watts (2004a: 168).
[179] For a bibliography on the late antique Academy at Athens and its closure in AD 529, see Watts (2004a: 168 n.1). On the closure of the Academy and Justinian's religious policies, see also Watts (2004a: 172-174), Thesz (2016: 38).
[180] Al. Cameron (1969: 8), Scott (1981: 21-22), Jeffreys (1990b: 202), Watts (2004a: 168).
[181] Watts (2004a: 170).
[182] Bjornlie (2013: 55-57).
[183] Watts (2004b: 14).
[184] Bjornlie (2013: 65-67).
[185] Watts (2004: 171-177).

tioch through a minority of Athenians who were resettled in Antioch on the acropolis by Seleucus I Nicator at his foundation of Antioch. At this foundational moment, the Athenian minority was also awarded by Seleucus I Nicator with a statue of Athena (*Chron.* VIII.14).[186] In *Chron.* VIII.30, we read how the statue of Athena was transferred to Rome together with the statue of Zeus Ceraunius. The mention in *Chron.* VIII.14 gives the city of Antioch a firmly Athenian ancestry. This Athenian ancestry is apparently an important element to emphasise, as we see it appearing in both the versions of John Malalas and Libanius on the foundation of Antioch, which otherwise contradict each other on several points.[187] Indeed, the importance of this Athenian ancestry is stressed by John Malalas himself when he mentions again in *Chron.* XIII.39, when expounding on the building activities of Theodosius I at Antioch, how the inhabitants of the acropolis were the descendants of the original populace of the city since its foundation by Seleucus I Nicator. Indeed, the Antiochians of Athenian descent are subject to honour, for instance by Pompey, when he rebuilt the *bouleuterion* in Antioch (*Chron.* VIII.29).

The question is whether Malalas' interest in the city of Athens is a function of his localist obsession with Antioch, i.e., whether his interest in Athens is a derivative of his interest in Antioch, or whether something more structural is at work. We know, for instance, that some of the alumni of the Academy of Athens hailed from Syria, which could explain Malalas' interest from a localist point of view.[188]

However, the hypothesis that Athens as such is - despite the closure of its Academy - still a prestigious locus in the *memoryscape* of late antique intellectuals and historians such as Malalas, is corroborated by the following. In addition to Malalas, also Lydus and Cassiodorus, independently of one another, or perhaps in implicit dialogue with one another, try to connect the city of Athens to their own respective regions of origin - which, as the previous sections have attempted to show, have become the new centres of the antiquarians' *memoryscape*.

---

[186] Agusta-Boularot (2006: 111), Saliou (2006: 81-82). "Après la destruction d' Antigonia et le transfert à Antioche des Athéniens qui y étaient installés, Séleucos, pour manifester sa bonne volonté à l'égard de ces anciens sujets d' Antigone, élève une statue d' Athéna" (Saliou 2006: 81).

[187] "Les versions transmises par les deux auteurs (Libanius et Malalas red.), apparemment contradictoires, s'accordent sur l'essentiel, à savoir la présence d' un élément concret marquant l'établissement de bonnes rélations entre Séleucos et les Athéniens contribuant au peuplement de la nouvelle cité. Or le rôle joué par ces derniers dans la fondation de la ville permet d' affirmer l'ascendance athénienne des Antiochéens, qui constitue un élément important de l'identité d' Antioche, au moins dans l'Antiquité tardive." (Saliou 2006: 81). The account on the foundation of Antioch can be found in Libanius, *Or.* XI.163-164 and XV.72. Also empress Eudocia, hailing from Athens, when visiting Antioch in 438, mentioned the Athenian descent of the Antiocheans (Saliou 2006: 81 n. 93).

[188] Watts (2004a: 170).

For instance, in *Mens.* IV.58 (Bandy IV.2),[189] John Lydus explicitly associates his home town of Philadelphia through the character of Proclus[190] - who is, as one of the heads of the Academy of Athens, the best person fitted to endorse Philadelphia:

"The Egyptians had founded Philadelphia in Lydia. The philosopher Proclus and his followers used to call Philadelphia little Athens because of its emulation of the famed Athens on account of both its festivals and temples of the idols."[191]

The city of Athens is also mentioned several times in the Case of Cassiodorus. In *Var.* I.45.3 Boethius is praised by Cassiodorus for introducing the knowledge of the Greeks through his translation programme into the Latin language. Noteworthy in this instance is the fact that Cassiodorus calls Greek knowledge also Athenian. This might indicate how Cassiodorus looks at the Greek intellectual landscape; for him the knowledge of the Greeks predominantly derived from the city of Athens. The Athenians are credited as well with different cultural achievements, such as the performance of theatrical games in an urban context (*Var.* IV.51.5) and the introduction of animal and gladiatorial games (*Var.* V.42.4).

Just like John Malalas and John Lydus, Cassiodorus connects the city of Athens, which he also values positively, with his own home town of Squillace in *Var.* XII.15. This time, Cassiodorus uses the shared propitious climate to connect and associate Squillace with Athens:

"It [Squillace red.] enjoys transparent light, and is blessed, too, with temperate air, experiencing warm winters and cool summers; and life is lived without gloom, where no bad weather is feared. Hence, men are more large minded, since the temperate climate governs all things. For indeed, a hot country makes men cunning and fickle; a cold makes them sly and sluggish; it is only the temperate that sets human nature in good order by its own quality. Thus it is that the ancients called Athens the country of the wise; one which, pervaded by the        purity of its air, through a happy generosity predisposed the clearest minds to the role of philosophy."[192]

In comparison to the attitudes of his contemporaries, Malalas' emphasis on Athens appears to be part of a general tendency. All three authors try to connect

---

[189] Maas (1992: 30-31), Schamp (2006a: xviii-xix).

[190] Schamp (2006a: xix-xxi). For introductions to Proclus' life and works, see, for instance, Siorvanes (1996: 1-47) and Lamberton (2012: xi-xiv).

[191] "ὅτι οἱ περὶ τὸν φιλόσοφον Πρόκλον μικρὰς Ἀθήνας ἐκάλουν τὴν Φιλαδέλφειαν διὰ τὸν πρὸς ἐκείνας ζῆλον διά <τε> τὰς ἑορτὰς καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ τῶν εἰδώλων." (Wünsch 1898: 113), trans. Bandy (2013a: 151, 153).

[192] "Fruitur luce perspicua; aeris quoque temperatione donata apricas hiemes, refrigeratas sentit aestates et sine aliquo maerore transigitur, ubi infesta tempora non timentur. Hinc et homo sensu liberior est, quia temperies cuncta moderatur. Patria siquidem fervens leves efficit et acutos, frigida tardos et subdolos: sola temperata est, quae mores hominum sua qualitate componit. Hinc est quod antiqui Athenas sedem sapientium esse dixerunt, quae aeris puritate peruncta lucidissimos sensus ad contemplativam partem felici largitate praeparavit." (Giardina et al. 2015e: 94), trans. Barnish (1992: 170).

their regions of origin, which are, as we have shown, the new centres of the *memoryscape* of the historian in the sixth century, to the city of Athens. Given the assumption that the closure of the Academy at Athens was only a *fait divers* in the first half of the sixth century, we can be astounded at the inventiveness with which these authors try to connect their regions of origin to Athens - be it by the presence of an Athenian minority, the endorsement of the head of the Academy or even by a climate theory. On the contrary, these echoes of Athens in the writings of historians, living and writing in Constantinople, show the retained importance and prestige of the city as the supplier of erudite bureaucrats. Returning to the mention of the closure of the Academy in Malalas, we can indeed perceive how this notice viewed Athens from the perspective of Constantinopolitan bureaucratic interests, as it connects the imperial initiative with legislation against soothsaying in Constantinople:[193]

> "During the consulship of Decius, the emperor issued a decree and sent it to Athens ordering that no-one should teach philosophy nor interpret the laws; nor should gaming be allowed in any city, for some gamblers who had been discovered in Byzantion had been indulging themselves in dreadful blasphemies. Their hands were cut off and they were paraded around on camels."[194]

In this section, we saw how the three authors coped with the gradual disappearance of a straightforward imperial centre of the *oikoumene* by shifting the focal point of erudite interest to an aspect of the scholar himself, namely his region of origin. These instances of personal recalibration of the focal point of the erudite *memoryscape* were conscious and contentious historiographical acts, with a specific readership in mind, and in dialogue with, or in opposition to, other such acts of recalibration. These localist tendencies functioned within the framework of ethnic groups vying with each other for power and prestige in the administration in Constantinople - and the imperial authority distributing this power and prestige to these different ethnic groups. In the following section we will see how these new centres of erudite and historical consciousness not only focused on the region of origin of the author, but also on the person of the author himself.

---

[193] Watts (2004a: 173-174).
[194] *Chron.* XVIII.47 "Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ὑπατείας τοῦ αὐτοῦ Δεκίου ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς θεσπίσας πρόσταξιν ἔπεμψεν ἐν Ἀθήναις, κελεύσας μηδένα διδάσκειν φιλοσοφίαν μήτε ἀστρονομίαν ἐξηγεῖσθαι μήτε κόττον ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων γίνεσθαι, ἐπειδὴ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ εὑρεθέντες τινὲς τῶν κοττιστῶν καὶ Βλασφημίαις δειναῖς ἑαυτοὺς περιβαλόντες χειροκοπηθέντες περιεβωμίσθησαν ἐν καμήλοις." Thurn (2000: 379), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 264).

# 6

# Replacing Rome: Bureaucracy

In the previous chapter (5), we have seen how John Lydus, John Malalas and Cassiodorus replaced Rome as the centre of the antiquarian *memoryscape* with their home region, thereby also emphasising the importance of themselves as persons mediating in the construction of historical meaning. In the following two chapters (6-7) I shall analyse further how this personalised engagement of the antiquarians with the knowledge and heritage of the past is performed, and how this personalised approach allowed for the partial replacement of Rome as the centre for the generation of historical meaning. The antiquarians will exhibit a strong personal focus which shall etch itself, bureaucrats as they are, on their treatment of the history of the Roman bureaucracy (chapter 6) and their treatment of women and children in their antiquarian accounts (chapter 7).

Before Late Antiquity, antiquarianism exhibited a general interest in the institutions of the Roman state.[1] In Late Antiquity, this erudite interest in the Roman state seems to have increased and specialised. Instead of a general interest in the whole of the Roman state apparatus, several authors devoted their attention to the antiquarian histories of specific departments within the Roman administration.[2] We can mention the fragmentarily preserved work *On the office of the Praetorian Prefect by Arcadius in one volume*, by the third-century jurist and bureaucrat Aurelius Arcadius Charisius,[3] Tribonian's fragmentary *Treatise on Consuls in prose dedicated to the Emperor Justinian*, which we treated in the network analysis (pp. 67-71 of this dissertation), and the antiquarian work - also fragmentarily preserved - of Peter the Patrician, who composed, according to John Lydus, a treatise on the *magister officiorum* (*Magistr.* II.

---

[1] Stevenson (2004: 142-144).
[2] Maas (1992: 42-43).
[3] Caimi (1984: 186, n. 286), Herzog and Schmidt (1989: 69-71), Schamp (2006a: cxix, cxcvi-cxcvii), Vittorio Piacente (2012). This jurist is used by Lydus in *Magistr.* I.14 (Maas 1992: 91), who had an indirect knowledge of him through the *Digests* (Karlowa 1885: 754). An edition of the fragments of this work can be found in Lenel (1889: 59).

25).[4] Besides these particular treatises, several introductions to Justinian's *Novels* exhibit the same interest in the origin of a specific department of state, as we will see later on.[5]

This increased interest in the history of administration can be interpreted as the natural byproduct of a society which underwent a drastic bureaucratisation from the reign of Diocletian onwards.[6] Furthermore, the specificity of this interest, which targeted separate departments of state instead of the Roman bureaucracy as a whole, is an indication of the fierce competition between the different administrative departments which were subjected to the antiquarian analysis. For in most cases we can perceive a personal connection between the author and the department he analysed. Tribonian, who worked on the office of consul, was promoted to the rank of *consularis* on 16th of March of AD 535.[7] Likewise, there is a personal connection between Peter the Patrician, the *magister officiorum* between at least AD 542 and 26th of March AD 565, and his work on the same office.[8]

The sorry state of the preservation of the works of Charisius, Tribonian and Peter the Patrician precludes an in-depth analysis of these sources. However, we can ascertain the methods of self-promotion and self-preservation of the bureaucrat/antiquarian through the antiquarian analysis of one's own department in the works of Cassiodorus, Lydus and Malalas. Indeed, in this chapter, I shall first consider how the personal situation of the antiquarians as bureaucrats elicited a bureaucratic focus in their works. These bureaucratic focuses, as evoked by the personal situation of the authors under scrutiny, indirectly attests to how the traditional centre of the antiquarian *memoryscape*, namely Rome and the Roman Empire, is being partially replaced by the person of the antiquarian. The person of the antiquarian becomes the new framework for generating historiographical meaning. As such, the occupation of the antiquarian as bureaucrat acquires an increased significance as a structural principle behind the antiquarian inquiry. Indeed, not only did the bureaucracy outlive Rome and the Roman Empire in the historiographical imagination of the antiquarian, but we can also perceive how in the western half of the former Roman Empire the Roman administration survived the end of Roman imperial rule. In Lydus, we will see how his bureaucratic focus is one of the dominant principles, next to his localism, determining his antiquarian work. Compared to John Lydus, Cassiodorus and John Malalas will only exhibit a general antiquarian interest in the bureaucratic context in which they functioned.

Second, I shall analyse how this personal focus on one's own bureaucratic situation strongly influenced the antiquarian's viewpoint on the history of his own department, of competing departments and of historical characters who curbed or augmented the power of their own or competing departments. I shall compare the

---

[4] Carney (1971b: 50, 53), Antonopoulos (1985, 1990), Caimi (1984: 280-281), Schamp (2006a: cxviii-cxix, ccvi-ccviii, cdlxxv). Fragments of this work can be found in Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus' *De Caerimoniis* I.84-95, Lydus' *Magistr.* II.25 and *Suda* Π 1406. See also Laniado (1997). http://www.late-antique-historiography.ugent.be/database/works/144/

[5] Roueché (1998).

[6] Carney (1971a: 89-127), Brown (1978: 48), Kelly (2004: 1-7, 107-113).

[7] For a biographical sketch of Tribonian with the dates of his promotions and offices, see Honoré (1978: 40-69).

[8] Antonopoulos (1985: 49, 1990: 21-42).

different ways by which both John Lydus and Cassiodorus grounded the authority of their department, the praetorian prefecture, in different versions of the distant past and origins of Rome. Next, I shall ascertain how Lydus, and, to a lesser extent, Malalas, provided the reader with dissimilar, partisan views on the history of the praetorian prefecture, based on their differing positions within this department. Lydus used the specific historical vicissitudes of the praetorian prefecture as specific losses, in the framework of LaCapra, to account for the perceived decline of the department and the whole of the state during his own lifetime - absence according to LaCapra. The coupling of both resulted in a strong rhetoric of the decline of the Roman state which could be reversed only by the actions of a dedicated and virtuous ruler, such as Justinian.

Third, I will analyse how, in the case of Lydus, the intense coupling of a generalised rhetoric of the decline of the praetorian prefecture to specific historical events and persons is also active on the personal level of Lydus' autobiography. Etched onto the personal history of the author himself, Lydus' personalised history of the praetorian prefecture colluded with his own autobiography. This intense coupling of the two levels associated with cultural trauma by LaCapra will create a strong personal narrative of melancholy and nostalgia. The perceived failure of the Roman state is presented as an acute and profound failure of the author himself.

I shall conclude this chapter with an assessment of the meaning of the history of bureaucracy in the antiquarianism of the three authors. These personalised histories of bureaucracy were not just a means to come to terms with the diminished importance of Rome as the centre of the antiquarian *memoryscape* - by replacing Rome with the persona of the author and his department as frameworks for generating historiographical meaning. These efforts to ground the departments of state in hallowed antiquity were also a form of political currency. As I analysed in the previous chapter, the intellectual localism exhibited by the three authors coincided with a similar local interest in Justinian's *Novels*.[9] Likewise, an antiquarian interest in Justinian's *Novels* for the origin and history of different departments of state similar to the bureaucratic interests of the three authors makes it clear that the antiquarian accounts of the three authors were written with a view toward obtaining a privileged treatment from the central authority. Justinian shows in his *Novels* how he appreciated the legitimising strength of antiquarianism for his bureaucratic reforms.

---

[9] See chapter 5.4.1. (pp. 231-232 of this dissertation).

## 6.1. A Bureaucratic Outlook Guiding the Antiquarian

In all three authors under consideration, we can perceive a distinct focus on the administration of the Roman state. In Lydus, this focus is, next to his localism, one of the dominant principles shaping his antiquarian work. The emphasis on bureaucracy is evident in his *De Magistratibus*, as this work is an account on the different offices of the Roman state. Lydus' interest in bureaucracy is however not limited to this treatise. A significant number of passages from *De Mensibus* treat a varied set of offices, which also betrays the fundamentally bureaucratic outlook of the author.[10] As Lydus handles an extensive set of different offices, political, military and religious,[11] his treatment of the Roman bureaucracy appears to be more in tune with the general and systematic accounts of the Roman state in earlier antiquarianism. However, the department of the praetorian prefecture receives most of his attention. *Magistr.* II.5-12 and the whole of Book III are devoted to the history of this office. Next, Lydus devoted a significant part of his treatise (*Magistr.* III.22-30) to the second-in-command of the praetorian prefecture, the *cornicularius*, a function he himself held for a number of years.[12] On a more profound level, I shall analyse in the next section how, throughout the whole of the treatise, the history of other offices is written in function of the praetorian prefecture[13] and, to a lesser extent, in function of

---

[10] We have analyses of the following offices in the following passages; *antiquarii* in *Mens*. I.33 (Bandy App. 2), augurs in *Mens*. IV.111 (Bandy IV.101), *augustales* in *Mens*. IV.138 (Bandy IV. 121) and Inc. sed. 3 (Bandy IV.103 and IV.105), *clavicularii* in *Mens*. I.31 (Bandy App. 3), consuls in *Mens*. IV.3 (Bandy IV.3), *curetes* in *Mens*. IV.71 (bandy IV.75), *curiosi* in *Mens*. I.30 (Bandy IV.105), *decani* in *Mens*. I.24 (Bandy App. 4), *dipundii Mens*. IV.157 (Bandy App. 20), directors of the *regiones Mens*. IV.138 (Bandy IV.121), *fabricenses Mens*. IV.28 (Bandy App. 13), *frumentarii Mens*. I.30 (Bandy IV.105), *luperci Mens*. IV.25 (Bandy IV.16), the *magister officiorum Mens*. I.30 (Bandy IV.105), *mancipes Mens*. IV.43 (Bandy App. 20), *matricarii Mens*. I.28 (Bandy App. 26), patricians *Mens*. IV.19 (Bandy IV.5), *pontifices Mens*. I.20 (Bandy IV.90), *Mens*. IV.15 (Bandy IV. 89) and *Mens*. IV.102 (Bandy IV.93), priests *Mens*. I.35 (Bandy I.14), *Mens*. IV.26 (Bandy IV.21), *Mens*.IV.67 (Bandy IV.72), and *Mens*. IV.135 (Bandy IV.116), *salii Mens*. IV.2 (Bandy IV.2), and *Mens*. IV.55 (Bandy IV.63), the *scriba* of the *praetor Mens*. I.28 (Bandy App. 26), *silentiarii Mens*. I. 30 (Bandy IV.105), *spatharii Mens*. IV.28 (Bandy App. 13), *veredarici Mens*. I.31 (Bandy App. 23), *vernaculi Mens*. IV.30 (Bandy App. 15), Vestal Virgins *Mens*. inc. sed. 6 (Bandy I.13), and the *vexillationes Mens*. I.41 (Bandy App. 24).

[11] Lydus treats of the *ab actis, adiutores, admissionales, advocati, aediles, antecessores, antiquarii, applicitarii, attentiones,* augurs, *augustales, biarchi, cancellarii, candidati, censores, censuales, centenarii,* centurions, *chartularii, claviculari, clientes, comites, commentarienses,* consuls, *consulares, corniculari, cubicularii,* the *cura epistularum, curetes, curiales, curiosi, cursores, decani, decemviri,* decurions, *delegatores, deputati, diaetarii,* dictators, *dipundii,* directors of the *regiones, ducenarii, exceptarii, excubitores, exodiarii, fabricenses, frumentarii, imperatores, instrumentarii, iudices, legati, lictores, litigatores, luperci,* the *magister officiorum, mancipes, manipuli, matricarii, nocturni, nomenculatores,* the palatine guard, patricians, *pedanei, pontifices, praecones,* the *praefectus annonae,* the *praefectus urbi* or *praetor urbanus, praepositi,* the *praetor,* the praetorian prefect, the *praetor peregrinus,* the prefect of the East, the prefect of the night watch, priests, *primiscrinii, quaesitores,* quaestors, *rationales, regendarii, reges, salii, scholarii,* the *scriba* of the *praetor,* the *scriba* of the *praetor Constantinianus, scriniarii, scutati, secretarii, silentiarii, singularii, spatharii,* the *subadiuva, thecophori, tractatores,* tribunes, tribunes of the plebs, *turmarii, veredarici, vernaculi,* the Vestal Virgins *and vexillationes.*

[12] On Lydus' treatment of this office and on its history, see Schamp (2006c: cciv-ccxx).

[13] On the praetorian prefecture see Hodgkin (1886: 93-144), Jones (1964: 586-592), O'Donnell (1979: 65-66).

the *cornicularius*. In Lydus' personal focus,[14] his own department and his own function of *cornicularius* appear throughout the *De Magistratibus* as the natural ends and centres of the Roman state and its development through the centuries.

In addition to Lydus, Cassiodorus exhibited an articulated interest in bureaucracy. Cassiodorus' focus on the history of the Roman offices of state is clear in Books VI and VII of the *Variae,* which have anonymised sample letters of appointment or *formulae*.[15] In these letters, Cassiodorus treats the various offices extant in the Ostrogothic state - an impressive range of offices which parallels Lydus' panoramic picture of the Roman state.[16]

The first three of these letters, regarding the consul, the patrician and the praetorian prefect, (*Var.* VI.1-3) have the most elaborate antiquarian descriptions. I will give here a short analysis of two of these *formulae* as representative of the whole the collection. *Var.* VI.3, on the praetorian prefect, will be discussed in the next section.

*Var.* VI.1, *Formula of the Consul*, is divided in two parts. The first, antiquarian part (§ 1-4) expounds on the dignity of the consulship which arose from its various executive powers and privileges. The third paragraph digressed on the origin of the rods-and-axes, and closed with an etymological explanation of the word consul:

---

[14] On the personal lens through which Lydus describes the Roman bureaucracy in his *De Magistratibus*, see Kelly (2004: 2). For his personal approach to the praetorian prefecture specifically see Carney (1971b: 37), Kelly (2004: 14-15), Kaldellis (2005: 2-5). For the same personal approach to his depiction of bureaucratic reforms see Kelly (2004: 76).

[15] Giardina (2006: 25-26), Bjornlie (2013: 230-234).

[16] We have, in order, VI.1 *Formula of the Consul*, VI.2 *Formula of the Patrician*, VI.3 *Formula of the Praetorian Prefect*, VI.4 *Formula of the Urban Prefect*, VI.5 *Formula of the Quaestor*, VI.6 *Formula of the Magister Officiorum*, VI.7 *Formula of the Comes Sacrarum Largitionum*, VI.8 *Formula of the Comes Privatarum*, VI.9 *Formula of the Comes Patrimonii*, VI.13 *Honours for* a *Comitiacus*, VI.14 *Formula for a senator*, VI.15 *Formula for the Vicarius of Rome*, VI.16 *Formula of the Notaries*, VI.17 *Formula of the Referendarii*, VI.18 *Formula of the Praefectus Annonae*, VI.19 *Formula of the Comes Archiatrorum*, VI.20 *Formula of the Consularis*, VI.21 *Formula of the Rector Provinciae*, VI.22 *Formula of the Comes Syracusanus*, VI.23 *Formula of the Comes Neapolitanus*, VII.1 *Formula of the Comes Provinciae*, VII.2 *Formula of the Praes*, VII.3 *Formula of the Comes Gothorum*, VII.4 *Formula of the Dux of Raetia*, VII.5 *Formula of the Cura Palatii*, VII.6 *Formula of the Comes Formarum*, VII.7 *Formula of the Praefectus Vigilum Urbis Romae*, VII.8 *Formula of the Praefectus Vigilum Ravennae*, VII.9 *Formula of the Comes Portus Urbis Romae*, VII.10 *Formula of the Tribunus Voluptatum*, VII.11 *Formula of the Defensor of a town*, VII.12 *Formula of the Curator of a town*, VII.13 *Formula of the Comes of Rome*, VII.14 *Formula of the Comes of Ravenna*, VII.15 *Formula of the Urban Prefect*, VII.16 *Formula of the Comes of some islands*, VII.17 *Formula of the Praepositus of lime factories of Rome*, VII.17b *Formula of the Praepositus of the candy stores of Rome*, VII.18-19 *Formula on the arms factories*, VII.23 *Formula on the Vicarius of a port*, VII.25 *Formula of the Princeps of Dalmatia*, VII.26-28 *Formula of the Count of diverse cities*, VII.29 *Formula of the guardsmen of the gates of a city*, VII.30 *Formula of the Tribune of a province*, VII.31 *Formula of the Princeps in Rome*, VII.32 *Formula on the mint*, VII.37 *Formula on the rank of Spectabilis*, VII.38 *Formula on the rank of Clarissimus*, VII.43 *Formula on the Chartularius*. Some *Formulae* are not directly related to a specific office. VI.10-12 are *Formulae of a vacant function*. VI.24-25 digress on the advent of the *Comes Neapolitanus*, after the *Formula* of this office in VI.23. Letters VII.20-22 treat the taxes *binae* and *ternae*, whereas letter VII.25 is a letter of recommendation of a *Princeps* to a *Comes*. *Var*. VII.33-36, 39-42, and 44-47 are different *Formulae* pertaining to civil law and administration.

"For this reason they prescribed that the fasces should be attached to the axes -weapons with such power. Namely, as the axes would be rather slowly detached from the fasces, they would receive a respite for deliberating on whether they would decree on the death, the slaughter of a human being. Likewise, the consul was named such after *consulting*, as all his decisions were given to judgment, lest he became insolent in his mind." [17]

The letter exhibits a sharp distinction between the description of the duties of the consul in past times (*Priscorum iudicio*) (§ 1) and the second part of the *Formula*, emphatically starting with *sed nunc* (§ 5) and describing the functions of the consuls under the Ostrogoths. As the consuls receive all the honours of the office without having to assume its ponderous duties - these belong now to the Ostrogoths -, the consuls are exhorted to take up the office with joy and liberality.

*Var.* VI.2, with the *Formula* of the Patrician, is in its whole an antiquarian description of the origins, functions and privileges of the patrician. Its origin is traced to the priests of Jupiter. The patricians took their name from the senators, *patres*, because of their resemblance (§ 1). The righteousness inherent in priests prompted the institution of the Roman kings from the priestly college of augurs. The priesthood is also used to explain why the function of patrician is a lifelong duty (§ 2). The same applies to the pontificate (§ 3). The letter closes with an enumeration of the privileges and functions of the patrician, and an exhortation to live up to the dignity of the office.

As the analysis shows, the *formulae* as bureaucratic templates usually start with praise of the office in question and a short account of the history and origin of the office. This antiquarian account typically prompts Cassiodorus to enumerate the duties of the office and to exhort the appointee to fulfill them dutifully. Most significantly, this structure of the *formulae* and the function of the antiquarian digressions on the origin of an office in the *formulae* exhibit parallels with some of Justinian's *Novels*.[18] In these, we can ascertain a structure and a function of the antiquarian digressions within the whole of a specific *Novel* similar to the *formulae*. The antiquarian analysis of the origin of a specific office provides Justinian with the motivation for his law. For instance, in *Novel* 30 (AD 536), on the proconsul of Cappadocia, an elaborate antiquarian description of the renowned origins of Cappadocia provides the justification for Justinian's institution of a proconsul:

"How renowned the name and nation of the Cappadocians was, and how much trouble they gave the Romans before they were conquered, is well known to the students of antiquity. They reigned over nearly all of Pontus, and produced celebrated men, worthy of the respect of the Romans; their

---

[17] "Hinc est quod etiam fasces atque secures tantae potestati praeceptae sunt inligari ut, cum tardius solverentur, moram deliberationis acciperent si de caede aut nece hominis aliquid censuissent. Ita, cum omnia eius traderentur arbitrio, ne insolesceret animo, consul dictus est a consulendo." Giardina et al. (2015a: 4), my own translation.

[18] Namely *Nov.* 13 Περὶ τῶν πραιτώρων τοῦ δήμου (AD 535), *Nov.* 15 Περὶ τῶν ἐκδίκων (AD 535), *Nov.* 24 Περὶ τοῦ πραίτωρος Πισιδίας (AD 535), *Nov.* 25 Περὶ τοῦ πραίτωρος Λυκαονίας (AD 535), *Nov.* 30 Περὶ τοῦ ἀνθυπάτου Καππαδοκίας (AD 536), *Nov.* 62 *De senatoribus* (AD 537), and *Nov.* 105 Περὶ τῶν ὑπάτων (AD 537). For an analysis of the parallels between the *fornulae* of Cassiodorus and Justinian's *Digests*, see Bjornlie (2013: 232).

country is large and admirable and so pleased the emperor that he appointed for the management of his possessions there a magistrate not of lower but of higher rank than the one in Pontus. The country is very populous, and has a large city which bears a name which is dear to us, namely, that of Caesar (Caesarea), who laid a good foundation for our empire, on account of which he is famous among all the nations of the earth, and of all the names of our majesty, we are proudest of the name of Caesar.

It has appeared to us that to give to this region a magistrate of inferior rank is more unbecoming than is proper (…)"[19]

Cassiodorus' *Formula of the Consul* (*Var.* VI.1) invites further comparison with Justinian's *Novels*. In *Novel* 62,[20] on the senators, the preface gives an antiquarian description of the functions and activities of the senate in the past. As in the *Formula* of the consul, this preface with its antiquarian content, starting with *Antiquissimis temporibus*, is meaningfully contrasted with the present practice as prescribed in the law itself: *in praesenti itaque*. In both documents, the transfer of power from a traditional institution in the Roman state to a new institution - the Ostrogoths in the case of Cassiodorus, the emperor in the case of Justinian - is emphasised. These similarities between Cassiodorus and Justinian in their treatment of antiquarianism in their rhetoric of statesmanship attest to a common ground for the expression of political aspirations. Antiquarianism is a valid form of political currency to debate on the state and future of the Roman administration. This commonality will be further explored in the conclusion to this chapter.

Cassiodorus does not only discuss the offices of the Roman state in Books VI and VII of the *Variae*. Antiquarian references to the origins and functions of Roman offices appear also scattered throughout the letter collection. In *Var.* VI.2, as well as the patricians, the augurs are also treated. The *cancellarii* are treated in *Var.* XI.6, and *Var.* XI.36 treats of the *cornicularius*. Cassiodorus treats of the *curiales* in *Var.* IX.2 and of judges in *Var.* III.27 and XI.40. Moreover, a set of short letters announcing the promotion and retirement of different office holders (*Var.* XI.17-37) appears as a miniature second version of the *formulae* later on in the letter-book.

The positions of both the *formulae* in Books VI-VI and the miniature set of *formulae* in Book XI.17-37 reveal the personal focus of Cassiodorus in his depiction of Ostrogothic bureaucracy. The two books of *formulae* receive a central position in the whole of the collection, dividing the work into two halves, Books I-V with letters

---

[19] "Ὁπόσον ἐστὶ τὸ Καππαδοκῶν ὄνομά τε καὶ ἔθνος, καὶ ὅπως τὴν ἀρχὴν ἵνα κτηθείη πράγματα παρέσχε Ῥωμαίοις, οἱ τῆς ἀρχαίας πολυμαθείας οὐκ ἠγνοήκασιν ἐρασταί. τοῦ τε γὰρ Πόντου σχεδὸν παντὸς ἐξῆρχε, καὶ ἄνδρες ὀνομαστότατοί τε καὶ φροντίδος ἄξιοι Ῥωμαίοις γενόμενοι μεγάλης ἐκεῖθεν ἤρθησαν. γῇ τε αὐτοῖς ἐστι πολλή τε καὶ θαυμαστὴ καὶ οὕτως ἀρέσασα τῇ βασιλείᾳ, ὡς καὶ ἀρχὴν ἐπιστῆσαι ταῖς ἐκεῖσε κτήσεσιν ἰδίαν, τῆς Ποντικῆς ἀρχῆς οὐκ ἐλάττω, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ μείζω. πολυανθρωποτάτη τε γὰρ καθέστηκε καὶ πόλιν παρέχεται μεγίστην τὴν τοῦ φιλτάτου Καίσαρος ἡμῖν ἐπώνυμον τοῦ δόντος ἀρχὴν ἀγαθὴν τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς μοναρχίᾳ, δι' ὃν ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς τῆς γῆς ἔθνεσιν ὀνομαστότατόν ἐστι τὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος ὄνομα καὶ ᾧπερ ἡμεῖς ἀντ' ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν τῆς βασιλείας συμβόλων σεμνυνόμεθα. Ταύτην δὴ τὴν χώραν ἀρχῇ παραδεδόσθαι μικρᾷ σφόδρα ἡμῖν ἐφάνη τοῦ προσήκοντος ἀνάξιον (…)" Kroll and Schöl (1895: 223-224), trans. Blume.
[20] Kroll and Schöl (1895: 332-333).

on behalf of King Theodoric, and Books VIII-XII, with letters on behalf of the former's successors and by Cassiodorus himself as praetorian prefect. According to Giardina,[21] this central position of the two books of *formulae* within the *Variae* is a chronological and logical consequence of the centrality of the quaestorship in Cassiodorus' political thought. The quaestor has a pivotal role in Cassiodorus' political hierarchy, since he, as the mouthpiece of the monarch, acts as the referee of *civilitas*, a notion which is the regulating framework and hierarchy in defining the relationships between the Goths and the Romans.[22] The quaestor likewise articulates the will of the king throughout the format of ancient legislative practice. He therefore serves as the crucial medium between the Roman past and the hybrid Romano-Gothic present.[23] Not by coincidence, the quaestorship was one of the offices which Cassiodorus held during his career in Ostrogothic Italy.

Next to the two books of *formulae* stressing the importance of the quaestor in the Roman state, we have a second set of *formulae* (*Var.* XI.17-37), which implicitly emphasised another office. The importance of this set in Book XI is suggested by the existence of two prefaces in the collection, one at the beginning of Book I and one at the beginning of Book XI, dividing the *Variae* in two parts; one of letters on behalf of Theodoric (I-V) followed by two books of *formulae* (VI-VII) and three books of letters on behalf of Theodoric's successors, and a second part of letters on Cassiodorus' own behalf as praetorian prefect. If we interpret the set of short letters of appointment and retirement in *Var.* XI.17-37 as a miniature copy of the two books of *formulae* in Books VI-VII, a compelling parallelism appears. The first part of the *Variae* has Theodoric's letters followed by a generic overview of the offices of the state in Books VI-VII. The part introduced by the second preface has a parallel structure: Cassiodorus' letters as praetorian prefect followed by a set of *formulae*. This parallelism positions the praetorian prefect as a miniature copy of, or second in command after, Theodoric, the emblematic leader and political example of the *Variae*.[24] This parallelism emphasised the role of the office of praetorian prefect, an office which Cassiodorus also held during his career in Italy. In the next section we will further explore Cassiodorus' antiquarian account of the praetorian prefect as mythical second-in-command of the Roman state.

As the analysis of Cassiodorus' descriptions of the Roman administration has shown, through the positioning of these letters, Cassiodorus implicitly highlighted the importance of two offices, namely the offices of quaestor and of praetorian prefect. As Cassiodorus held these two offices, his presentation of the Roman bu-

---

[21] Giardina (1993: 62-72). The centrality of the quaestorship is also suggested by the fact that a significant part of the *Variae* as separate documents were most possibly written during Cassiodorus' term as quaestor, such as the letters in Books I-IV and the last two letters of book V (O'Donnell 1979: 23, 60), and Books VI and VII of *formulae* (O'Donnell 1979: 60).

[22] On the notion of *civilitas* in Cassiodorus, see Momigliano (1966: 191), O'Donnell (1979: 96-99), Barnish (1992: xxiv-xxv), Giardina (1993), Heydemann (2016: 26-27, 29).

[23] On the influence of Cassiodorus' quaestorship on the *Variae*, see Gillett (1998), Barnish (2008).

[24] O'Donnell (1979: 80): "The first five books reflect most favorably on Theodoric himself, while the last five books seem to be centered more and more on the person of Cassiodorus himself (…) It is even possible to see an ironic twist (or *apologia pro vita sua*) in this transition, perhaps even a hint that with Theodoric gone, Cassiodorus himself was the last guardian of the old values left in the government.".

reaucracy is highly personal, focused on enhancing the prestige of his own *curriculum vitae*. As regards his highlighting the importance of the office of praetorian prefect, we can even suspect a notion of family pride, as also Cassiodorus' father had also held the office of praetorian prefect.[25] In this aspect, his strategies of personal self-presentation through the antiquarianism of bureaucracy are similar to the strategies of John Lydus, Peter the Patrician, Tribonian and Charisius.

In John Malalas, we can observe a general interest in the machinations of the Roman bureaucracy which betrays his personal outlook. His interest in legislation, most notably legislation on the legitimacy of offspring, and the connection of this interest to Justinian's legislation, will be explored in the next chapter on antiquarianism and women (pp. 293-312 of this dissertation).[26] Apart from this legal interest, Malalas' *Chronography* is the only extant source from Late Antiquity which systematically mentioned the creation of provinces.[27] This bureaucratic focus on the internal provincial boundaries of the empire[28] is in tune with the outlook of a bureaucrat. Most typically for a bureaucrat, who in general only celebrates the augmentation of the administration, John Malalas merely mentioned the creation, not the abolishment, of provinces.[29]

The focus on bureaucracy as exhibited by the three antiquarians, and the specific focus on the offices which were part of their *curriculum vitae*, are indications of a personal agenda guiding their research. The appearance of this personal agenda in historical inquiry can be interpreted as a replacement of Rome and the Roman Empire as the centre of the antiquarian *memoryscape*. In the next section, I shall further explore the personal quality of these agendas through an analysis of the antiquarians' subjective and partisan approach to the history of their own departments - and the departments of their competitors in the Roman administration.

---

[25] As can be read in *Var.* I.3 (O'Donnell 1979: 19, 23). Also in the east, a cousin of the Cassiodori, Heliodorus, had a splendid career as praetorian prefect, as we can read in letter I.4 of the *Variae*. Yet, as this character is nowhere else attested, we can surmise that this Heliodorus was a, yet again a part of the family history priding itself in being a family of praetorian prefects (Carney 1971b: 97, n. 2).

[26] On Malalas' interest in Justinian's legislation, see Scott (1981), Jeffreys (1990b: 201-202), Watts (2004a: 172-175), Métivier (2006: 156), Carrara and Gengler (2017: 15).

[27] Métivier (2006: 155).

[28] Jeffreys (1990a: 61-62, 1990b: 205-206, 213), Métivier (2006: 166).

[29] Métivier (2006: 165).

## 6.2. Partisan Accounts

### 6.2.1. Lydus and Cassiodorus: Which Praetorian Prefecture?

In this section, I shall compare the differing personal agendas behind the antiquarian depictions in John Lydus and Cassiodorus of the praetorian prefecture, a department in which the former functioned and of which the latter was prefect.[30] Both derived the importance of the office[31] from its place as the second in command of the Roman state from its origins onward. However, both authors traced different lines of descent for the praetorian prefecture. Whereas Lydus depicted the praetorian prefecture as the continuation of an office which originated in Rome's mythical foundation history, Cassiodorus traced the praetorian prefecture to the biblical precedent of Joseph and the pharaoh in the Book of Genesis.

#### 6.2.1.1. John Lydus: The Antiquity of the Praetorian Prefecture and the Antiquarian Dilemma

In Lydus' account, the authority of the praetorian prefecture, and, under him, the *cornicularius*, derived from its continuity with the hallowed past.[32] As a continuator of the office of cavalry commander,[33] instituted by Romulus, the office traced its origins to the very foundation of Rome. This strategy of retrojecting the origins of the praetorian prefecture to the earliest history of Rome, however, yet again put Lydus in an antiquarian dilemma. For Lydus had painted the earliest history of Rome and notably Romulus in dark colours, emphasising the tyranny and illegitimacy of his rule, as we have seen in a previous chapter (pp. 143-153 of this dissertation). In this case as well, Lydus concocted an idiosyncratic solution to this antiquarian dilemma.

Throughout Lydus' antiquarian history of the magistracies of the Roman state, we can perceive a tendency to stress the continuity of the praetorian prefecture with its predecessor, the cavalry commander, throughout the centuries. In the first book of *De Magistratibus*, Lydus gives an overview of the nine civil institutions of the Roman state, namely, in order, the cavalry commander, the *patricii*, the *quaestores*, the *decemviri*, the dictator, the censor, the tribunes, the *praetores* and the prefect of the night watch. After an introduction on the earliest phases of Roman institutional history, with the institutional achievements of Romulus (*Magistr.* I.1-13), we have in or-

---

[30] On this department, see Carney (1971b: 4-7). On the Praetorian Prefecture in Lydus, see Schamp (2006b: dxxxvi-dxli, dcxxxvii-dclv, dccxxv-dccxxxix).

[31] Carney (1971b: 77).

[32] "He does so because it is vital that he establish a key point: the Prefecture has to have a pedigree stemming from a Republican magistracy, because the magistracies created by the Emperors were held in far, far lower esteem." (Carney 1971b: 37). "L'évolution de la fonction [de la préfecture des prétoriens] à l'époque impériale a vraisemblablement été antéposée aux temps des origines pour lui conférer une ancienneté gage de majesté, pour justifier l'importance croissante que reçut ce poste dans l'histoire de l'empire." (Meurant 2003: 492). Debuisson (1991: 70-72), Maas (1992: 83-101), Kelly (2004: 14-15), Schamp (2006a: cxix, 2006b: d, dxxxvi, dxxxviii). Also in his treatment of the Prefect of the Night Watches, Lydus' aim was to prove that there was no discontinuity in the history of this office (Schamp 2006a: cdlvi).

[33] On the cavalry commander in Lydus, see Schamp (2006b: cdxcviii-dii, dlv, dclxviii-dclxxi).

der a treatment of nine offices. In *Magistr.* I.9, Lydus quoted Tarrutienus Paternus' *De re militari*[34] in order to explain the organisation of the Roman army under Romulus:

> "(…) he [Romulus] added also three hundred horseman to the forces, and he turned the authority over them to a certain Celer, so he was called. For this reason synecdochically the entire army at that time was styled *celeres*."[35]

John Lydus furthermore stressed the continuity between the cavalry commander and the praetorian prefect.[36] In *Magistr.* I.14, Lydus quoted from the above mentioned Aurelius Arcadius Charisius, in order to explain how the emperors enhanced the power of the cavalry commander after having renamed the office to praetorian prefect:

> "It is needful to state briefly whence the prefect of the *praetoria* got his origin. It was rather from the cavalry commander, for it has been handed down by all the ancients that in his place the prefect was instituted. (…) Later, however, when sovereign power had been transferred to the emperors, the prefect of the *praetoria* emerged in the pattern of the cavalry commander. And greater power was given him than his predecessor wielded to administrate affairs and also to establish and train armies and to right whatever needed righting, and he advanced to such a degree of preeminence that no one was permitted to proceed to appeal or to bring any charge at all against this judgment."[37]

The renaming of the office of cavalry commander in praetorian prefect and the enhancement of the power of this office came about during the transition from Republic to principate. Whereas Julius Caesar usurped different titles, amongst

---

[34] Caimi (1984: 149, n. 194), Schamp (2006a: cxxviii, clxxxv-clxxxvii). This jurist who lived under the Antonines is only fragmentarily preserved. See Lenel (1889: 335-336), Liebs (1997: 136-137).

[35] "προστέθεικε δὲ καὶ τριακοσίους ἱππότας ταῖς δυνάμεσιν, Κελερίῳ τινὶ οὕτω καλουμένῳ τὴν φροντίδα τούτων παραδούς. ταύτῃ συνεκδοχικῶς ἅπας ὁ στρατὸς κελέριοι τότε προσηγορεύθησαν." (Schamp 2006b: 17-18), trans. Bandy (1983: 21).

[36] Caimi (1984: 203-204).

[37] "Tanto intensa dové essere la gioia di Lido nel ritrovarsi fra le mani un autorevole testo comprovante le lontane e nobili radici della prefettura (…)." Caimi (1984: 203). On Lydus' quote of Charisius in *Magistr.* I.14, see Caimi (1984: 186-193, 203-204). This quote originated in the *Digests* I.11.1. Lydus either derived it from a preparatory copy to the *Digests* or borrowed it directly from the *Digests* themselves (Caimi 1984: 190). Caimi (1984: 192-193) accounted for the differences between the extract in the *Digests* and Lydus' translation by assuming Lydus interpolated the original or the excerpt from the *Digests* in order to make the Praetorian Prefecture look more important. See also Schamp (2006b: dxxxvi-dxxxvii). "διὰ βραχέων εἰπεῖν χρειῶδές ἐστι πόθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν <ὁ> τῶν πραιτωρίων ὕπαρχος ἔσχεν. ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱππάρχου ἦν μᾶλλον· εἰς τόπον γὰρ ἐκείνου τὸν ἔπαρχον προχειρισθῆναι πᾶσι τοῖς ἀρχαίοις <παραδέδοται> (…) τοῦ δὲ κράτους ὕστερον ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοκράτορας μετενεχθέντος, πρὸς ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ ἱππάρχου <ὁ> τῶν πραιτωρίων προῆλθεν ἔπαρχος. καὶ δέδοται αὐτῷ μείζων ἢ κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἰσχὺς τῆς τε διοικήσεως τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς τε καταστάσεως καὶ ἀσκήσεως τῶν στρατευμάτων καὶ ἐπανορθώσεως ἁπάσης καὶ εἰς τοσοῦτον ὑπεροχῆς προελθεῖν, ὡς μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι πρὸς ἔφεσιν ὁρμᾶν ἢ ὅλως ἐγκαλεῖσθαι τὴν αὐτοῦ κρίσιν." (Schamp 2006b: 23), trans. Bandy (1983: 27, 29).

which was the title of cavalry commander (*Magistr.* II.2), Augustus implemented the reforms leading to the Prefecture (*Magistr.* II.3):

> "He also made use of all the insignia which his father had used, and all the military services  and staffs and bodyguards which both Romulus and all from the latter down to his day had employed. He altered only the cavalry commander to prefect; he honored him with a sumptuous chariot made of silver, assigned to him a civilian staff to obey his commands, and called them *Augustales* after himself, about whom I shall speak a little later in the part concerning the staff of the prefects."[38]

In this passage also there is a strong emphasis on the continuity between the cavalry commander and the praetorian prefecture. Maintaining this continuity also implied suppressing alternative versions to the history of the Roman state. In spite of the fact that Lydus has a distinct interest in the reforms of Numa Pompilius, as we analysed in a previous chapter (pp.154-157 of this dissertation), and despite the fact that Lydus quoted from Plutarch's *Lives*,[39] he fails to mention - possibly on purpose - Numa's first reform of state as mentioned by Plutarch (*Numa* 7.4):

> "His [Numa's] first measure on assuming the government was to disband the body of three hundred men that Romulus always kept about his person, and called " Celeres " (that is, *swift ones*) ; for he would not consent to distrust those who trusted him, nor to reign over those who distrusted him.".[40]

Indeed, as this passage drastically disrupts the continuity between *celeres*, cavalry commander and praetorian prefect, it is not a surprise that Lydus did not make any mention of it.

As the cavalry force under the command of Celer gave its name to the entire Roman army, the *celeres*, we can assume a certain importance of the cavalry commander within the whole of the army. Indeed, Lydus placed the cavalry commander as the first office of nine in his overview of offices, later in Book I (*Magistr.* I. 14-I.15).[41] This primary position of the cavalry commander reflects its importance within the early Roman state, an importance which was maintained during the royal

---

[38] Caimi (1984: 137). Significantly, this version of the facts can only be found in Lydus (Schamp 2006b: dxxxviii): "Sous la plume de Jean, la création devient une simple transformation, même s'il doit concéder des modifications considérables.". "ἐπισήμοις τε πᾶσιν ἐχρήσατο, οἷς ὁ πατήρ, καὶ στρατείαις καὶ τάξεσι καὶ δορυφόροις, ὅσοις ὁ Ῥωμύλος τε καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μέχρι τούτων ἐχρήσαντο, μόνον τὸν ἵππαρχον εἰς ἔπαρχον μεταβαλών, ὀχήματι τιμήσας ὑπερηφάνῳ ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένῳ, καὶ τάξιν πολιτικὴν ἀπονείμας αὐτῷ πειθαρχεῖν, Αὐγουσταλίους ἐξ αὐτοῦ καλέσας αὐτούς, περὶ ὧν ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν ὑπάρχων μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐροῦμεν." (Schamp 2006c: 5), trans. Bandy (1983: 87).
[39] For a list of testimonies of Plutarch in Lydus, amongst which two from the *Lives*, see Maas (1992: 234).
[40] "Παραλαβὼν δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν πρῶτον μὲν τὸ τῶν τριακοσίων σύστημα διέλυσεν, οὓς Ῥωμύλος ἔχων ἀεὶ περὶ τὸ σῶμα Κέλερας προσηγόρευσεν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ ταχεῖς · οὔτε γὰρ ἀπιστεῖν πιστεύουσιν οὔτε βασιλεύειν ἀπιστούντων ἠξίου." (Perrin 1914: 328), trans. Perrin (1914: 329).
[41] Caimi (1984: 135).

period, the republic, and later, as praetorian prefecture, during the imperial period (*Magistr.* I.14):

> "As, then, I have said, Romulus handed over the infantry force to the centurions but the cavalry [force] to Celer, who previously had been leader of the entire army, and enjoined him to be master of every power and fortune and administration; consequently, the king      witheld from the cavalry commanders nothing other than the crown alone as a power over which he could not exercise ownership. Both the *reges* and the *dictatores* all had this magistracy, and afterwards so did the C*aesares*, though they had renamed the cavalry commander as prefect.".[42]

Lydus' positioning of the cavalry commander as the first of the nine institutions of the state is justified by the importance accorded to this office as second in command under Romulus and the kings, and under the dictators during the republican period. Indeed, Lydus continually stressed the fact that the cavalry commander/ praetorian prefect was the second in command of the Roman state (*Magistr.* I.37, II. 6, II.5, II.9):[43]

> "And in Rome (where and where alone it was a custom for the court to be called *palatium*) he was accustomed to be called "prefect of the *Caesar*," that is to say, "second after the latter"".[44]

> "That the magistracy from the beginning ceded to the sceptre alone, as I have stated earlier, having been allotted an honour which was equal to it, can be clearly discerned from the imperial residence.".[45]

As the analysis has shown, throughout the *De Magistratibus*, Lydus stressed the continuity between the cavalry commander and the praetorian prefect, thereby tracing the origins of the Prefecture, and its authority, to the hallowed mythical origins of Rome herself. Furthermore, Lydus emphasised the importance of his department by stressing the fact that this office was considered to be the omnipresent second in command of the Roman government, surviving every stage of this state.[46] As such, the prefecture transcended the different forms of the Roman state in order

---

[42] Meurant (2003: 492). "Ὡς οὖν εἴρηταί μοι, τὴν μὲν πεζομάχον δύναμιν τοῖς ἑκατοντάρχοις, τὴν δὲ ἱππικὴν Κελερίῳ τῷ πρὶν τῆς ὅλης ἡγησαμένῳ στρατιᾶς παραδέδωκεν, πάσης αὐτὸν δυνάμεως καὶ τύχης καὶ διοικήσεως κρατεῖν ἐγκελευσάμενος, ὡς ἕτερον οὐθὲν ἢ μόνον τὸν στέφανον τὴν βασιλείαν παρὰ τῶν ἱππάρχων κατασχεῖν ἐξουσίαν ἀδέσποτον ἑαυτῇ. ταύτην τὴν ἀρχὴν οἵ τε ῥῆγες οἵ τε δικτάτωρες ἔσχον ἅπαντες καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν οἱ Καίσαρες, ἔπαρχον τὸν ἵππαρχον μετονομάσαντες." (Schamp 2006b: 22), trans. Bandy (1983: 27).
[43] Schamp (2006b: d-di, dlv). In *Magistr*. II.17.2 and II.9.2-3, Lydus even described rituals likening the praetorian prefect to the sovereign (Schamp 2006a: cdlxxxv).
[44] Caimi (1984: 192). *Magistr.* II.6 "καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς Ῥώμης (ἐφ᾽ ἧς καὶ μόνης τὴν αὐλὴν παλάτιον καλεῖσθαι νόμος) ὕπαρχος τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐνόμιζεν, οἷον εἰ δεύτερος μετ᾽ ἐκεῖνον" (Schamp 2006c: 8), trans. Bandy (1983: 91).
[45] *Magistr.* II.9 "Ὅτι δὲ κατὰ τὸ πρόσθεν εἰρημένον μόνῳ τῷ σκήπτρῳ ἀνέκαθεν ἡ ἀρχὴ παρεχώρησεν, τὴν ἴσην ἐκείνῳ λαχοῦσα τιμήν, ἄντικρυς ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας ἔστι λαβεῖν." (Schamp 2006c: 11), trans. Bandy (1983: 97).
[46] Carney (1971b: 129).

to become the essence of it. Be it a kingdom, republic, or empire, Rome could always fall back on its second in command.

Lydus applied both characteristics of the prefecture, namely its continuity through the ages and its status as the second authority after the ruler, to his depiction of the *cornicularius* at the beginning of his description of this office (*Magistr.* III.22):[47]

"(…) there remains again finally to show the *cornicularius* in history as an august leader; for, since he holds the entire staff together, there is need to prove his as its beginning and at the same time its end. Now then, even time alone suffices to confirm the fact that he has been head of the staff for over one thousand three hundred years and that he had made his appearance in the state along with the very founding of sacred Rome; for from the beginning he was in attendance upon the cavalry commander, while the cavalry commander upon the *rex* at that time. Consequently, the *cornicularius* is well known from the beginnings of the Roman state, even if nothing but his designation has been left to him."[48]

The parallelism between the praetorian prefect and the *cornicularius* was used by Lydus to bestow prestige and authority on the latter. Lydus described a chain of command, in which power emanated from the central authority (king/dictator/emperor) through the second in command (cavalry commander/praetorian prefect) to the third in command, the *cornicularius*. Lydus furthermore used this parallelism in order to furnish the *cornicularius* with prestigious origins. Perhaps this parallelism was even intended to mask an otherwise conspicuous lack of the *cornicularius*' historical credentials. For we can notice how, apart from this bold and unfounded statement on the antiquity of the *cornicularius*, Lydus gave no further antiquarian descriptions of the office, despite the length he devoted to this office.[49] Apparently, Lydus' antiquarianism - and antiquarian inventions - ran parallel to his own career within the Roman bureaucracy. This coupling of a generalised narrative of the history of the Roman state, absence in LaCapra's framework, to the personal history of a bureaucrat, loss in LaCapra's framework, will be further explored in sections 6.2.2.2. and 6.3. of this chapter (pp. 265-272, 285-287 of this dissertation).

By tracing the origins of the praetorian prefecture to Romulus and the earliest history of Rome, Lydus put himself yet again in an antiquarian dilemma. On the one hand, the antiquity of the praetorian prefecture, and its continued existence from the beginnings of Rome onward until Lydus' own day, added to the prestige of this office. On the other hand, the association between the prefecture and Romulus

---

[47] Carney (1971b: 37, n. 7), Caimi (1984: 29-30, 208-209). "Tra le righe Lido vorrebbe dare ad intendere che la continuità del *cornicularius* rispetto all'arcaico omonimo è ancora più intima di quanto non possa dirsi per il *praefectus praetorio* (…)." Caimi (1984: 30).
[48]"ὑπόλοιπόν ἐστιν αὖθις καθάπερ ἡγεμόνα σεμνὸν ἐπὶ τέλους τὸν κορνικουλάριον ἐπὶ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀναδεῖξαι· δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν τὴν ὅλην συνέχοντα τάξιν ἀρχὴν ἅμα καὶ πέρας αὐτῆς ἀποδεῖξαι. ἀρκεῖ μὲν οὖν αὐτῷ πρὸς ἀξιοπιστίαν καὶ μόνος ὁ χρόνος ὑπὲρ τριακοσίους καὶ χιλίους ἐνιαυτοὺς ἡγουμένῳ τοῦ τάγματος καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τῷ πολισμῷ τῆς ἱερᾶς Ῥώμης ἐπιφανέντι τοῖς πράγμασιν· παρῆν γὰρ ἀνέκαθεν τῷ ἱππάρχῳ, ὁ δὲ ἵππαρχος τῷ τότε ῥηγί. ὥστε ἐκ προοιμίων τῆς Ῥωμαϊκῆς πολιτείας γνώριμος ὁ κορνικουλάριός ἐστιν, κἂν εἰ μηδὲν αὐτῷ παρὰ τὴν προσηγορίαν ἀπολέλειπται·" (Schamp 2006c: 71), trans. Bandy (1983: 169).
[49] Schamp (2006c: ccxv).

entailed the risk of negative associations diminishing this prestige. For, as we have analysed in a previous chapter (pp. 143-153 of this dissertation), Lydus associated the character of Romulus with whimsical and therefore illegitimate, or even tyrannical rule (*Magistr.* I.3 and I.5). If Romulus' rule was illegitimate, we can equally interpret his achievements, such as the institution of the predecessor to the praetorian prefecture, as illegitimate - a conclusion which would go against the thrust of Lydus' treatise. In order to resolve this antiquarian dilemma, Lydus gave an idiosyncratic interpretation to the role of Romulus' second in command, Celer.

In previous traditions, the character of Celer was used to divert blame for the demise of Remus away from Romulus.[50] After the omen of the vultures deciding which of both brothers was to found a city, Romulus started building the city walls of Rome. Remus taunted the work of his brother by jumping over the wall, after which Celer killed him - by order of Romulus or on his own. Although the traditions on Celer have different variants, they all share the commonality of Celer killing Remus. In cases where the name of the *celeres* is derived from Celer, his murder of Remus is also mentioned.[51]

Lydus appears to be the only exception to this rule.[52] Although he did derive the *celeres* from Celer, he put the blame for Remus' demise on Romulus, in essence disconnecting Celer from the foundational murder. This is a bold move, as it effectively reversed a whole tradition which used Celer to divert blame for Remus' murder away from Romulus.[53]

This self-conscious departure from the Roman historiographical tradition on Celer can be interpreted as a strategy used by Lydus in order to solve the antiquarian dilemma. Disconnecting Celer from the foundational murder of Remus avoids implicating the praetorian prefecture in the tyrannical act of Romulus while at the same time maintaining the origins of the office in the hallowed distant past. This dual depiction of the Roman state with, on the one hand, a tyrannical and

---

[50] Meurant (2003). For a summary of the different existing traditions surrounding Celer with lists of testimonia, see Wiseman (1995: 9-11).

[51] Namely, in Festus (Paulus) 48L (Schamp 2006b: d) and Servius *Aen.* XI.603 (Meurant 2003: 492), (Schamp 2006b: cdxcix). There are other instances in which the *celeres* are mentioned, but these do not mention Celer; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. Rom.* II.13.2 gives other etymologies of the name *celeres* (Schamp 2006b: cdxcix-d), *Ant. Rom.* IV.71.6 and IV.75.1 only mention the *celeres*. Livy I.15.8 has a mention of the *celeres* without Celer (Schamp 2006b: cdxcix) - Livy stated Romulus killed Remus, I.7.3. Pliny *Nat. Hist.* XXXIII.IX also mentioned the *celeres* without Celer. Plutarch likewise mentioned the *celeres* in *Romulus* 26.2 without mentioning Celer (Meurant 2003: 491). In *Romulus* 10, however, he stated that Remus was killed by either Romulus or Remus. In *Numa* 7.4, we read how Numa Pompilius abolished the corps, yet again without mention of Celer. Sextus Pomponius *Dig.* I.2.2.15 and I.2.2.19 described the function of the regiment, yet again without a word on Celer.

[52] On the appearance of Celer in Lydus (*Magistr.* I.9, I.14 and I.37), see Meurant (2003: 492), who nevertheless failed to notice Lydus' departure from the historiographical mainstream.

[53] Although Lydus connected Celer to the *celeres* by quoting Tarrutienus Paternus, we cannot tell whether Lydus derived his innovation from Paternus, as we only have some scraps from his work. It is furthermore unlikely Paternus dwelled on the foundation of Rome as he wrote a judicial work on the military. Even if Lydus derived his innovative version of the Remus-Celer-*celeres* narrative from Paternus, this version still remains an underrepresented version within the tradition.

whimsical monarch - be it Romulus, the kings or the emperors - and, on the other hand, a second in command - the cavalry commander, later the praetorian prefect - allows for both veiled criticism of absolute monarchy while at the same time justifying and even glorifying participation in such a monarchy. Indeed, as we have seen above, Lydus continually stressed the fact that the cavalry commander/praetorian prefect was the second in command of the Roman state. He also emphasised, quoting from the work of Charisius, that the office shared power with the highest authority (*Magistr.* I.14):

> "For, whenever total authority for a time over the affairs of state used to be entrusted among the ancients to the *dictatores*, the few that there were, each of them chose for themselves a commander of the cavalry as a sharer, as it were, in their magistracy and administration of the affairs of state."[54]

This dual model can be interpreted as a republican check on the absolute power of the monarch, as the sharing of power is an effective means to curb tyranny. What is more, this model aptly suits the outlook of a bureaucrat as we still know today: being second in command furnishes the bureaucrat with power and prestige, without bearing the burden of full responsibility.

The mixed loyalties behind Lydus' antiquarian account of the history of the Roman state also influenced his portrayal of historical characters. The first emperor Augustus is a case in point. Augustus' associations with Romulus could compromise his image as the inheritor of illegitimate and whimsical monarchical rule.[55] However, these negative associations are overshadowed by the positive descriptions of Augustus as the ruler who enhanced the powers of Lydus' beloved praetorian prefecture. This combination of contradicting agendas explains the muddled assessment of Augustus' rule at the end of *Magistr.* II.3.[56] Augustus is associated through his insignia with Romulus and Caesar, both characters enshrouded with negative associations of tyranny. I already mentioned how Caesar in *Magistr.* II.2, "Glutted with his successes",[57] usurped the different titles of the republic, amongst which the title of cavalry commander. Caesar's usurpation of titles clearly went against the grain of Lydus' republican principle of sharing power with a second in command. As such, Augustus is portrayed with allusions to Rome's two tyrants:

> "He also made use of all the insignia which his father had used, and all the military services and staffs and bodyguards which both Romulus and all from the latter down to his day had employed.".[58]

---

[54] Schamp (2006a: cxxviii). "ἐπεὶ τοῖς δικτάτωρσι παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις> ἔστιν οἷς ἡ πᾶσα πρὸς καιρὸν ἐξουσία τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιστεύετο, ἐπελέγοντο γὰρ ἑαυτοῖς ἡγεμόνα τῶν ἱππέων ἕκαστος κοινωνὸν ὥσπερ τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ διοικήσεως τῶν πραγμάτων." (Schamp 2006b: 23), trans. Bandy (1983: 27).
[55] See chapter 4.2.2. (pp. 143-153 of this dissertation).
[56] Schamp (2006a: ccclxx-ccclxxvi).
[57] "οὕτως ἐμφορηθεὶς ταῖς εὐπραγίαις" (Schamp 2006c: 2), trans. Bandy (1983: 84).
[58] "ἐπισήμοις τε πᾶσιν ἐχρήσατο, οἷς ὁ πατήρ, καὶ στρατείαις καὶ τάξεσι καὶ δορυφόροις, ὅσοις ὁ Ῥωμύλος τε καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ μέχρι τούτων ἐχρήσαντο" (Schamp 2006c: 5), trans. Bandy (1983: 87).

After these negative associations, however, Lydus recounts of Augustus' elevation of the praetorian prefecture, a merit which prompts Lydus nevertheless to affirm the benignant rule of Augustus:

> "He altered only the cavalry commander to prefect; he honoured him with a sumptuous chariot made of silver, assigned to him a civilian staff to obey his commands, and called them *Augustales* after himself, about whom I shall speak a little later in the part concerning the staff of the prefects. Nevertheless, however, he did treat his subjects benignantly"[59]

The section closes with a poignant summary of Lydus' mixed feelings and agendas towards Augustus. A monarch and heir to tyranny who nevertheless enhanced the position of his own beloved department should be both mourned and condemned at his death:

> "(…) so that the Romans said with reference to him in their native language: *utinam nec natus nec mortuus fuisset*, for they deprecated his birth because he alone had established the rule of the *Caesares*, and likewise his death on account of his gentleness and at the same time his ability to do away with their intestine discords; for after him no civil war flared up".[60]

As this section has shown, John Lydus constructed an antiquarian history of part of his own *curriculum vitae* as bureaucrat, namely the praetorian prefecture and the office of *cornicularius*. This history traced the origins of these offices to the high-prestige beginnings of Rome. The prestige of the hallowed origin is furthermore coupled in Lydus' mind with power; the praetorian prefecture and *cornicularius* were the effective second and third in command of the Roman state, transcending the different phases of Rome's central authority. In the following section, we will see how Cassiodorus used similar strategies - construction of continuity and being second in command -, yet to another end. Instead of the pagan beginnings of Rome, Cassiodorus will trace the origin of his office to biblical history.

### 6.2.1.2. Cassiodorus: The First Praetorian Prefect under the Pharaoh

In the *Formula on the Praetorian Prefect* (*Var.* VI.3), Cassiodorus described the functions of the office (§ 3-6), and concluded the *formula* with an exhortation and praise of the newly appointed prefect (§7-9). In the introduction to this *formula*, however (§ 1-2), Cassiodorus gave an antiquarian analysis of the origins of the praetorian

---

[59] "μόνον τὸν ἵππαρχον εἰς ἔπαρχον μεταβαλών, ὀχήματι τιμήσας ὑπερηφάνῳ ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένῳ, καὶ τάξιν πολιτικὴν ἀπονείμας αὐτῷ πειθαρχεῖν, Αὐγουσταλίους ἐξ αὐτοῦ καλέσας αὐτούς, περὶ ὧν ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν ὑπάρχων μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐροῦμεν. ἠπίως δὲ ὅμως ἐχρήσατο τοῖς ὑπηκόοις" (Schamp 2006c: 5), trans. Bandy (1983: 87).
[60] "(…) ὥστε τοὺς Ῥωμαίους εἰπεῖν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ · utinam nec natus nec mortuus fuisset. ἀπηύχοντο γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὴν γένεσιν, ὅτι μόνος ἐστήριξε τὴν τῶν Καισάρων ἡγεμονίαν καὶ ὁμοίως τὴν τελευτὴν διὰ τὸ ἤπιον ἅμα καὶ τὸ τῶν ἐμφυλίων στάσεων ἀναιρετικόν · οὐδὲ γὰρ μετ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐμφύλιος ἀνήφθη πόλεμος." (Schamp 2006c: 5), trans. Bandy (1983: 87, 89).

prefect, which takes us back to the tale of Joseph and the pharaoh in the biblical Book of Genesis:[61]

> "If the origin of any post deserves praise, if a good beginning can give glory to what comes after, the Praetorian Prefecture may take pride in a founder who was clearly both of the highest wisdom before the world, and most acceptable before God. For when Pharaoh king of Egypt was warned by unprecedented dreams of the peril of future famine, and human counsel could not explain such a vision, the blessed Joseph was discovered, who could both truthfully predict the future, and providently rescue an endangered people. He first consecrated the insignia of this dignity; he mounted the official carriage as an object of reverence; he was raised to this peak of glory that his wisdom might bestow on the populace what the power of their ruler could not provide. For even now the Prefect is hailed as Father of the Realm on the model of that patriarch; even today the herald's voice is sounding Joseph's name, advising the magistrate to resemble him - it is right that he to whom such power has been entrusted should be constantly and delicately admonished."[62]

In this antiquarian analysis, the authority of the prefect is derived from the high prestige of both his spiritual and worldly origins. This combination of two sources of authority is next illustrated with the biblical narrative of the pharaoh's dream. The powerlessness of pharaoh, the central power, contrasts with the wisdom of Joseph as the second in command (*Var.* VI.3.1). Cassiodorus derived in the next section (*Var.* VI.3.2) the insignia of the prefect's carriage from Joseph. Hereby Cassiodorus in effect Christianised a secular antiquarian tradition which attributed the institution of the carriage to Emperor Augustus, and which is also retained in John Lydus (*Magistr.* II.3 and *Magistr.* II.14): "He [= Augustus] altered only the cavalry commander to prefect; he honoured him with a sumptuous chariot made of silver".[63] For a second time, we have in this paragraph (*Var.* VI.3.2) a mention of the contrast between the inability of the central power and the wisdom of the second in command: "he was raised to this peak of glory that his wisdom might bestow on the

---

[61] *Gen.* 37:1-50:26. Throughout Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, the character of Joseph was a popular symbol for moral leadership (Riddle: 1981). In the sixth century specifically, we have, next to Cassiodorus' use of Joseph (Riddle 1981: 70), the appearance of Joseph in several hymns of Romanos the Melodist (*Hymn* 43, 44, and an anonymous sixth-century hymn attributed to him) (Riddle 1981: 72), and a comparison between Emperor Anastasius I and Joseph in Priscian's panegyric *De Laude Anastasii Imperatoris* (vv. 208-217).

[62] "[1] Si honoris alicuius est origo laudabilis, si bonum initium sequentibus rebus potest dare praeconium, tali auctore praefectura praetoriana gloriatur, qui et mundo prudentissimus et divinitati maxime probatur acceptus. nam cum Pharao rex Aegyptius de periculo futurae famis inauditis somniis urgeretnr nec visionem tantam humanum posset revelare consilium, Ioseph vir beatus inventus est, qui et futura veraciter praediceret et periclitanti populo providentissime subveniret. [2] Ipse primum huius dignitatis infulas consecravit: ipse carpentum reverendus ascendit: ad hoc gloriae culmen evectus, ut per sapientiam conferret populis quod praestare non potuerat potentia dominantis. ab illo namque patriarcha et nunc pater appellatur imperii: ipsum hodieque resonat vex praeconis, instruens iudicem, ne se patiatur esse dissimilem: merito, ut, cui tanta potestas potuit dari, videretur semper subtiliter ammoneri." (Giardina et al. 2015a: 6, 8), trans. Barnish (1992: 94).

[63] *Magistr.* II.3 "μόνον τὸν ἵππαρχον εἰς ἔπαρχον μεταβαλών, ὀχήματι τιμήσας ὑπερηφάνῳ ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένῳ" (Schamp 2006c: 5), trans. Bandy (1983: 87).

populace what the power of their ruler could not provide."[64] The paragraph closes with the mention that the praetorian prefect was hailed as the father of the realm, a title derived from Joseph's dignity as patriarch.

This passage is revealing for the similarities and differences in strategies both Cassiodorus and Lydus used in order to ground their office in the hallowed distant past of Rome. Although the similarities and differences between Lydus and Cassiodorus in their history of the prefecture have been noticed by scholars such as Carney and Maas, they have been subjected only to a very superficial analysis.[65] In order to fully explore these two depictions of the prefecture therefore, I will focus in this comparative analysis on three aspects: 1) the relation between the central authority and the second in command, 2) the methods used to create a historical continuity between the origins of the prefect and the prefect in the sixth century, and 3) the individuality of Cassiodorus' depiction of the prefecture.

A first similarity between both authors can be identified in their depiction of a relationship between the central power - the king of Egypt, *rex Aegyptius* (*Var.* VI. 3.1), or, more general, the ruling power, *potentia dominantis* (*Var.* VI.3.2), in Cassiodorus. Cassiodorus stressed twice the powerlessness of the central authority versus the second in command. This assertive role attributed to the prefect can also be seen in the fact that Joseph designed his own insignia of the carriage in stead of letting the ruler do this for him - in Lydus, we read how Emperor Augustus designated the carriage as an insignia for the prefect. This creation of a strong second in command can serve the same motive as we mentioned for Lydus. Claiming power as a second in command, without the responsibility of the central power, puts Cassiodorus in a comfortable position. Through this depiction, Cassiodorus can showcase his power and activity as a bureaucrat in the Ostrogothic state, without however, being held responsible for the negative actions of that state. Among these should be mentioned the Ostrogoths' conflict with and massacre of the Roman senate, and the antagonism with the eastern Roman Emperor leading to the Gothic wars - two events Cassiodorus would like to dissociate himself from during his stay in Constantinople.[66] Furthermore, Cassiodorus contrasts the power of the praetorian prefect on a superior spiritual level with the possibly godless worldly power. This opposition could be used to distance himself as a Catholic civil servant from Theodoric and the other Ostrogothic kings who were Arian heretics. This contrast did not only dissociate Cassiodorus from unwanted religious associations in the past, but in view of Cassiodorus' involvement in the negotiations between Pope Vigilius and the emperor surrounding the Three Chapters Controversy, this opposition could also safeguard both Cassiodorus' ambitions; staying in the Roman administration whilst remaining a partisan for the Catholic cause in Constantinople.[67] The reconciliation of both motives runs parallel to Lydus' trying to combine criticism on the Roman central authority with contributing to the same authority in the Roman administration.

---

[64] "ad hoc gloriae culmen evectus, ut per sapientiam conferret populis quod praestare non potuerat potentia dominantis." (Giardina et al. 2015a: 8), trans. Barnish (1992: 94).

[65] Carney (1971b: 37), Maas (1992: 41, 83-84).

[66] For an analysis of similar strategies by which Cassiodorus tried to dissociate himself from edgy aspects of the Ostrogothic reign in Italy, see Bjornlie (2009).

[67] On the Three Chapters Controversy, see Gary (2005), Price (2007), Bjornlie (2013: 70-72). On Cassiodorus' involvement in the negotiations with pope Vigilius in Constantinople surrounding the same controversy, see Bjornlie (2013: 160).

Secondly, we can perceive several similarities and differences in the way by which both authors construct a legitimising continuity between their office in their own day and the distant past. Cassiodorus exhibits a double attitude to the origins of the offices of the Roman state. In case of distinctly republican offices, such as the consulate (*Var.* VI.1) and the patriciate (*Var.* VI.2), Cassiodorus traced the origins of these offices to the Roman past. In case of an imperial office such as the praetorian prefecture, Cassiodorus used the biblical past in order to silently replace the secular antiquarian lore which was maintained by Lydus. This difference in treatment of offices has its implications for the different conceptions of time in Lydus and Cassiodorus. In Lydus, the breaking point between the hallowed past and the unworthy present occurs in Late Antiquity. Lydus for instance did not treat offices created in the Dominate such as the *comes sacrarum largitionum*, *comes privatarum rerum*, *comes sacri patrimonii* and *magister officiorum*[68] because they originated in the unworthy present.[69] In Cassiodorus, this breaking point seems to occur earlier. The Roman monarchy and Republic are part of the hallowed distant past of Rome. Offices which were created in this period, can be explained in Cassiodorus through their Roman origins. From Augustus to his own day, however, the Roman past seems to lose its authoritative power, so that the Roman past is replaced by another past. Cassiodorus therefore retrojected the origins of an imperial office such as the praetorian prefecture not to the foundation of Rome, but to a more distant past; the biblical past of the patriarch Joseph.[70] As such, this retrojecting of the origins of the prefect furthermore enhanced its authority vis-a-vis the central authority; Cassiodorus' prefect historically

---

[68] On this office in Lydus, see Schamp (2006a: cdlxxi-cdlxxxv). In the depiction of Lydus, the power of the *magister officiorum* derived from the transfer of functions from older offices (Caimi 1984: 205), (Schamp 2006a: cdlxxi-cdlxxii) - for a list of functions, see Schamp (2006a: cdlxxiii-cdlxxv). As a new office and a parasite of older offices, the *magister* was inferior to the praetorian prefect - Lydus also created an illusory superiority of the praetorian prefect over the *magister militum* (Schamp 2006a: cdlxxxviii) on the basis of the same argument of the latter receiving its functions from the former (*Magistr.* II.11.1), (Schamp 2006a: cdlxxxv). Part of the inferiority of the *magister officiorum* derived according to Lydus from the fact that the *magister* was a part of the *comitatus* of the emperor (*Magistr.* II.7.4), (Schamp 2006a: cdlxxii). This reason confirms Lydus' theory of the dually structured Roman state; offices which were attached to the tyrannical monarch were inferior to the sovereign second in command.

[69] Cf. *Magistr.* II.27. "D'ailleurs, d'après l'*Histoire universelle* qu'il utilise, une magistrature ne peut avoir une origine récente et obscure ; par conséquent, toute création d'époque impériale sans précédent royal ou républicain est cause d'exclusion (…)." (Schamp 2006a: cdxlvi). Also throughout *De Magistratibus*, Lydus construed an implicit boundary between a hallowed past and an unworthy present on the basis of moral criteria. For instance, in *Magistr.* II.20, implicitly opposed the virtuous Constantine in the time of emperor Leo I (reigned AD 457 to AD 474) with his descendants in the present: "καὶ τοῦτο ἄχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς Λέοντος διέμεινεν, ἐφ' οὗ Κωνσταντῖνος (…) ἀνὴρ εὐπατρίδης (…) (καὶ Ῥούφῳ τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς πάππος γενόμενος), παρεχώρησεν τῇ ἀρχῇ δίαιταν εὐτελῆ καὶ σώφρονα (…) οὕτως ἦν παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοτέροις τὰ τῆς τρυφῆς ἠμελημένα, οἳ μόνης ἀπέλαυον τῆς τῶν ὑποτελῶν εὐθυμίας." (Schamp 2006c: 26), "(…) and this situation continued down to the time of our Leo. During the latter's reign Constantine, a patrician gentleman (…) (he had also been grandfather to Rufus of our time), (…) turned over to the magistracy a simple and modest dwelling (…) to such an extent were matters of luxury disregarded by men of an older day, who enjoyed only the happiness of the taxpayers." trans. Bandy (1983: 115). Lydus compared the present-day situation negatively with the hallowed past in *Magistr.* I.12, I.20, I.40, II.9, II.15-18, III.10, III.66-68.

[70] For similar strategies of retrojecting the Roman past to a pre-Roman and biblical past in the *Origo Gentis Romanorum,* see Ando (2015).

transcends every form of Roman central authority - be it the king or the emperor - as he is older than any of these offices - and, by the way, even older than Lydus' praetorian prefect.

Thirdly, we can consider the individuality of Cassiodorus' strategies surrounding his depiction of the prefect. In their commentary on this *formula*, Giardina et al. discuss the tradition of assimilation between Joseph and the praetorian prefect.[71] As this tradition predated Cassiodorus, it was not his invention. However, his choice can still be interpreted as a personal one. This personal emphasis on the biblical origins of the prefect is also suggested by the fact that these origins are a recurring motive in the *Variae*.[72] In Cassiodorus' personal depiction of the praetorian prefect, the prefecture appears as a religiously sanctified office.[73] This Christianised version of the origins of the prefecture is in tune with Cassiodorus' personal clerical interests. As he indicated at the end of *Var.* VI.3: "For, if we recall that aforementioned and most holy founder, to discharge with fitness the office of praetorian prefect is a kind of priesthood."[74] As such, Cassiodorus' prefecture transcended the central authority of Rome not only historically, but also spiritually - whereas Lydus' prefect only did so historically.[75]

As the analysis has shown, the personal focus on the bureaucratic situation of Lydus and Cassiodorus strongly influenced their views on the history of their own department. In different ways, John Lydus and Cassiodorus grounded the authority of their department, the praetorian prefecture, in different versions of the distant past and origins of Rome. Although both authors used the distant past in order to emancipate the prefect as a strong second in command of the Roman state, their different personal situations elicited different approaches to this second in command. On the one hand, Lydus' allegiances to the bureau and its Roman credentials fixed the origin of the Prefecture in the hallowed foundation history of Rome. Cassiodorus, on the other hand, Christianised the origins of the praetorian prefecture in accordance with his religious interests and his Christian view on the Roman state. In the next section, I shall explore how the personal agenda of the antiquarian also influenced his attitude towards historical characters who curbed the power of the own department.

### 6.2.2. Lydus and a Bureaucracy in Crisis

In this section, I shall analyse how the depiction of rulers and bureaucrats in the antiquarian histories of the Roman state was to a high degree determined by the partisan position the antiquarians took in the debate. The focus will be on the history of the praetorian prefecture by John Lydus. Where possible, comparisons

---

[71] Giardina et al. (2015a: 116).

[72] References and allusions to Joseph occur in *Var*. VIII.20.3, *Var*. X.27.2, *Var.* XI.Praef.9, *Var*. XII.25.7, and *Var*. XII.28.10.

[73] Carney (1971b: 104, 111-112, 119-120).

[74] "nam si praedictus auctor sanctissimus ille recolatur, quoddam sacerdotium est praefecturae praetorianae competenter agere dignitatem." (Giardina et al. 2015a: 8), trans. Barnish (1992: 94, 96).

[75] It needs to be said, however, that Lydus also bestowed extra dignity on the offices of the Roman state by deriving them from Etruscan priesthoods in the introduction to his *De Magistratibus* (Schamp 2006a: cxxi).

with John Malalas will shed a light on the individuality of John Lydus' depiction. This exercise provides us with a prime opportunity to apply the framework of Dominick LaCapra to the antiquarianism of John Lydus. As the analysis will show, by blurring the distinctions between absence - in the form of the metaphysically determined decline and fall of the Roman Empire - and loss - in the form of the specific historical acts of bureaucrats and rulers - John Lydus will create a strong rhetoric of endless melancholy, impossible mourning and infinite nostalgia.[76] This analysis will be conducted in two parts. In the first part, we shall see how John Lydus in his negative discourse coupled the metaphysical decline of the empire to the specific acts of historical characters. In the second part, we shall ascertain how the coupling of absence and loss does not always create a defeatist discourse of impossible mourning of cultural trauma. On the positive side, John Lydus also coupled the continuation and hopes of restoration of the empire to the specific acts and codes of conduct of ideal bureaucrats and rulers.

### 6.2.2.1. Decline and Fall

In a negative way, John Lydus created a strong discourse of endless nostalgia by tying the decline and fall of the Roman Empire on a metaphysical level to the specific negative acts and codes of conduct of the bureaucrats of the Roman administration.[77]

In a previous chapters, I analysed how John Lydus coupled the metaphysical decline of the Roman Empire to the specific acts of human beings through the prophesies of the Sibylla. We saw how the actions of Emperor Avitus triggered the removal of the seat of the empire from Italy, as predicted in the Sibylline Oracle on the statues of Rome (*Mens*. IV.145, Bandy IV.53). Likewise, Cyrus of Panopolis' issuing decrees in Greek instead of Latin further deteriorated the Roman state, as we read in the oracle given to Romulus (*Magistr*. II.12, III.42). After the mistakes of emperors and bureaucrats, even the anonymous scribes initiated, with their errors, the flawed textual transmission of the Sibylline oracles, as was predestined by God (*Mens*. IV.47, Bandy IV.52).[78]

The impact of the Sibylline Oracles on the tale of decline and fall of the Roman Empire illustrates Lydus' connection of a metaphysical absence to the specific plane of loss. The same interconnection of these three levels - metaphysical level of divine providence, the specific level of the emperors and the specific level of bureaucrats and ordinary people - can be perceived in Lydus' account of the decline of the praetorian prefecture.

---

[76] LaCapra (1999: 698).

[77] Carney (1971b: 39, 103). "Hence John's world is bestridden by a series of giant figures, Head of *Corps* whose decisions have shaped Rome's destiny." (Carney 1971b: 103). Lydus' self-centredness and prejudices influenced his partial account of reforms of the prefecture (Kelly 2004: 76). For instance, Lydus is not objective in his description of the demise of the praetorian prefecture under Constantine (Schamp 2006b: dcxxxvii-dcxxxviii). Furthermore, several reforms which benefited the prefecture were deliberately left out of his account in order to create a strong story of decline and fall of the prefecture (Kelly 2004: 79-80).

[78] See chapters 4.3.1. and 4.3.2. (pp. 159-173 of this dissertation).

On a metaphysical level, Lydus gave a description of time, generation and corruption that determined the growth and decline of the Roman state (*Magistr.* II. 23):

> "All the things that exist come into being and exist conformably to the nature of the good. The things that exist exist, as they exist, while the things that come into being do not exist perpetually, nor do they exist in the same manner, but they revolve through generation to corruption, then from the latter to generation, and with respect to existing they are perdurative, but with respect to undergoing change they are somewhat different; for, whenever they retire into themselves, they exist by means of substance but come into being by means of corruption because nature preserves them with itself and brings them forth again into manifestation in accordance with the conditions of existence set down by the Creator."[79]

Although this interpretative framework has strong Aristotelian overtones,[80] Lydus Christianised this framework by tracing the conditions set for the cycles of generation and corruption to a Creator, "ὑπὸ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ." Indeed, Lydus' Christian view on the cause of the decline of the state is also extant in *Magistr.* III.12, where he put the blame on the devil as a cause of the state's deterioration:

> "I am inclined to shed tears whenever I take note of the force of the law and how the Fiend lacerated and robbed us of every excellence."[81]

After sketching the contours of this metaphysical drama of decline and fall, Lydus explicitly coupled these metaphysical machinations to the actions of human beings (*Magistr.* III.18):

> "This state of affairs also has perished "through the agency of both gods and men," for that which remains is "of no account nor of consequence.""."[82]

Of the first quote "through the agency of both gods and men," we regrettably do not know the source. The second quote, "of no account nor of conse-

---

[79] Justinian attributed the need for (continuous) legal change to abstract notions such as nature and the variety of human affairs (Honoré 1978: 126). Schamp (2006a: cxxvi). "Πάντα τὰ ὄντα καὶ γίνεται καὶ ἔστι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ φύσιν· τὰ μὲν ὄντα, ὡς ἔστιν, τὰ δὲ γινόμενα, οὐκ ὄντα μὲν ἀεί, οὐδὲ ὡσαύτως ἔχοντα, διὰ δὲ τῆς γενέσεως ἐπὶ τὴν φθοράν, εἶτα ἐξ ἐκείνης ἐπὶ τὴν γένεσιν ἀναστρέφοντα, καὶ τῷ εἶναι μὲν ἀθάνατα, τῷ δὲ μεταβάλλεσθαι ἀλλοιότερα· εἰς ἑαυτὰ γὰρ ἀναχωροῦντα τῇ μὲν οὐσίᾳ ἐστίν, τῇ δὲ φθορᾷ γίνεται, τηρούσης αὐτὰ τῆς φύσεως παρ' ἑαυτῇ προαγούσης τε αὖθις εἰς τοὐμφανὲς κατὰ τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ τεθέντας ὅρους." (Schamp 2006c: 29), trans. Bandy (1983: 119). A similar philosophical digression explained the relationship between Rome and Constantinople in *Magistr.* II.30. See chapter 4.1.1. (pp. 128-132 of this dissertation).
[80] Maas (1992: 88-89, 97-101), Schamp (2006a: lii-lv).
[81] Scott (1972: 445), Bjornlie (2013: 116). "μοὶ δὲ δακρύειν ἐπέρχεται τὴν τοῦ νόμου συνιέντι δύναμιν καὶ ὅπως πάσης ἡμᾶς ἀρετῆς ἀφείλετο καταζαίνων ὁ Δαίμων." (Schamp 2006c: 58), trans. Bandy (1983: 151).
[82] "Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἔκ <τε> θεῶν ἔκ τ' ἀνθρώπων' ἀπόλωλεν· τὸ γὰρ λοιπόν ἐστιν 'οὐδ' ἐν λόγῳ οὐδ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ.'" (Schamp 2006c: 65), trans. Bandy (1983: 161).

quence," derived from an oracle which is now extant in the *Anthologia Graeca*.[83] As in the case of Lydus' uses of the Sibylline Oracles, this oracular source could yet again indicate Lydus' metaphysical outlook in his search for the explanations behind the decline of the praetorian prefecture.

In several cases, Lydus used Time as a personified entity in order to explain the vicissitudes of the Roman state.[84] In *Magistr.* III.39, Lydus used this personification of time in order to couple yet again the metaphysical decline of the Roman state to the indolence of the state's bureaucrats:

> "(…) it is clear that time, because it is destructive by nature, either has completely extinguished the many at once useful and seemly features of the staff obedient to the magistracy or has altered them so much that as to preserve henceforward only a faint trace of what was at one time admired. Whereas the magistracy would exist by its own power, its staff, sometimes as a result of the former's changes and sometimes as a result of its own instances of indolence, would be slipping almost into complete disintegration (…)"[85]

Most characteristically, further on in this passage, Lydus explicitly stated that it was not the bureau as such, but specific persons who were responsible for the decline of the bureau. In Lydus' grand vision of the decline and fall of the Roman state, the metaphysical decline (absence) is intrinsically coupled to the specific actions of historical characters:

> "(…) let those who prudently evaluate matters not impute their vexation to the magistracies themselves but to those who have made improper use of them."[86]

Going from the metaphysical level of absence to the level of losses with the specific actions of historical characters, Lydus' use of the Sibyllae, as mentioned above, gives us a clue as to his valuation of human action. In his depiction of the Sibyllae, bad governance, such as Avitus' melting down the statues of Rome (*Mens.* IV.145, Bandy IV.53) and Cyrus of Panopolis' issuing decrees in Greek (*Magistr.* II. 12, III.42) are put on the same plane as general ignorance - the scribes making errors in the transmission of the Sibylline Oracles (*Mens.* IV.47, Bandy IV.52). Therefore,

---

[83] *Anth. Gr.* XIV.73, an oracle given to the Megarians.

[84] On Time as a destructive force, see Carney (1971b: 112). Other examples are *Magistr.* Intr., *Magistr.* II.5 "Time, however, is clever at both eating away and undermining whatever has been allotted generation and at the same time corruption.", "δεινὸς δὲ ὁ χρόνος ἐκφαγεῖν τε καὶ ὑπεργάσασθαι τὰ γένεσιν ἅμα καὶ φθορὰν εἰληχότα." (Schamp 2006c: 7), trans. Bandy (1983: 91), and *Magistr.* II.19. The motive of time and the antiquarian struggle against the oblivion caused by time is already present in Varro, for instance in his *De Lingua Latina* V.5.

[85] "ἀλλ' ὅτι ὁ χρόνος, λυμαντικὸς ὢν κατὰ φύσιν, τὰ πολλὰ τῶν τῆς πειθομένης τῇ ἀρχῇ τάξεως χρειώδη ἅμα καὶ κόσμια ἢ παντελῶς ἔσβεσεν ἢ τοσοῦτον ἐνήμειψεν, ὡς ἴχνος ἀμυδρὸν τῶν ποτε θαυμαζομένων τὸ λοιπὸν διασῴζειν, τῆς μὲν ἀρχῆς ἐν τῇ σφετέρᾳ δυνάμει συνισταμένης, τῆς δὲ τάξεως, νῦν μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἐκείνης παραλλαγῶν, νῦν δὲ ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων ῥαθυμιῶν" (Schamp 2006c: 93), trans. Bandy (1983: 193).

[86] "μὴ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς αὐταῖς ἀλλὰ τοῖς οὐ προσηκόντως ἀποχρησαμένοις αὐταῖς τὴν ἀγανάκτησιν οἱ σωφρόνως εἰς τὰ πράγματα βλέποντες ἀναγέτωσαν." (Schamp 2006c: 93), trans. Bandy (1983: 193).

for Lydus, bad governance is as damaging as an ignorance of the antiquarian knowledge of the trappings of the state.

This coupling has two ramifications. The first is that we have to take serious Lydus' recurrent complains of prevailing ignorance and incompetence.[87] Even his bewailing of the ignorance of antiquarian details, most of them pertaining to the misunderstanding of Latin words and Roman history,[88] should not be interpreted as mere pedantry. For Lydus, the minutiae of the science of state are a genuine cause for concern,[89] as the antiquarian knowledge of the trappings of state is a prerequisite for that state's survival.

An emphatic example of Lydus' stress on the details of the trappings of state as the guarantees of its very existence can be found in *Magistr.* III.14, where he digressed on the quality of paper:

> "Whereas many, in fact, beyond count, were the tokens of the solemnity of old that have utterly perished, the members of the staff stoop to demand even paper of those who transact business, while previously it was customary not only not to attempt such shabby things, but, besides, to consume even the clearest paper of all for the transactions, with the scribes resplendent proportionately to their parchments. Both of these things, however, vanished afterwards, and from the lack of money they exact an extremely modest and disgraceful copper and issue grass instead of paper with vile and poverty-redolent writing."[90]

Apparently, in the bureaucratic mind of John Lydus, the smallest detail in his daily practices in the administration, such as the quality of paper, upholds the whole of the Roman state. Absence in the form of the decline and fall of the state, and loss in the form of low-quality paper are intricately tied in the mind of John Lydus.

John Lydus stands, however, not alone in giving a great deal of importance to the minutiae of bureaucratic practice. For we can perceive the same mechanism in a letter of Cassiodorus (*Var.* XI.38), which treats a request for funding for the pur-

---

87 For instance in *Magistr.* I.37, II.18, III.9, III.20, and III.55, *Ost.* Pref. (Bandy Pref.), *Ost.* 9b (Bandy 11).
88 *Mens.* I.28 (Bandy IV.52, App. 25), *Mens.* I.29 (Bandy IV.46), *Mens.* I.32 (Bandy App. 23), *Mens.* II.6 (Bandy II.5), *Mens.* IV.53 (Bandy IV.54), *Mens.* IV.64 (Bandy IV.70), *Mens.* IV.76 (Bandy IV.78), *Mens.* IV.110 (Bandy App.14), *Mens.* IV.133 (Bandy App.19), *Magistr.* I.23, I.28, I.46, II.4, II.6, II.9, II.13 (twice), II.14, III.2, III.20, and III.64. Also in a positive way, Lydus gloated over complex administrative procedures and their intricate technical details and terminology (Lamma 1947: 81, n. 3, 84), (Scott 1972: 441, 442, 444).
89 Carney (1971b: 120).
90 Scott (1972: 446), Barnish (1992: 159, n. 20). "Πολλῶν δὲ <ὄντων> καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐξολωλότων τῆς πάλαι σεμνότητος γνωρισμάτων, καὶ χάρτην ἀπαιτεῖν οἱ τῆς τάξεως ὑπομένουσι τοὺς πράττοντας, τὸ πρὶν εἰωθός, μὴ μόνον μὴ τοιούτοις γλίσχροις ἐγχειρεῖν ἀλλ᾽ ἔτι καὶ τοὺς πάντων διειδεστάτους χάρτας ἐπὶ τοῖς πραττομένοις ἀναλίσκεσθαι, ἀναλόγως ἐμπρεπόντων τοῖς σκύτεσι τῶν γραφέων· τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἑκάτερον ἐκποδών, καὶ χαλκὸν κάρτα μέτριον καὶ αἰσχρὸν εἰσπράττουσιν ἐξ ἀκερμίας καὶ χόρτον ἀντὶ χάρτου γράμμασι φαύλοις καὶ πενίᾳ ὄζουσιν ἐκδιδόασιν." (Schamp 2006c: 61), trans. Bandy (1983: 155).

chase of paper. It starts with a description of the workings of the office which gives a positive version of Lydus' dirge:

> "Antiquity, which ordered all things, took careful thought that there should be no deficiency in the supply of paper, since great numbers have to consult our secretariat [*scrinia*]. Thus, when judges give rulings that will be of use to many, their sweet services will suffer no hateful delays. This benefit is granted to petitioners: that they shall not be forced from avarice to pay a fee for things which are known to be supplied by the liberality of the state. The opportunity for a most impudent piece of extortion is removed: those for whom the prince's humanity has made a grant, it has especially exempted from loss."[91]

The letter continues with a short introduction to the history of writing materials (§ 2-6). The city of Memphis is accredited with the ingenious invention of papyrus, after which we have an elaborate description of the paper plant. In a discussion of the previous practice of writing onto bark (§ 3-4), Cassiodorus admits this was hugely inferior to papyrus. In this section he gives the etymology of the Latin word for book, *liber*, which was derived from the word for bark. He concludes his digression with a laudatory description of papyrus. Cassiodorus did not only connect the optimal functioning of the state to the production of paper, as Lydus did, but he also closed his letter on the purchase of paper with a reflection on the endurance of the state throughout the ages, similar to Lydus. In contrast to Lydus' rhetoric of eternal decline, Cassiodorus stressed the endurance of the administration:

> "The secretariat does not know the weakness of mortality; it grows by annual accumulation, constantly receiving the new and preserving the old."[92]

Like Lydus, Cassiodorus coupled the general level of the preservation of the state (absence) to the minutiae of the administrative process (loss), yet, in contrast with Lydus, in a positive way.[93]

The second ramification of Lydus' equation of ignorance of the bureaucratic process to bad governance is the following. Antiquarian knowledge and learnedness are in Lydus' depiction of the history of the prefecture criteria in the judgment of the actions of bureaucrats. The wicked destroyers of the Roman state are uneducated boors or otherworldly poetic dabblers, whereas, as we will see in the second part of this section, the true upholders of the Roman state are invariably antiquarian intellectuals, both bureaucrats and emperors. The actions of uneducated

---

[91] "[1] Moderatrix rerum omnium diligenter consideravit antiquitas, ut, quoniam erat plurimis per nostra scrinia consulendum, copia non deesset procurata chartarum, quatinus, cum iudices multis profutura decernerent, odiosas moras dulcia beneficia non haberent. hoc munus supplicantibus datum est, ne avare constringerentur ad commodum, pro quibus a largitate publica constabat acceptum. ademptus est impudentissimus exactionibus locus: specialiter a damnis exemit propter quos principis humanitas dedit." (Giardina et al. 2015c: 60), trans. Barnish (1992: 159).

[92] "quod defectum inter mortalia nesciens annua cumulatione semper augescit, nova iugiter accipiens et vetusta custodiens." (Giardina et al. 2015c: 62), trans. Barnish (1992: 160).

[93] On the general emphasis of the corps on minutiae such as dress, paper and verbiage, see Carney (1971b: 82).

bureaucrats, which result from their ignorance, contributed to the inevitable decline of the Roman state.

We already analysed the actions of Cyrus of Panopolis, who, by issuing his decrees in Greek instead of Latin, triggered the metaphysical decline of the Roman state as prophesied to Romulus (*Magistr.* II.12, III.42) (pp. 167-173 of this dissertation). In his description of Cyrus, we can perceive how specifically Lydus defined the intellectual ideal necessary for the preservation of the Roman state. Although Cyrus was a prolific Greek poet, poetic skill is not the only requirement in John's cultural ideal. On the contrary, solely spending time as a poet could prove detrimental to the Roman state:

> "For, when a certain Cyrus, an Egyptian, who even today continues to be admired for poetic art, was administering both the city prefecture and that of the *praetoria*, although he knew nothing but poetry, ventured to transgress the ancient practice and produced his decrees in the Greek language, the magistracy threw away along with the language of the Romans also its Fortune."[94]

An enlightening comparison can be made with the portrait of Cyrus by John Malalas (*Chron.* XIV.16):

> "The emperor appointed the patrician Kyros the philosopher, a man of great learning in every field, to be praetorian prefect and city prefect. He was in power for four years, holding two offices, riding out in the carriage of the city prefect, supervising building operations and reconstructing the whole of Constantinople, for he was a most refined man."[95]

As John Malalas did not need Cyrus as a pawn in the drama of the decline and fall of the Roman state, his description of the bureaucrat is markedly more positive than Lydus'. Notice also that John Malalas described Cyrus as a learned man *in all fields*, a description which is narrowed down in John Lydus to his poetic skill. Indeed, Lydus could not apply the same description to his version of Cyrus, as it would contradict his premeditated scheme of decline of the Roman state; all who diminished the role of the prefecture did so through their lack of knowledge of the Roman administration.

---

[94] "Κύρου γάρ τινος Αἰγυπτίου, ἐπὶ ποιητικῇ καὶ νῦν θαυμαζομένου, ἅμα τὴν πολίαρχον ἅμα τὴν τῶν πραιτωρίων
ἐπαρχότητα διέποντος, καὶ μηδὲν παρὰ τὴν ποίησιν ἐπισταμένου, εἶτα παραβῆναι θαρρήσαντος τὴν παλαιὰν συνήθειαν καὶ τὰς ψήφους Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ προενεγκόντος, σὺν τῇ Ῥωμαίων φωνῇ καὶ τὴν Τύχην ἀπέβαλεν ἡ ἀρχή." (Schamp 2006c: 16, 95), trans. Bandy (1983: 103, 199).
[95] "Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς προεβάλετο ἔπαρχον πραιτωρίων καὶ ἔπαρχον πόλεως τὸν πατρίκιον Κῦρον τὸν φιλόσοφον, ἄνδρα σοφώτατον ἐν πᾶσι. καὶ ἦρξεν ἔχων τὰς δύο ἀρχὰς ἔτη τέσσαρα, προϊὼν εἰς τὴν καρούχαν τοῦ ἐπάρχου τῆς πόλεως καὶ φροντίζων τῶν κτισμάτων καὶ ἀνανεώσας πᾶσαν Κωνσταντινούπολιν· ἦν γὰρ καθαριώτατος." (Thurn 2000: 281-282), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 197).

In addition to the case of Cyrus of Panopolis, John of Cappadocia,[96] the praetorian prefect who served under Justinian, was a prime target of Lydus' rhetoric of the inevitable decline of the Roman state as triggered by the immodest conduct of its officials.[97] I already analysed part of Lydus' invective on John of Cappadocia in the context of the former's use of Latin as an important emblem of the Roman Empire (pp. 167-173 of this dissertation). As in the case of Cyrus of Panopolis, the specific historical action of John of Cappadocia debasing the Latin language in the administration (*Magistr.* III.68) yet again accelerated the eternal process of the decline of the Roman state:

> "There was an ancient law that all matters being transacted in any way whatsoever by the prefects, and perhaps by the other magistracies as well, be expressed in the language of the Italians. When this law had been sidestepped, as I have stated, since it could not have been otherwise, the process of reduction began to advance. (…) The Cappadocian changed that [language] into a haggish and base idiom, not because he cared for clarity, as he alleged, but in order that it might be handy and colloquial and cause no difficulty to those who, in accordance with his aim, dared to fill in what from no aspect belonged to them."[98]

In this case also we can perceive the different intertwined levels of the decline of the Roman state; the metaphysical decline of the department is coupled to the actions of a senior official, who in turn influenced the actions of bureaucrats at the base.[99] These three levels mirror the agents who interacted, as we already said, with the oracles of the Sibylla; senior officials (Cyrus of Panopolis) and ordinary bureaucrats (the scribes of the Sibylline Oracles) all contribute to an interconnected decline and fall of the Roman state. Indeed, John Lydus will also devote ample attention in his portrait of John of Cappadocia to John Maxilloplumbacius,[100] one of his subalterns, in order to make a point of John of Cappadocia's contribution to the decline of the state, as we will see below.

### 6.2.2.2. An Institute of Evil: John of Cappadocia

The case of the portrait of John of Cappadocia in Lydus merits an extensive analysis in order to ascertain the personalist tendencies in Lydus' antiquarianism, coupling personal motives such as localism and bureaucratic feuds (losses) to the

---

[96] *PRLE* III.627-635 Fl. Ioannes 11 ('the Cappadocian'). Lamma (1947), Purpura (1976), Caimi (1984: 243-257), Greatrex (1995), Schamp (2006c: clxx-clxxxiii).

[97] Scott (1972: 447).

[98] Scott (1972: 445), Schamp (2006c: clxxvi-clxxvii). "Νόμος ἀρχαῖος ἦν πάντα μὲν τὰ ὅπως οὖν πραττόμενα παρὰ τοῖς ἐπάρχοις, τάχα δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τῶν ἀρχῶν, τοῖς Ἰταλῶν ἐκφωνεῖσθαι ῥήμασιν. οὗ παραβαθέντος, ὡς εἴρηται, οὐ γὰρ ἄλλως, τὰ τῆς ἐλαττώσεως προὔβαινεν. (…) ταῦτα μετέβαλεν ὁ Καππαδόκης εἰς γραώδη τινὰ καὶ χαμαίζηλον ἀπαγγελίαν, οὐχ ὡς σαφηνείας φροντίζων, ἀλλ' ὅπως πρόχειρα ὄντα καὶ κοινὰ μηδεμίαν ἐμποιοῖ δυσχέρειαν τοῖς κατὰ σκοπὸν <αὐτοῦ> πληροῦν τὰ μηδαμόθεν αὐτοῖς ἀνήκοντα τολμῶσιν." Schamp (2006c: 128-129), trans. Bandy (1983: 239, 241).

[99] Scott (1972: 447-448).

[100] *PLRE* II.626 Ioannes 'Maxilloplumbacius' 10, Caimi (1984: 245-248), Schamp (2006c: clxxxiii-clxxxix).

general decline of the Roman state (absence). These personal motives are furthermore enhanced by emphatic personal statements of Lydus in the narrative on John of Cappadocia.[101] On a structural level, the intertwining of the general narrative of decline and fall (absence) with a biography of a bureaucrat (loss), is extant in Lydus' antiquarian technique. Lydus applied antiquarian techniques to the life of John of Cappadocia as if he were an antiquarian subject, such as an office of state. This use of antiquarian techniques for the biography of a living contemporary nicely illustrates Lydus' complete blurring of absence and loss in his big drama of the Roman administration. Historical and mythological figures, such as Romulus and Avitus, offices such as the cavalry commander and the praetorian prefecture, and even contemporaries such as John of Cappadocia, in Lydus' account all blend into one antiquarian continuum describing the inevitable decline and fall of the Roman state. We shall even see how Lydus applied these antiquarian techniques to his own autobiography in the next section. In addition to these personal tendencies in John of Cappadocia's biography, Lydus fashioned his portrait on the premeditated scheme as mentioned above: John of Cappadocia is an uneducated bureaucrat and as such a bane to the state. This portrayal will be enhanced by the portraits of virtuous and intellectual bureaucrats functioning as mirror image to John of Cappadocia.

John of Cappadocia appears three times in the *De Magistratibus*. His biography (*Magistr.* III.57-72) is announced two times (*Magistr.* II.17 and II.21). Through these repeated announcements, Lydus generates a tension with the reader.[102] The long biography of John of Cappadocia in the last book of *De Magistratibus* seems to be intended as the climax of Lydus' history of decline of the Roman state.[103] In the latter of these announcements, the conduct of John of Cappadocia is meaningfully contrasted with the actions of the administrator Sergius[104] and his superintendent, Emperor Anastasius:

> "Now, afterwards Sergius, a man who was an expert from the ranks of the trail rhetoricians and respected for his learning by the upright Anastasius, because he had burdened the aforementioned dwelling with an upstairs residence, disregarded temperateness and introduced greater luxury at a time when the magistracy was already withering away, not having foreseen (for it is not characteristic of human nature to divine the future) that he was constructing a den for the Cappadocian. (…) The Cappadocian (who he is, I will tell a little later), however, then he had swooped into the magistracy, turned over the magistracy's old and so august a dwelling to his battalions of servants, but he himself, making his lair in its upper story, urine and excre-

---

[101] On Lydus' personal approach to his depiction of John of Cappadocia, see Lamma (1947: 81). Scott (1972: 446) assumed the same personal recollection underlying the vivid descriptions of the administrative changes in *Magistr.* III.11-14, which were also enacted by John of Cappadocia.

[102] On these announcements see Caimi (1984: 243). Schamp (2006a: cxxix-cxxx) suspects the same motive of creating suspension behind all of Lydus' announcements.

[103] Caimi (1984: 140). Lydus presented the decline of the praetorian prefecture as a long process (Scott 1972: 446).

[104] *PLRE* II.994-995 Sergius 7.

ment looking around his bedchamber, used to lie languidly upon his bed naked, (…)".[105]

Lydus continued the passage by indulging himself in a detailed and rhetorical description of John of Cappadocia's misdeeds in his residences. In this passage, which *in nuce* contains the elements of John of Cappadocia's biography in Book III,[106] we can see how Lydus intertwines the levels of absence and loss in order to create a strong rhetoric of decline. The level of absence manifests itself in his remark on the inability of mankind to divine the future steps in the metaphysical plan for the empire. This remark is tied to the actions of Sergius and, *mutatis mutandis*, Anastasius, who, in spite of their virtues, could not foresee the future debaucheries of John of Cappadocia which they unwittingly prepared. The decline of the prefecture is hastened by both John of Cappadocia and his subalterns who are housed in the palace of the prefecture. In Sergius, expertise and intellectualism meaningfully contrast with the ineptitude and boorishness of John of Cappadocia.

After these two announcements, John of Cappadocia received an elaborate biography (*Magistr.* III.57-72), which is, again, meaningfully contrasted to a laudatory biography of the patrician, bureaucrat and gentleman scholar Phocas (*Magistr.* III. 72-76).[107] Throughout the narrative, the portraits of John of Cappadocia's victims in their virtue and intellectualism also furnish a mirror image to the acts and conduct of John of Cappadocia as a bad bureaucrat.[108] Lydus moulded both the character of John of Cappadocia and the characters of his counter-examples in the same premeditated scheme: the banes of the prefecture are irrevocably uneducated barbarians, whereas good administrators are intellectuals. I will analyse the portrait of Phocas in the second part of this section.

In the appendix (pp. 345-347 of this dissertation), there is a schematic overview of Lydus' biography of John of Cappadocia (*Magistr.* III.57-72). The whole of the account is a very personal rendering of John of Cappadocia's life by Lydus. Throughout the narrative, indeed, Lydus intervened to personally attest to the veracity of his account as an eye-witness. In *Magistr.* III.57, he attested to the demise of one of his friends at the order of John of Cappadocia:

"And, whereas the populace is an attester of these things, I know because I had been spectator and was present at the things that were being done; and how, I shall explain. A certain Antiochus, already an old man by age, was

---

[105] Caimi (1984: 144, 207). "Σέργιος δὲ ὕστερον, ἐκ τῶν δικανικῶν ῥητόρων ἀνὴρ σοφιστὴς καὶ διὰ τοὺς λόγους αἰδέσιμος Ἀναστασίῳ τῷ χρηστῷ, τὴν εἰρημένην δίαιταν ὑπερῴῳ φορτώσας καταγωγίῳ, τὸ μὲν σῶφρον ὑπερεῖδεν, μείζονα δὲ τρυφήν, τῆς ἀρχῆς ἤδη μαραινομένης, εἰσήγαγεν, οὐ προθεωρήσας (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως τὸ ἐσόμενον στοχάζεσθαι) φωλεὸν τῷ Καππαδόκῃ κατασκευάζειν · (…) ὁ δὲ Καππαδόκης (τίς δὲ οὗτος, μικρὸν ὕστερον ἐρῶ), ἐνσκήψας τῇ ἀρχῇ, τὴν μὲν παλαιὰν καὶ οὕτω σεμνὴν τῆς ἀρχῆς δίαιταν ταῖς φάλαγξι τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ παρεχώρησεν. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπερῴας κατακοιταζόμενος, οὔρου καὶ ἀφόδου περισκοποῦντος τὸν κοιτῶνα, γυμνὸς ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης ἐξεκέχυτο" Schamp (2006c: 26-27), trans. Bandy (1983: 115, 117).
[106] Schamp (2006a: cxxxii-cxxxiii).
[107] Lamma (1947: 86), Schamp (2006c: clxxxix).
[108] In *Magistr.* III.59, a victim of John of Cappadocia, Petronius (*PLRE* III.992, Petronius 1), is described as distinguished for his learning (Caimi 1984: 247), (Schamp 2006c: clxxxv).

reported to him as being a possessor of a certain amount of gold. For that reason he arrested him and suspended him from both hands with stout ropes until the old man, having denied it, was freed from his bonds as a corpse. I was a spectator of that vile murder, for I knew Antiochus."[109]

Another instance of Lydus' personal statements is revealing for his intertwining of absence and loss (*Magistr.* III.66):

"I shared in this ill-fortune, too, because not even my daily expense had I obtained while fulfilling this service. For, as Truth bears witness to me, I do not know of a single speedwriter who served throughout the entire year of completing the appointment."[110]

As in the cases where he used a personification of Time in order to explain the demise of the Roman state, in this instance Lydus yet again devised a personification of another abstract entity, Truth, to come to the aid of his statement - we shall see the same mechanism for personifications of Justice and Nemesis later on in this section. Similarly to his use of a personified entity Time, Lydus intertwined the abstract level of absence (personifications of values) with the specific level of loss (Lydus' own witnessing of the decline of his bureau). Additionally, in the following paragraph (*Magistr.* III.67),[111] Lydus personally bore witness (loss) to the general decline of the prefecture (absence).

We can see how this personal approach yet again etched itself on Lydus' strong sense of localism. In contrast to Lydus' positive approach to Lydia as the new centre of the antiquarian universe,[112] however, Lydus' localist approach manifests itself in a negative way. He exhibited a negative prejudice against John of Cappadocia precisely because he was a Cappadocian. In order to underscore his point, he also quoted a poem mocking the Cappadocians in *Magistr.* III.57.[113] This negative regional stereotype is repeated in the depiction of the subalterns of John of Cappadocia, such as John Maxilloplumbacius (*Magistr.* III.58), who are also Cappadocians. According to Lydus, the Cappadocians were cunning (*Magistr.* III.57) and gluttonous (Magistr. III.62):

[109] Caimi (1984: 245, 248), Schamp (2006a: xxxvii, 2006c: clxxv-clxxvi). "καὶ τούτων μάρτυς μὲν ὁ δῆμος, ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα θεωρὸς γενόμενος καὶ παρὼν τοῖς πραττομένοις · καὶ ὅπως, ἐρῶ. Ἀντίοχός τις, ἤδη γέρων τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἐμηνύθη αὐτῷ χρυσίου δεσπότης εἶναί τινος. Συσχὼν οὖν αὐτὸν καλῳδίοις στιβαροῖς ἀνέδησεν ἐκ χειροῖν ἕως ἔξαρνος γενόμενος ὁ γέρων νεκρὸς τῶν δεσμῶν ἠλευθερώθη. ταύτης ἐγὼ τῆς μιαιφονίας γέγονα θεωρός · ἠπιστάμην γὰρ τὸν Ἀντίοχον." Schamp (2006c: 114), trans. Bandy (1983: 223).
[110] "καὶ ταύτης ἐγὼ μετέσχον τῆς ἀστοχίας, μηδὲ τὴν ἐφήμερον δαπάνην ἐν τῷ πληροῦν τὴν στρατείαν εὐράμενος. μαρτυρούσης γάρ μοι τῆς Ἀληθείας, ἕνα ταχυγράφον παρ' ὅλον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τοῦ πληρώματος οὐκ οἶδα στρατευσάμενον, πολυτρόπου τῆς ἀφορμῆς τυγχανούσης ·" Schamp (2006c: 126), trans. Bandy (1983: 237).
[111] Schamp (2006a: l).
[112] See chapter 5.1.3. (pp. 202-206 of this dissertation).
[113] Caimi (1984: 244). A longer version of this poem is preserved in *Anth. Gr.* XI.238 (Schamp 2006c: clxxiv, 113, n. 215).

"(…) he craftily, Cappadocian as he was, gained access to the emperor and won his friendship (…)"[114]

"(…) the scallops seemed not to entrust themselves to their natural flight from place to place but to retire into the air, using their shells as if they were wings, in order to dodge the gluttony of the Cappadocians."[115]

The greatest ill a region could befall was being visited by the hordes of Cappadocian subalterns of John of Cappadocia (*Magistr.* III.61):

"And would that he himself alone had chanced to devour just that province alone, and that others such as himself, or even worse than he, had not gone about throughout both every city and district, sucking up the obol in whatever manner it might have been buried, dragging behind themselves an army of havoc-workers and hordes of Cappadocians!"[116]

Lydus' negative stereotype of the Cappadocians is linked to their targeting of Lydia during their campaigns of extortion. As such, we can understand Lydus' ire as a vehement testimony to the excesses of a regional competition within the empire (*Magistr.* III.58):

"This shark-toothed Cerberus, though he was the common plague of all mankind, chewed up my Philadelphia so finely that after him, because it had become reft not only of money but also of human beings, it could no longer admit any opportunity of change for the better."[117]

Lydus' emphatic wording revealing his personal involvement, "my Philadelphia", returns when he described the fate of the fellow Lydian Petronius in *Magistr.* III.58. Also the dire state of the whole of his home region is emphatically depicted with a quote from Lycophron in *Magistr.* III.61.[118]

On a more profound level, Lydus coupled the regional opposition between the Lydians and the barbarian Cappadocians to his cherished scheme of intellectualism. In *Magistr.* III.64, a graphic description of John of Cappadocia's female company prompted Lydus to start with an antiquarian digression on the clothing of the Lydians (*Magistr.* III.64-65):

---

[114] Lamma (1947: 84). "δολερῶς, οἷα Καππαδόκης, παρεισδὺς οἰκειοῦται τῷ βασιλεῖ" Schamp (2006c: 112), trans. Bandy (1983: 221).

[115] "μὴ τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ἐκ τόπου εἰς τόπον πτήσει καταπιστεύοντας ἑαυτούς, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς ἀέρα, τοῖς ὀστράκοις ὡς εἰ πτέρυζι χρωμένους, δοκεῖν ἐκκλίνειν τὴν Καππαδοκῶν ἀδηφαγίαν." Schamp (2006c: 122), trans. Bandy (1983: 233).

[116] "καὶ εἴθε μόνος αὐτὸς καὶ μόνην ἐκείνην τὴν ἐπαρχίαν ἔτυχε διατρώγων καὶ μὴ καθ᾽ ἑκάστην πόλιν τε καὶ χώραν, οἷος αὐτός, ἄλλοι καὶ χείρους αὐτοῦ τὸν ὁποῖα δ᾽ ἂν κατορωρυγμένον ὀβολὸν ἀνασπῶντες παρῆλθον, στρατὸν ἀλαστόρων καὶ στίφη Καππαδοκῶν ἐπισυρόμενοι." Schamp (2006c: 120), trans. Bandy (1983: 231).

[117] Carney (1971b: 118). "οὗτος ὁ Κέρβερος ὁ καρχαρόδους κοινὸς μὲν ἐτύγχανεν ἁπάντων ὄλεθρος, τὴν δ᾽ ἐμὴν Φιλαδέλφειαν οὕτως εἰς λεπτὸν ἀπεμασήσατο, ὡς μετ᾽ αὐτὸν ἔρημον οὐ χρημάτων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπων γενομένην μηδεμίαν ἐπιδέχεσθαι τὸ λοιπὸν ἀφορμὴν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον μεταβολῆς." Schamp (2006c: 115), trans. Bandy (1983: 223, 225).

[118] Lycophron 38. Carney (1971b: 62-63).

"As, however, the Cappadocian used to make his way to the capital, or rather used to be escorted back, girls were seen at his side in troops, their bodily frame draped with *sandyces*, clearly revealing such parts as they "ought to have concealed from the eyes of males." I shall leave the present subject for the moment and try to explain what the *sandyx* is and what sort of garment the Lydians had in days of old. (…) One had to say such things by way of digression, as it were, but I now return to the Cappadocian.".[119]

Lydus implicitly advanced antiquarian learnedness and Lydian culture against Cappadocian barbarity.

As the schematic analysis of the passages in Appendix 9.8. shows, the biography of John of Cappadocia is a complex piece of text. The main thrust of the narrative, is, however, quite strait-forward. The conduct of John of Cappadocia, as a specific loss, lead up to the Nika-riots.[120] These riots were the climactic ending-point of the grand absence described by Lydus, namely the gradual decline of the praetorian prefecture.[121] In this light we can also interpret the two announcements of the biography of John of Cappadocia in *Magistr.* II.17 and II.21. The life of John of Cappadocia combines both the losses of his life *stricto sensu* with the absence of the decline of the prefecture. As such, both aspects of this long-awaited climax were already prepared and premeditated throughout the whole of the *De Magistratibus*. Lydus' history of the decline and fall of the prefecture in Books II and III of the treatise are preparations for this climax in like manner to the announcements of the biography of John of Cappadocia in *Magistr.* II.17 and II.21. Distinct from the straightforwardness of John of Cappadocia's biography, the complexity of it derived from the fact that Lydus applied the same antiquarian techniques encumbering all his other writing to the life of John of Cappadocia.

[119] "περὶ δὲ τὴν ἄνοδον, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνακομιδήν, τοῦ Καππαδόκου στιχηδὸν αὐτῷ παρεφαίνοντο κόραι σάνδυξι περικεχυμέναι τὰ μέλη, προφανῶς ἐκκαλύπτουσαι ὅσα 'καλύπτειν ὄμματ' ἀρσένων ἐχρῆν.' πρὸς βραχὺ δὲ τὸ προκείμενον ἀφείς, ὅ τι τυγχάνει σάνδυξ καὶ ποῖον εἶδος ἐσθήματος γέγονε Λυδοῖς τὸ πάλαι, ἑρμηνεῦσαι πειράσομαι. (…) Τοιαῦτα μὲν ἄν τις ὡς ἐν παρεκβάσει λέγοι, ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Καππαδόκην ἐπάνειμι." (Schamp 2006b: 123-124), trans. Bandy (1983: 233, 235).
[120] Caimi (1984: 256-257). Both Lydus and Procopius pinned the blame for the Nika-riots on the conduct of John of Cappadocia (Greatrex 1995: 4-5). Significantly, Lydus' analysis which solely singled out John of Cappadocia as the cause of the riots is historically incorrect (Lamma 1947: 86).
[121] Lamma (1947: 81).

The whole of the biography is interspersed with documents and testimonies which Lydus used to underscore his argument.[122] These testimonies are often accompanied by bibliographical references to the antiquarian works Lydus consulted.[123] He furthermore, as in the rest of his oeuvre, provided ample explanations, translations and etymologies of mostly Latin terminology.[124]

Most notably, the biography of John of Cappadocia is time and again interrupted and encumbered by learned digressions on different topics, digressions which are often announced as such (*Magistr.* III.63-64):[125]

"Because mention of the fish sturgeon happens to have presented itself, I shall set forth what I have learned about it. (…) Let some such points stand said as regards this fish.".[126]

As the life of John of Cappadocia (loss) is also the climax of a long process of decline of the praetorian prefecture as analysed by Lydus in Books II and III of the *De Magistratibus* (absence), Lydus applied the same antiquarian techniques he used for the explanation of institutions to the life of a specific historical character.

---

[122] Schamp (2006a: cxxvi-cxxvii). The following documents and testimonies are mentioned or quoted by Lydus: *Magistr*. III.57 a satiric poem against the Cappadocians, *Magistr.* III.58 a quote Euripides on the gold of the Lydians, *Magistr.* III.59 a quote of unknown poet (Schamp 2006c: clxxxv), *Magistr.* III.61 a quote of Lycophron (Schamp 2006c: clxxxvi), *Magistr.* III.61 the paraphrase of a law, *Magistr.* III.62 a translated quote from Juvenal, *Magistr.* III.63 references to the works of Athenaeus, Aristotle, all the naturalists, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Cornelius Nepos and Laberius (Schamp 2006a: cxxviii), *Magistr.* III.64 a quote from Euripides (Schamp 2006c: clxxxv), *Magistr.* III.64 a testimony of Peisander, *Magistr.* III.67 a reference to Hesiod, *Magistr.* III.68 a reference to a law on Latin, *Magistr.* III.69 a quote from an unknown poet (Schamp 2006c: clxxx). In *Magistr.* III.70 we also have two lists of types of taxes (Schamp 2006a: ccxviii-ccxxxiv).

[123] In *Magistr.* III.61 we have a reference to Lydus' own *On the months*, in *Magistr.* III.63 to Aristophanes of Byzantium's *Compendium of the Physical Properties of Fishes*, in *Magistr.* III.64 a testimony of Apuleius' *Eroticus*, and to Suetonius' *On Famous Courtesans* (Schamp 2006a: cxxviii), in *Magistr.* III.70 a testimony to Castor's *Epitome of Annals*.

[124] Schamp (2006a: cxxv). In *Magistr.* III.59 a Latin translation of steading, *stabulum*, in *Magistr.* III.59 an explanation of the Latin word *sportulae*, in *Magistr.* III.61 an explanation of the Latin word *veredi*, in *Magistr.* III.63 explanations of the Greek and Latin words for sturgeon, in Greek ἔλοψ, and in Latin *aquipenser*, in *Magistr.* III.65 the Temple of Justice which is called *Secretum* in Latin, in *Magistr.* III.65 an explanation of the Latin term *matricularius, in Magistr.* III.68 a translation of the Latin term *tractatores, in Magistr.* III.68 a translation of the Latin word *cottidiana, in Magistr.* III.70 an explanation of the Latin term *senatus*.

[125] In *Magistr.* III.57 we have a digression on the history of Mazaca, in *Magistr.* III.63 a digression on the sturgeon Caimi (1984: 146), (Schamp 2006a: cclxv-cclxxi), in *Magistr.* III.64 a digression on the garment *sandyx* Caimi (1984: 146), (Schamp 2006a: cclxxi-cclxxxii), in *Magistr.* III.70 a digression on the origin of the name *Zeuxippus*, on the origin of the name *Severeum*, and on the construction history of Constantine's colonnades in Constantinople. The digressions on the sturgeon and on the garment *sandyx* are even some of the longest digressions of the treatise (Schamp 2006a: cxxv). "Force est bien d'avouer que les digressions, parfois en cascade, ne facilitent pas la tâche du lecteur qui s'efforce de pénétrer la composition du traité." (Schamp 2006a: cxxvi). See also Caimi (1984: 141).

[126] "Ὅτι δὲ τυχὸν ἔλοπος τοῦ ἰχθύος μνήμη παρῆλθεν, περὶ αὐτοῦ τὰ γνωσθέντα μοι παραθήσομαι. (…) Τοιαῦτα μέν τινα τοῦ ἰχθύος χάριν εἰρήσθω." (Schamp 2006b: 122-123), trans. Bandy (1983: 233).

John of Cappadocia is treated as if he were an institution himself, the embodiment of a the continual perversion of the Roman state, an institute of evil.[127]

Indeed, the strong connection in the life of John of Cappadocia between metaphysical absence and specific loss is also extant in Lydus' descriptions of John of Cappadocia and his subordinates. Both John of Cappadocia and John Maxilloplumpacius are described, institutes of evil and decline as they are, as the demonic forces of wickedness behind the decline of the prefecture.[128] John of Cappadocia is characterised as Alastor in *Magistr.* III.58, Maxilloplumbacius as Cerberus,[129] a common plague and a nether demon in *Magistr.* III.58, also as Alastor in *Magistr.* III. 59, and yet again as Cerberus in *Magistr.* III.60.[130] Through these descriptions, Lydus connected both bureaucrats with the metaphysical forces behind the decline of the Roman state. Indeed, we have already seen how Lydus invoked the devil as one of the causes for the deterioration of the Roman state in *Magistr.* II.12. Through similar denominations, Lydus depicted John of Cappadocia as a sheer incarnation of the devil. The metaphysical level of absence is incarnated in the actions of contemporaries (loss) in order to create a strong rhetoric of melancholy and infinite cultural trauma.

The same intertwining of absence and loss exists in the narrative on John of Cappadocia's denouncement and eventual disappearance, in which the positive forces of the universe (God, and personifications of abstract notions such as Justice and Nemesis), combined with the level of loss in the form of the specific persons of the rulers, Justinian and Theodora, to denounce John of Cappadocia (*Magistr.* III. 69):

> "Because this most abominable enemy of the laws had behaved in such a manner, God took heed of him, having resolved to turn over the author of these evils to his own deeds, convincing him that "there is Justice and Nemesis, bringing distress to the wicked." (…) his co-reigning spouse (…) went to the emperor and informed him of all the things that were hitherto escaping his notice (…)"[131]

With the apocalyptic Nika-riots, there also came an end to the appearance of John of Cappadocia in the *De Magistratibus* as the text survives to today (*Magistr.* III.72): "This, then, was the end of the wicked Cappadocian's first brigandage.".[132]

---

[127] "Giovanni (…) rappresenta non solo il cattivo prefetto per eccellenza, ma anche l'impersonificazione del male (…)." Caimi (1984: 243).

[128] This strategy of coupling the metaphysical force of the devil to a specific historical character was not unique to Lydus. Also Procopius applied this strategy to Justinian as possessed by a demon in his *Anecdota* (Carney 1971b: 81), (Bjornlie 2013: 116).

[129] Schamp (2006c: clxxxiv).

[130] On the nicknames of John Maxilloplumbacius, see Caimi (1984: 246).

[131] Lamma (1947: 85-86), Scott (1972: 449). "Οὕτως τοῦ μιαρωτάτου πολεμίου τῶν νόμων διαγενομένου, ἐπεστράφη θεός, ἐκδοῦναι τὸν αἴτιον τῶν κακῶν ταῖς ἰδίαις πράξεσι ψηφισάμενος, πείθων αὐτὸν ὡς 'ἔστι Δίκη Νέμεσίς τε κακοῖς κακότητα φέρουσα.' (…) μόνη ἡ ὁμόζυγος γυνή (…) ἅπαντα αὐτὸν τὰ τέως διαλανθάνοντα διδάσκουσα" (Schamp 2006c: 129-130), trans. Bandy (1983: 241, 243).

[132] "Πέρας οὖν τοῦτο τῆς πρώτης ληισταρχίας τοῦ πονηροῦ Καππαδόκου." (Schamp 2006c: 134), trans. Bandy (1983: 249).

When we compare Lydus' depiction of John of Cappadocia, and the pivotal function the biography of John of Cappadocia has for the whole of the *De Magistratibus*, to the appearance of John of Cappadocia in John Malalas, the intentions of Lydus are even more accentuated. For Malalas, who does care little for the fate of the praetorian prefecture, John of Cappadocia plays only a marginal role, weaned from any invective. Of the five mentions of John of Cappadocia, two of them (*Chron.* XVIII.61 and *Chron.* XVIII.74) are mere remarks on his promotion to praetorian prefect. In another of them, John of Cappadocia serves as eponymous official (*Chron.* XVIII.84). *Chron.* XVIII.89 recounts John of Cappadocia's last stages of his life in Cyzicus. Most notably, *Chron.* XVIII.71, with an account of the Nika-riots, only mentions John of Cappadocia as one of the officials whose deposition was demanded by the rioting mob. John Malalas named as causes of the riotous nature of the mob in Constantinople and the two factions. The whole account of Lydus, attributing the final and spectacular phase of the decline and fall of the prefecture to the heinous acts of John of Cappadocia is completely absent in John Malalas - and in all probability an idiosyncratic attribution of John Lydus.[133]

### 6.2.2.3. Men of Providence: The Restoration of the Prefecture

As the quote on the denouncement of John of Cappadocia (*Magistr.* III.69) shows, there are also positive forces at work in Lydus' antiquarian universe. In this section, we will analyse how Lydus coupled in a positive way the metaphysical forces responsible for the continual rejuvenation and restoration of the empire (absence) to the specific acts and codes of conduct of responsible emperors and bureaucrats. In this case also, intellectualism and erudition will be judged the core values of good bureaucrats. Moreover, Lydus also applied this intellectualist paradigm to the evaluation of emperors. We shall see how Lydus did not only picture bureaucrats, but also positively evaluated emperors such as Augustus and Justinian as erudite intellectuals. In Lydus' antiquarian universe, the ideal ruler is also an ideal antiquarian.

Supernatural powers are not only responsible for the perennial decline of the Roman state; Lydus also singles out metaphysical powers such as God and Fortune as the causes behind the restoration and rejuvenation of the prefecture and the state.[134] In *Magistr.* III.44 we read how the privileged position God granted to Constantinople impeded Emperor Leo I from abandoning the capital:

> "And one man might have overturned such an empire as this if God had not preserved the sovereignty which He had given to this city.".[135]

The abstract force of Fortune also presided over the restoration of the empire through the appointment of the virtuous Emperor Anastasius (*Magistr.* III.45):

---

[133] For instance, Lydus' chronology in his account of the riots is muddled (*PRLE* III.631). Far from being the main cause of the riots, John of Cappadocia was targeted by the mob as a symbol of Justinian's reviled policies (Bjornlie 2013: 73). Malalas' account reflected the official view on the revolt (Croke 1990: 8).

[134] Carney (1971b: 103).

[135] "καὶ εἰς τοιαύτην βασιλείαν μετατρέψαι εἰ μὴ θεὸς τοῦθ' ὃ δέδωκε τῇ πόλει διεσώσατο κράτος." (Schamp 2006c: 98), trans. Bandy (1983: 203).

"After so many ills had been heaped upon the heretofore blessed [magistracy] of the magistracies, Fortune, laughing for a short time but genuinely, set Anastasius over the expiring subjects."[136]

As these passages suggest, the specific level of human actions (loss) is subjected to the metaphysical forces behind the vicissitudes of the empire. Lydus indeed explicitly took into account the limitations inherent in human action in his judgment of emperors, such as Anastasius (*Magistr.* III.47):

"Because, however, he alone after Constantine had lightened the taxation of persons, if even not all of it (for he did not achieve [that]), he should have God gracious unto the offences committed by him in any way whatsoever; for he, too, was human."[137]

The limitation of human knowledge and foresight is indeed a handy tool by which Lydus acquitted bureaucrats and emperors which he did not wish to openly criticise. I already mentioned the case of *Magistr.* II.21, in which Sergius and Anastasius, because of their intellectualist profile dear to Lydus, were acquitted for their unwitting contribution to the later debaucheries of John of Cappadocia. The same strategy is used in order to combine acid criticism of John of Cappadocia as a subordinate of Emperor Justinian with a praise of Justinian as the restorer of the Roman Empire.[138] Although one could be tempted to read this contradiction ironically, as such scholars as Lamma and Kaldellis have done,[139] I would propose a different reading. The theme of the limitations of human knowledge and power in the face of the metaphysically determined decline of the state is an essential part of Lydus' rhetoric. Bureaucrats and rulers, in spite of their virtue, failed from time to time in their efforts to preserve the Roman state.

As these passages have shown, the metaphysical level of absence interacted indirectly with the specific historical events (losses) through the appointment or impediment of emperors. And more directly, the metaphysical force of God combined with the emperor to renovate the Roman state, as we have seen in the denouncement of John of Cappadocia (*Magistr.* III.69), quoted above. Lydus' apocalypse of the Roman state with the Nika-riots ends on a positive note, revealing yet again God and the emperor at work to restore the empire (*Magistr.* III.70-71):

"But God (for it was dependent upon Him alone) relieved so dire a … (…) nevertheless, however, after God, the emperor's Fortune overcame in all respects the heap of ruins, and in a short time. The city, however, appeared better and more beautiful, both strong and at the same time safe, just as if the Creator, precisely as He had done formerly, were again calling forth the

---

[136] "τοσούτων κακῶν ἐπιχεθέντων τῇ πρόσθεν εὐδαίμονι τῶν ἀρχῶν, ἡ Τύχη, βραχύ τι γνήσιον δὲ γελῶσα, τὸν Ἀναστάσιον θανατῶσιν ἐπέστησε τοῖς ὑπηκόοις" (Schamp 2006c: 99), trans. Bandy (1983: 203).

[137] "ὅτι δὲ μόνος αὐτὸς μετὰ Κωνσταντῖνον τὴν τῶν ψυχῶν ἐκούφισε δασμολογίαν, εἰ καὶ μὴ πᾶσαν (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔφθασεν), θεὸν ἐχέτω ἵλεων τῶν ὅπως δή ποτε πλημμεληθέντων αὐτῷ· καὶ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἦν." (Schamp 2006c: 102), trans. Bandy (1983: 207).

[138] Carney (1971b: 82, 103, 112).

[139] Lamma (1947: 84), Kaldellis (2005b: 9-12).

universe into light out of formless matter by the mere power of His volition."[140]

The Emperor is not a passive object of the divine will or a junior partner in the coalition between the metaphysical level of absence and the specific level of loss. Lydus also depicts the emperor, more specifically Justinian, as a force against the nefarious metaphysical forces behind the decline of the empire (*Magistr.* II.5 and III. 1):

"Time, however, is clever at both eating away and undermining whatever has been allotted generation and at the same time corruption. But the emperor's excellence is such a great thing that whatever has utterly perished in the past awaits regeneration through him."[141]

"Through this account one would faintly get for oneself a mirrored picture of both the splendour which prevailed in it long ago and the good order, which, although almost lost, our noble emperor did not allow to be completely extinguished but holds them together, as it were, and strengthens antiquity as it flows away in the course of time."[142]

In *Magistr.* III.39, quoted above, Lydus coupled a personification of Time (absence) to the indolence of the state's bureaucrats (loss) to conceptualise the decline of the Roman state. In this passage Lydus also depicted the positive forces in the drama of the empire; God and the emperor:

"Even if perchance it is possible to perceive still even to this day the magistracy itself both greater than itself and more renowned by reason of the emperor's vigilance (for there is no branch of the entire government which the emperor by his careful consideration and at the same time all-round scrutiny did not elevate in general simultaneously to both grandeur and effective power coupled with elegance; nor was there any of the distinctive features which it had had from the beginning that it had not taken up with the addition of perfections), (…) the magistracy (…) would be slipping al-

---

[140] "ἀλλὰ θεὸς (μόνου γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῦ) τὴν τοσαύτην παραμυθήσας (end of f 95v) ...... (line 8 of f 98v) ἐνίκησε δὲ ὅμως μετὰ θεὸν ἡ βασιλέως Τύχη κατὰ πάντα τὸν ἐρειπιῶνα καὶ ἐν βραχεῖ χρόνῳ· κρείττων δὲ ἡ πόλις καὶ καλλίων ὤφθη ἰσχυρά τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀσφαλής, καθάπερ ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης αὖθις τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ, καθάπερ τότε, τὸ πᾶν εἰς φῶς μόνῃ τῇ δυνάμει τῆς βουλῆς ἀνακαλοῦντος." (Schamp 2006c: 134), trans. Bandy (1983: 247).
[141] "δεινὸς δὲ ὁ χρόνος ἐκφαγεῖν τε καὶ ὑπεργάσασθαι τὰ γένεσιν ἅμα καὶ φθορὰν εἰληχότα. ἀλλ' ἡ βασιλέως ἀρετὴ τοσαύτη τίς ἐστιν, ὥστε παλιγγενεσίαν δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὶν ἐξολωλότα καραδοκεῖν." (Schamp 2006c: 7), trans. Bandy (1983: 91).
[142] "(…) ἐπῆλθεν ἐμοὶ ἴδιόν τινα καὶ μονήρη λόγον περὶ τῆς μεγίστης τάξεως τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀρχῶν ὑποθεῖναι τῇ ἱστορίᾳ, δι' οὗ ἄν τις ἀμυδρῶς ἐσοπτρίσοιτο τὴν πάλαι κρατήσασαν ἐν αὐτῇ λαμπρότητά τε καὶ εὐταξίαν· ἣν ἐγγὺς ἀπολομένην ὁ γενναῖος ἡμῶν βασιλεὺς οὐκ εἴασε παντελῶς ἀποσβεσθῆναι, συνέχει δὲ ὥσπερ καὶ σφίγγει διαρρέουσαν τῷ χρόνῳ τὴν ἀρχαιότητα." (Schamp 2006c: 42), trans. Bandy (1983: 133).

most into complete disintegration unless God and the present emperor who is good in all respects were rendering aid to it."[143]

In *Magistr*. III.38 and III.55, the might of the Emperor Justinian is a shield against the decline of the Roman state. Note that in these descriptions of Justinian as the emperor restoring the Roman state, almost all of these instances denote Justinian by his title as emperor and not by his personal name. Actually, despite three instances in which his name appears to describe an office in a title, the name Justinian only appears once throughout the *De Magistratibus*.[144] This feature in the depiction of Justinian enhances the interconnection between absence and loss in one historical person. As in the case of the Cappadocian, yet in this case in a positive way, Emperor Justinian was the personal embodiment of an institute, namely the timeless Roman Emperor as a metaphysical force in the defence of the Roman Empire.[145]

In his metaphysical task of protecting the empire, a good emperor of necessity relied on good bureaucrats, as a digression on Hadrian and Lucius Flavius Arrianus of Nicomedia (ca. AD 86/89 – ca. after AD 146/160) in *Magistr*. III.53 shows:

> "Arrian discusses the latter rather accurately in his *History of the Alans*, and especially in Book VIII of his *Parthian Wars*, because he himself had been placed in charge of the area as governor of the very region under the upright Hadrian. For such magistrates had he as by both their words and their deeds elevated the state, too, to so great renown."[146]

In this digression, Lydus connected the good Emperor Hadrian to Arrian, who is not only a good governor, but also a prolific historian, as the two references to titles of his oeuvres suggest.[147] In Lydus' mind, as we can see from this and following cases, a good bureaucrat combines the practical knowledge and experience of statecraft with antiquarian erudition. As Lydus also referred to his own oeuvre in his biography of John of Cappadocia (*Magistr*. III.61),[148] Lydus implicitly equated himself

---

[143] "κἂν εἰ τυχὸν αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἑαυτῆς καὶ μείζονα καὶ κλεινοτέραν τῇ βασιλέως ἀγρυπνίᾳ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἔστι συνιδεῖν (οὐδὲ γὰρ μέλος ἐστὶ τῆς ὅλης πολιτείας ὃ μὴ καθ᾽ ὅλου εἰς ὕψος τε ἅμα καὶ δύναμιν ἰσχυρὰν ὁ βασιλεὺς μετὰ καλοῦ ἀνέστησεν, περινοστῶν ἅμα καὶ περιθεώμενος, μήτε τῶν ἀνέκαθεν ὑπαρξάντων αὐτῇ γνωρισμάτων ὃ μὴ μετὰ προσθήκης τῶν ἀρετῶν ὑπολάβοι) (…) τῆς μὲν ἀρχῆς ἐν τῇ σφετέρᾳ δυνάμει συνισταμένης, τῆς δὲ τάξεως, νῦν μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἐκείνης παραλλαγῶν, νῦν δὲ ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων ῥαθυμιῶν, εἰ μὴ θεὸς καὶ βασιλεὺς οὗτος ὁ πάντα καλὸς ἐπεκούρει, ἐγγὺς εἰς παντελῆ κατάλυσιν ὀλισθαινούσης." (Schamp 2006c: 90-91), trans. Bandy (1983: 193).

[144] Namely in *Magistr*. III.55. The three instances in which his name appears in a title can be found in *Magistr*. table of contents (II.6), *Magistr*. III.27 and III.30.

[145] This characterisation of the person of the Emperor as the earthly embodiment of a timeless institute is, in my opinion, closely connected to the sacralisation of the colour purple, see chapter 4.3.3. (pp. 174-178 of this dissertation).

[146] "Ἀρριανὸς ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀλανικῆς Ἱστορίας, καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα ἐπὶ τῆς ὀγδόης τῶν Παρθικῶν, ἀκριβέστερον διεξέρχεται, αὐτὸς τοῖς τόποις ἐπιστὰς οἷα τῆς χώρας αὐτῆς ἡγησάμενος ὑπὸ Ἀδριανῷ τῷ χρηστῷ. τοιούτους γὰρ ἄρχοντας ἐκεῖνος ἔσχεν, οἳ τοῖς τε λόγοις τοῖς τε ἔργοις εἰς τοσαύτην εὔκλειαν τήν τε πολιτείαν ἀνέστησαν." (Schamp 2006c: 108), trans. Bandy (1983: 215).

[147] On the use of Arrian in Lydus, see Schamp (2006a: clxxiii-clxxv).

[148] Schamp (2006a: cxxviii).

to Arrian. Lydus' portrait of the ideal bureaucrat is also a portrait of an ideal anti-quarian - and Lydus himself closely approached this ideal.

It was not only the past that furnished Lydus with examples of this ideal coalition of a good emperor with virtuous bureaucrats. Not unsurprisingly, Justinian also maintained the same relationship with similar officials (*Magistr.* III.38):

> "Gabrielius alone, while he was prefect of the city, restored it to his court of justice. For the emperor, being good and liberal, is naturally inclined to re-spect those who emulate him in descent, mode of life, and munificence in accordance with their ability."[149]

Taking into account the fact that Gabriel, the city prefect, appointed Lydus to his professorship at the university of Constantinople, we can see here a positive counterpart to the demonic chain of command from the negative metaphysical forces to John of Cappadocia and his subordinates, such as John Maxilloplumbacius. The positive chain of command responsible for the restoration of the empire com-mences with God, goes down to Justinian, "the Emperor", down to his subordinates, the city prefect Gabriel, and his subordinate Lydus.

Lydus in several places elaborated generally on the intellectual profile of his ideal bureaucrat, which combined experience in the workings of the administration with a profound erudition (*Magistr.* II.18 and III.9):[150]

> "For there was a law, not a simple but a documented one, which permitted absolutely no one to be advanced to the office of assistant, until, being both graced with respectability of descent and training in liberal learning and having become distinguished for nine years on the docket, after having both gone through every kind of experience in its affairs and having transformed the recklessness of youth into gentility (…)"[151]

> "And in the beginning each used to choose for himself from the ranks of the speedwriters three men who were the best in all respects (for no one except those who were graced with both scholarship and experience was permitted to fill posts of service in the court of justice), but nowadays, though selection requirements are gone, their number is being preserved still even to this day."[152]

---

[149] "μόνος Γαβριήλιος πολιαρχῶν ἀποκατέστησεν ἐκεῖνο τῷ δικαστηρίῳ· πέφυκε γὰρ ὁ βασιλεύς, καλὸς ὢν καὶ ἐλεύθερος, ἐρυθριᾶν τοὺς γένει καὶ βίῳ καὶ φιλοτιμίᾳ ζηλοῦντας αὐτὸν κατὰ δύναμιν." (Schamp 2006c: 90), trans. Bandy (1983: 193).

[150] See also *Magistr.* III.15.

[151] "νόμος γὰρ ἦν, οὐ φιλὸς ἀλλ᾽ ἐν γράμμασιν, μηδενὶ παντελῶς ἐπιτρέπων ἐπὶ τὸ τοῦ βοηθοῦ ἀναβαίνειν φρόντισμα πρὶν ἄν, γένους τε μετριότητι καὶ λόγων ἐλευθερίων παρασκευῇ κοσμούμενος καὶ ἔνατον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς δέλτου διαπρέψας, δι᾽ ὅλης τε ἐλθὼν τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων πείρας καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς νεότητος τόλμαν εἰς ἐπιείκειαν μεταβαλών" (Schamp 2006c: 23-24), trans. Bandy (1983: 111, 113).

[152] "καὶ ἀνέκαθεν μὲν ἕκαστος τρεῖς ἄνδρας τοὺς πάντα ἀρίστους ἐκ τῶν ταχυγράφων ἐπελέγετο (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐξῆν <εἰ> μὴ τοὺς πείρᾳ τε καὶ λόγοις κοσμουμένους τὴν λειτουργίαν τοῦ δικαστηρίου πληροῦν), νῦν δὲ τὰ μὲν τῆς ἐπιλογῆς οἴχεται, ὁ δὲ ἀριθμὸς ἔτι καὶ νῦν σῴζεται." (Schamp 2006c: 54), trans. Bandy (1983: 145).

In Lydus' opinion, this combination of practical skill and erudition was superior to mere academic knowledge, as we read that these bureaucrats with their knowledge challenged the professors in the city of Constantinople (*Magistr.* III.11 and III.13):

"men most expert in the law (…) men who caused difficulties with respect to questions of learning even to professors themselves"[153]

"Not even the time of their retirement did they get free of literary questions because the illustrious men among professors of learning used to go to them and debate concerning topics that were not understood."[154]

This positioning of the seasoned bureaucrat above academics reveals Lydus' disdain for academics, which we will encounter again and more explicitly in his description of the rule of Emperor Anastasius in *Magistr.* III.47 below.[155]

Lydus' strong focus on intellectualism as a requirement for the ideal bureaucrat helps us to further understand the motivations behind Cassiodorus' reworking of the *Variae* as a letter-encyclopaedia.[156] In his emphasis on both practical knowledge and theoretical sciences, Cassiodorus was well in tune with the intellectual ideal as proposed by Lydus. We can see how both are part of a common culture of bureaucratic intellectualism in Constantinople.[157] Besides these parallels, *Magistr.* III.13 and its description of bureaucrats engaging with academics in erudite debates also hints at the context in which both the *Variae* and the treatises of Lydus functioned. We can assume that both Cassiodorus and Lydus wrote for a learned public of bureaucrats who liked to indulge in debates with their peers and competitors from the bureau and the university.

Lydus did not only comment on the ideal bureaucrat/intellectual in general. The whole of the *De Magistratibus* is interspersed with short portraits of such administrators who upheld the traditions of the Roman state and therefore also the Roman state itself throughout the centuries.[158] In these depictions, we can perceive how a role of authority is attributed to the persons capable of preserving the traditions and heritage of the past. The past became, in the outlook of Lydus, a mediator of political authority and a form of political currency. This scheme provided authority to the bureaucrat as an intellectual while at the same time providing a template for the good bureaucrat. The good bureaucrat is an antiquarian intellectual, and, in

---

[153] "ἀνδρῶν καὶ διδασκάλοις αὐτοῖς πράγματα περὶ λόγων ζητήσεις παρεχόντων" (Schamp 2006c: 134), trans. Bandy (1983: 151).

[154] "μηδὲ τὸν τῆς ἀργίας καιρὸν ἔρημον λογικῶν ζητημάτων ἀπολαμβάνοντες, τῶν ἐνδόξων ἐν διδασκάλοις λόγων συντρεχόντων ὡς αὐτοὺς καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀγνοουμένων συζητούντων." (Schamp 2006c: 134), trans. Bandy (1983: 153, 155).

[155] In this context, it is also worthwhile to recall Lydus' reticence of his possible predecessor Priscian as professor of Latin, and what this reticence could tell us of the possibly troubled relation between both, see chapter 3.1.2. (pp. 58-59 of this dissertation).

[156] See chapter 5.3.2. (pp. 221-224 of this dissertation).

[157] Carney (1971b: 47).

[158] On the personal and prejudiced perspective of Lydus influencing his portraits of these bureaucrats, see Kelly (2004: 61).

turn, an antiquarian is a good bureaucrat. It is clear that these associations neatly fit Lydus' own profile as a bureaucrat with erudite aspirations, as we shall see in the following section.

Lydus elaborated to different extents on his intellectual portraits throughout the *De Magistratibus*. Some portraits are mere mentions such as the depiction of Leontius in *Magistr.* III.17,[159] and Sergius, Proclus and Tribonian in *Magistr.* III.20.[160] His extended depictions are more revealing for his connection of absence and loss in his great drama of the Roman state. I shall give a short analysis of these portraits of Peter the Patrician, Hephaestus and Phocas.

In his succinct account on the *magister officiorum* (*Magistr.* II.23-26), Lydus referred to the antiquarian work of Peter the Patrician on this office (*Magistr.* II.25) before pouring elaborate praise on him in the concluding paragraph (*Magistr.* II.26):

> "And preeminently such is the aforementioned much-famed Petrus, who is in no way second to anyone as regards virtues. For he maintains and preserves the court, and he does not spurn the Roman greatness, which, although almost lost on account of the fatuity of his predecessors, he restores inasmuch as he is learned and constantly devotes himself to his books. Because, however, he knows the laws, if anyone else does, in which he was brought up from a tender age, defending those in need, he has demonstrated himself to be both a magistrate who is very great and displays a dignity worthy of his authority and a judge who is keen and knows how to administer justice uprightly, one's station in life in no way making him submissive. (…) He cedes not time to occasions of idleness because he is wrapped in his books during the night and in business during the day. Even the journey itself from his home to the court he does not whistle away simply in conversations but binds himself with intellectual questions and the recounting of more ancient things with those who have leisure for such matters. And none of his time is unconcerned with instructional matters, so that the expounders of learning fear encounter with him, for he surrounds them with facts and complexities, gently rebuffing them with due moderation that "they are merely said to be,

---

[159] *PLRE* II.672-673 Leontius 23, Schamp (2006a: xxxiii).
[160] Lamma (1947: 86, n.3).

but they are not such as their fame fables them to be." Association with him stirs up, for me especially, no trivial vertigoes."[161]

In this description of the ideal magistrate, Lydus employed the motif of the scholar working late in the night on his research, a motif he reiterated in *Magistr.* III. 15 when describing in general the conduct of a good magistrate. This motif has a long pedigree in Latin scholarly and antiquarian literature as a marker of scholarly activity.[162] We can see how Lydus applied this motif of antiquarian self-representation to the life of Peter as a magistrate. Lydus yet again models the life of the ideal bureaucrat on the conduct of the antiquarian. In spite of this depiction of Peter the Patrician as an antiquarian, Lydus in his biography also reiterated his motif of the erudite bureaucrat besting mere academics in the intellectual debates Peter held with "the expounders of learning". These debates can yet again give us a hint as to the context in which Lydus' own works functioned.[163]

As in the case of the biography of Phocas following the biography of the Cappadocian, this biography of Peter meaningfully contrasts with the life of the Cappadocian. The Cappadocian's idleness and debauchery during the night is here contrasted to Peter's erudite activities after the toils of the day. Where John of Cappadocia let himself be escorted by throngs of prostitutes on his way to the capital, Peter the Patrician held discussions on learned topics on route to his duties in Constantinople. As this positive account shows, for Lydus the adherence to a cultural paradigm of bureaucratic intellectualism is more important than bureaucratic feuds and allegiances. This order of priorities explains why Lydus praised Peter the Patrician who was, nevertheless, as a *magister officiorum*, part of a competing department.[164]

A short yet revealing case is the depiction Lydus gave in an aside on Hephaestus in *Magistr.* III.30:

"it was the upright Hephaestus, a man who was good and from his name alone displayed the nobility which he had, for he was reputed to be a de-

---

[161] Carney (1971b: 124), Caimi (1984: 145), Schamp (2006a: xliv-xlv). "καὶ διαφερόντως Πέτρος οὗτος, ὁ πολύς, ὁ μηδενὶ ταῖς ἀρεταῖς κατὰ μηδὲν δεύτερος. διασῴζει μὲν γὰρ καὶ φρουρεῖ τὴν αὐλὴν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν οὐκ ἀποπτύει μεγαλειότητα, ἣν ἐγγὺς ἀπολομένην ἀβελτερίᾳ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ, οἷα σοφὸς καὶ διὰ παντὸς τοῖς βιβλίοις προσανέχων, ἀποκαθίστησιν· τοὺς δὲ νόμους εἰδὼς εἴπερ τις ἄλλος, οἷς ἐξ ἁπαλῶν ὀνύχων ἐνετράφη, συνηγορῶν τοῖς δεομένοις, ἄρχων τε μέγιστος καὶ ἀξίαν ὀφρὺν τῆς ἐξουσίας ἀνατείνων ἐδείχθη καὶ δικαστὴς ὀξὺς καὶ τὸ δίκαιον κρίνειν εἰλικρινῶς ἐπιστάμενος, κατὰ μηδὲν αὐτὸν ὑπτιαζούσης τῆς τύχης. (…) μηδένα καιρὸν ταῖς ῥαθυμίας παραχωρῶν, τὴν μὲν νύκτα τοῖς βιβλίοις, τὴν δὲ ἡμέραν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐγκείμενος, μηδὲ αὐτὴν τὴν μέχρι τῆς αὐλῆς ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας ἐν ὁμιλίαις διασυρίζων ἁπλῶς, ζητήμασι δὲ λογικοῖς καὶ ἀφηγήσεσι πραγμάτων ἀρχαιοτέρων μετὰ τῶν περὶ ταῦτα σχολαζόντων εἰλούμενος. καὶ καιρὸς οὐδεὶς αὐτῷ διδαγμάτων ἐστὶν ἀμέριμνος, ὡς τοὺς τῶν λόγων ἐξηγητὰς δεδιέναι τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐντυχίαν· πράγμασι γὰρ αὐτοὺς καὶ στροφαῖς περιβάλλει μετρίως ὑπελέγχων ὡς λέγοιντο μόνον, οὐκ εἰσὶ δὲ τοιοῦτοι ὁποίους αὐτοὺς ἡ φήμη διαθρυλεῖ. ἐμοὶ δὲ μάλιστα σκοτοδινίας οὐ μικρὰς ἀνακινεῖ ἡ πρὸς αὐτὸν συνήθεια." (Schamp 2006c: 31-33), trans. Bandy (1983: 123).
[162] Stevenson (2004: 125-126).
[163] Carney (1971b: 52, 124).
[164] Schamp (2006a: cdlxxv-cdlxxvi). "De ses actions et de son comportement, notre écrivain ne retient que ce qui a trait aux services qu'il rendait à la vie intellectuelle dans la capitale (26 3-5)." (Schamp 2006a: cdlxxvi).

scendant of Hephaestus, who, according to the Sicilian,[165] had reigned as the king of Egypt."[166]

As in the life of the Cappadocian, Lydus applied his antiquarian techniques in this case to the life of a contemporary (loss), as if he were the topic of antiquarian research (absence). Insofar as John of Cappadocia was for Lydus an institute of evil meriting antiquarian research, so virtuous upholders of the Roman state constituted an institute in themselves, and were, as such, worthy of antiquarian research.

A clear counterpart to the biography of John of Cappadocia is the life of Phocas, "a patrician gentleman",[167] which immediately follows the life of the former (*Magistr.* III.72-76). As in the case of John of Cappadocia and Hephaestus, the portrait of Phocas is interspersed with antiquarian elements, such as a digression on the origin of the region of Galatia, which Lydus gave on the occasion of Phocas' benefactions in that region (*Magistr.* III.74).[168] Comparably to Peter the Patrician, Phocas is a mirror-image of the Cappadocian,[169] with his ascetic lifestyle (*Magistr.* III.72), his interest in Latin education (*Magistr.* III.73)[170] and his liberality. The extensive praise poured on Phocas in the last extant chapter of the *De Magistratibus* (*Magistr.* III.76) shows how Lydus coupled a concrete episode in the life of Phocas - the level of loss - to God and the emperor as the providential forces behind the restoration of the empire - the level of absence. Indeed, Phocas, as the upholder of the intellectualist bureaucratic ideal of Lydus, is "a man of Providence" for whom God thwarted an attempt on his life:[171]

> "Rejoicing at the fact that the man [=Phocas] was such as the was, the emperor with much effort persuaded him to display publicly towards all men the liberality of spirit which he possessed, to undertake the administration of public affairs, and to steer the helm of the whole state which was already in process of being ruined because of its ills. (…) he [=Phocas] perceived God by his side eager to help him. For, after he had assumed the magistracy and had made his appearance before the court, no sooner was he being brought up to his chariot than the entire populace, people of both every age and sex alike, lifted up their hands to the sky and proceeded to offer to God with tears of joy hymns of thanksgiving for having deemed those prostrate with countless ills worthy of such great providence. When God has resolved to

---

[165] Namely the historian Diodorus Siculus.
[166] Fl. Ioannes Theodorus Menas Narses Chnoubammon Horion Hephaestus *PLRE* III. 582-583. "Ἥφαιστος δὲ ἦν ὁ χρηστός, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐκ μόνης τῆς προσηγορίας τὴν οὖσαν εὐγένειαν αὐτῷ δεικνύς· Ἥφαίστειαν γὰρ τοῦ πρώτου βασιλεύσαντος Αἰγύπτου κατὰ τὸν Σικελιώτην ἀπόγονος εἶναι διεφημίζετο" (Schamp 2006c: 80), trans. Bandy (1983: 179, 181). A contemporary to Lydus, Anatolius 5 (*PLRE* III.71-72), made the same flattering connection between Hephaestus and the eponymous god by quoting from Homer (*PRLE* III.583).
[167] "Φωκᾶς γέγονεν ἀνὴρ εὐπατρίδης" (Schamp 2006c: 134), trans. Bandy (1983: 249). See note 259 (p. 67 of this dissertation).
[168] Caimi (1984: 260), Schamp (2006c: cxciii-cxcv).
[169] Caimi (1984: 258).
[170] Scott (1972: 449-450), Purpura (1976: 63, n. 37), Caimi (1984: 259-260), Schamp (2006c: cxciii), Kaldellis (2013: 362).
[171] Lamma (1947: 86 n.2), Carney (1971b: 124), Scott (1972: 449-450), Caimi (1984: 261-262), Schamp (2006c: cc-cci).

convince men, He shows that He is present at what is being done and that by the acts of His volition benefits come into being. For, as the prefect stood in front of his chariot, some wretch inserted an arrow into his bow (…) and shot at him, but, because the arrow had missed, since he was, indeed, unharmed, he was clearly shown to be a man of Providence."[172]

6.2.2.4. The Ruler as Antiquarian

As the analysis has shown, the intellectualist ideal of Lydus united bureaucratic skill and experience with antiquarian erudition. For Lydus, the ideal bureaucrat is also an antiquarian. In this section, we shall see how Lydus, in effect, also applied this intellectualist scheme in his judgment of the conduct of the rulers of the Roman state throughout the centuries. Good rulers are also good antiquarians.

Indeed, throughout his antiquarian account of the history of Rome, the rulers whom Lydus chose to portray in a positive way are invariably interpreted as erudite scholars.[173] In a previous chapter we have analysed how Numa Pompilius, as the respectable second founder of Rome, was also depicted by Lydus as an antiquarian, whose scholarly output Lydus even mentioned (pp. 154-158 of this dissertation). Likewise, in Lydus' depiction of the Emperor Augustus, erudition, moderation and regard for liberty featured in a positive sketch of the first emperor, as we have seen previously (pp. 176-173 of this dissertation).

A similar picture arose for the Emperor Tiberius, when Lydus digressed on the learned correspondence of the Emperor with Sheik Aretas on the cures of epilepsy (*Mens.* IV.104, Bandy IV.95):

"When the sheik of the tent-dwelling Arabs Aretas wrote a letter to Claudius Caesar about the cure by means of birds, he says that the liver of the vulture cooked with its blood, administered with honey for three weeks, rids one of epilepsy and likewise also the heart of the vulture, when dried up, administered in water, is effective in the same manner."[174]

---

[172] "Τοσοῦτον ὄντα τὸν ἄνδρα χαίρων ὁ βασιλεὺς πείθει καμάτῳ πολλῷ κοινὴν εἰς ἅπαντας ἐπιδείξασθαι τὴν οὖσαν αὐτῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν ἀναδέξασθαι φροντίδα καὶ διϊθῦναι τὸν οἴακα βυθιζομένης ἤδη τοῖς κακοῖς τῆς ὅλης πολιτείας. ὁ δὲ (…) εἶδε τὸν θεὸν παρόντα βοηθεῖν αὐτῷ προθυμούμενον. ἅμα γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν παραλαβὼν καὶ τῆς αὐλῆς προφανεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπήνης ἀνεφέρετο <καὶ> σύμπας ὁ δῆμος ἡλικία τε πᾶσα καὶ φύσις ὁμοῦ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνατείναντες ὕμνους εὐχαριστηρίους μετὰ δακρύων ἀνέφερον τῷ θεῷ τοσαύτης ἀξιώσαντι προνοίας τοὺς μορίοις κατεστρωμένους κακοῖς. πείθειν δὲ θεὸς ἀνθρώπους ἀξιώσας δείκνυσι παρεῖναι τοῖς πραττομένοις καὶ βουλαῖς αὐτοῦ προϊέναι τὰ χρηστά. ὡς γὰρ ἔστη τῆς ἀπήνης ἔμπροσθεν ὁ ὕπαρχος, βέλος ἐναφεὶς τόξῳ πονηρός τις (…) στοχάζεται μὲν αὐτοῦ, τοῦ δὲ βέλους ἀμπλακόντος, αὐτὸς μὲν ἀβλαβὴς ὢν ἄνθρωπος τῆς Προνοίας φανερῶς ἀπεδείχθη." (Schamp 2006c: 139), trans. Bandy (1983: 255).

[173] On the contemporary popularity of the works of scholar-emperors such as Constantine and Julian, see Carney (1971b: 50).

[174] "Ἀρέτας δὲ ὁ τῶν Σκηνιτῶν Ἀράβων φύλαρχος Κλαυδίῳ Καίσαρι γράφων ἐπιστολὴν περὶ τῆς δι' ὀρνέων θεραπείας φησίν, ἧπαρ γυπὸς σὺν τῷ αἵματι ὀπτὸν μετὰ μέλιτος διδόμενον ἐπὶ ἑβδομάδας τρεῖς ἀπαλλάττειν ἐπιληψίας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ γυπός, ὅτε ξηρανθῇ, ἐν ὕδατι διδομένην τῷ ἴσῳ τρόπῳ ἰσχύειν." Wünsch (1898: 143), trans. Bandy (2013a: 280).

The cure 'by birds', and the use of the liver of a bird in it, could be taken as indirect references to the Etruscan prophesying arts of haruspicy and augury, into which Claudius took a lively interest and on which he also published.[175] Yet again, Lydus depicted a Roman Emperor mainly as a learned individual engaging in intellectual correspondence.[176]

As already mentioned in a previous chapter (pp. 46-50 of this dissertation), Lydus speaks very highly of Emperor Anastasius, as he owed his enrolment in the praetorian prefecture to Zoticus under the rule of the Emperor (*Magistr.* III.26). Furthermore, Anastasius' learnedness and his active support of the bureaucratic culture of erudition are highly praised in Lydus' portrait of the Emperor in *Magistr.* III.47, in which he, yet again, contrasted the learned pragmatism of the emperor/bureaucrat to the behaviour of academics:

> "Now, while such was the emperor, in other respects, however, he was intelligent and cultured, gentle and at the same time also energetic, munificent and also too great for anger, and he respected learning so that, though he had wanted to grant to the teachers of learning a retirement and rank, he was hindered by their discords, for intellectuals are naturally prone to disagree with themselves because of their detachment from reality."[177]

The last emperor depicted as an intellectual is Justinian himself. In *Magistr.* II.28, we read how some of Justinian's reforms were ushered in by his reading up on the old traditions of Rome:

> "After him, however, because Justin lived in quietude and had devised nothing newer, the one who came thereafter, his nephew, being eager to bring about everything that was beneficial to the common good and attempting to recall all the dignity of the ancient form, first of all devised the so-called prefect of Scythia. For, since he was wise and had found out through books that the region both now is and has long been wealthy in warfare (the celebrated Trajan, who had been the first to capture it including Decebalus, leader of the Getans, brought in to the Romans five millions of pounds of gold and double that amount in pounds of silver, apart from goblets and vessels that had transcended the limit of estimation, both herds and tools, as well as over five hundred thousands of highly skilled fighting men including their arms, as Crito, who was present at the war, confidently affirmed), he

---

[175] On Claudius' erudite activity in the fields of omens and etruscology, see Domenici (2007: 15).

[176] Apart from this passage, emperor Claudius only figured directly in *Mens.* IV.59 (Bandy IV. 65), which recounted of a certain ritual on the Palatine Hill introduced by Claudius. *Magistr.* III.63 mentions how the sturgeon was introduced into the Mediterranean Sea by a freedman of Claudius, and *Ost.* 4 (Bandy 4) has a description of omens during his reign.

[177] "Ἦν μὲν οὖν τοιοῦτος ὁ βασιλεύς, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα συνετὸς καὶ πεπαιδευμένος, ἐπιεικής τε ἅμα καὶ δραστήριος, μεγαλόδωρός τε καὶ κρείττων ὀργῆς, ἐρυθριῶν τε τοὺς λόγους, ὡς καὶ πλήρωμα χρόνου καὶ βαθμὸν τοῖς τῶν λόγων διδασκάλοις βουληθέντα παρασχεῖν ταῖς αὐτῶν διχονοίαις ἐμποδισθῆναι· πέφυκε γὰρ ἐξ ἀπραγμοσύνης τὸ λογικὸν πρὸς ἑαυτὸ διαφωνεῖν." (Schamp 2006c: 101-102), trans. Bandy (1983: 207).

resolved, being himself in no way inferior to Trajan, to preserve for the Romans the northern region which was already at length rebelling."[178]

In this passage, the acts of a specific historical character such as Justinian (the level of loss) is accompanied by an antiquarian digression as if the life of this emperor was already material for antiquarian research (the level of absence). This depiction of an emperor ruling as an antiquarian is furthermore a very strong yet implicit means of self-profiling by Lydus. As an antiquarian, Lydus acted as the gatekeeper of information on the past traditions of Rome which was necessary for the policies of the virtuous emperors upholding the Roman state. As such, antiquarians in general, and Lydus in particular, were indispensable parts of the imperial decision making process.

As the analysis in this section has shown, Lydus created a strong rhetoric of both inevitable decline of the Roman state and hopes for the restoration of that state, by coupling, in two ways, the metaphysical level of absence to the specific level of loss. In a negative way, the ominous metaphysical forces behind the decline of the empire, Time, and the devil, combined with specific bureaucrats and their subordinates, such as John of Cappadocia and John Maxilloplumbacius, in order to effect the momentous and perennial fall of the empire. This negative rhetoric, prepared throughout Books II and III of the *De Magistratibus*, came to a spectacular climax with the cautionary life of John of Cappadocia, an institute of evil, and the ensuing Nika-riots. From the ashes of the riots appeared, in a positive way, the coalition which Lydus set against the decline of the state with the hopes of renewal. In this coalition, the will of God combined with the actions of "men of Providence", virtuous emperors, and more importantly, the erudite bureaucrats of whom Lydus was an exponent. In his grand drama of the empire, intellectualism and erudition were the main criteria by which to judge human action. The banes of the empire were invariably uneducated boors such as the Cappadocian, or one-sidedly educated pseudo-intellectuals such as Cyrus of Panopolis or the anonymous academics who were challenged by bureaucrats such as Peter the Patrician. In this great drama, Lydus also reserved for himself a role, as we will see in the next section.

---

[178] "Μετ' ἐκεῖνον δέ, Ἰουστίνου ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ βιοῦντος καὶ μηδὲν νεώτερον ἐξευρόντος, ὁ μετὰ ταῦτα, ἀδελφιδοῦς αὐτῷ

γενόμενος, πᾶν ὅ τι χρήσιμον περιποιεῖν τοῖς κοινοῖς ἐπειγόμενος, ὅλην τε τὴν ὀφρὺν τῆς ἀρχαίας ὄψεως ἀνακαλούμενος, πρῶτον μὲν ἐξεῦρε τὸν λεγόμενον τῆς Σκυθίας ὕπαρχον. Σοφὸς γὰρ ὢν καὶ διὰ τῶν βιβλίων εὑρὼν ὡς εὐδαίμων μὲν ἡ χώρα τοῖς χρήμασιν, ἰσχυρὰ δὲ τοῖς ὅπλοις ἐστί τε νῦν καὶ πάλαι γέγονεν (<ἦν> πρῶτος ἑλὼν σὺν Δεκεβάλῳ τῶν Γετῶν ἡγησαμένῳ Τραϊανὸς ὁ πολὺς πεντακοσίας μυριάδας χρυσίου λιτρῶν, διπλασίας δὲ ἀργύρου, ἐκπωμάτων ἄνευ καὶ σκευῶν τιμῆς ὅρον ἐκβεβηκότων ἀγελῶν τε καὶ ὅπλων καὶ ἀνδρῶν μαχιμωτάτων ὑπὲρ πεντήκοντα μυριάδας σὺν τοῖς ὅπλοις Ῥωμαίοις εἰσήγαγεν, ὡς ὁ Κρίτων παρὼν τῷ πολέμῳ διϊσχυρίσατο) συνεῖδεν, αὐτὸς κατὰ μηδὲν Τραϊανῷ παραχωρῶν, περισῶσαι Ῥωμαίοις ἤδη ποτὲ ἀφηνιάζουσαν τὴν βορείαν." (Schamp 2006c: 34-35), trans. Bandy (1983: 127).

## 6.3. Biography of the Bureau and History of a Bureaucrat: The Case of John of Lydia

John Lydus was not merely a detached reporter of the drama of empire which he described in his *De Magistratibus*. In this section, I shall discuss how Lydus also inserted himself into this drama as an active contributor to it. By doing so, Lydus profoundly coupled the metaphysical level of absence to the specific level of loss, namely his own life, as he also explicitly stated in the first book of *De Magistratibus* (*Magistr.* I.15):

> "And, while this is what the writer of legal treatises wrote, it is clear that, even if perchance the prefecture of the *praetoria* has been granted to be older and greater than all the magistracies, it is both needful and at the same time befitting to conduct a discussion of both all its staff and power. (…) I shall narrate in detail all its functions one after the other and all of which it was deprived little by little, and then also about the truly very great staff which functions under its jurisdiction, in which I, too, happened to serve (for I know it, in fact, not by hearsay but by having rendered service to its affairs by actual deeds), offering a thank-offering, just as an affectionate dedication, to the overseers of the magistracy because they supported me decorously and at the same time, next after God, the Lord of all, have granted me both rewards for my toils and a noble end and besides a superior fortune." [179]

The immediacy which resulted from this personal connection accounts for the strength of Lydus' rhetoric of inevitable decline and hope of future restoration. [180]

As his personal interventions throughout the *De Magistratibus* attest, [181] Lydus highly identified his personal vicissitudes and losses in the praetorian prefecture with the general tale of absence or decline he sketched in his *De Magistratibus*. In his antiquarian account of the praetorian prefecture, he subtly wove his autobiography (*Magistr.* III.25-30). [182] John shared in the misfortunes of the praetorian prefecture. He consoled himself with the thought that his personal misfortune was inevitable, because it was intricately linked to his office (*Magistr.* III.25):

---

[179] "Καὶ τόδε μὲν ὁ νομογράφος, ὅτι δέ, κἂν εἰ τυχὸν πρεσβυτέρα καὶ μείζων τῶν ἀρχῶν ἁπασῶν <ἡ> ἐπαρχότης τῶν πραιτωρίων εἶναι δέδοται, καὶ χρειῶδες ἦν ἅμα καὶ ἁρμόδιον δι' ὅλης αὐτῆς τῆς τάξεώς τε καὶ δυνάμεως ἐξαγαγεῖν τὸν λόγον · (…) ἐφ' ἑξῆς ἅπαντα ὅσων τε κατὰ σμικρὸν ἀφῃρέθη, εἶτα δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς ὑπ' αὐτὴν τελούσης μεγίστης ὡς ἀληθῶς τάξεως, ἐν ᾗ κἀμὲ τελέσαι συμβέβηκεν, λεπτομερῶς ἀφηγήσομαι (καὶ γὰρ ἐπίσταμαι οὐκ ἀκοῇ ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς ἔργοις ὑπουργήσας τοῖς πράγμασιν), εὐχαριστήριον ὥσπερ ἀνάθημα προσφιλὲς τοῖς ἐφόροις τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀναφέρων, διαθρέψασιν ἅμα κοσμίως ἡμᾶς καὶ μετὰ θεὸν τὸν πάντων κύριον γέρα τε τῶν πόνων καὶ πέρας ἐσθλὸν καὶ τύχην κρείττονα παρεσχηκόσιν." Schamp (2006b: 24), strand. Bandy (1983: 29).

[180] For the interpretation of the *De Magistratibus* as a means to come to terms with personal failure, see (Kelly 2004: 61).

[181] Personal anecdotes, experiences and observations can be found in *Magistr.* I.15, *Magistr.* III.17, *Magistr.* III.20, *Magistr.* III.25-30, *Magistr.* III.57, *Magistr.* III.59, *Magistr.* III.66, and *Magistr.* III.67.

[182] Caimi (1984: 145).

"For, all this, just as everything else, too, having ceased to exist already in former times, I myself also shared the fruits of the misfortune of the time because I had arrived at the end of the ranks of the service, having acquired nothing but my title. (…) And rightly has this happened to me for having embarked upon this public service (…)."[183]

John's autobiography continued within the general current of his antiquarian discourse. Facts of his own life follow antiquarian descriptions of the office and vice versa. Unsurprisingly, in his depiction of himself, Lydus was an example of the ideal cultural profile which he sketched throughout his *De Magistratibus*.[184] He was given a philosophical education by Agapius in Constantinople (M*agistr.* III.26),[185] composed panegyrical poetry for his patron Zoticus (*Magistr.* III.27)[186] and for the Emperor Justinian (*Magistr.* III.28),[187] and was versed in the intricate details and Latin procedures of the Roman bureaucracy (*Magistr.* III.27). Lydus' intellectual capacities incited the emperor to commission a history from his pen (*Magistr.* III.28),[188] and he pursued his historiographical and erudite interests as a professor of Latin language and literature (*Magistr.* III.28-30).[189]

As his biography shows, Lydus presented himself as an intellectual all-rounder combining administrative acumen with erudition. His poetical skills, representing only one part of his intellectual panoply, meaningfully contrast with Cyrus of Panopolis, who was a bad bureaucrat because he was versed in poetry only. This holistic cultural ideal of the bureaucrat and intellectual is also mentioned in Hephaestus' decree on Lydus (*Magistr.* III.30):

"Because, however, he had considered it to be a small thing, as it seems, if he should be adorned with only the pursuits of learning (and yet, indeed, what would one regard as greater than these?), he involved himself also in civil affairs."[190]

At the end of his autobiographical excursus, John Lydus quoted in full two documents pertaining to his rewards during his service, a pragmatic sanction of the emperor (*Magistr.* III.29)[191] and the decree by the Prefect Hephaestus mentioned above (*Magistr.* III.30).[192] As in the portraits of other pawns in his drama of empire,

[183] "πάντων γὰρ ἤδη πρότερον τούτων ὃν τρόπον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπολομένων, παραπέλαυσα καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῆς κακοδαιμονίας τοῦ χρόνου, καταντήσας εἰς τὸ πέρας τῶν τῆς στρατείας βαθμῶν, μηδὲν παρὰ τὴν προσηγορίαν κτησάμενος. (…) καὶ δικαίως ταῦτά μοι συμβέβηκεν εἰς ταύτην ἐμβαλόντι τὴν λειτουργίαν·" Schamp (2006c: 73-74), trans. Bandy (1983: 170, 172).
[184] On his education and intellectual profile, see Schamp (2006a: lii-lxxvi).
[185] Caimi (1984: 9-12), Schamp (2006a: xxi-xxvii).
[186] Schamp (2006a: xxix, lxxvii-lxxviii).
[187] Caimi (1984: 59-60, 63-65), Schamp (2006a: xxxviii-xlv, lxxviii-lxxix).
[188] Caimi (1984: 61-65), Schamp (2006a: xxxviii-xlv).
[189] Schamp (2006a: xliii-xlv).
[190] "μικρὸν δέ, ὡς ἔοικεν, εἶναι νενομικὼς εἰ μόνοις κοσμοῖτο τοῖς ἐκ λόγων ἐπιτηδεύμασιν (καίτοι γε τί ἂν τις τούτων ἡγήσοιτο μεῖζον;) καὶ τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἐνέμιζε πράγμασι·" (Schamp 2006c: 81), trans. Bandy (1983: 181).
[191] Caimi (1984: 65-66).
[192] Caimi (1984: 81-83).

John applied the same antiquarian technique of citing documentary evidence indiscriminately both on antiquarian subjects and on himself. According to LaCapra, the blurring of the distinction between absence and loss runs parallel to a blurring of the distinction between the past and the present.[193] Exactly the same happens in John's autobiography and his biographies of contemporaries. John of Lydia, his colleagues, peers and competitors became the antiquarian tradition he described. By becoming themselves the antiquarian material, the distinction between the antiquarian past and the present is entirely erased.

---

[193] LaCapra (1999: 699).

## 6.4. Conclusion

As the analysis has shown, the personal focus of the antiquarians on their own department in the Roman administration was a powerful means of self-profiling. By tracing the origins of their own department and their professional trajectory to the origins of Rome - be it to Rome's pagan foundation history or to biblical times -, the antiquarian author functioning in that department implicitly contributed to the hallowed continuity with the distant past of Rome which was one of the prerequisites to the survival of the Roman state. As such, antiquarian research on the hallowed origins of their department proved to be a good form of political currency used to increase the prestige of both the intellectuals/bureaucrats working in the department and the department itself as sources of good governance validated by the past. A proof of the validity of this bureaucratic antiquarianism as political currency can be found, as we also saw above in the analysis of Cassiodorus' *formulae* (pp. 241-246 of this dissertation), in Justinian's legislation. As in the case of localist tendencies in antiquarian research (pp. 231-232 of this dissertation), Justinian, and his ghostwriter Tribonian, engaged in their *Novels* in an implicit dialogue with the bureaucratic antiquarianism of Lydus. By way of conclusion, I shall explore in a case study the parallels between one of Justinian's *Novels* and Lydus' antiquarianism.

The existence of an implicit dialogue between Justinian's *Novels* and the *De Magistratibus* of Lydus can explain the special features of two texts; *Novel* 13 with the title *Concerning the Praetors of the People*,[194] and *Magistr*. I.50 *On the Prefect of the Night Watches*.[195]

In the preface to *Novel* 13, which was promulgated on the fifteenth of October AD 535,[196] Justinian complained about the low value attributed to the office of the prefect of the Watch, in Latin *praefectus vigilum*, which was rendered in Greek ἔπαρχος τῶν νυκτῶν, or, prefect of the night watch. The association of the office with the unseemly period of the night rendered it an undesirable office. In order to strengthen his indignation at the current debasement of the office, Justinian rhetorically ventilated his ignorance on why the term "prefect of the watch" in Latin was translated into Greek as "prefect of the night watch" (*Novel* 13, preface):

"The name of the honourable prefects of the watch was both respected and well known to the ancient Romans, and we do not know in what manner another name and order came to be bestowed upon them. Our fatherland called them prefects of the watch, who superintended those who kept watch and left nothing unexplored. But in Greek, they are called, we know not how, prefects of the nights, as though their authority came into being with the setting of the sun, to be laid down with the rising of the sun. Why was the word "nights" added? Is it because that official looks only after those who commit wrong at night, and because he goes about in the city (during that time)? Why we see the officials of the prefect of the city doing the same

[194] Franciosi (1998: 57-102).
[195] On this passage in Lydus see Caimi (1984: 181-184), Franciosi (1998: 63), Schamp (2006a: cdlvi-cdlxxi). Caimi (1984: 181 n. 273) only shortly mentioned *Novel* 13 in his analysis of *Magistr.* I.50 without an analysis of the parallels.
[196] Franciosi (1998: 57).

thing, so that there would be nothing to hinder from calling that official by the same name. If any thinks that the powers are divided, those of the day-time being vested in the glorious prefect of this fortunate city, those of the night in others, they stray far from the truth, the right reason of the name being in some way corrupted. Hence everyone surely rightly shuns this name, as obscure, nebulous and connected with the night, considers an appointment to that office as a penalty and not even worthy of the requirement of an imperial letter-patent."[197]

After the preface, Justinian announced his measures aimed at enhancing the prestige of the office. One of them is changing the name of the office to "praetor of the people", *praetor plebis*.

Whether Justinian's airing of his ignorance of the origin of the term was a sincere question or a rhetorical tool to vent his indignation, the question it raised on the origin of the prefect of the (night) watch seems to have been picked up and elaborated by Lydus in *Magistr.* I.50. He traced the origin of the office to the Gallic invasion of Rome under Brennus. The Gallic assault was countered successfully by Mallius who was awakened by the geese in the temple on the Capitoline Hill. Rome's narrow escape from being conquered prompted the institution of the prefect of the Night Watches. Lydus continued his analysis with an extensive explanation of why he treated this office at this point of his analysis:

"And, though, so far as regards the length of their temporal existence, I ought to have mentioned them before this, yet, because it is not a custom for this office, too, to be counted in with the magistracies of the state but happens to have been devised as an organised body, that is, a corps for the sake of public service, it was fitting to have set it aside as a conclusion at least to the magistracies."[198]

---

[197] "Τὸ τῶν λαμπροτάτων τῆς ἀγρυπνίας ἀρχόντων ὄνομα, σεμνόν τε καὶ τοῖς πάλαι Ῥωμαίοις γνωριμώτατον ὄν, οὐκ ἴσμεν ὅπως εἰς ἀλλοίαν μετέστη προσηγορίαν καὶ τάξιν. ἡ μὲν γὰρ πάτριος ἡμῶν φωνὴ praefectos vigilum αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσε, τῇ τῶν ἀγρυπνούντων καὶ οὐδὲν ἀνερεύνητον καταλιμπανόντων ἀνθρώπων ἀρχῇ τούτους ἐπιστήσασα. ἡ δέ γε Ἑλλήνων φωνὴ οὐκ ἴσμεν ὅθεν ἐπάρχους αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσε τῶν νυκτῶν, ὥσπερ ἀναγκαῖον ὃν ἡλίου μὲν ὡς ἔοικε δύνοντος ἐξανίστασθαι τὴν ἀρχήν, παύεσθαι δὲ ἀνίσχοντος. τί γὰρ ἂν εἴη, διότι τὸ τῶν νυκτῶν προσέθηκεν ὄνομα; εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὡς ταύτης μόνης τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν ἐν νυξὶν οὐκ ὀρθῶς πραττομένων ἐπιμελουμένης καὶ περινοστούσης τὴν πόλιν ταύτην ἔσχε τὴν προσηγορίαν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν πολιαρχίαν ὁρῶμεν πράττουσαν, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἦν τὸ κωλῦον τό γε ἐπὶ τῇ προσηγορίᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκείνην τούτῳ τῷ ὀνόματι καλεῖν. εἰ δὲ διῃρῆσθαι τὰς ἀρχὰς οἴονται καὶ τὸν μὲν ἐνδοξότατον ἔπαρχον τῆς εὐδαίμονος ταύτης πόλεως εἶναι τῆς ἡμέρας ἄρχοντα, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους τῆς νυκτός, σφόδρα τῶν εἰκότων ἀπεπλανήθησαν, τὴν ὀρθότητα τῶν ὀνομάτων οὐκ ἴσμεν [δὲ] ὅπως διαφθείραντες. ταύτῃ τοι καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν ταύτην ζοφώδη τε οὖσαν καὶ σκοτεινὴν καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς ἐπώνυμον εἰκότως ἀποφεύγουσιν ἅπαντες καὶ ποινὴν τὴν χειροτονίαν ἡγοῦνται καὶ οὐδὲ βασιλικῶν ἀξίαν συμβόλων εἶναι νομίζουσιν." Kroll and Schöl (1895: 99-100), trans. Blume.
[198] "καὶ ὅσον μὲν πρὸς τὸ μῆκος τοῦ χρόνου, ἐχρῆν ἡμᾶς ἔμπροσθεν τούτων ἐπιμνησθῆναι, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ μὴ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς τῆς πολιτείας καὶ τουτὶ συναριθμεῖσθαι τὸ φρόντισμα νόμος, σύστημα δὲ καὶ σῶμα τυγχάνει λειτουργίας χάριν ἐπινοηθέν, εἰκὸς ἦν καὶ αὐτὸ ὥς γ' οὖν πέρας τι τῶν ἀρχῶν παραθέσθαι." (Schamp 2006b: 66-67), trans. Bandy (1983: 81).

Lydus continued his analysis with an enumeration of the duties of the prefect and a translated quote from Paulus' *De Officio Praefecti Vigilum*, which can be also found in the *Digests* I.15.1.[199] A testimony on the functioning of the office in Lydus' own day concluded the section. Lydus' analysis could be read as an implicit rebuke of the emperor's rhetorical indignation and his use of the past in order to institute his "praetor of the people". For in Lydus' account, the prefect was always called "prefect of the night watch", and this designation did not diminish the prestige or importance of the office.

Lydus' explanation of why he did not mention the office in chronological order of its appearance, and its addition as an epilogue at the end of Book I seem to imply that he added the description of this office without much premeditation, and that he therefore did not include it in his original plan for the First Book. Indeed, in his edition of *De Magistratibus*, Schamp analysed how Lydus did not have a single reason for including this office in his overview.[200] Later on in his analysis, Schamp attributed Lydus' inclusion of this office into his overview to mere "antiquarian bravura", "un morceau de bravoure" on the part of the Lydus.[201] Although the display of knowledge can always be assumed as one of the motives behind the writing of Lydus, indeed, behind any form of antiquarian writing, this explanation is too general to satisfy. In my opinion, *Novel* 13 explains the appearance of this passage in the *De Magistratibus*. Lydus' translation of a fragment of Paulus which can be found in Justinian's *Digests*[202] furthermore pleads in favour of Lydus' active engagement with Justinian's legislation.[203] Viewed in this light, *Magistr.* I.50 can be seen as an implicit answer to the rhetorical ignorance of the emperor and a gentle correction of the Emperor's conclusions drawn from his study of the distant past in *Novel* 13.

In this context it is handy to recall the image of the emperor as an antiquarian student, basing his policies on the study of the distant past in *Magistr.* II.28. The exchange between *Novel* 13 and *Magistr.* I.50 implies the same image of the good

---

[199] Caimi (1984: 183), Franciosi (1998: 64), Schamp (2006a: cxxviii, clxxxvii-clxxxix).

[200] Schamp (2006a: cxxx-cxxxi, cdlvi).

[201] Schamp (2006a: cdlxxi).

[202] On Lydus' quote of Paulus in *Magistr.* I.50, see Caimi (1984: 181-186). In the section of the *Digest* where Lydus found the fragment of Paulus, *De Officio Praefecti Vigilum*, (*Dig.* 1.15), we furthermore do not find the account of the origins of the office in the Gallic assault on Rome as given by Lydus. This again points to a (professed or real) ignorance of Justinian and his legislators as to the origins of the office and the sincerity of Lydus' attempt at clarifying the question on the origins of this office. Caimi (1984: 184) analysed how Lydus consulted part of the *Digests*, without having read (or having ignored) the part in which the office is attributed to Augustus.

[203] Caimi (1984: 150-151) described two strands of scholarship, one which hypothesised that Lydus' quotes from jurisprudence derived directly from the *Digests*, and another strand which presumed that Lydus quoted from the original sources. He furthermore sensible analysed (Caimi 1984: 193-199) that Lydus either used the *Digests* or a preparatory copy, or first consulted the *Digests* for the exact reference before looking up the passages of his interest in the original texts. Either way, it is very likely Lydus had a direct knowledge of and access to the texts of Justinian's legal projects - for instance, through his connection with Phocas, who was part of one of Justinian's legal commissions (Caimi 1984: 196-198). For example, as we saw in chapter 6.2.1.1. of this dissertation, Lydus quoted Charisius indirectly in *Magistr.* I.14 through the *Digests* (Karlowa 1885: 754), (Maas 1992: 91). According to Carney (1971b: 51), all of Lydus' references to jurisprudence can be traced to Book I of the *Digests*.

emperor as a good student of antiquarianism, and the antiquarian teacher as the source of his erudition. This implicit engagement of Lydus with the laws of Justinian therefore is a powerful attempt at valorising his antiquarian knowledge as political currency. Lydus presented himself and his erudite peers through this implicit dialogue as the privileged gate-keepers to the knowledge of the past, and, therefore, indispensable advisors to the policies of the present. Although a systematic comparison of Justinian's legislation with contemporary antiquarian writing exceeds the scope of this thesis, such a comparative study would greatly enhance our understanding of the valorisation of the past in the sixth-century present of Constantinople.

As we have seen in this chapter, antiquarian studies of one's own department were not only a means of self-profiling the author and the department in which he functioned. On a more profound level, the personal focus of the antiquarians on the histories of their departments was a strategy employed in order to deal with the disappearance of Rome as the epicentre and ordering principle of Roman historiographical interest. Instead of Rome, the transferable institutions of Rome could still be revered as the continuations of the Roman Empire - despite the fact that these institutions in the present functioned in the city of Constantinople. John Lydus furthermore transformed his beloved praetorian prefecture into a metaphysical battleground in which the forces of the universe - absence in the framework of LaCapra - combined with emperors and bureaucrats - the level of loss according to LaCapra - to steer the Roman state, either to its doom, or to a longed-for restoration.

This chapter served as the main panel in a triptych of strategies by which the antiquarians tried to replace Rome and the Roman Empire as the all-encompassing centres of the antiquarian *memoryscape*. In the first panel, we saw how the antiquarians reverted to the home region as a new centre for the ordering and generation of historiographical meaning. In addition to the home region, the own department appeared as a new centre from which one could describe the history of the empire. With this new centre, we can perceive a nice parallel between the reality and the historiographical practice. Just as the institutions of the Roman bureaucracy survived the "fall" of the Roman Emperor in the west, the department as a framework of historiographical meaning survived and partially replaced Rome as the centre of historiographical interest. In the following and last part of this triptych, I shall ascertain how the antiquarians pursued this personal strategy of replacement. Next to their home region and their own department as new centres of historiographical interest emanating from the person of the antiquarian, we shall see how the antiquarian devoted interest to categories of the personal life which were heretofore not foregrounded in antiquarian or historical writing: women and children.

# 7

# Replacing Rome:
# What's on a Man's Mind

In this section, I shall discuss the hypothesis that in their antiquarian writings, the authors of the sixth century show either directly or indirectly aspects of their personal life or personal proclivities. As such, the antiquarians gave a new place for the personality of the author in the generation of historical meaning. This is an indication of the increased importance of the personal life of the author as the regulator of historical meaning in antiquarianism. In sixth-century antiquarianism, the historian as an individual is the lens through which one perceived and engaged with the Roman past. This foregrounding of the individual as a new centre of historical meaning is a strategy of replacement - next to localism (chapter 5) and a focus on the bureaucracy (chapter 6), the third and final strategy of replacement I shall analyse in this dissertation. In order to come to terms with the loss of Rome and the Roman Empire as the centres of Roman historical consciousness, these failing centres are replaced by the person of the historian. We perceive in antiquarian writing of the sixth century on the one hand a presence of the historian as a person in his work, and on the other hand the integration of this person into the *memoryscape* of the historical work. In order to establish this hypothesis, I shall focus on the antiquarian treatment of women and children. Two criteria will be taken into account when ascertaining the personal presence of the author in his antiquarian writing:[1] the cumulative repetition of details,[2] and emphatic personal assertions on the veracity of a given statement.[3]

---

[1] These criteria were formulated in the study of autobiographical tendencies in late antique historians by Austin (1983).
[2] Austin (1983: 65, 61-62).
[3] Austin (1983: 56, 62).

## 7.1. John Lydus and the Worries about Pregnancy[4]

"The month of *Iunius* is unsuitable for marriages, as the books of the priests among the Romans say. Their statement is true and there is every inevitability for a rather young man to lose a marriage made at this point of time. I experienced also this outcome, having soon lost my wife, most dear to me. For three days women were not permitted either to cut their hair or to pare their nails.".[5]

This emphatic statement of Lydus can be read in Book Four of Lydus' *De Mensibus*. The context, in which this passage is embedded, can teach us more on the origins of this rather emotional gloss in the otherwise detached antiquarian account of *De Mensibus*. Indeed, the passage in *De Mensibus* (IV.89, Bandy IV.85) starts in the same format as the last book. After a mention of the day of the month, the *Kalendae* of June, there is a short description of the rituals performed in honour of the deity honoured on that date, namely Hera. There is also a typical account of the dietary restrictions which were to be followed during this period. This description allows Lydus to elaborate on descriptions and anecdotes related to the science of gynaecology:

"On the *Kalendae* of *Iunius* there was the Festival of Hera and prayers were held on the *Capitolium*, all Romans likewise partaking of cold water from early morning as a precaution against illness of every sort and especially gout, as the *Oracle* maintained, also so that childbirths might not become twins or monstrous."[6]

The section continues with the mention of a woman under Emperor Hadrian, who gave birth to a miraculous amount of children in a short span of time, a feat of nature which is also supported by the testimony of Aristotle. Lydus continues with a very specific scientific explanation of the phenomenon of multiple child birth:

"Heraclides says that this happens when ejaculation twice or thrice after continence aims well down into the opening or also when the womb has

---

[4] This chapter is dedicated to the beloved memory of someone I lost in 2017.

[5] "ὅτι ὁ Ἰούνιος μὴν ἀνεπιτήδειος πρὸς γάμους, ὡς τὰ βιβλία τῶν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις ἱερέων λέγει· ἀληθὴς δὲ ὁ λόγος καὶ ἀνάγκη πᾶσα, κατὰ τόδε καιροῦ γινόμενον συνοικέσιον τὸν νεώτερον ἀποβαλεῖν, καὶ ταύτης ἐγὼ τῆς ἐκβάσεως ἔμπειρός εἰμι, τὴν ἐμοὶ φιλτάτην γυναῖκα ὡς τάχος ἀποβαλών. ἐπὶ δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας οὐκ ἐξῆν γυναιξὶν ἢ καρῆναι ἢ ὀνυχίσασθαι." *Mens.* IV.89 (Bandy IV.86), (Wünsch 1898: 137), trans. Bandy (2013a: 276). On this passage see Caimi (1984: 14), Schamp (2006a: xxix). Domenici (2007: 11) sees in this passage an affirmation of Lydus' superstitious belief in the veracity of the pagan omens and predictions he described.

[6] "Καλένδαις Ἰουνίαις ἑορτὴ Ἥρας καὶ εὐχαὶ ἐν τῷ Καπετωλίῳ, πάντων ὁμοῦ Ῥωμαίων ὕδατος ἐξ ἑωθινῆς ἀπογευομένων ψυχροῦ πρὸς φυλακὴν νόσου παντοίας καὶ διαφερόντως ποδαλγικῆς, ὡς ὁ χρησμὸς ἐβούλετο, καὶ ὥστε μὴ διδύμους ἢ τερατώδεις γενέσθαι τοὺς τοκετούς." *Mens.* IV.89 (Bandy IV.85), (Wünsch 1898: 136-137), trans. Bandy (2013a: 275).

been opened up after previous coagulation in such a way that the delivery would become multiple.".[7]

The detail, technicality and abundance of these gynaecological remarks should not astound us, however. On closer inspection, Lydus appears to have devoted in his treatises more time and space to the science of gynaecology than any other aspect of the medicinal sciences.[8] In these passages furthermore, he exhibits an impressive knowledge of a wide array of written sources, as shall be indicated throughout this chapter. These passages are characterised by a proclivity for number symbolism and a very practical concern for the wellbeing of newborn infants.

Number symbolism[9] structured Lydus' view on both the ideal time for a child to be born and the process of the generation and growth of a foetus in the womb.[10] The Second Book of *De Mensibus* is an overview of the week which is supplied with a conspicuous amount of musings on the number symbolism of the seven days of the week. In a section devoted to the seventh day of the week and the perfection of the number seven (*Mens.* II.7) Lydus claims the seventh month is the best month to be born:

"Thence also infants born in seven months are naturally disposed to be born perfectly formed, as Hippocrates says, because this number's soul-generative power renders perfect those born in seven months because they are embraced by a perfect and spherical cycle and universe-befitting number, being soul-retentive and soul-generative, for, in fact, the *Timaeus* composed the soul of seven numbers."[11]

Alternatively, the number eight, on account of its imperfection and indefiniteness, renders the eighth month of the pregnancy an inauspicious moment for

---

[7] "τοῦτο δέ φησιν ὁ Ἡρακλείδης συμβαίνειν, ὅταν ἐξακοντισμὸς δὶς ἢ τρὶς ἀπὸ ἐγκρατείας κατ᾽ ἀναστομώσεως εὐστοχήσῃ ἢ καὶ τῆς μήτρας ἐπανοιχθείσης μετὰ τὴν προτέραν πῆξιν κατὰ τοσοῦτον καθ᾽ ὅσον ὁ τοκετὸς ἀριθμοῖτο." *Mens.* IV.89 (Bandy IV.85), (Wünsch 1898: 137), trans. Bandy (2013a: 275). In reverse, one of the causes of infertility as the inability of the male to project semen well into the uterus is listed by Hippocrates (*Aphorismi* V.63) and Diocles of Carystus (Hanson 2004: 299-302).
[8] Apart from gynaecology, Lydus only mentions from time to time in Book Four of *De Mensibus* the dietary prescriptions which were followed by the Romans during a specific period of time.
[9] Late antique embryologies were no medical embryologies but numerical and allegorical readings of foetal development (Mistry 2014: 15). On embryology with numerical symbolism in the *Laterculus Malalianus*, see Mistry (2014: 148-151). On the same in Isidore of Seville and Rabanus Maurus, see Mistry (2014: 293).
[10] Regrettably, the cultural history of late antique conceptualisations of the foetus in terms of physiology, symbolism and theology remains a desideratum (Mistry 2014: 264). For the conceptualisation of aborted foetuses in the late antique and early mediaeval west, see Mistry (2014: 262-295).
[11] "ἔνθεν καὶ τὰ ἑπτάμηνα βρέφη τελειογονεῖσθαι πέφυκεν, ὡς Ἱπποκράτης λέγει · ἡ γὰρ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ψυχογονικὴ δύναμις τὰ ἑπτάμηνα τέλεια ἀποφαίνει, διότι τελείας περιόδος σφαιρικῆς ἀριθμῷ τελείῳ καὶ κοσμικῷ, τῷ ψυχοκρατητικῷ καὶ ψυχογονικῷ περιέχεται · καὶ γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν ὁ Τίμαιος ἐξ ἑπτὰ ἀριθμῶν συνέστησε." *Mens.* II.12 (Bandy II.27), (Wünsch 1898: 35), trans. Bandy (2013a: 101).

birth (*Mens.* IV.162, Bandy II.27). The source for this passage is Nicomachus.[12] Lydus' avowal of the seventh month as a favourable time for birth acquires specific historical meaning later on in the treatise. For in *Mens.* IV.105 (Bandy IV.96), we read the following:

> "Many of the historians say that Caesar had been born in seven months and for this reason he changed the seventh month of the sacerdotal year to his own name. No one else exhibited bravery as he."[13]

Caesar's bravery as a historical element is therefore partially explained through Lydus' analysis of the ideal time for birth.

As well as the ideal time of birth, the process of the foetus' development in the womb is conditioned by number symbolism. In the anecdote of the prolific woman under Hadrian mentioned above (*Mens.* IV.89, Bandy IV.85), the woman gives birth to four children in four days and to a fifth infant after forty days. The same number forty returns in an elaborate symbolic description of the process of generation in Book Four, where three numbers, namely three, nine and forty, are essential (*Mens.* IV.26, Bandy IV.21).[14] Yet again, Lydus states where he derived this description from, namely from "those of the Romans who write treatises on natural history".[15] First, the generation of the foetus in forty days is described; in three days blood and heart are formed, in nine days the flesh, and in forty days the whole of the human being.[16] Second, the numbers of the months are described; in the third

---

[12] Ps.-Nicomachus, *Theologumena Arithm.* p. 55,25 Ast. The viability of the foetus in the seventh month and the unfavorability of the eight month was widely accepted in the Greco-Roman world, in Hippocratic writings, Aristotle, Soranus and in Jewish literature (Cilliers 2004: 362-363). Also Vindicianus mentions the seventh, ninth and tenth month and avoids the ominous eighth month in his treatise (Cilliers 2004: 362). The numerological symbolism behind the important number seven guided many of the medicinal writers in their assessments (Cilliers 2004: 362-363).

[13] "Ὅτι οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἱστορικῶν φασι τὸν Καίσαρα ἑπτάμηνον τεχθῆναι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸν ἕβδομον μῆνα τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν μεταβαλεῖν προσηγορίαν. οὐδεὶς δὲ ἄλλος ἠνδραγάθισεν ὡς οὗτος." *Mens.* IV.105 (Bandy IV.96), (Wünsch 1898: 143-144), trans. Bandy (2013a: 280).

[14] On this passage, see Nardi (1971: 622). This numerically conditioned process of foetal development is also repeated *in nuce* in *Mens.* III.9 (Bandy III.6), where Lydus describes the generation process of birds in their eggs.

[15] "Οἱ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τὴν φυσικὴν ἱστορίαν συγγράφοντες" *Mens.* IV.26 (Bandy IV.21), (Wünsch 1898: 84), trans. Bandy (2013a: 181). A possible candidate is Helvius Vindicianus, a doctor who was active in late fourth-century Carthage, and whose *Gynaecia* exhibits several parallels with Lydus. On this author see Cilliers (2004: 344-346). An overview of his detailed work on foetal development can be found in Cilliers (2004: 355-360). The parallels will be mentioned in the footnotes below. Nardi (1971: 622) mentions as possible sources Aristotle, Diocles of Carystus and Empedocles, apparently ignoring that Lydus mentioned Latin sources.

[16] On the development of the fruit in Greek medical writers see (Cilliers 2004: 353-360), Stol (2009: 142). The development of the foetus in 40 days was espoused by many ancient theorists, among them Aristotle and Vindicianus (Cilliers 2004: 353-355), (Stol 2009: 145-146). Aristotle, and most possibly Vindicianus, state also that the heart is the first organ to be formed (Cilliers 2004: 357). Later on, also Isidore of Seville and Rabanus Maurus expound on this symbolic development of the foetus; the heart is formed first and the whole of the body develops in 40 days (Mistry 2014: 293).

month the baby moves in the womb,[17] girls are born in the ninth, and boys in the tenth month.[18] Lydus next elaborates on how a foetus develops its sex: warm sperm results in a swift formation of a male foetus, whereas colder semen engenders a more slowly formed female foetus.[19] This elaboration prompts Lydus to make yet another personal assertion of his written sources:

> "The statement is true, for, if the male fetuses miscarry even within the forty days, they prolapse formed, but, if the female fetuses miscarry even after the forty days, they prolapse both fleshy and unformed."[20]

This passage resembles the personal statement of Lydus on his spouse which I cited at the beginning of this section. In both cases, a distanced antiquarian account, which is founded on written sources mentioned by Lydus, is abruptly interrupted by a personal statement. As in the case of Lydus' deceased wife, this statement also seems to be founded in personal experience. This can also be inferred from the emphatic wording of the truth of his assertion, "ὅτι δὲ ἀληθὴς ὁ λόγος", which does not occur frequently - as the case of Lydus' statement on his home region has shown.[21]

After this personal gloss, Lydus returns to his symbolic account, with a description of the first days of the infant: in three days the child loses its swaddling clothes, in nine days it gains strength and in forty days it can smile and recognise its mother. The account closes with a description of the process of human disintegration, which follows a reverse pattern; in three days a corpse loses its character traits, in nine days the body decays and the heart - the first organ to be formed - endures until the fortieth day.

---

[17] Vindicianus also stated that the foetus starts to move in the third month (Cilliers 2004: 357).
[18] Aristotle discerned sharply between a pregnancy of a male and a pregnancy of a female baby (Stol 2009: 145-146). The idea of a ten-month pregnancy originated in classical and ancient Near Eastern sources (Cilliers 2004: 361), (Stol 2009: 148-149). Also Vindicianus stated that a female foetus is born in the ninth month, and a male foetus in the tenth (Cilliers 2004: 359, 361).
[19] The theory that the temperature of the uterus, which was in turn determined by the phase in the menstrual cycle, determines the sex of the child is common in Greco-Roman medicine (Cilliers 2004: 351). Aristotle stated, more closely to Lydus, that females are engendered through a lack of vital heat (Cilliers 2004: 352). Galen connected this theory of heat determining the sex of the foetus to its position in the uterus. Males were generated in the right side of the uterus which was better blooded and therefore warmer (Cilliers 2004: 352). Lydus' warmth based theory deviates from the two-seed theory, articulated in the Bible and several Greco-Roman authors. The two-seed theory, which stated that also the female produced seed, and that the dominant seed in the mixture of female seed and male semen decided the gender of the foetus, was espoused by several Pre-Socratics, Hippocrates and the Jewish and Babylonian traditions. Aristotle and, most possibly, Vindicianus espoused the one-seed theory, which Lydus here also implicitly follows (Cilliers 2004: 347-350, 351), (Stol 2009: 138-141).
[20] "ὅτι δὲ ἀληθὴς ὁ λόγος, τὰ μὲν ἄρρενα καὶ τῶν τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν ἐντὸς ἐκτιτρωσκόμενα μεμορφωμένα προπίπτει, τὰ δὲ θήλεα καὶ μετὰ τὰς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας σαρκώδη τε καὶ ἀδιατύπωτα." Mens. IV.26 (Bandy IV.21), (Wünsch 1898: 85), trans. Bandy (2013a: 183). Significantly, Lydus does not mention any sources for this theory, whereas many authorities in Greco-Roman medicine, such as Hippocrates, Aristotle and Galen all state that the female foetus develops slower because of lack of warmth (Cilliers 2004: 354).
[21] See chapter 5.1.3. (pp. 203 of this dissertation).

Lydus' personal statements on his wife and on miscarried foetuses, next to his remarkable interests in the details and technicalities of gynaecology, seem to suggest that his interest in the process of pregnancy goes beyond a mere antiquarian "relish, to the ears of many", as he states at the beginning of the Second Book.[22] From the perspective of a personal concern therefore, it is not surprising that Lydus' theoretical musings on the ideal timing for a human being to be born are coupled with a real and practical concern for the wellbeing of a newborn child. Throughout the *De Mensibus*, indeed, - next to various details on newborn children[23] - Lydus provides us both with tips for the fostering of a newborn infant and passages which reveal a concern for women during the various stages of pregnancy. In *Mens.* IV.65 (Bandy IV.71), we read that myrtle strengthens the body of the newly born child. In *Mens.* IV.84 (Bandy IV.85), Lydus refers to the opinions of Plato and Empedocles on the causes of monstrous births. In *Mens.* IV.148 (Bandy IV.130), Plutarch is referred to for information on the protective goddesses in childbirth: Ilithyia and Artemis.

The fate of pregnant women also receives extensive treatment in the works of Lydus. He treats every aspect of the pregnancy of a woman. In *Mens.* IV.106 (Bandy IV.97) we find the advice to women to abstain from sex in the month of July, in order to preserve their health. In *Mens.* IV.66 (Bandy IV.85) we yet again find a very technical passage on the causes of female (in)fertility:

> "The natural philosophers say that females having the opening of their ducts in a straight line are prolific, but those having it in a crooked line are barren".[24]

Lydus' concern for women in labour is not limited to the *De Mensibus*. When Lydus reports on the remarkable effect of the thunderbolt *Lampros* in *De Ostentis*,[25] his concern for the wellbeing of the pregnant woman is apparent:

> "It is also possible in this matter to marvel at nature and the impenetrability of the investigations in respect of it, for all thunderbolts, although they are all produced from air and collision of clouds; do not do the same things as each other. For that which among them is called *Arges*, which the ancients particularly call also *Lampros*, often, when it had fallen upon a jar or simply a vessel either of wine or of water, lets the container remain undamaged but

---

[22] "ὥσπερ ἥδυσμά τι ταῖς τῶν πολλῶν ἀκοαῖς." *Mens.* II.1 (Bandy II.1), (Wünsch 1898: 18), trans. Bandy (2013a: 67).

[23] In *Mens.* IV.31 (Bandy IV.22) the dead who do not require libations are compared to foetuses not requiring external food then in the womb. In *Mens.* IV.40 (Bandy IV.23) Lydus stated that a foetus has no teeth in the womb. In *Mens.* IV.80 (Bandy IV.81) we read how an infant walks before it talks.

[24] "Ὅτι οἱ φυσικοί φασι τὰς θηλείας τὰς κατ' εὐθὺ τὴν ἀναστόμωσιν τῶν ἀγγείων ἐχούσας τοκάδας εἶναι, τὰς δὲ ἐκ πλαγίου στείρας." *Mens.* IV.66 (Bandy IV.85), (Wünsch 1898: 120), trans. Bandy (2013a: 275-276).

[25] Although *De Ostentis* is for the most part composed of translated treatises, the passage at hand is part of Lydus' own commentary. Other passages on pregnancy and childbirth in *De Ostentis* are part of the *Brontoscopic calendar* of Nigidius Figulus, which was translated by Lydus and included in his treatise: *Ost.* 27 (Bandy 52) second of June, *Ost.* 35 (Bandy 60) eleventh and fourteenth of February (Turfa 2012: 119).

its content to vanish and not least when it had fallen even on coffers being gold or silver, in like manner it melted the things inside but preserved intact the things outside. And, manifestly, the most remarkable thing of all, the great Apuleius says that it occurred also in the case of a pregnant woman, and a woman not unknown, clearly the famed Marcia, who had lived in wedlock with Cato the Younger. For a thunderbolt, the so-called *Arges* or *Lampros*, although it had fallen upon her, preserved her completely unharmed but dissipated the fetus in her so imperceptibly as to make her not even to be conscious what became of the fetus in her, although it was on the verge of delivery. Such exceptional activity, indeed, then, the nature of the *Arges* has been allotted."[26]

The emphatic wording in this passage is revealing. Lydus' emphasis on the marvel and exceptionality of this natural phenomenon is, indeed, exceptional for the otherwise detached Lydus. For example, he used in this passage twice words with the stem θαυμα-, namely θαυμάσαι and the superlative θαυμασιώτατον, whereas words with this stem only appear six times throughout the whole of the *De Ostentis*, otherwise a work on natural 'wonders'. More significantly, the phrase κατ'ἐξαιρετόν, which Lydus used to describe the exceptional activity of the *Lampros*, only appears four times in the whole of Lydus' oeuvre.[27] Lydus emphatically marvels at the survival and the lack of pain of the woman in this case, yet his comparing the unborn child to gold or silver in a coffer reveals at the same time a sensitivity towards the child, such as he exhibited also throughout *De Mensibus*.[28]

Marcia and Cato the Younger are not the only historical examples to figure in passages exhibiting Lydus' concern for pregnant women. In his elaborate discussion on the different possible etymologies of the name Caesar (*Mens.* IV.102, Bandy IV.86), he also mentions, in an aside, the fate of Caesar's mother, who died in childbirth:

---

[26] "Ἔστι δὲ θαυμάσαι κἂν τούτῳ τὴν φύσιν καὶ τὸ ἄβατον τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ θεωρημάτων. οὐδὲ γὰρ πάντες (καίτοι πάντες ἐξ ἀέρος καὶ συστροφῆς νεφῶν φερόμενοι) τὰ αὐτὰ ἀλλήλοις δρῶσιν. ὁ γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς λεγόμενος ἀργής, ὃν καὶ λαμπρὸν ἐξαιρέτως καλοῦσιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, πολλάκις ἐμπεσὼν ἐπὶ πίθον ἢ ἄγγος ἁπλῶς ἢ οἴνου ἢ ὕδατος, τὸ μὲν περιέχον ἀπήμαντον τὸ δὲ ἐμπεριεχόμενον ἄφαντον ἐποίησεν. οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ ἐν σκεύεσι χρυσίον ἢ ἀργύριον φέρουσιν ἐμπεσὼν τῷ ἴσῳ τρόπῳ τὰ μὲν ἔνδον ἔτηξε, τὰ δὲ ἔξωθεν ἔσωσε. καὶ τὸ δὴ πάντων θαυμασιώτατον ἐπὶ γυναικὸς ἐγκύμονος συμβῆναί φησιν ὁ μέγας Ἀπουλήιος, καὶ γυναικὸς οὐκ ἠγνοημένης, Μαρκίας δὴ ἐκείνης τῆς Κάτωνι τῷ τελευταίῳ συνοικησάσης. ἐμπεσὼν γὰρ αὐτῇ κεραυνὸς ὁ λεγόμενος ἀργής ἤτοι λαμπρὸς αὐτὴν μὲν παντελῶς ἐφύλαξεν ἀβλαβῆ, τὸ δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ διεφόρησεν οὕτως ἀνεπαισθήτως, ὡς μηδὲ αὐτὴν συνιδεῖν ὅ τι γέγονε τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ, καίτοι πρὸς ἔξοδον ἔχον. τοιαύτην μὲν κατ' ἐξαίρετον ἐνέργειαν ἡ τοῦ ἀργῆτος εἴληχε φύσις." O*st.* 44 (Bandy 89), (Wachsmuth 1897: 97-98), trans. Bandy (2013b: 195-197).
[27] θαυμ- *Ost.* 3 (Bandy 3), 7 (Bandy 7), 9 (Bandy 9), 16a (Bandy 23) and 44 (Bandy 89), twice. κατ' ἐξαιρετόν *Ost.* 44 (Bandy 89), *Mens.* IV.19 (Bandy IV.5), IV.37 (Bandy IV.30), IV.47 (Bandy IV.52).
[28] It has to be said that both the comparison with precious metals and the stress on the wonder of the phenomenon are already present in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* II.137, of which the passage in Lydus seems to be a translation. However, Lydus seems to value the unborn child slightly more than Pliny, as the former speaks only of gold and silver, whereas the latter speaks of gold, silver and bronze: "aurum et aes et argentum liquatur intus, sacculis ipsis nullo modo ambustis ac ne confuso quidem signo cerae" (Rackham 1944: 274).

"He was named *Caesar* not, as the ancients say, from the fact that he had been taken by the dissection of the belly of his mother Aurelia, who, when she was dying, being clearly pregnant, was cut open." [29]

Yet again, this passage could point in the direction of the personal involvement of Lydus in his antiquarian narrative. First, Lydus explicitly denounces the hypothesis of the name Caesar being derived from a cesarian section, whereas, in similar discussions, he does not often explicitly indicate which hypothesis carries his favour - we have seen Lydus making a similar choice, in favour of a Lydian hypothesis, in a discussion on the etymologies of Zeus.[30] Second, we can suspect that this version of Caesar's birth, in which his mother died, was made up by Lydus, as Aurelia, Caesar's mother, did not in fact die in childbirth. Apparently, Lydus wanted to connect the life of an important historical character such as Julius Caesar to the tragedy of women dying in childbirth.

Lydus' emphasis on the fate of both women and children during pregnancy, coupled to his emotional declaration about his wife, seem to suggest a personal concern guiding his antiquarian research. Was he a young father? Did his wife die in childbirth? Did his child(ren) die? For a want of conclusive biographical evidence, any statements on the life of Lydus explaining these emphases must of necessity remain in the field of speculation.

It has to be said that Lydus' concern for pregnant women and newborn children to a certain extent runs parallel to a contemporary concern for pregnant women in Justinianic legislation.[31] Without going into further speculation on the private life of Lydus, his wife and possible children, however, I would like to emphasise how in the *De Mensibus* - and, to a lesser extent, in the *De Ostentis* - Lydus' presentation of the (distant) past is, in part, modelled on and determined by a personal and idiosyncratic concern for women and children during pregnancy. For instance, characters such as Marcia and Cato the Younger are - despite the importance of the latter for the history of the late Republic - only mentioned by Lydus in the passage on Marcia's abortion. A historical character of the utmost importance in Roman history such as Julius Caesar is presented in the works of John Lydus to an important degree through passages related to the circumstances of his birth - and the ensuing demise of his mother. These personal concerns which guide Lydus' view on Rome's distant past are more fundamental to his work than a general legalistic interest in the position of women in Justinian's empire could explain.[32]

---

[29] "Καῖσαρ δὲ ὠνομάσθη, οὐ καθώς φασιν οἱ παλαιοί, ἐκ τῆς ἀνατομῆς τῆς γαστρὸς Αὐρηλίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἧς δῆθεν ἀποβιούσης ἐγκύμονος αὐτὸν ἀνατμηθείσης ἐκείνης ληφθῆναι." *Mens.* IV.102 (Bandy IV.93), (Wünsch 1898: 142), trans. Bandy (2013a: 279).

[30] See chapter 5.1.3. (pp. 203 of this dissertation).

[31] "There is a strong trend in Justinian's legislation (in the *Codex* as well as in the *Institutes* and the *Novellae*, especially) to improve the woman's and especially the mother's position taking into consideration her natural love, the "female weakness," her labour in child-birth, and the danger often of death." (Tsirpanlis 1995: 63).

[32] In comparison, also Cassiodorus in his *Variae* once (*Var.* I.35) used the metaphor of abortion to describe a failed harvest. However, in this case, the use of the metaphor is not part of a general interest in pregnant women and children in the *Variae*. On this passage, see (Mistry 2014: 265).

In the light of the diminishing importance of Rome as the centre and framework for the creation of historiography, the personality of the author and his personal life take over the role of Rome. Through the lens of the person of the author and his concerns, such as the concerns over pregnancy in the case of Lydus, an idiosyncratic view of the history of the Greco-Roman *oikoumene* is formed. We will analyse the same personalistic tendency in the work of John Malalas in the following section, where the worries about pregnancy are replaced by worries about infidelity.

## 7.2. John Malalas and the Worries about (In)fidelity

"As soon as Kekrops began to reign over the Athenians, he ordered a law to be issued that the women who were subject to his empire, while virgins, were to marry one man. (…) Before Kekrops' reign, all the women of Attica, both the Athenians and those from the surrounding countryside, had intercourse like wild animals, sleeping with each man who pleased them, so long as the woman was willing. Women who were abducted were considered no one's wives but went with everyone, giving themselves up to fornication. They remained in a man's house, supported by him, for as many days as he wished to keep them. This custom was excluded from Attica, so than women were not compelled to be with a man who was chosen for them. Thus no one knew who was his son or daughter, and the mother gave the child she bore, whether male or female, to whichever man she wished of those who had had intercourse with her, and they accepted the child joyfully. Kekrops, who was originally from Egypt, promulgated this law, saying that the land of Attica was being destroyed because of this practice. Then all women learnt chastity, and the unmarried virgins attached themselves to men, while a woman who had fornicated married one man whom she chose. The Athenians admired the emperor's law, and so some have stated that the reason why the Athenians called him Double-natured was that he ennobled children through their knowing their own parents."[33]

The pleasure which John Malalas exhibits in describing the lascivious habits of the Athenians before the interventions of Cecrops seems to suggest a personal interest in monogamy and adultery of the author, who otherwise does not make any statements on his personal life. In the following section I shall analyse the recurrent theme of adultery in Malalas' *Chronographia*, and what this might reveal of the otherwise elusive personality of the author. This case will show yet again how the personal interests and inclinations of the author replace Rome and the Roman Empire as frameworks for the organisation of historical knowledge.

Indeed, the issue of adultery and the enforcement of monogamy are recurrent themes in the first half of the *Chronographia* which also structure the narrative of

---

[33] *Chron.* IV.5 "ᾗ μόνον δὲ αὐτὸς ἐβασίλευσε Κέκροψ Ἀθηναίων, ἐκέλευσε νομοθετῆσαι τὰς γυναῖκας τὰς ὑπὸ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ οὔσας, ἐν ᾧ εἰσιν παρθένοι γαμεῖσθαι ἑνὶ ἀνδρί · (…) πρὸ γὰρ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ πᾶσαι αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν Ἀττικῶν καὶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῆς πλησίον χώρας θηριώδει μίξει ἐμίγνυντο, ἑκάστῳ συγγινόμεναι τῷ ἀρεσκομένῳ αὐταῖς, ἐὰν κἀκείνη ἠβούλετο · καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ἡ ἁρπαζομένη γυνὴ οὐδενός, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πᾶσι προσήρχοντο, διδοῦσαι ἑαυτὰς εἰς πορνείαν. καὶ ὅσας ἠβουλήθη τις κρατῆσαι αὐτὰς ἡμέρας, κατ᾿ οἶκον παρέμενον αὐτῷ τρεφόμεναι · καὶ εἰ ἤθελε, πάλιν ἀπέλυσεν αὐτὴν τοῖς βουλομένοις. τοῦτο δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀττικῆς εἴρχθη, τὸ μὴ ἀναγκάζεσθαι αὐτὰς συνεῖναι ἀνδρί, πρὸς ὃν βούλονται · οὐδεὶς οὖν ᾔδει, τίς ἦν υἱὸς ἢ θυγάτηρ, ἀλλ᾿ ὡς ἂν ἔδοξε τῇ μητρί, ἔλεγε καὶ ἐδίδου τὸ τεχθὲν ᾧ ἠβούλετο ἀνδρὶ συμμιγέντι αὐτῇ, εἴτε ἄρρεν εἴτε θῆλυ ἔτεκε, καὶ ἔχαιρον δεχόμενοι. ὁ δὲ Κέκροψ ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου καταγόμενος ἐξεφώνησεν τὸν νόμον τοῦτον, εἰρηκώς, ὅτι ἡ Ἀττικὴ χώρα διὰ τοῦτο ἀπώλετο. καὶ λοιπὸν ἐσωφρόνησαν πᾶσαι, καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἐζεύγνυον ἑαυτὰς αἱ ἄγαμοι παρθένοι, ἡ δὲ πορνευθεῖσα ἐγαμεῖτο ἑνὶ ᾧ ἠβούλετο ἀνδρί · καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν τοῦ βασιλέως νόμον · ὡς δὲ καί τινες ἐξέθεντο, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι εἶπαν διφυῆ, ὅτι ἐξευγένισε τὰ τέκνα τοῦ εἰδέναι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν γονεῖς." (Thurn 2000: 50-51), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 34).

the chronicle. In the First Book, we have, next to other cases of adultery,[34] a record of the many affairs of Picus Zeus, who fathers several of the later key players in Malalas' mythical genealogy of rulers:

> "[Picus Zeus] had many sons and daughters by beautiful women, for he used to beguile them. For he had mystic knowledge and used to put on displays and astonish the women, who regarded him as a god and were seduced by him since he showed them displays by mechanical means."[35]

The book closes with the mention of how Hephaestus received gratitude from his subjects for introducing monogamy in Egypt:

> "Hephaistos issued a law that Egyptian women were to be monogamous and to live chastely, while those who were caught in adultery were to be punished. The Egyptians were grateful to him, since this was the first law on chastity which they received."[36]

In the Second Book, John Malalas recounts of two cases of adultery,[37] whereas in the Book III there are none. There are two other cases of adultery in Book IV,[38] with also the elaborate passage on Cecrops' measures against adultery which was cited at the beginning of this section. Book V, with the title "ΠΕΡΙ ΤΡΩΙΚΩΝ",[39] in its entirety recounts the events of the Trojan War and its aftermath, which were initiated by the adultery of Paris and Helen.[40] Apart from this case of adultery with far-reaching consequences, John Malalas also recounts the wanderings of Ulysses, together with the different women with whom he committed adultery, such as Circe in *Chron.* V.19 and Calypso in *Chron.* V.20. Furthermore in this

---

[34] In *Chron.* I.9, Cronus leaves his wife Rhea Semiramis in order to conquer the west, where he takes Philyra for his wife. In this episode, however, the adultery of Cronus is treated neutrally. In *Chron.* I.9 Ares murders Adonis, the son of Aphrodite, as Aphrodite wants to commit adultery with Adonis.

[35] *Chron.* I.13 "καὶ ἔσχεν υἱοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας ἀπὸ τῶν εὐπρεπῶν γυναικῶν (ὑπενόθευεν γὰρ αὐτάς· ἦν γὰρ καὶ μυστικὸς καὶ φαντασίας τινὰς ποιῶν καὶ ἐκπλήττων αὐτάς)· αἵτινες γυναῖκες καὶ ὡς θεὸν εἶχον αὐτὸν φθειρόμεναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ὡς δεικνύοντα αὐταῖς φαντασίας τινὰς μηχανικῶς." (Thurn 2000: 13), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 8). On this passage see Jeffreys (1990a: 64), Bernardi (2004: 58-60).

[36] *Chron.* I.15 "ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς Ἥφαιστος νόμον ἔθηκεν τὰς Αἰγυπτίων γυναῖκας μονανδρεῖν καὶ σωφρόνως διάγειν, τὰς δὲ ἐπὶ μοιχείᾳ εὑρισκομένας τιμωρεῖσθαι. καὶ ηὐχαρίστησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, διότι πρῶτον νόμον σωφροσύνης <τοῦτον> ἐδέξαντο." (Thurn 2000: 16), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 10).

[37] In *Chron.* II.1 Aegyptia committed adultery and was punished for her act by Helius, who tortured and paraded her, whereas the adulter was executed. In *Chron.* II.16 Antiope was raped by Theoboos and faced punishment as she was a priestess. She is, however, taken into protection by her uncle Lycus, who committed adultery with her. On this passage see Caire (2006: 48).

[38] In *Chron.* IV.12, Leda commits adultery with Cycnus. On this passage, see Caire (2006: 49). In *Chron.* IV.13, Stheneboea attempts to commit adultery with Bellerophon. In *Chron.* IV.16 Pasiphae commits adultery with Taurus, with Icarus and Daedalus acting as go-betweens, for which they are punished. On this passages see Caire (2006: 44).

[39] Thurn (2000: 67).

[40] Wyatt (1976: 111, 122).

book (*Chron*. V.30) Clytaemnestra committed adultery with Aegistheus.[41] Book VI has one case of adultery (*Chron*. VI.22), with the double adultery of Agialeia causing the exile of Diomedes to the Italian peninsula. In Book VII, we read how Olympias gave birth to Alexander the Great after having an affair with the Egyptian Pharaoh Nectanebo. After this passage, however, the sequences of adultery as a structural principle for the narrative of the chronicle come to an abrupt end.

As we can notice in the quotation from *Chron*. IV.5 at the beginning of this section, John Malalas explicitly couples the theme of adultery to the issue of the legitimacy of offsprings. The Athenians were grateful to Cecrops because, through the institution of monogamy, he ennobled their offspring with the knowledge of their parents. Throughout his *Chronographia*, John Malalas maintains this pairing of adultery with the illegitimacy of the children engendered by the adulterous act. In *Chron*. II.16 Antiope, who was raped by Theoboos and who fornicated with her uncle Lycus, gives birth to two illegitimate children: "καὶ ἐγέννησεν δύο παῖδας ἐκ πορνείας".[42] As already mentioned, Alexander the Great is described by John Malalas in *Chron*. VII.17 as the bastard child of Olympias and Nectanebo - further on in the *Chronographia*, John Malalas ironically stresses the illegitimate origin of Alexander by consistently calling him "Alexander, the son of Phillip".[43]

Furthermore, the illegitimate origin of a ruler is used both explicitly, by characters in the narrative, and implicitly, by John Malalas himself, as an argument to question the right to power of this ruler. In *Chron*. II.1 we have the narrative of Pentheus and Dionysus vying for the throne of Thebes. In their struggle for power, Pentheus enrages Dionysus by accusing him of being an illegitimate child: "ἔλεγεν γὰρ πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἐκ πορνείας ἐτέχθη".[44] Further on, in *Chron*. IV.18 Theseus and the senators of Crete rebel against Minotaurus, the illegitimate product of the affair of Pasiphae and Taurus (*Chron*. IV.16). The reason for this rebellion is, yet again, Minotaurus' illegitimate parentage:

> "So after Minos' death Minotaur, the son of Pasiphae and Tauros her secretary, reigned over Crete. The senators of Crete considered it an insult to be ruled by Minotaur, since he was born out of wedlock, and they plotted against him. They invited Theseus, the son of Aigeus, emperor of Thessaly, as he was of noble birth, to fight against Minotaur."[45]

John Malalas also implicitly problematises the legitimacy of the ruler on the basis of his illegitimate origin. I already analysed in a previous chapter (pp. 143-153

---

[41] Wyatt (1976: 111).
[42] Thurn (2000: 35).
[43] In *Chron*. VII.19 and VIII.1.
[44] Thurn (2000: 31).
[45] *Chron*. IV.18 "καὶ μετὰ τὴν τούτου τελευτὴν τοῦ Μίνωος ἐβασίλευσε τῆς Κρήτης ὁ Μινώταυρος, ὁ Πασιφάης υἱὸς καὶ Ταύρου τοῦ νοταρίου αὐτῆς. καὶ ὕβριν λογιζόμενοι οἱ συγκλητικοὶ τῆς Κρήτης τὸ βασιλευθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Μινωταύρου, ὡς μοιχογεννήτου, συσκευάζονται αὐτῷ καὶ προτρέπονται τὸν Θησέα, ὡς γενναῖον, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Αἰγέως, βασιλέως τῆς Θεσσαλίας, εἰς τὸ πολεμῆσαι αὐτῷ" (Thurn 2000: 62), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 42) with own adaptations. Jeffreys et al translate γενναῖον with "a valiant man". I, however, opted for the phrase "of noble birth", as the γενναῖον of Theseus in this case, to my opinion, meaningfully contrasts the μοιχογεννήτου "born out of wedlock" of Minotaurus.

of this dissertation) how John Malalas contested the legitimacy of Romulus' rule because he killed his own brother. We can add to the causes of the illegitimacy of the rule of both brothers their ignoble origin; the two brothers were born out of wedlock, the senators of Rome reproached them for this, and Romulus devised the festival of the *Brumalia* to overcome these allegations (*Chron.* VII.7).

This connection between adultery, illegitimate kinship and problematic rule is maintained throughout the first half of the *Chronographia*. As already mentioned, in *Chron.* I.13, the womaniser Picus Zeus seduces different women. His actions prove negative for his offspring. For in the following paragraph Hermes, the son of Picus Zeus, is forced to develop metallurgy in order to defend himself from the threats of other children of the promiscuous Picus Zeus:

> "After the decease of Picus Zeus his son Faunus, also called Hermes, ruled over Italy for thirty-five years. He was a clever man and a gifted scientist, who discovered - for the first time in the west - the metal gold and developed metallurgy, knowing that the brothers, which he had from the women with whom his father Picus Zeus slept, envied him. For they wanted to kill him, and they were many, up to around seventy - for Zeus fathered scores of children, sleeping as he did with many women."[46]

Picus Zeus' profligacy between the sheets also produced undesirable offspring. John Malalas reports in *Chron.* II.11 on another of his illegitimate children, namely Perseus. This child is taught black magic by Zeus and kills his family members in war. The implications of the fate and deeds of Zeus' progeny are clear. Acts of adultery, and the illegitimacy they bestow on the children born out of these acts, pose a significant threat to the political order and are the cause of conflict.

The same connection between adultery and political conflict is manifest in Book Five of the *Chronographia*,[47] in which the adultery of Helen is the cause of the Trojan War and the demise of Troy. The wanderings of Ulysses are also recounted within this moralistic framework. I already mentioned how John Malalas recounts Ulysses' adultery with both Circe and Calypso. John Malalas does not fail to give a moralistic allegory of Circe as a force of sexual desire blinding men in *Chron.* V.19:

> "The most learned Homer related poetically that through a magic potion she [=Circe] transformed the men who had been ensnared by her, making some into the shape of lions, giving others dogs' heads, making others into pigs and others into bears with pigs' heads. The learned Pheidalios of Corinth, mentioned above, wrote out this poetic composition and interpreted it as follows: he said that to turn men into animal forms in no way corresponded with Kirke's desire for a large army, but the poet was referring to the habits of men in love, and Kirke made them grind their teeth and rage

---

[46] *Chron.* I.14 "Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τελευτὴν Πίκου τοῦ καὶ Διὸς ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ αὐτοῦ υἱὸς Φαῦνος ὁ καὶ Ἑρμῆς τῆς Ἰταλίας ἔτη λε΄, ὃς ἦν ἀνὴρ πανοῦργος καὶ μαθηματικός, ὅστις ἐφηῦρεν τὸ μέταλλον τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἐν τῇ δύσει πρῶτος καὶ τὸ χωνεύειν, γνοὺς δέ, ὅτι διαφθονοῦνται αὐτῷ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν, ὧν ἔσχεν Πῖκος ὁ καὶ Ζεὺς ὁ αὐτοῦ πατήρ· ἐβούλοντο γὰρ αὐτὸν φονεῦσαι· ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ ὡσεὶ περὶ ἑβδομήκοντα. μετὰ γὰρ πολλῶν συμμιγόμενος γυναικῶν ἐτεκνοποίησεν ὁ Ζεύς." (Thurn 2000: 14), my own translation.
[47] Wyatt (1976: 110-111).

and go mad with desire, like beasts, on her orders. For it is a natural habit of men in love to cling to the woman whom they love and die on her behalf. This is the way of men in love: they become like wild beasts in their desire and are incapable of rational thought; their appearance is changed and they come to resemble beasts in body, appearance and manners; they attack their rivals, for it is natural for rivals to regard one another, as wild beasts do, and to fight one another to the death. Men react differently to the forms taken by this kind of desire. Some are like dogs in their approach to sex and have intercourse frequently; others are like lions which pursue only their impulse and desire exclusively, others are like bears and copulate in a foul way. Phei-dalios gave the clearer and more truthful interpretation in his account."[48]

Although John Malalas cites in this passage Phidalius of Corinth,[49] again the detail and elaboration of the description of lascivious behaviour reminds one of the passage on Cecrops and Athens cited at the beginning of this section. In his elaboration, Malalas seems to show us a trace of his personal interests. In the light of this allegory it is not surprising therefore, that Ulysses' encounter with Circe, or "sexual desire", proved detrimental to the person of Ulysses himself. For in *Chron.* V. 21, John Malalas recounts the tradition which states that Ulysses was killed by the bastard child he had with Circe, namely Telegonus. Illegitimate children as the products of adultery and sexual desire in the moralistic framework of John Malalas do not only threaten the political order, but also the very person of the ruler himself.

As the analysis of his treatment of adultery shows, John Malalas combines his political theory of legitimate rule with his views on the family in order to construct a strong moralistic framework. Conflict on the microlevel of the family results in conflict on the macrolevel of the state. Not only does strife within a family, such as the fratricide of Remus by Romulus, count as bad management of the family, but also adultery, and the uncertainty of kinship which it creates, are cases of bad man-

---

[48] *Chron.* V.19 "ὁ δὲ σοφώτατος Ὅμηρος ποιητικῶς ἔφρασεν, ὅτι διὰ πόματος μαγικοῦ τοὺς συλλαμβανομένους πρὸς αὐτὴν ἄνδρας μετεμόρφου, ποιοῦσα τοὺς μὲν λεοντομόρφους, τοὺς δὲ κυνοκεφάλους, ἄλλους δὲ συομόρφους, ἑτέρους δὲ ἀρκομόρφους καὶ χοιροκεφάλους. ὁ δὲ προγεγραμμένος σοφὸς Φιδάλιος ὁ Κορίνθιος ἐξέθετο τὴν ποιητικὴν ταύτην σύνταξιν, ἑρμηνεύσας οὕτως, ὅτι τῇ Κίρκῃ οὐδὲν ἥρμοζε πρὸς ἣν ἠβούλετο ἐπιθυμίαν πολυοχλίας ποιεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους θηριομόρφους, ἀλλὰ τρόπον σημαίνων ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ἀντερώντων ἀνδρῶν, ὅτι ὡς θηρία ἐποίει αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ ἡ Κίρκη βρύχειν καὶ μαίνεσθαι καὶ λυσσᾶν ἐκ πόθου, καθὼς ἐκέλευσεν ἡ Κίρκη. φυσικὸν γὰρ τῶν ἐρώντων ἀντέχεσθαι τῆς ἐρωμένης καὶ ὑπεραποθνήσκειν· τοιοῦτοι γὰρ ὑπάρχουσιν οἱ ἐρῶντες. ἐκ γὰρ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀποθηριοῦνται, μηδὲν ἔμφρενον λογιζόμενοι, ἀλλὰ ἀλλοιούμενοι τὰς μορφὰς καὶ τῷ σώματι ὡς θηριόμορφοι γίνονται καὶ τῇ θέᾳ καὶ τοῖς τρόποις, ἐπερχόμενοι τοῖς ἀντερασταῖς· φυσικὸν γὰρ τοὺς ἀντεραστὰς ὁρᾶν ἀλλήλους ὡς θηρία καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐπερχομένους ἄχρι φόνου. οἵ καὶ διαφόρως ἔχουσι πρὸς τοὺς τῆς τοιαύτης ἐπιθυμίας τρόπους· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὡς κύνες ἐπέρχονται τῇ μίξει, πολλὰ συμμιγνύμενοι, οἱ δὲ ὡς λέοντες τὴν ὁρμὴν καὶ μόνην τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ζητοῦσιν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὡς ἄρκοι μιαρῶς κέχρηνται τῇ συνουσίᾳ. καὶ μᾶλλον σαφέστερον οὗτος καὶ ἀληθινώτερον ἑρμήνευσεν ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐκθέσει." (Thurn 2000: 89-90), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 63) with adaptations. Wyatt (1976: 111, 121). "Phaedalios the Korinthian's allegorical interpretation (…) cited explicitly by John Malalas as the correct interpretation of the episode, reinforces the consistently implied ethical norm that immoderate sexual desire determines an inexorable chain of destructive consequences." (Wyatt 1976: 111).

[49] *BNJ* 30 F 2.

agement on the microlevel of the family which can damage through the person of the ruler the macrolevel of the state.

Malalas' personal focus on adultery and illegitimate children is articulated within a political and Christian framework. Most notably, after the moral shift which Book X brought about with the coming of Christ,[50] John Malalas reports no more cases of adultery.[51]

Furthermore, throughout the *Chronographia*, the good ruler is a defender of monogamy. In *Chron.* I.15, we read how Hephaestus was the first to introduce monogamy in Egypt, for which "the Egyptians were grateful to him, since this was the first law on chastity which they received."[52] Also in the passage on Cecrops, which we cited at the beginning of this section (*Chron.* IV.5) Cecrops is admired by the Athenians for his institution of monogamy, and is even awarded the meritorious nickname "Double-natured". In Book V, we can also observe how a good judge is, according to Malalas, supposed to ruthlessly punish adultery and to curb its diffusion. In *Chron.* V.30, Clytaemnestra committed adultery with Aegistheus, who is made king by Clytaemnestra after she killed Agamemnon. In the following paragraph, Orestes, who avenges his father Agamemnon, is acquitted by the just judge Menestheus. He intended his judgment explicitly as a precedent; "he said this especially with other women in mind, so that no other woman should commit such a dreadful deed."[53]

The coming of Jesus Christ in Book X has replaced the immoral practices of adultery, and the rule it exercised over the unfolding of the political history of the world, by the rule of law. After Book X, John Malalas replaced his reports on adultery with mentions of the promulgation of laws by emperors. He has a distinct penchant for laws regarding the definition of legitimate heirs and the connected settle-

---

[50] See chapter 4.2.1. (pp. 141-142 of this dissertation).

[51] The only exception seems to be a passage on the reign of Philippus Arabs which has been suggested to fill in the lacuna of the text at *Chron.* XII.25: "Ὅτι ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας Φιλίππου τῶν Ῥωμαίων βασιλέως ἐμφυλίου πολέμου γενομένου ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ μεταξὺ στρατιωτῶν ἕνεκε Βρούτιδος μοιχευθείσης" (Thurn 2000: 227), "During the reign of Philip the emperor of the Romans a civil war broke out in Rome between the soldiers because of the seduction of the Brutides", trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 161). In this case, we are entitled to doubt whether this passage was part of Malalas' original text. Furthermore, this confused text seems to be out of place. The reference to the Brutides, the Roman women who were called thus in honour of Lucius Iunius Brutus, the founder of the Roman republic, seems to fit more in a context of Roman republican history, such as *Chron.* VII.6, which recounts the (civil) war between the Romans and the Sabines after the abduction of Brutides, or *Chron.* VII.9, with the account of the civil war after the rape of Lucretia, which was avenged by Brutus. In other instances after Book X John Malalas stresses the fact that no adultery was committed, such as in the case of the tale of the alleged adultery of Eudocia with Paulinus, which was brought to light by Theodosius' gift of an apple to Paulinus (*Chron.* XIV.8). On this tale see Schultz (2016).

[52] *Chron.* I.15 "καὶ ηὐχαρίστησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι, διότι πρῶτον νόμον σωφροσύνης <τοῦτον> ἐδέξαντο." (Thurn 2000: 16), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 10).

[53] *Chron.* V.31 "μάλιστα καὶ διὰ τὰς ἄλλας γυναῖκας, ὅπως μή τις ἑτέρα γυνὴ τοιουτόν τι δεινὸν ἐργάσηται." (Thurn 2000: 103), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 72).

ment of inheritances.[54] The first mention of hereditary law is found in Malalas' description of the life of Marcus Aurelius. John Malalas devotes only a handful of passages to this emperor (*Chron.* XI.28-31). Significantly however, one of the passages describes Marcus' promulgation of a law on inheritances, which is styled by John Malalas as "a most just law", "δικαιότατον". Apart from generic descriptions of his appearance, his death, and a short mention of his subduing the Germanic tribes, there is also a mention of Marcus' building activities in Antioch. This minimalistic biography of Marcus Aurelius is a nice testimony to Malalas' personalised approach to history. The life of an emperor is filtered onto the *Chronographia* through the lens of Malalas' personal interests, namely his localist focus on the city of Antioch, and his interest in the moral issue of adultery and the related problem of the origin of offspring.

In his description of the more recent emperors, too, John Malalas devotes attention to their legal efforts in enhancing the certainty surrounding legitimate children. In *Chron.* XVI.14, we read how Anastasius promulgated the following decree:

> "The emperor published another sacred decree that no one, without an imperial rescript, was to adopt children either male or female, but only by a rescript, so that even an adopted child should have the right of a legitimate son or daughter to inherit the property of the adoptive parent even if intestate."[55]

This law reappears in an account of Justinian's legal efforts in *Chron.* XVIII. 20. Significantly, of all the possible laws and legal achievements of Justinian, which were otherwise praised by contemporaries and by Justinian himself,[56] John Malalas - who is otherwise not interested in Justinian's legislation[57] - again singles out for mention, amongst other laws, some of Justinian's laws on natural children and legitimate inheritance:

> "The emperor renewed the laws decreed by previous emperors and made new laws which he sent to each city: (…) Likewise in the case of natural children: that they should inherit according to the law of the emperor Anastasios. As regards an heir: that he should be permitted to reject the inheri-

---

[54] The problem of illegitimate children received ample attention in late antique legislation (Beaucamp 1990: 195-201), (Tate 2008), (Albrecht and Schultheiss 2004: 31-32), (Harper 2012: 689).

[55] *Chron.* XVI.14 "ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἕτερον ἐξέθετο θεῖον τύπον, ὥστε μηδένα δίχα σάκρας τινὰ τεκνοποιεῖσθαι, μήτε ἄρρεν μήτε θῆλυ, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ θείας σάκρας, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸ τεκνοποιούμενον ἔχειν δίκαιον υἱοῦ νομίμου καὶ θυγατρὸς εἰς τὸ καὶ ἐξ ἀδιαθέτου κληρονομεῖν τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ τεκνοποιουμένου αὐτόν." (Thurn 2000: 328), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 225).

[56] For instance in the Constitution *Haec* (13th of February 528) and the Constitution *Summa* of the 7th of April 529. For Justinian's use of laws as propaganda see Rubin (1960: 146-168), Scott (1981: 12-13, 17-20), Maas (1986). For praises of contemporaries on Justinian's legal projects, see, for instance, Lydus *Magistr.* III.1.

[57] Scott (1981: 12).

tance whenever he wished and he should not be restricted by a time limit. (…)”.[58]

As is the case with Lydus and his concern for pregnant women, also Malalas' focus on adultery and the legitimacy of offspring is also, as well as a product of his personal interests, a testimony to the pietism surrounding the reign of Justinian and his legislation.[59] Some of the major legal innovations of Justinian were achieved in the realm of marital law and the laws surrounding inheritances. In the Greek collection of 168 *Novels* of Justinian, we find thirteen laws on marriage, one specifically on adultery, twelve on inheritances and legitimate children, and three laws on the curbing of prostitution and rape. Taken together, 29 of the 168 *Novels* of Justinian, or 17,26% of Justinian's legal innovations coincide with Malalas' interest in the same themes.[60] On the level of the text we can also notice some resemblances. We can reconsider a passage from the account of Cecrops at the beginning of this section (*Chron.* IV.5):

"Women who were abducted were considered no one's wives but went with everyone, giving themselves up to fornication. They remained in a man's house, supported by him, for as many days as he wished to keep them."[61]

This sequence of actions in ancient Athens has some echoes of the description of human trafficking and prostitution in the preamble to *Novel* 14,[62] *That there shall be no panders in any part of the Roman Republic*:

"We have learned that men who live dishonestly, have in various cruel and detestable ways found the occasion of making money by nefarious means, in that they travel about in the provinces and in many places, deceive poverty

---

[58] *Chron.* XVIII.20 "Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἀνενέωσε τοὺς νόμους τοὺς ἐκ τῶν προλαβόντων βασιλέων θεσπισθέντας, καὶ ποιήσας νεαροὺς νόμους ἔπεμψε κατὰ πόλιν, (…) Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν φυσικῶν παίδων, ὥστε κληρονομεῖν κατὰ τὸν Ἀναστασίου τοῦ βασιλέως νόμον. Καὶ περὶ τοῦ κληρονομοῦντος, ὥστε ἐξεῖναι αὐτῷ παραιτεῖσθαι τὴν κληρονομίαν ὅτε δ' ἂν βούληται, καὶ μὴ ἀποκλείεσθαι χρόνῳ." (Thurn 2000: 365), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 254). On this passage, see Scott (1981: 13-14).

[59] On the attitudes towards adultery in Late Antiquity, see Beaucamp (1990: 139-170), Arjava (1996: 193-205), Harries (2012: 802-803). Adultery was considered to be a very grave crime (Grubbs and Ann 1995: 216-225), (Arjava 1996: 193-202), which therefore received ample attention in late antique legislation (Beaucamp 1990: 140-141). Justinian's innovations in the legislation of adultery aimed at the protection of the institution of marriage and improved the position of the woman (Beaucamp 1990: 165, 169-170). On marriage and divorce in Justinian's legislation see Riga (1986-1987: 923-930), Tsirpanlis (1995: 64-67). On Justinianic legislation exhibiting a concern for the legitimacy of offspring within the context of safeguarding the continuation of the Justinianic dynasty, see Daube (1966-1967: 389).

[60] "Some [*Novels*] represent major innovations, departing from the law of the *Digest* and *Codex*. For example the law on marriage is thoroughly Christianized and codified." Birks and McLeod (1987: 9). The *Novels* on marriage are *Novel* 2, 12, 22 (Lanata 1989), 39, 61, 74 (Lanata 1988, 1989: 259-260), 78, 91, 98, 117, 139, 140 and 154. *Novel* 134 treats the issue of adultery 134. There are twelve *Novels* on inheritances and legitimate children, namely *Novels* 1, 18, 19, 38, 48, 68, 74, 84, 89, 127, 153 and 156. For the *Novels* on the curbing of prostitution and on rape see *Novels* 14, 51 and 143=150.

[61] See note 33 (p. 302 of this dissertation).

[62] On this novel see Beaucamp (1990: 128-129).

stricken girls, ensnare them by promising them shoes and clothing, bring them to this city, confine them in their own lodging places, feed and clothe them scantily and offer them up to anyone's pleasure; that they take the evil income from prostituting the bodies of the girls"[63]

Indeed, this law, which was also issued on the instigation of Justinian's spouse Theodora, is alluded to specifically in *Chron.* XVIII.24:

"At that time the pious Theodora added the following to her other good works. Those known as brothel-keepers used to go about in every district on the look-out for poor men who had daughters and giving them, it is said, their oath and a few *nomismata*, they used to take the girls as though under a contract; they used to make them into public prostitutes, dressing them up as their wretched lot required and, receiving from them the miserable price of their bodies, they forced them into prostitution. She ordered that all such brother-keepers should be arrested as a matter of urgency."[64]

Through these associations, past and present collude to create one ideal ruler; Justinian and Cecrops are different embodiments of the just ruler, who is a defender of monogamy. In this respect, the association between Justinian and Cecrops, the mythical ruler of Athens, conforms to Malalas' positive emphasis on the city of Athens as I have sketched in the previous chapter (pp. 233-237 of this dissertation).

Malalas' attuning his interest to the general climate generated by the legislation and the policies of Justinian is a strategy which was not only followed by Malalas. In his article on the cycle of Agathias, McCail rightly pointed out how the poems of Agathias mirrored in their attitude towards sexuality and adultery the pietistic ethos of Justinian, most possibly not only to articulate a personal Christian piety, but also out of opportunism.[65]

Although we could expect the same mechanisms of conformation for self-preservation to be at work in the *Chronographia* of Malalas, I would like to emphasise at this point how Malalas' interest in adultery and legitimate children is both too

---

[63] "Ἔγνωμεν γάρ τινας ζῆν μὲν ἀτόπως, ἐκ δὲ αἰτιῶν χαλεπῶν τε καὶ μεμισημένων πρόφασιν ἑαυτοῖς μιαρῶν ἐξευρίσκειν κερδῶν· περινοστεῖν γὰρ χώρας τε καὶ τόπους πολλοὺς καὶ νέας ἐλεεινὰς δελεάζειν, προτεινομένους ὑποδήματά τε καὶ ἐσθῆτά τινα, καὶ τούτοις θηρεύειν αὐτὰς καὶ ἄγειν εἰς τὴν εὐδαίμονα ταύτην πόλιν καὶ ἔχειν καθειργμένας ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτῶν καταγωγαῖς καὶ τροφῆς αὐταῖς ἐλεεινῆς μεταδιδόναι καὶ ἐσθήματος, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἐκδιδόναι πρὸς ἀσέλγειαν αὐτὰς τοῖς βουλομένοις· καὶ πάντα πόρον ἄθλιον ἐκ τοῦ σώματος αὐτῶν προσγινόμενον αὐτοὺς λαμβάνειν (…)" *Novel* 14 (Kroll and Schöll 1895: 106), trans. Blume.
[64] "Ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ καιρῷ ἡ εὐσεβὴς Θεοδώρα μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων αὐτῆς ἀγαθῶν ἐποίησε καὶ τοῦτο. οἱ γὰρ ὀνομαζόμενοι πορνοβοσκοὶ περιῆγον ἐν ἑκάστῳ τόπῳ περιβλεπόμενοι πένητας ἔχοντας θυγατέρας, καὶ διδόντες αὐτοῖς, φησίν, ὅρκους καὶ ὀλίγα νομίσματα ἐλάμβανον αὐτάς, ὡς ἐπὶ συγκροτήσει, καὶ προΐστων αὐτὰς δημοσίᾳ, κατακοσμοῦντες ἐκ τῆς αὐτῶν ἀτυχίας, κομιζόμενοι παρ' αὐτῶν τὸ τοῦ σώματος αὐτῶν δυστυχὲς κέρδος, καὶ ἠνάγκαζον αὐτὰς τοῦ προΐστασθαι. καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους πορνοβοσκοὺς πάντας ἐκέλευσεν συσχεθῆναι μετὰ πάσης ἀνάγκης." *Chron.* XVIII.24 (Thurn 2000: 368), trans. Jeffreys et al. (1986: 255). On this passage see Beaucamp (1992: 339).
[65] McCail (1969: 95-96).

fundamental to the *Chronographia* and too idiosyncratic to John Malalas to be a mere reflection of the contemporary ethos. First, it is too fundamental. Adultery is a recurrent and structuring element in the course of the history, as is recounted in the first half of the chronicle, until it is completely effaced from the historical landscape by the coming of Christ in Book X, after which it is replaced by the rule of the law. As in the case of the juxtaposition of Rome in Book VII and Constantinople in Book XIII, adultery is a structural element giving significance to the circle composition of the *Chronographia.* As a structural element, John Malalas must have kept the theme of adultery constantly in the back of his head during his writing and re-writing of the chronicle. Second, Malalas' accounts of adulterous relationships are too idiosyncratic. Although John Malalas has the habit of lavishly supplying the reader with mentions of his sources, a significant number of the tales on adultery lacks such references.[66] More significantly, the two passages on the introduction of monogamy, by Hephaestus in *Chron.* I.15 and by Cecrops in *Chron.* IV.5 lack any reference to a source.[67] Moreover, some of the love affairs John Malalas recounts deviate from the mainstream myth and are unique to Malalas.[68] We can therefore say that the recurrent theme of adultery in John Malalas must have been to a certain extent an origi-

---

[66] Passages without a reference to a source are, *Chron.* I.9 (Chronus and Philyra), *Chron.* I.9 (Aphrodite and Adonis), *Chron.* I.15 (Hephaestus' introduction of monogamy), Chron. IV.5 (Cecrops' introduction of monogamy) and Chron. V.30 (Clytaemnestra and Aegistheus). The following passages do have a source reference; *Chron.* I.13 (Picus Zeus, source Diodorus) (Jeffreys 1990b: 177), *Chron.* II.1 (Aegyptia sources Homer and Palaephatus) (Jeffreys 1990b: 183-184, 188), *Chron.* II.16 (Antiope and Lycus, sources Cephalion and Euripides) (Jeffreys 1990b: 179, 185), *Chron.* IV.12, (Leda and Cycnus, source Palaephatus) (Jeffreys 1990b: 188), *Chron*. IV.13 (Stheneboea and Bellerophon, source Euripides) (Jeffreys 1990b: 179), *Chron*. IV. 16 (Pasiphae and Taurus, source Euripides) (Jeffreys 1990b: 179), book V (Helena and Paris, different sources), *Chron.* V.19 (Ulysses and Circe, sources Sisyphus, Dictys, Homer and Phidalius) (Jeffreys 1990b: 176-177, 183-184, 189, 192-193), *Chron.* V.20 (Ulysses and Calypso, source Dictys) (Jeffreys 1990b: 176-177), *Chron.* VI.22 (Agialeia, source Didymus) (Jeffreys 1990b: 176), *Chron.* VII.17 (Olympias and Nectanabo, source Irenaeus) (Jeffreys 1990b: 179).

[67] Apart from other inventions of Hephaestus, there is no mention of him introducing monogamy (March 1998: 230-232). Cecrops' introduction of monogamy was, however, already known in previous sources: "Cecrops is also credited with recognising the supremacy of Zeus among the gods, with establishing monogamous marriage, writing and funeral rites, and with putting an end to human sacrifice." (March 1998: 115).

[68] The following cases deviate from the mainstream narrative: *Chron.* I.9 (Chronus and Philyra) Philyra gives birth to Chiron instead of to Afrus such as is reported by John Malalas (March 1998: 395-396). *Chron.* I.9 (Aphrodite and Adonis) Adonis and Aphrodite are indeed lovers and Ares is reported to be one the possible killers of Adonis, but Adonis being the son of Aphrodite is unique to John Malalas (March 1998: 14-15). *Chron.* I.13 (Picus Zeus). *Chron.* I.15 (Hephaestus) Apart from other inventions of Hephaestus, there is no mention of him introducing monogamy (March 1998: 230-232). *Chron.* II.1 (Aegyptia). *Chron*. II.16 (Antiope and Lycus) Antiope was raped by Zeus instead of by Theoboos, and did not have an affair with Lycus (March 1998: 59-60). *Chron.* IV.12 (Leda and Cycnus) Leda was raped by Zeus in the form of a swan, κύκνος, instead of by Cycnus (March 1998: 285-287). *Chron.* IV.16 (Pasiphae and Taurus) Pasiphae mated a bull, ταῦρος, sent by Poseidon, instead of sleeping with Taurus (March 1998: 372).

In the following passages, John Malalas echoes the common mythological tradition: *Chron.* IV.5 (Cecrops), *Chron.* IV.13 (Stheneboea and Bellerophon), (March 1998: 98), Book V (Helena and Paris), *Chron.* V.19 (Ulysses and Circe), (March 1998: 128-129), *Chron.* V.20 (Ulysses and Calypso), (March 1998: 110), *Chron.* V.30 (Clytaemnestra and Aegistheus), (March 1998: 19-20), *Chron.* VI.22 (Agialeia), (March 1998: 160-161).

nal and personal construct[69] by the author - the fact that in many cases, the adulterers are characterised by titles which were commonly used in Malalas' daily life as an administrator, such as συγκλητικός "senator" and νοτάριος "secretary", gives only a particularly personal shade to his antiquarian history of adultery.[70]

The personal life of John Malalas must of necessity remain elusive for a want of any biographical information - contrary to Cassiodorus and Lydus, and apart from his succinct reports on his research activities such as mentioned above, the author does not furnish any details of his personal life in his works. However, without going into any speculation on his personal life - did John Malalas commit adultery or was he the victim of adultery?[71] -, this analysis has shown that John Malalas exhibits an idiosyncratic emphasis on women and the negative aspects of womanhood - apart from his emphasis on the problem of adultery and legitimate kin, we can also mention his eccentric predilection for the sacrifice of virgin women or *Tychai* during the foundation of a city.[72] In these emphases, John Malalas most possibly shows the reader more of his personal life than he probably would have liked. More importantly, these personal emphases are the lens through which John Malalas articulates his view on the distant past of the Roman Empire. As such, the personal predilections of John Malalas have replaced the traditional ideological centre of Rome as the framework for generating historiographical knowledge. Yet again, the farther an author is removed from Rome, the more his personal predilections have come to replace Rome as the generator of historiographical meaning. As we have seen, Lydus combines both his interest in Rome and Constantinople with his personal predilections (localism and women) to construe his historiographical framework. In the case of Malalas, Rome has more or less been replaced by personal predilections; his focus on Antioch, and his emphasis on women. In the *Variae* of Cassiodorus, we see the opposite mechanism at work; the fact that for Cassiodorus Rome remains the centre of historiographical meaning precludes his developing a genuine personal framework aside from classical and rhetorical stereotypes - apart from his localist focus on his home region in the South of Italy, Cassiodorus does not exhibit in his *Variae* any significant personal interest in women or children such as we perceived in Lydus or Malalas.[73]

---

[69] On Malalas' personal fascination for the adultery of Picus Zeus in *Chron*. I.13, see Bernardi (2004: 58-59).

[70] In *Chron*. V.30 Aegistheus is coined συγκλητικός, in *Chron*. II.16 Theoboos, the rapist of Antiope, συγκλητικός, in *Chron*. IV.12 Cycnus, συγκλητικός, in *Chron*. IV.16 Taurus, νοτάριος, in *Chron*. VI.22 Comes, a name which as such already recalls terminology from the late antique state apparatus, is coined συγκλητικός.

[71] For what it's worth, we know of one example of a late antique antiquarian being the victim of adultery, namely Horapollo (Beaucamp 1992: 78, 94-95, 100-101).

[72] Liebeschuetz (2004: 151), Garstad (2005), Saliou (2006: 78-81).

[73] Yet again, this lacking emphasis on women and children could be explained from his personal situation: "We cannot tell if he ever married or sired children, though his silence on this point may mean that he did not." (O'Donnell 1979: 13).

# Overall Conclusion

The aim of this dissertation was to ascertain the cultural meaning of antiquarianism in the sixth century AD. Before proceeding to the formulation of an hypothesis, however, the otherwise elusive concept of antiquarianism had to be defined. This dissertation started therefore with an overview of the uses of the term antiquarianism in the history of science, with a focus on Antiquity and Late Antiquity. In Late Antiquity, there were different types of texts which might aspire to the label of antiquarianism. Therefore, assigning the term "antiquarianism" to just one of these modes of engaging with the past is of necessity impossible. The term antiquarianism constitutes thus an archipelago, with the antiquarianism studied in this dissertation as just one of its islands.

This research on the concept of antiquarianism led to a charting of different antiquarianisms, of which one specific form appeared as a dominant cultural force in the sixth century. This form of antiquarianism, "Roman antiquarianism", was defined as a textual attitude with three characteristics. Interest in the past is centred on Rome and the Roman Empire. The past is idealised as a model, and there is an awareness of the growing distance between the past as a declining standard of moral excellence and present-day life. The cultural unease generated by the different transformations which took place in Late Antiquity, and which distanced the citizens of the Roman Empire from their heritage, proved to be the motor behind the rediscovery of antiquarianism in the sixth century. Hence, the main thesis of this dissertation was formulated through the lens of this phenomenon of cultural unease: antiquarianism in the sixth century was an expression of and a means to come to terms with the cultural unease engendered by a fundamental transformation of Late Antiquity: the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople.

A study of antiquarianism as an attestation to and means to deal with cultural unease benefited from the nascent field of cultural trauma studies - such as developed by J.C. Alexander and Dominick LaCapra - and memory studies - such as developed by P. Nora. In this dissertation, I developed a flexible approach to both theoretical frameworks. This flexible approach allowed for a further development of otherwise established methodologies. I redefined Nora's concept of *lieu de mémoire* to a more flexible *memoryscape*, an imaginary landscape which acts as a platform onto which different landscapes, elements from different real places, mythological and historical characters, and even more abstract elements such as emblems and symbols are combined. This redefinition allowed for a more rounded view on the multi-layered conceptualisation of Rome and Constantinople in the sixth century.

Also the theory of cultural trauma benefited from the flexible dynamic between the theoretical framework on the one hand and the historical and textual data on the other hand. First, I redefined the concept of cultural trauma in order to fit the situation of the late antique transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople. Instead of using the term trauma, which implied an injury or form of injustice inflicted by a perpetrator onto a victim, and which furthermore implied a rupture-like event such as a genocide or act of warfare, I opted for the term unease. The term unease was better attuned to the gradualness of the transfer from Rome to Constantinople, and it furthermore transcended the divide between victim and perpetrator which is accentuated by the term trauma. Second, I proved that the conflation of absence and loss, as LaCapra's explanation of the rhetoric of melancholy behind exclusively negative or traumatic events, could also be used in a positive way in order to create a strong rhetoric of hope and expectation.

In order to pursue the hypothesis of antiquarianism in the sixth century being a means to cope with cultural unease, this dissertation proceeded with an analysis of the different factors which are, according to the frameworks of J.C. Alexander and D. LaCapra, necessary prerequisites for the development of cultural trauma: the traumatic event, the different carrier groups which create and negotiate the discourse of cultural trauma, and the various strategies which were used to articulate and come tot terms with the cultural trauma.

In the second chapter of this dissertation, I gave an analysis of the event which generated the cultural unease in the sixth century: the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople, a gradual process which culminated with the devastation of Rome during the Gothic wars in the sixth century. The ending of this process triggered the awareness of the "fall" of Rome in the antiquarian imagination in the sixth century.

Starting from the biographies of the three authors I selected for scrutiny, namely Cassiodorus, John Malalas and John Lydus, I gave, in the third chapter of this dissertation, an analysis of the dense network of educated bureaucrats in sixth-century Constantinople which carried the discourse of cultural trauma. This network centred around the educational context of the university of Constantinople, with Priscian of Caesarea and Tribonian as its crucial yet elusive centres. It was densely interconnected but not unified in its approach to the cultural unease of the transfer from Rome to Constantinople: different groups, divided and united among different lines of ethnic solidarity, dynastic loyalties and bureaucratic codes of conduct, competed with each other for enhancements of their power, prestige and imperial favour. This competition also reflected the ways in which the discourse on cultural unease was articulated; different views on the position and destiny of Rome and Constantinople shaped a contemporary debate and cultural negotiation of the discourse of cultural trauma, as the following analysis showed. The interconnectedness of these groups of bureaucrats was reflected in the texts that these bureaucrats produced. An analysis of the similarities and differences in the approaches of the

three authors to antiquarian material demonstrated that they implicitly engaged in a dialogue with each other, attesting to a common culture of antiquarian erudition.

The lion's share of the dissertation was devoted to the analysis of the strategies which the three authors used to engage with the cultural unease of the transfer from Rome to Constantinople. This analysis was divided into two triptychs.

The first triptych, chapter four of this dissertation, considered the different strategies that the three authors employed in their depiction of Rome and Constantinople. We saw how authors with a Constantinopolitan perspective assimilated Constantinople to Rome in their antiquarian *memoryscape*, whereas westerners such as Cassiodorus resisted such assimilations. Furthermore, John Lydus and John Malalas enhanced the image of Constantinople by comparing her favourably to Rome - this meant discrediting Rome through a critical scrutiny of her controversial earliest history. Finally, we saw how the transfer from Rome to Constantinople forced the three antiquarians to define their *Romanitas* in terms of transferable emblems of empire, such as statues, the Latin language, and the colour purple.

The second triptych, chapters 5 to 7 of this dissertation, analysed how the three authors sought to partially replace Rome as the centre for the generation of historical meaning by formulating alternatives to the eternal city. One of these alternatives was the foregrounding of their own region of origin as the new centre of the antiquarian *memoryscape*. These instances of antiquarian localism were embedded in the social reality of different ethnic groups vying for imperial favour, and interacting with the corresponding instances of antiquarian localism in the imperial legislature. A second alternative to Rome was their own bureaucratic department. The analysis showed how the antiquarian interest in the department of the state was a literary expression of the social reality of inter- and intra-departmental feuding, a competition which was also fired on by the imperial power. The third and final alternative to Rome was composed of the person of the antiquarian in his emphasis on personal issues which otherwise remained in the shadows, namely women and children. This alternative also operated in tandem with a genuine concern for women and children in the legislation of Justinian, Tribonian and Theodora.

These strategies, which were marshalled to deal with the traumatic transfer from Rome to Constantinople, were manifold and did not exclude several internal contradictions and dilemmas. Promoting Constantinople to the detriment of Rome through a slanderous treatment of Rome's early history, and through the presentation of Rome as a derivative product, contradicted the fact that Constantinople derived her prestige from her affiliation with Rome. In order to resolve these dilemmas, a careful selection was made from the reservoir of Roman history and antiquarian lore: Numa Pompilius was foregrounded as an alternative to the otherwise tainted founder of Rome, Romulus. Furthermore, these dilemmas and internal contradictions led to a certain measure of antiquarian detachment.

As this dissertation has shown, the antiquarian writing produced in the sixth century was no bookish product of knowledge for the sake of knowledge. On the contrary, Roman antiquarianism in the sixth century was to a high degree conditioned by the sociological circumstances in Constantinople which determined the life of the intellectualist bureaucrats writing antiquarian treatises. The intense competition of different ethnic groups produced instances of antiquarian localism in dialogue with each other, and vicious inter- and intra-departmental feuding produced a high degree of identification with the antiquarian history of their own department. The antiquarianism produced under such circumstances implicitly engaged with the legislation of the central authority, which understood the legitimising value of antiquarianism and used the same antiquarian arguments in its new legislation. This dissertation was written from the perspective of one end of this dialogue, namely, the antiquarian bureaucrats vying for power and prestige for themselves, their own bureau and their own ethnic group. However, it would be rewarding to write the history of antiquarianism in the sixth century from the perspective of the other end of this antiquarian dialogue. Further research is warranted on how the persons of the imperial centre, Theodora, Justinian, and his ghostwriter Tribonian, conceived of their antiquarian *memoryscape* in their legislation.

# *Appendices*

CONCORDANCE OF THE EDITIONS OF WÜNSCH AND BANDY OF *DE MENSIBUS*

| Wünsch (1898) | Bandy (2013a) |
|---|---|
| 1,01 | 1,1 |
| 1,02 | 4,51 |
| 1,03 | 4,55 |
| 1,04 | 4,55 |
| 1,05 | 4,55 |
| 1,06 | 4,91 |
| 1,07 | 4,91 |
| 1,08 | 1,2 |
| 1,09 | 1,3 |
| 1,10 | 1,4 |
| 1,11 | 1,4 |
| 1,12 | 1,6 |
| 1,13 | 1,7 |
| 1,14 | 1,8 |
| 1,15 | 2,20 |
| 1,16 | 1,9 |
| 1,17 | 1,10 |
| 1,17 | 1,11 |
| 1,18 | 4,57 |

| 1,19 | app. 18 |
|---|---|
| 1,20 | / |
| 1,21 | 1,12 |
| 1,22 | 3,10 |
| 1,23 | app. 10 |
| 1,24 | app. 4 |
| 1,25 | app. 1 |
| 1,26 | 3,24 |
| 1,27 | 3,24 |
| 1,28 | 4,52 |
| 1,28 | app. 25 |
| 1,28 | app. 26 |
| 1,29 | 4,46 |
| 1,30 | 4,105 |
| 1,31 | app. 3 |
| 1,32 | app. 23 |
| 1,33 | app. 2 |
| 1,34 | 1,15 |
| 1,35 | 1,14 |
| 1,36 | 4,104 |
| 1,27-40 (*Magistr.*) | / |
| 1,41 | app. 24 |
| 2,01 | 2,1 |
| 2,02 | 2,2 |
| 2,03 | / |
| 2,04 | 2,3 |
| 2,05 | 2,4 |
| 2,06 | 2,5 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 2,07 | 2,6 |
| 2,08 | 2,7 |
| 2,08 | 2,8 |
| 2,08 | 2,14 |
| 2,08 | 2,15 |
| 2,08 | 2,16 |
| 2,09 | 2,17 |
| 2,09 | 2,18 |
| 2,09 | 2,19 |
| 2,10 | 2,25 |
| 2,11 | 2,26 |
| 2,12 | 2,27 |
| 3,01 | 3,1 |
| 3,02 | 3,2 |
| 3,03 | 4,33 |
| 3,04 | 2,21 |
| 3,04 | 2,22 |
| 3,05 | 3,3 |
| 3,06 | 3,4 |
| 3,07 | 3,12 |
| 3,08 | 3,5 |
| 3,09 | 2,28 |
| 3,09 | 3,6 |
| 3,10 | 3,9 |
| 3,10 | 3,11 |
| 3,11 | 3,13 |
| 3,11 | 3,15 |
| 3,12 | 3,16 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3,12 | 3,17 |
| 3,12 | 3,18 |
| 3,13 | 3,19 |
| 3,14 | 3,20 |
| 3,15 | 3,21 |
| 3,16 | 3,22 |
| 3,16 | 3,23 |
| 3,16 | 3,25 |
| 3,16 | 3,26 |
| 3,16 | 3,27 |
| 3,16 | 3,28 |
| 3,17 | 3,29 |
| 3,18 | 3,30 |
| 3,19 | 3,31 |
| 3,20 | 3,32 |
| 3,21 | 3,33 |
| 3,22 | 3,36 |
| 3,23 | 3,37 |
| 4,001 | 4,1 |
| 4,002 | 4,2 |
| 4,003 | 4,3 |
| 4,004 | 4,4 |
| 4,005 | 4,25 |
| 4,006 | 2,24 |
| 4,007 | 4,5 |
| 4,008 | 4,7 |
| 4,009 | 4,8 |
| 4,010 | 4,9 |

| 4,010 | 4,9 |
|-------|-------|
| 4,011 | 4,74 |
| 4,012 | 4,27 |
| 4,013 | 4,27 |
| 4,014 | 4,73 |
| 4,015 | 4,89 |
| 4,016 | 4,10 |
| 4,016 | 4,70 |
| 4,017 | 4,7 |
| 4,017 | 4,10 |
| 4,018 | 4,11 |
| 4,018 | 4,11 |
| 4,018 | 4,13 |
| 4,018 | 4,14 |
| 4,018 | 4,15 |
| 4,019 | 4,5 |
| 4,020 | 3,24 |
| 4,020 | 4,90 |
| 4,021 | 4,17 |
| 4,022 | 3,35 |
| 4,022 | 4,80 |
| 4,023 | 4,5 |
| 4,024 | 3,14 |
| 4,025 | 4,16 |
| 4,025 | 4,17 |
| 4,025 | 4,18 |
| 4,025 | 4,136 |
| 4,026 | 4,21 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4,027 | 4,19 |
| 4,028 | app. 6 |
| 4,028 | app. 13 |
| 4,029 | 4,25 |
| 4,030 | 2,11 |
| 4,030 | 2,12 |
| 4,030 | 2,13 |
| 4,030 | app. 15 |
| 4,031 | 4,22 |
| 4,032 | 4,24 |
| 4,033 | 4,26 |
| 4,034 | 4,27 |
| 4,035 | 4,28 |
| 4,035 | 4,29 |
| 4,036 | 4,33 |
| 4,037 | 4,30 |
| 4,038 | 4,30 |
| 4,039 | 4,32 |
| 4,040 | 4,23 |
| 4,041 | 4,34 |
| 4,042 | 4,35 |
| 4,043 | app. 21 |
| 4,043 | app. 22 |
| 4,044 | 4,36 |
| 4,045 | 4,37 |
| 4,046 | 4,6 |
| 4,047 | 4,52 |
| 4,048 | 4,44 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4,049 | 4,45 |
| 4,050 | 4,48 |
| 4,051 | 4,49 |
| 4,052 | 4,118 |
| 4,053 | 4,54 |
| 4,054 | 4,59 |
| 4,054 | 4,79 |
| 4,055 | 4,63 |
| 4,056 | 4,9 |
| 4,057 | 4,64 |
| 4,058 | 4,2 |
| 4,059 | 4,65 |
| 4,060 | 4,66 |
| 4,061 | 4,67 |
| 4,061 | 4,68 |
| 4,062 | app. 11 |
| 4,063 | 3,7 |
| 4,064 | 4,70 |
| 4,065 | 4,71 |
| 4,066 | 4,85 |
| 4,067 | 4,72 |
| 4,068 | 2,9 |
| 4,069 | 4,62 |
| 4,070 | app. 17 |
| 4,071 | 4,75 |
| 4,072 | 4,76 |
| 4,073 | 4,77 |
| 4,073 | app. 7 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4,074 | 4,99 |
| 4,075 | 4,77 |
| 4,076 | 4,78 |
| 4,077 | 4,98 |
| 4,078 | 4,92 |
| 4,079 | 4,42 |
| 4,080 | 3,5 |
| 4,080 | 4,81 |
| 4,081 | 4,31 |
| 4,082 | 4,82 |
| 4,083 | 4,100 |
| 4,084 | 4,85 |
| 4,085 | 4,5 |
| 4,086 | 4,39 |
| 4,087 | 4,119 |
| 4,088 | 4,83 |
| 4,089 | 4,85 |
| 4,089 | 4,86 |
| 4,090 | app. 12 |
| 4,091 | 4,87 |
| 4,092 | 4,41 |
| 4,093 | 4,84 |
| 4,094 | 4,88 |
| 4,095 | 4,91 |
| 4,096 | app. 9 |
| 4,097 | 4,70 |
| 4,098 | 4,61 |
| 4,099 | 4,79 |

| 4,100 | 4,5 |
|---|---|
| 4,101 | 4,5 |
| 4,102 | 4,93 |
| 4,103 | 1,8 |
| 4,104 | 4,95 |
| 4,105 | 4,96 |
| 4,106 | 4,97 |
| 4,107 | 4,98 |
| 4,108 | 4,40 |
| 4,109 | 4,56 |
| 4,110 | app. 14 |
| 4,111 | 4,101 |
| 4,112 | 4,102 |
| 4,113 | 4,5 |
| 4,114 | 4,106 |
| 4,115 | 4,41 |
| 4,116 | 4,27 |
| 4,117 | 3,34 |
| 4,118 | 4,58 |
| 4,119 | 4,60 |
| 4,120 | 4,107 |
| 4,121 | 4,108 |
| 4,122 | 2,28 |
| 4,123 | 4,109 |
| 4,124 | 4,110 |
| 4,125 | / |
| 4,126 | 4,111 |
| 4,127 | 4,69 |

| 4,128 | 4,112 |
|-------|-------|
| 4,128 | 4,113 |
| 4,129 | app. 8 |
| 4,130 | 4,43 |
| 4,131 | 4,8 |
| 4,132 | 4,5 |
| 4,133 | app. 19 |
| 4,134 | 4,114 |
| 4,135 | 4,115 |
| 4,135 | 4,116 |
| 4,135 | 4,119 |
| 4,136 | 4,120 |
| 4,137 | 3,8 |
| 4,138 | 4,121 |
| 4,139 | 4,122 |
| 4,139 | 4,123 |
| 4,140 | 4,58 |
| 4,141 | 4,124 |
| 4,141 | 4,125 |
| 4,141 | 4,126 |
| 4,142 | 4,38 |
| 4,143 | 4,127 |
| 4,144 | 4,128 |
| 4,145 | 4,53 |
| 4,146 | app. 16 |
| 4,147 | 4,117 |
| 4,148 | 4,129 |
| 4,148 | 4,130 |

| | |
|---|---|
| 4,149 | 4,131 |
| 4,149 | 4,132 |
| 4,150 | 4,133 |
| 4,151 | 4,134 |
| 4,152 | 4,135 |
| 4,153 | 4,137 |
| 4,154 | 4,138 |
| 4,154 | 4,139 |
| 4,154 | 4,140 |
| 4,154 | 4,245 |
| 4,155 | 4,141 |
| 4,156 | 4,142 |
| 4,157 | app. 20 |
| 4,158 | 4,143 |
| 4,159 | 4,144 |
| 4,160 | 4,50 |
| 4,161 | 2,23 |
| 4,162 | 2,27 |
| fals. trib. 1 | 4,62 |
| fals. trib. 2 | / |
| fals. trib. 3 | 4,54 |
| fals. trib. 4 | 4,62 |
| fals. trib. 5 | 4,20 |
| fals. trib. 6 | 4,5 |
| inc. sed. 01 | 4,25 |
| inc. sed. 02 | 4,5 |
| inc. sed. 03 | 4,103 |
| inc. sed. 03 | 4,105 |

| inc. sed. 04 | 2,10 |
|---|---|
| inc. sed. 05 | 4,94 |
| inc. sed. 06 | 1,13 |
| inc. sed. 7 (*Magistr.*) | / |
| inc. sed. 08 | 4,25 |
| inc. sed. 09 | 1,5 |
| inc. sed. 10 | app. 5 |
| inc. sed. 11 | 4,5 |
| inc. sed. 12 | 4,47 |

Concordance of the Editions of Wachsmuth and Bandy of *De Ostentis*

| | Wachsmuth (1897) | Bandy (2013b) |
|---|---|---|
| I. Prooemium | 1-8 | 1-8 |
| II. De solis lunaeque significatibus | 9, 9a-d | 9-13 |
| IIIa. De cometis (secundum Apuleium) | 10, 10a-b | 14-16 |
| IIIb. Campestris de cometis dissertatio | 11-12 13-15, 15a-b | 17 18-22 |
| IVa. Observationes generales ad lunam spectantes | 16 | 23 |
| IVb. Veterum observations singulars ad lunam spectantes, secundum menses lunares discriptae | 17 18 19 20 | 24-26 27-29 30-32 33-35 |
| Va. De tonitruis | 21 22 | 36 37-38 |
| Vb. Tonitruale ex Aegyptorum doctrina, secundum menses solares discriptum | 23 24 25 26 | 39-41 42-44 45-47 48-50 |
| Vc. Nigidii Figuli tonitruale (sec. menses sol. discr.) | 27 28-38 | 51-52 53-63 |
| Vd. Fonteii tonitruale (sec. menses lun. discr.) | 39 40 41 | 64-66 67-71 72-75 |
| VI. Labeonis observations quae ad lunae solstitio aestivo collocationem spectant | 42 | 76-86 |
| VIIa. De fulguribus | 43 44 45 46 | 87 88-89 90-91 92 |
| VIIb. Labeonis (?) fulgurale (ad mens. sol. discr.) | 47 48 49 50 51 52 | 93 94 95-96 97-99 100-101 102-104 |

| VIIIa. De terrae motibus | 53<br>54 | 105-106<br>107 |
|---|---|---|
| VIIIb. Vicellii seismologium (sec. menses sol. discr.) | 55<br>56<br>57<br>58 | 108-110<br>111-113<br>114-116<br>117-119 |
| IX. Calendarium Clodii Tusci | 59-70 | 120-131 |
| X. Ethnographia astrologica | 71 | 132 |

## Three Julians

The *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (*PRLE*) makes the distinction between three characters with the name Julian. *PRLE* II.639 has Iulianus 14, Urban Prefect of Constantinople in AD 491, a native of Alexandria and scholar, who was replaced by Secundinus after riots in the city. For the purpose of the analysis, we will call this Julian "Julian 1". A second Julian is mentioned in *PRLE* II.641. This person, Iulianus 26, is the dedicatee of Priscian's *Institutiones*, and is called "Iuliani consuli et patricio" in Priscian's dedication (*GL* II.1). This is "Julian 2" in our analysis. A third Julian, *PRLE* III.733, Iulianus 11, is Julian the Egyptian, ex-Prefect and contributor to the cycle of Agathias, "Julian 3" in this analysis.[1]

I would like to argue that these three persons with the name Julian in the *PRLE* are in fact one and the same person. First, there are some arguments in favour of identifying Julian 1 with Julian 2. Julian 1 is the Urban Prefect of Constantinople, and Priscian dedicated his works to Julian 2. We already mentioned the tendency of university professors to dedicate the fruits of their research to the Urban Prefect responsible for their enrolment. An example of this mechanism of patronage is John of Lydia, who dedicated two of his extant treatises to the Urban Prefect Gabriel. Therefore we can assume the dedicatee of Priscian's work (Julian 2) was, in fact, Urban Prefect (Julian 1). This identification would imply that Priscian was enrolled as professor in Constantinople in 491. Together with the proposed date of his death between 540 and 550, this would make for a longevous Priscian – if, let us say, Priscian was at least twenty-five years old when he became professor in 491, this would imply he was born in 466, which would make him 79 at his presumed death in 540. This is by no means exceptional when we compare this age with the ages of our other intellectuals; Lydus attained approximately 75 years, John Malalas presumably 80, and Cassiodorus even could have lived for a century. Furthermore, the attainment of a prestigious posting such as stately funded professorship at an early age was by no means impossible; in this period we have numerous examples of well-connected youths attaining prestigious offices at an early age.[2] Furthermore, Priscian need not be enrolled in AD 491; although Julian 1 was removed from office after riots in 491, he could have been reinstated in his prefecture on numerous occasions.[3]

Second, there are some grounds for identifying Julian 1 with Julian 3. Julian 1 originated from Alexandria in Egypt, and Julian 3 is known as the Egyptian. The common origin of both makes identification possible. Furthermore, identifying the Julians solves an old conundrum of the manuscript transmission of Julian 3's poems; in the extant testimonies to Julian's poems, Julian 3 is both designated as ἀπὸ ὑπάρχων, or, former Prefect, and ἀπὸ ὑπάτων, or, former Consul. Scholars have felt forced to

---

[1] This Iulianus 11 is most possibly identical to Iulianus 4 *PLRE* III.729-730 (Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron 1966: 13), (Al. Cameron 1977: 47).

[2] On the late antique tendency to promote young men to the consulship, for example, see O'Donnell (1979: 21-22).

[3] There are many cases of officials being removed temporarily from office to appease rioting crowds; the re-instalment of Tribonian and John of Cappadocia after the Nika revolt is a notorious example.

denounce either one of both as a transmission error; Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron and McCail have deemed ἀπὸ ὑπάτων as erroneous.[4] However, an identification can solve the conundrum; Julian 2 was called by Priscian a Consul, and Julian 1 and Julian 3 were Prefects;[5] if the three Julians are one and the same, he could have been designated with both ἀπὸ ὑπάρχων and ἀπὸ ὑπάτων.[6] Indeed, Ballaira deemed our 'three Julians' as one and the same person – without, however, proving it.[7]

---

[4] Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron (1966: 12), McCail (1969: 88).

[5] Av. Cameron and Al. Cameron (1966: 12-14) thought Julian 3 was either a praetorian prefect, or, less likely, Julian the urban prefect. McCail (1969: 87-88) identified Julian the urban prefect and Julian the praetorian prefect as one and the same.

[6] Ballaira (1989: 83) identified Julian 2 as consul with Julian 3 on the basis of the designation consul – ἀπὸ ὑπάτων.

[7] Ballaira (1989: 81-85). Likewise, Salamon (1979: 93-94) first stated definite identification is impossible, and later identified Julian 2 with Julian 3. See also Schamp (2006a: xxix-xl, 2006c clxxxix-cxc).

## AN OVERVIEW OF ANTIQUARIAN PASSAGES IN THE *VARIAE*

Below one can find an overview of the positions of antiquarian passages in the *Variae* of Cassiodorus. The horizontal axis indicates which number the letter has, whereas the vertical axis indicates to which Book a letter pertains. The first column has the mention of each Book, abbreviated Bk., with the number of letters between brackets (). The abbreviation *Pref.* indicates the a preface. A Book of *Formulae* is indicated by *Form*. As not all Books have the same amount of letters, the last letter of a Book shall be indicated by |. An X indicates a letter with antiquarian passage.

| | 1 | | | | | | | | | 10 | | | | | | | | | | 20 | | | | | | | | | | 30 | | | | | | | | | | 40 | | | | | | | | | | 50 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Pref.* | \| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bk. I (46) | | x | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | \| | | | | | | | |
| Bk. II (41) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | x | \| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bk. III (53) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | x | | | x | x | x \| |
| Bk. IV (51) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x \| | | |
| Bk. V (44) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | \| | | | | | | | | | |
| Bk. VI (25) Form | x | x | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | x | | | | \| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bk. VII (47) Form | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | x | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | \| | | | | | | |
| Bk. VIII (33) | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | x | x \| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bk. IX (25) | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | x \| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bk. X (35) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | \| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Pref.* | \| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bk. XI (40) | x | | | | | x | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | x | | \| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bk. XII (28) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | x | | | \| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## John Lydus in John Malalas

Below I give an overview of the passages which have parallels with Lydus, with a mention of the parallel passages in Lydus. The underlined paragraphs are paragraphs in which John Malalas mentions a source. Paragraphs in bold are paragraphs with the parallel to Lydus added at the beginning or at the end of the paragraph. M. = *De Mensibus*, Mg. = *De Magistratibus*, O. = *De Ostentis*.

| Bk. I | Bk. II | Bk. IV | Bk. VI | Bk. VII | Bk. VIII | Bk. IX | Bk. XI | Bk. XII | Bk. XIII | Bk. XVII | Bk. XVIII |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I.1 M.II.3 | **II.1** M.IV.86 M.III.5 | **IV.5** M.IV.47 | **VI.18** M.I.13 | VII.1 Mg.II.6 M.IV.4 | VIII.7 M.IV.47 | **IX.1** M.IV.102 M.IV.105 | XI.17 M.I.18 | XII.20 M.I.12 Mg.III.70 | XIII.8 M.IV.138 | XVII.4 M.IV.116 O.10A O.15 | XVIII.52 M.IV.116 O.10A O.14 |
| I.6 M.IV.107 | **II.2** M.IV.86 | **IV.10** M.IV.47 | VI.24 Mg.II.6 M.IV.4 | VII.3 M.IV.33 M.IV.34 M.IV.41 | | **IX.3** M.III.5 M.III.6 | | | | | XVIII.122 M.IV.116 O.10A O.13 |
| **I.8** M.I.32 | II.3 M.III.1 | IV.11 M.I.12 | VI.29 Mg.I.21 | VII.4 M.I.12 M.IV.30 | | **IX.18** M.Inc.3 | | | | | |
| I.14 M.IV.67 | II.8 M.I.21 Mg.I.4 Mg.I.17 Mg.I.23 Mg.I.32 Mg.II.2 Mg.II.4 Mg.II.13 Mg.II.24 | IV.14 M.I.12 | | VII.5 M.I.12 M.IV.30 | | | | | | | |
| I.15 M.III.5 | II.17 Mg.I.46 | | | VII.6 M.IV.29 Mg.I.16 Mg.I.19 Mg.I.21 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | VII.7 M.IV.158 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | **VII.8** M.IV.47 | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | VII.9<br>M.IV.<br>29<br>Mg.I.9<br>Mg.I.<br>14 | | | | | | |
| | | | VII.10<br>M.IV.<br>27 | | | | | | |
| | | | VII.11<br>M.IV.<br>27<br>Mg.I.<br>50 | | | | | | |
| | | | VII.12<br>M.I.<br>14<br>M.I.<br>16<br>M.I.<br>17<br>M.III.<br>5<br>M.IV.<br>1<br>M.IV.<br>25<br>M.IV.<br>30<br>M.IV.<br>31<br>M.IV.<br>32<br>M.IV.<br>33<br>M.IV.<br>49<br>M.IV.<br>102<br>M.IV.<br>152 | | | | | | |
| | | | **VII. 13**<br>M.III.<br>5<br>M.III.<br>6<br>M.IV.<br>102<br>M.IV.<br>105<br>M.IV.<br>111<br>O.25 | | | | | | |

THE ANTIQUARIAN HISTORIES OF THE HIPPODROME

Below one can find a structural analysis of the five antiquarian histories of the hippodrome, which are divided according to the general pattern which was sketched in chapter 3.3.3. of this dissertation. I first assign each segment the function it has in the general pattern indicated in chapter 3.3.3. - either a description of the universe, in bold, or digressive material, or a succession of three characters/hippodromes. After this designation comes the beginning and ending of the text, with a short overview of elements relevant for the analysis given in chapter 3.3.3.

| Anonymus *Anthologia Latina* 188 (197R) | Cassiodorus *Variae* III.51, 3 – 10 | John Lydus *De Mensibus* I.12 | John Malalas *Chronographia* VII.4 – 5 | Corippus *In laudem Iustini* I.314-344 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Main character: Circe Incipit: *Κίρκη τις ἦν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ (…)* Desinit: *ἐξ αὐτῆς ὠνομάσθη κίρκος.* -sexual partners -races in honour of her father the sun -etymology circus <Circe | Main character: Romulus Incipit: *Καὶ εὐθέως πάλιν ἀρξάμενος* Desinit: *οὐδὲ ἐν μιᾷ ἑορτῇ.* -κερκέσιον, no etymology -circus as a means to divert rioting population -races in honour of the sun and the four elements | |

| Image of the universe: Incipit: *Circus imago poli* Desinit: *crevit honore deum.* **-opening stalls = 12 = months = zodiac** **-4 horses = seasons** **-4 colours = 4 elements** **-Sun and 4 seasons = charioteer and 4 horses** **-start by Janus** **-axes = rising and setting** **-spina =sea** **-obelisk** **-7 circuits = planetary orbits** **-2-horse-chariots = moon** **-4-horse-chariots = sun** **-single horses = Dioscuri** | | Digressive material Incipit: *ἐν δὲ Ἑλλάδι πρότερον* Desinit: *πάλιν ὁ λόγος ἐπανελθέτω.* Enyalius -2-horse-chariots Etymology bigarii <bigae Oenomaus: -4-horse-chariots -contest on 24th of March -2 colours (green and blue) – 2 elements (earth and water) – 2 factions (mainland and coastal) -murdered by Pelops -etymology Peloponnesus <Pelops | Digressive material Incipit: *ὁ δὲ τῆς Πισαίων χώρας* Desinit: *τοῦ Λυδοῦ ἐφονεύθη.* Oenomaus -contest on the 25th of March -2 elements (earth and sea) = 2 gods (Demeter and Poseidon) = 2 colours (green and blue) = 2 factions (mainland and coastal) -omens related to outcome -murdered by Pelops | Incipit: *solis honore novi* Desinit: *circensia gaudia Romae.* -races in honour of the sun **Image of the universe:** **-4 horses − 4 seasons − 4 charioteers − 4 colours** **-2 teams < winter ⇔ summer** **-4 seasons − 4 colours** **-the arena = a circle = the year** Digressive material -Oenomaus invented the chariots and was murdered by Pelops -Error of worship of the sun rectified by Christ: races transferred from Rome to Constantinople and in honour of the emperors |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Three characters<br>1. Oenomaus<br>Incipit: *primus enim hoc*<br>Desinit: *Oenomaus fertur edidisse*<br><br>-invention of races | Three characters<br>1. Circe<br>Incipit: *ἡ γὰρ δὴ προρρηθεῖσα Κίρκη*<br>Desinit: *γὰρ εἶναι νομίζεται.*<br><br>-first hippodrome in Italy<br>**-Image of the universe:**<br>**--Euripus = the sea**<br>**--pyramid = the sun**<br>**--three altars**<br>**--two tripods**<br>**--statue of a woman = the earth carrying the sea**<br>**--12 barriers = zodiac**<br>-digression *mappa* and Consuls<br>**-Image of the universe:**<br>**--7 laps = planetary orbits**<br>**--24 prizes = 12 angles of the pyramid x 2 = 24 hours of day and night** | Three characters<br>1. Enyalius<br>Incipit: *Τὸν δὲ ἱππικὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦτον*<br>Desinit: *τόποις ἐπετέλεσαν.*<br><br>-2-horse-chariots<br>Source: Callimachus of Cyrene | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Three characters<br>2. Romulus<br>Incipit: *quod post Romulus*<br>Desinit: *ostentavit Italiae.*<br><br>-races in Italy | Three characters<br>2. Romulus<br>Incipit: κατὰ γοῦν μίμησιν<br>Desinit: ἢ μᾶλλον τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος.<br><br>-imitation of Circe<br>-three colours of chariots (red, white and green) = three gods (Ares, Zeus and Aphrodite) = three elements (fire, air and earth)<br>-Addition of colour by the Galli; blue in honour of Poseidon | Three characters<br>2. Erychthonius<br>Incipit: Ὁ δὲ Οἰνόμαος πρῶτος<br>Desinit: τῆς μεγάλης ἄρκτου.<br><br>-4-horse-chariots<br>**-Image of the universe**<br>**--12 opening stalls = zodiac**<br>**--race track = the earth**<br>**--spina = sea**<br>**--two curves = East and West**<br>**--7 lanes = seven stars of the Great Bear**<br>**Source: Charax** | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Three characters<br>3. Augustus<br>Incipit: *Sed mundi dominus*<br>Desinit: *matribus aptaverunt.*<br><br>**-Image of the universe:**<br>**--opening stalls = 12 = zodiac**<br>**--4 colours = 4 seasons**<br>**-- zodiac = year**<br>**---2-horse-chariots = moon**<br>**--4-horse-chariots = sun**<br>**--separate horses = morning star**<br>**--7 circuits = 7 days**<br>**--axes = rising/east and setting/west**<br>**--spina =sea**<br>**--obelisks dedicated to sun and moon**<br>-digression *mappa* and Nero<br>-etymology circus: *circu-ensis*<br>**-Image of the universe:**<br>**--24 heats = 24 hours of day and night**<br>-breaking of eggs (Dioscuri) | Three characters<br>3. Sept. Severus<br>Incipit: χρόνοις δὲ ὕστερον ἱκανοῖς<br>Desinit: ἐξ ὧν καὶ βιγάριοι.<br><br>-references to Dioscuri, brothers | Three characters<br>3. Romulus<br>Incipit: Ὁ δὲ Ῥῶμος βασιλεὺς<br>Desinit: τῷ αὐτῷ κανόνι ἐχρήσαντο.<br><br>-institution of races in honour of the sun and the four elements subjected to it<br>-four elements (= earth, water, fire and air) = four colours (= Prasinos, Benetos, Rousios, Albos) = four factions (Greens, Blues, Reds and Whites)<br>-etymology green faction <prasinon praisenteuein,<br>-etymology blue faction veneton <region of Venetia, with the capital city of Aquileia providing the blue dye<br>-Four factions team up in two parts; white and green, red and blue<br>-notion of civil strife<br>-fratricide | |

TERTULLIAN AND THE ANTIQUARIAN HISTORIES OF THE HIPPODROME

| Ch. Tert. | Description – analysis – *material of erudition* – **sources mentioned** | Parallel passages |
|---|---|---|
| V | 1) The origins of the public spectacles<br>-**Timaeus**: *Lydians under Tyrrhenus settle in Etruria and introduce the games, taken over by the Romans, etymology: ludii < Lydians*<br>-**Varro**: *Etymology: ludii < ludus*<br>-*First games Liberalia in honour of Liber, Bacchus, for invention of wine.*<br>-*Next Consualia held in honour of Neptune Consus.*<br>-*Third games Ecurria instituted by Romulus in honour of Mars, etymology Ecurria <equi*<br>-*Or Romulus instituted Consualia from a good counsel, negative description of Romulus: Sabine women, fratricide.*<br>-*Altar of Consus in the circus, inscription and rites.*<br>-**Piso**: *Romulus instituted Tarpeian and Capitoline games in honour of Jupiter Feretrius.*<br>-*Later games by Numa Pompilius, Tullus Hostilius, Ancus Martius and others,* sources are **Suetonius and Suetonius' sources**. | John Lydus, *Ost.* 3 (Bandy 3)<br>*Tarchon taught by Tyrrhenus the Lydian.*<br>John Lydus, *Magistr.* Intr. = *Mens.* I.37<br>*The Lydian Tyrrhenus taught the rites of the Lydians to the Etruscans.*<br>John Lydus, *Magistr.* I.30<br>*Poseidon Consus, etymology consilia condere, races at the hippodrome called consualia because of connection with Poseidon Hippios.*<br>John Malalas, *Chron.* VII.3<br>Romus held an annual festival in honour of Ares, called *on the field of Mars* and observed until today. |
| VI | 2) The names of the public spectacles<br>-*Names of games originated with the gods they honour: the Great Mother, Apollo, Neptune, Jupiter Latiaris and Flora.*<br>-*Two types of games; games in honour of the gods and games in honour of the dead, all equally idolatrous.* | |
| VII | 3) The apparel and cultic features of the games<br>-*Explanation of the word pompus.*<br>The pomp of the circus is offending to God. | |

| VIII | 4) The locations of the games<br>*-The circus is dedicated to the Sun.*<br>*-The first circus games were held by Circe in honour of her father the Sun, etymology circus <Circe.*<br>*-Pagan ornaments in the circus: eggs in honour of Castor and Pollux, dolphins in honour of Neptune, Sessia, Messia and Tutulina on the columns, three altars of Samothracian gods, Egyptian obelisk in honour of the Sun with inscription* **Hermateles***, the great mother, Consus, Murcia.*<br>-The Christian does not commit a sin by going into places with idols, only by participating in the idolatrous practices being held in these places. | John Malalas, *Chron*. IV.11<br>*Victory in contest of Pelops the Lydian over Oenomaus the Pisaean, celebration of this victory during the festival of the Sun,* sources **Philochoros and Charax**.<br>John Malalas, *Chron*. VII.4<br>*Romus instituted races during festival of the Sun and four elements subordinate to it, similar contest organised by Oenomaus in honour of the Sun, Demeter and Poseidon.*<br>John Malalas, *Chron*. VII.5<br>*Romus' institution of races in honour of the sun and the four elements subjected to it.*<br>John Lydus, *Mens*. I.12 (Bandy I.6)<br>*Circe invented the equestrian races in honour of her father, etymology circus <Circe, hippodrome of Circe: euripus and pyramid refer to the Sun.*<br>Cassiodorus, *Var*. III.51.6-7<br>*Four-horse chariot in imitation of the sun.*<br>Corippus, *In laudem Iustini*, I.314, 338-339<br>*The races were held in honour of the Sun.*<br>Cassiodorus, *Var*. III.51.8<br>*Dolphins refer to the sea. Obelisks refer to the sun and the moon and are marked with Chaldean signs as if letters.*<br>Cassiodorus, *Var*. III.51.10<br>*Superstitious belief behind the breaking of eggs, natural explanation: birds.* |

| IX | 5) The arts displayed in the circus: art of horse racing<br>-Equestrian skill is no idolatry unless it be practiced in the circus.<br>**-Stesichorus**: *horses assigned to Castor and Pollux by Mercury.*<br>*-Neptune associated to horses through epithet Hippios.*<br>*-Four-horse chariot is consecrated to the sun, the two-horse chariot to the moon.*<br>*-Erichthonius invented the four-horse chariot.*<br>*-Trochilus invented the two-horse chariot and dedicated it to Juno.*<br>*-Romulus was the first to introduce the four-horse chariot in Rome, as an idol called Quirinus.*<br>*-First there were two colours; white dedicated to winter, red dedicated to summer.*<br>*-Afterwards four colours were introduced for the sake of idolatry: red dedicated to Mars, white dedicated to the Zephyrs, green dedicated to Mother Earth of spring, blue dedicated to the Sky, the Sea or Autumn.* | John Lydus, *Magistr*. I.30<br>*Poseidon Hippios.*<br>(see above)<br>Cassiodorus, *Var*. III.51.6-7<br>*Two-horse chariot in imitation of the moon.*<br>*Four-horse chariot in imitation of the sun.*<br>(see above)<br>John Malalas, *Chron*. VII.4<br>*Erichthonius invented races with four-horse-chariots.*<br>Cassiodorus, *Var*. III.51.3<br>*Romulus introduced the races in Rome.*<br>John Malalas *Chron*. VII.4<br>*Romus instituted races during festival of the Sun and four elements subordinate to it (= earth, water, fire and air). Similar contest organised by Oenomaus in honour of the Sun, , scientific interpretation elements, two colours = two elements (earth and water) = two gods (Demeter and Poseidon) = two regional factions.*<br>John Malalas, *Chron*. VII.5<br>*Romus' institution of races in honour of the sun and the four elements subjected to it, four elements (= earth, water, fire and air) = four colours (= Prasinos, Benetos, Rousios, Albos) = four factions (Greens, Blues, Reds and Whites), etymology green faction <prasinon praisenteuein, etymology blue faction veneton <region of Venetia, with the capital city of Aquileia providing the blue dye. Four factions team up in two parts; white and green, red and blue.*<br>John Lydus, *Mens*. I.12 (Bandy I.6)<br>*Races by Oenomaus: two colours (green and blue) = two elements (earth and water) = two factions (mainland faction and coastal faction). Races by Romulus: three colours of chariots (red, white and green) = three gods (Ares, Zeus and Aphrodite) = three elements (fire, air and earth). Addition of colour by the Galli; blue in honour of Poseidon.*<br>John Lydus, *Mens*. IV.30 (Bandy II.12-13)<br>*Three obeli/factions (reds, whites and greens) = three gods (Ares, Zeus and Aphrodite). Addition of fourth faction by the Galli etymology veneti. Four elements = four factions/contests = four colours = four gods = four seasons = parts of the world.*<br>Corippus, *In Laudem Iustini*, I.315-333<br>*Four horses = four seasons = four charioteers = four colours. Two teams < winter versus summer. Four seasons = four colours.* |

| X | 5) The arts displayed in the circus: stage plays<br>*-Same origin and name (ludi) as equestrian games, performed next to equestrian games, description of apparel.*<br>*-Places of the stage plays: shrine of Venus, theatres often destroyed by the censors =* precursor to Christian morale.<br>*-Pompey the great: temple of Venus as a cover-up for his theatre.*<br>*-Venus and Bacchus patrons of the stage arts; Liberalia dedicated to and instituted by Liber.*<br>*-Arts with gesture and posture depend on Venus and Bacchus, arts with voice, song, instrument and book depend on Apollo, the Muses, Minerva and Mercury.*<br>-Practitioners and inventors of arts are human yet are worshipped as gods, which is idolatry.<br>-Arts invented by demons to turn mankind away from God. | Cassiodorus, *Var.* IV.51.12<br>*Pompey the great called great because of his theatre.*<br>Cassiodorus, *Var.* IV.51.8-10<br>*Description of the silent arts of mime and pantomime based on gestures, mime devised by the muse Polymnia.* |
| XI | 5) The arts displayed in the circus: stage plays<br>*-Their origin: in honour of the dead and the gods.*<br>*-Olympian or Capitoline games in honour of Jupiter, Nemean games in honour of Hercules, Isthmian games in honour of Neptune, Muses, Minerva, Apollo Mars.*<br>*-Gymnastic acts originated with Castor, Hercules and Mercury.* | John Malalas, *Chron.* IV.20<br>*First Olympic games devised by the Pisaeans in honour of the Olympic Zeus, source* **Africanus.** |
| XII | 5) The arts displayed in the circus: animal and gladiatorial games<br>*-Names: munus and officium.*<br>*-Origin: sacrifice of slaves or captives at a funeral, later on training of the victims, later addition of animals.*<br>-Names tainted with idolatry.<br>-Apparel tainted with idolatry.<br>*-Place: the amphitheater patronized by Diana and Mars.* | Cassiodorus, *Var.* V.42.2-3<br>*Animal and gladiatorial games dedicated to Diana.*<br>Cassiodorus, *Var.* V.42.5<br>*Etymology amphitheater.* |

LYDUS' BIOGRAPHY OF JOHN OF CAPPADOCIA

Below is a schematic overview of Lydus' biography of John of Cappadocia (*Magistr.* III.57-72). Digressions in the narrative are marked by an indentation to the right.

*Magistr.* III.57-72 John of Cappadocia
    -*Magistr.* III.57 hailed from Mazaca
        -*Magistr.* III.57 digression: history of Mazaca
    -*Magistr.* III.57 his elevation to the prefecture
        -*Magistr*. III.57 satiric poem against the Cappadocians
    -*Magistr.* III.57 calamities of the Cappadocian: treatment of prisoners
        -*Magistr.* III.57 comparison with Phalaris
        -*Magistr.* III.57 example: his victim Antiochus
    -*Magistr.* III.58 the minions of the Cappadocian
        -*Magistr.* III.58 comparison with Briareus and Alastor
        -*Magistr.* III.58 example of his minions: John Maxilloplumbacius
            -*Magistr.* III.58 comparison with Cerberus
            -*Magistr.* III.58 his ravaging of Philadelphia
                -*Magistr.* III.58 quote of Euripides on the gold of the Lydians
            -*Magistr.* III.58 comparison with Phalaris, Busiris and Sardanapalus
            -*Magistr.* III.59 crimes committed for money
                -*Magistr.* III.59 example: his victim Petronius
            -*Magistr.* III.59 comparison with a Cyclops
                -*Magistr.* III.59 Latin translation of steading, *stabulum*
                -*Magistr.* III.59 quote of unknown poet
            -*Magistr.* III.59 comparison with Alastor
            -*Magistr.* III.59 comparison with Salmoneus
            -*Magistr.* III.59 comparison with a Cyclops
                -*Magistr.* III.59 explanation Latin *sportulae*
            -*Magistr.* III.60 comparison with Cerberus
            -*Magistr.* III.60 acts of bloodthirstiness
                -*Magistr.* III.60 example: his victim Proclus
            -*Magistr.* III.61 his ravaging of Lydia
            -*Magistr.* III.61 comparison with a Laestrygonian
            -*Magistr.* III.61 quote of Lycophron
            -*Magistr.* III.61 his ravaging of Asia Minor
                -*Magistr.* III.61 paraphrase of a law
                    -*Magistr.* III.61 explanation Latin *veredi*: reference *On the months*
    -*Magistr.* III.61 comparison to Niobe
    -*Magistr.* III.62 his usurpation and factitiousness: the Greens
    -*Magistr.* III.62 his nepotism
    -*Magistr.* III.62 his outrageous life: sex, alcohol, gluttony
        -*Magistr.* III.62 translated quote from Juvenal
        -*Magistr.* III.63 digression on the sturgeon

-*Magistr.* III.63 references: Athenaeus, Aristotle, all he naturalists, Aristophanes of Byzantium "*Compendium of the Physical Properties of Fishes*"

-*Magistr.* III.63 Greek name *elops*, Latin name *aquipenser*

-*Magistr.* III.63 references: Cornelius Nepos, Laberius[8]

-*Magistr.* III.63 introduction of the sturgeon by Optatus

-*Magistr.* III.64 his outrageous life: sex

-*Magistr.* III.64 quote from Euripides

-*Magistr.* III.64 digression on the garment *sandyx*

-*Magistr.* III.64 Lydian origin: production of gold-woven clothing

-*Magistr.* III.64 testimony of Peisander

-*Magistr.* III.64 myth of Omphale and Hercules, nickname of Hercules *Sandon*

-*Magistr.* III.64 testimony of Apuleius "*Eroticus*", Suetonius "*On Famous Courtesans*"

-*Magistr.* III.65 outrageous life: sex, alcohol, gluttony

-*Magistr.* III.65 Temple of Justice called *Secretum* in Latin

-*Magistr.* III.66 the impact on the magistracy: decline

-*Magistr.* III.66 explanation of the Latin term *matricularius*

-*Magistr.* III.66 personal assertion of John Lydus

-*Magistr.* III.67 the decline of the *probatoriae*

-*Magistr.* III.67 reference to Hesiod

-*Magistr.* III.67 personal assertion of John Lydus

-*Magistr.* III.68 the fate of Latin in the magistracy

-*Magistr.* III.68 reference to law on Latin

-*Magistr.* III.68 translation of Latin *tractatores*

-*Magistr.* III.68 neglect of documents

-*Magistr.* III.68 translation of Latin *cottidiana*

-*Magistr.* III.69 his misconduct noticed through divine intervention, Theodora and Justinian

-*Magistr.* III.69 quote unknown poet

-*Magistr.* III.70 the desolation of the taxpayers resulted from his policies

-*Magistr.* III.70 lists of types of taxes

-*Magistr.* III.70 the Nika-revolt[9] resulted with the disappearance of the Cappadocian

-*Magistr.* III.70 catalogue of buildings burned during the riots

-*Magistr.* III.70 explanation of the Latin term *senatus*

-*Magistr.* III.70 origin of the name *Zeuxippus*

-*Magistr.* III.70 testimony of Castor "*Epitome of Annals*"

-*Magistr.* III.70 origin of the name *Severeum*

-*Magistr.* III.70 construction history of Constantine's colonnades

-*Magistr.* III.70 comparison of the destruction to Lipari or Vesuvius

[Lacuna]

---

[8] On Laberius, see Schamp (2006a: cxxxv).
[9] Schamp (2006c: cli-clxx).

-*Magistr.* III.71-2 restoration and end of the Cappadocian's first term in office

# *Bibliography*

NOTE: THE TEXT EDITIONS USED IN THIS DISSERTATION

Of the texts under scrutiny, the oeuvre of John Lydus has endured the most problematic textual transmission. His *De Magistratibus*[1] was edited satisfactory by A.C. Bandy in 1983 and, later on, by M. Dubuisson and J. Schamp in 2006. In this dissertation, I use the Greek text of the latter edition, while reverting for translated excerpts to the English translation of the former with my own interventions indicated in the notes. The textual transmission of Lydus' *De Mensibus*,[2] and, to a lesser extent, *De Ostentis*[3] is notoriously difficult. In anticipation of the new edition of the former treatise, which is being prepared by E. Zingg in Leuven, I revert to the edition of Wünsch, published in 1898, which remains, if flawed, the best option currently available.[4] For the Greek text of *De Ostentis*, I use the second edition of Wachsmuth (1897).[5] As regards translations of the two treatises, I opt to use the translations of the posthumously published editions by Bandy.[6] As these editions are problematic in themselves, the translations used were subjected to scrutiny and, if necessary, adjusted - which is again indicated in the footnotes. As Bandy used a different numbering of the paragraphs in his editions of *De Ostentis* and *De Mensibus*, I shall indicate the paragraphs of these treatises with the numbering of Wünsch and Wachsmuth, with an indication of the paragraph number in Bandy. A concordance of these editions can be found in the appendices to this dissertation.

A recent and monumental edition with Italian translation and commentary on Cassiodorus' *Variae* has been achieved by A. Giardina and his team.[7] I used this edition for quoting the Latin text, or, when this edition was not yet accessible, I used the edition of Fridh and Halporn (1973). In anticipation of the English translation which is being prepared by M.S. Bjornlie, I used the translation of selections from

---

[1] Schamp (2006a: cxix-cxxxiii).
[2] Schamp (2006a: lxxxiv-xcix). For an overview of all textual problems surrounding the *De Mensibus* see Schamp (2006a: lxxxiv-xcix).
[3] Schamp (2006a: xcix-cxv).
[4] Schamp (2006a: xciii).
[5] Schamp (2006a: ci).
[6] Bandy (2013a, 2013b).
[7] Giardina (2014a, 2014b, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c).

the *Variae*, published by Barnish in 1992. For the *Variae* which were not translated by Barnish, I made my own translation.

In spite of some of its shortcomings, I use the edition of H. Thurn, posthumously published in 2000, for the text of Malalas' *Chronographia*.[8] The translation of Malalas' work by Jeffreys and her team (1986) is used in this dissertation with my own adaptations where necessary.

---

[8] Meier, Radtki and Schultz (2016: 10).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, A. (1935) Suidae Lexicon: Pars IV Π - Ψ (Lexicographi Graeci recogniti et apparatu critico instructi, 1). Leipzig.

Adler, W. (2017) 'From Adam to Abraham: Malalas and Euhemeristic Historiography'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Quellenfragen, ed. L. Carrara - M. Meier - C. Radtki-Jansen (Malalas Studien, 2). Stuttgart: 27-47.

Agusta-Boularot, S. (2006) 'Malalas épigraphiste ? Nature et fonction des citations épigraphiques dans la *Chronique*'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas II, ed. S. Agusta-Boularot - J. Beaucamp - A.M. Bernardi - E. Caire (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 24). Paris: 97-135.

Albrecht, K. - Schultheiss, D. (2004) 'Proof of paternity: historical reflections on an andrological-forensic challenge'. Andrologia 36: 31-37.

Alchermes, J. (1994), 'Spolia in Roman Cities of the Late Empire: Legislative Rationales and Architectural Reuse', Dumbarton Oaks Papers 48: 203-229.

Alexander, J.C. (2003) The Meanings of Social Life: A Cultural Sociology. New York.

_____ (2004) 'Towards a Theory of Cultural Trauma'. In: Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity, ed. J.C. Alexander - R. Eyerman - B. Giesen - N.J. Smelser - P. Sztompka. Berkeley - Los Angeles - London: 1-30.

_____ (2012) Trauma: A Social Theory. Cambridge.

Alto Bauer, F. (2007) 'Virtuelle Statuensammlungen'. In: Statuen in der Spätantike, ed. F. Alto Bauer – C. Witschel (Kunst im ersten Jahrtausend Reihe B: Studien und Perspektiven, 23). Wiesbaden: 79-109.

Alto Bauer, F. – Witschel, C. (2007) 'Statuen in der Spätantike'. In: Statuen in der Spätantike, ed. F. Alto Bauer – C. Witschel (Kunst im ersten Jahrtausend Reihe B: Studien und Perspektiven, 23). Wiesbaden: 1-24.

Ando, C. (2001) 'The Palladium and the Pentateuch : Towards a Sacred Topography of the Later Roman Empire'. Phoenix 55: 369-410.

_____ (2015) 'Mythistory: The Pre-Roman Past in Latin Late Antiquity'. In: Antike Mythologie in Christlichen Kontexten der Spätantike, ed. H. Leppin (Millenium-Studien, 54). Berlin: 205-218.

Angelucci, M.C. (2011) 'Polemon's contribution to the periegetic literature of the II century B.C.'. Ormos 3: 326–341.

Antonopoulos, P. (1985) 'Peter Patricius: Some Aspects of his Life and Career'. In: From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium: Proceedings of the Byzantinological Symposium in the 16th International Eirene Conference, ed. V. Vavrinek. Prague: 49-53.

_____ (1990) Πέτρος Πατρίκιος: Ὁ βυζαντινός διπλωμάτης, ἀξιοματοῦχος καί συγγραφέας (Ἱστορικές Μονογραφίες, 7). Athens.

Arena, P. (2010) Feste e rituali a Roma: Il principe incontra il popolo nel Circo Massima. Bari.

Arjava, A. (1996) Women and Law in Late Antiquity. Oxford.

Austin, J.N. (1983) 'Autobiography and History: Some Later Historians and their Veracity'. In: History and Historians in Late Antiquity, ed. B. Croke - A.M. Emmett. Sydney: 54-65.

Avery, W. T. (1940) 'The "Adoratio Purpurae" and the Importance of the Imperial Purple in the Fourth Century of the Christian Era'. Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 17: 66-80.

Baldwin, B. (1976) 'Vergilius Graecus'. The American Journal of Philology 97: 361-368.

_____ (1982) 'Vergil in Byzantium'. Antike und Abendland : Beiträge zum Verständnis der Griechen und Römer und ihres Nachlebens 28: 81-93.

_____ (1985) 'Latin in Byzantium'. In: From Late Antiquity to early Byzantium: Proceedings of the Byzantinological Symposium in the 16th International Eirene Conference, ed. V. Vavrinek. Prague: 237-241.

_____ (1995) 'John Lydus in Latin on Augustus'. Byzantion 65: 527-528.

Ballaira, G. (1989) Prisciano e i suoi amici. Torino.

Bandt, C. (2007) Der Traktat "Vom Mysterium der Buchstaben": Kritischer Tekst mit Einführung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen von Cordula Bandt (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 162). Berlin.

Bandy, A.C. (1983) Ioannes Lydus On Powers or The Magistracies of the Roman State (The American Philosophical Society: Memoirs Series, 149). Philadelphia.

_____ (2013a) (ed.) Ioannes Lydus On the Months (De Mensibus). Lewiston.

_____ (2013b) (ed.) Ioannes Lydus On Celestial Signs (De Ostentis). Lewiston.

Banchich, T.M. (2015) The Lost History of Peter the Patrician. An Account of Rome's Imperial Past from the Age of Justinian. London.

Baratin, M. (2005) 'Priscianus Caesariensis (5./6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.)'. In: Lateinische Lehrer Europas. Fünfzehn Portraits von Varro bis Erasmus von Rotterdam ed. W. Ax. Cologne, Weimar and Vienna: 247-272.

_____ (2009) 'Priscian'. In: Lexicon Grammaticorum: A bio-bibliographical companion to the history of linguistics, ed. H. Stammerjohann. Place: 1214-1217.

Barnish, S.J.B. (1984) 'The genre and composition of Cassiodorus' "Gothic History"'. Latomus 43: 336-361.

_____ (1988) 'Transformation and Survival in the Western Senatorial Aristocracy, C. A. D. 400-700'. Papers of the British School at Rome 56: 120-155.

_____ (1992) Selected Variae of Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator: The Right Honorable and Illustrious Ex-Quaestor of the Palace, Ex-Ordinary Consul, Ex-Master of the Offices, Praetorian Prefect and Patrician Being Documents of the Kingdom of the Ostrogoths in Italy, Chosen to Illustrate the Life of the Author and the History of his Family (Translated Texts for Historians, 12). Liverpool.

_____ (2001) 'Sacred Texts of the Secular: Writing, Hearing, and Reading Cassiodorus' Variae'. Studia Patristica 38: 362-70.

_____ (2008) 'Roman Responses to An Unstable World: Cassiodorus' Variae in Context.'. In: Vivarium in context, ed. S.J.B. Barnish. Vicenza: 7-22.

Bassett, S. (2004) The Urban Image of Late Antique Constantinople. Cambridge.

_____ (2007) 'Ancient Statuary in Fourth-Century Constantinople: Subject, Style, and Function'. In: Statuen in der Spätantike, ed. F. Alto Bauer – C. Witschel (Kunst im ersten Jahrtausend Reihe B: Studien und Perspektiven, 23). Wiesbaden: 189-201.

Beaucamp, J. (1990) Le statut de la femme à Byzance (4e-7e siècle): I. Le droit impérial (Travaux et mémoires du centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance Collège de France Monographies, 5). Paris.

_____ (1992) Le statut de la femme à Byzance (4e-7e siècle): II. Les pratiques sociales (Travaux et mémoires du centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance Collège de France Monographies, 6). Paris.

_____ (2006) 'Le passé biblique et l'histoire juive : La version de Jean Malalas'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas II, ed. S. Agusta-Boularot - J. Beaucamp - A.M. Bernardi - E. Caire (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 24). Paris: 19-33.

Beaulieu, P. A. (1994) 'Antiquarianism and the Concern for the Past in the Neo-Babylonian Period'. Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies 28: 37-42.

_____ (2013) 'Mesopotamian Antiquarianism from Sumer to Babylon'. In: World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives, ed. A. Schnapp – L. von Falkenhausen – P. Miller – T. Murray. Los Angeles: 121-139.

Beckby, H. (1958) Anthologia Graeca: Buch IX-XI. München.

Becker, E.-M. - Dochhorn, J. - Holt, K. (2014) (ed.) Trauma and Traumatization in Individual and Collective Dimensions: Insights from Biblical Studies and Beyond (Studia Aarhusiana Neotestamentica, 2). Göttingen.

Beke, W. (1945) La spiritualité chez les démocrates-chrétiens de l'Orient médieval. Leopoldsburg.

Bell, P.N. (2009) Three Political Voices from the Age of Justinian: Agapetus, *Advice to the Emperor*, *Dialogue on Political Science*, Paul the Silentiary, *Description of Hagia Sophia* Translated with an introduction and notes by Peter N. Bell (Translated Texts for Historians, 52). Liverpool.

_____ (2013) Social Conflict in the Age of Justinian: Its Nature, Management, and Mediation. Oxford.

Bernardi, A.-M. (2004) 'Les *mystikoi* dans la chronique de Jean Malalas'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas I, ed. J. Beaucamp - S. Agusta-Boularot - A.M. Bernardi - B. Cabouret - E. Caire (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 15). Paris: 53-64.

_____ (2006) 'Regards croisés sur les origines de Rome : La fête des Brumalia chez Jean Malalas et Jean Lydos'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas II (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, Monographies 24)., ed. S. Agusta-Boularot, J. Beaucamp, A.-M. Bernardi, E. Caire. Paris: 53-67.

Bernardi, A.-M. - Caire, E. (2016) 'John Malalas: from computation to narration'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Autor - Werk - Überlieferung, ed. M. Meier - C. Radtki - F. Schulz (Malalas Studien: Schriften zur Chronik des Johannes Malalas, 1). Göttingen: 119-136.

Berthelot, K. (2004) 'La chronique de Malalas et les traditions juives'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas I, ed. J. Beaucamp - S. Agusta-Boularot - A.M. Bernardi - B. Cabouret - E. Caire (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 15). Paris: 37-51.

Bidez, J. (1908) La tradition manuscrite de Sozomène et la Tripartite de Théodore le Lecteur. Leipzig.

Bieter, F.A. (1938) The Syntax of the cases and prepositions in Cassiodorus' Historia Ecclesiastica Tripertita. Washington.

Birks, P. - McLeod, G. (1987) Justinian's Institutes: Translated with an introduction by Peter Birks and Grant McLeod. With the Latin text of Paul Krueger. Eastbourne.

Bjornlie, M.S. (2009) 'What have elephants to do with sixth-century politics? : a reappraisal of the « official » governmental dossier of Cassiodorus'. Journal of Late Antiquity 2: 143-171.

_____ (2013) Politics and Tradition between Rome, Ravenna and Constantinople: A Study of Cassiodorus and the Variae (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought Fourth Series, 89). Cambridge.

_____ (2016) 'Governmental Administration'. In: A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy, ed. J.J. Arnold - M.S. Bjornlie - K. Sessa (Brill's Companions to European History, 9). Leiden: 47-72.

_____ (2017) 'The Letter Collection of Cassiodorus'. In: Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide, ed. C. Sogno - B.K. Storin - E.J. Watts. Oakland (Ca.): 433-448.

Blume, F.H. (1952) Annotated Justinian Code: College of Law George William Hopper Law Library.

Boardman, J. (2002). The archaeology of nostalgia: how the Greeks re-created their mythical past. London.

Borsch, J. - Radtki-Jansen, C. (2017) 'Diplomaten und Anekdoten; Mündliche Quellen bei Malalas?'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Quellenfragen, ed. L. Carrara - M. Meier - C. Radtki-Jansen (Malalas Studien, 2). Stuttgart: 235-259.

Bowersock, G. (2009) 'Old and New Rome in the Late Antique Near East'. In: Transformations of Late Antiquity: Essays for Peter Brown, ed. P. Rousseau – M. Papoutsakis. Farnham: 37-49.

Bravo, B. (2007) 'Antiquarianism and History'. In: A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography, ed. J. Marincola. Volume One. Malden, MA: 515-527.

_____ (2009) La chronique d'Apollodore et le Pseudo-Skymnos: Erudition antiquaire et littérature géographique dans la seconde moitié du IIe siècle av. J.-C.. Leuven – Paris – Walpole.

Brenk, B. (1987) 'Spolia from Constantine to Charlemagne: Aesthetics versus Ideology', Dumbarton Oaks Papers 41, Studies on Art and Archeology in Honor of Ernst Kitzinger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday: 103-109.

Briquel, D. (1990) L'origine lydienne des Étrusques: Histoire de la doctrine dans l'Antiquité. (Publications de l'École française de Rome, 139). Rome.

Brittain, Ch. (2006) Cicero. On Academic Scepticism. Indianapolis.

Brown, P. (1978) The Making of Late Antiquity. Cambridge (Mass.)

Burgess, R.W. - Kulikowski, M. (2012) The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century BC to the Sixth Century AD Volume I: A Historical Introduction to the Chronicle Genre from its Origins to the High Middle Ages. Turnhout.

_____ (2016) 'The Historiographical Position of John Malalas. Genre in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine Middle Ages'. In: Die

Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Autor - Werk - Überlieferung, ed. M. Meier - C. Radtki - F. Schulz (Malalas Studien: Schriften zur Chronik des Johannes Malalas, 1). Göttingen: 93-117.

Bury, J.B. (1923) History of the later Roman empire from the death of Theodosius I. to the death of Justinian (A. D. 395 to A. D. 565). London.

Cabouret, B. (2006) 'La fondation de cités du IIe au IVe siècle (des Antonins à Théodose) d'après la *Chronique* de Malalas'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas II, ed. S. Agusta-Boularot - J. Beaucamp - A.M. Bernardi - E. Caire (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 24). Paris: 173-185.

Cadden, J. (2013) 'The Organisation of Knowledge: Disciplines and Practices'. In: The Cambridge History of Science: Volume 2 Medieval Science, ed. D.C. Lindberg - M.H. Shank. New York: 240-267.

Caimi, J. (1984) Burocrazia e diritto nel *De Magistratibus* di Giovanni Lido (Università di Genova Fondazione Nobile Agostino Poggi, 16). Milan.

Caire, E. (2004) 'Le *diamérismos* selon Jean Malalas'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas I, ed. J. Beaucamp - S. Agusta-Boularot - A.M. Bernardi - B. Cabouret - E. Caire (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 15). Paris: 19-36.

_____ (2006) 'La chronologie de l'histoire grecque jusqu'à Alexandre dans la *Chronique* de Malalas'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas II, ed. S. Agusta-Boularot - J. Beaucamp - A.M. Bernardi - E. Caire (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 24). Paris: 35-51.

Cameron, Al. (1965) 'Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt'. Historia 14: 470-509.

_____ (1969) 'The last days of the Academy at Athens'. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society 15: 7-29.

_____ (1974) 'The Date of Priscian's "De laude Anastasii"'. Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 15.3: 313-316.

_____ (1976a) Circus factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium. Oxford.

_____ (1977) 'Some Prefects Called Julian'. Byzantion Revue Internationale des Études Byzantines 67: 42-64.

_____ (1978) 'The House of Anastasius'. Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 19: 259-276.

Cameron, Av. (1976b) Flavius Cresconius Corippus: In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris libri IV. London.

Cameron, Av. – Cameron, Al. (1966) 'The Cycle of Agathias'. The Journal of Hellenic Studies 86: 6-25.

Carney, T.F. (1971a) Bureaucracy in Traditional Society: Romano-Byzantine Bureaucracies Viewed from Within. Book One: A Survey of Roman and Byzantine Bureaucracies. Lawrence (Ks.).

_____ (1971b) Bureaucracy in Traditional Society: Romano-Byzantine Bureaucracies Viewed from Within. Book Two: Byzantine Bureaucracy from Within. Lawrence (Ks.).

Carrara, L. - Gengler, O. (2017) 'Zu den Quellen der Chronic des Johannes Malalas: Eine Einleitung'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Quellenfragen, ed. L. Carrara - M. Meier - C. Radtki-Jansen (Malalas Studien, 2). Stuttgart: 9-24.

Chantraine, H. (1992) 'Konstantinopel : vom Zweiten Rom zum Neuen Rom'. Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht : Zeitschrift des Verbandes der Geschichtslehrer Deutschlands 43: 3-15.

Chastagnol, A. (1960) La prefecture urbaine à Rome sous le bas-empire. Paris.

Chauvot, A. (1986) Procope de Gaza, Priscien de Césarée : Panégyriques de l'empereur Anastase Ier (Antiquitas. Abhandlungen zur Alten Geschichte, 35). Bonn.

Christensen, A.S. (2002) Cassiodorus, Jordanes and the History of the Goth: Studies in a migration myth. Copenhagen.

Cilliers, L. (2004) 'Vindicianus' *Gynaecia* and Theories on Generation and Embryology from the Babylonians up to Graeco-Roman Times'. In: Magic and Rationality in Ancient Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman Medicine, ed. H.F.J. Horstmanshoff - S. Stol (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 27). Leiden: 343-369.

Clarke, M.L. (1971) Higher education in the ancient world. London.

Coates-Stephens, R. (2007) 'The Reuse of Ancient Statuary in Late Antique Rome and the End of the Statue Habit'. In: Statuen in der Spätantike, ed. F. Alto Bauer – C. Witschel (Kunst im ersten Jahrtausend Reihe B: Studien und Perspektiven, 23). Wiesbaden: 171-187.

Condorelli, A. (2007) 'Ulisse e David : qualche osservazione su Cassiodoro, Var. 2, 40'. Wiener Studien 120: 179-190.

Cooperson, M. (2013) 'Early Abbasid Antiquarianism : Al-Ma'mun and the Pyramid of Cheops'. In: World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives, ed. A. Schnapp – L. von Falkenhausen – P. Miller – T. Murray. Los Angeles: 201-211.

Copeland, R. – Sluiter, I. (2009) (ed.) Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language, Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300-1475. Oxford.

Cornell, T.J. (1995) The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (Routledge History of the Ancient World). London – New York.

Cornell, T.J. – Bispham, E. (2013) (ed.) The fragments of the Roman historians. Oxford.

Courcelle, P. (1943) Les lettres Grecques en Occident: De Macrobe à Cassiodore. Paris.

Coyne, P. (1991) Priscian of Caesarea's *De laude Anastasii imperatoris*: Translated with Commentary and Introduction by Patricia Coyne (Studies in Classics, 1). Lewiston.

Cracco Ruggini, L. (2008) 'Cassiodorus and the Practical Sciences'. In: Vivarium in context: Essays by Samuel J.B. Barnish, Lellia Cracco Ruggini, Luciana Cuppo, Ronals Marchese and Marlene Breu, ed. J.B. Barnish. Vicenza: 23-53.

Cribiore, R. (1999) 'Greek and Coptic education in late antique Egypt'. Ägypten und Nubien in spätantiker und christlicher Zeit 2: 279-286.

_____ (2001) Gymnastics of the mind: Greek education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. Princeton.

_____ (2007) 'Higher Education in Early Byzantine Egypt: Rhetoric, Latin and the Law'. In: Egypt in the Byzantine World, ed. R.S. Bagnall. Cambridge: 47-66.

Croke, B. (1983) 'A.D. 476: The Manufacture of a Turning Point'. Chiron Mitteilungen der Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 13: 81-119.

_____ (1987) 'Cassiodorus and the Getica of Jordanes'. Classical Philology 82: 117-134.

_____ (1990) 'Malalas, the Man and his Work'. In: Studies in John Malalas (Byzantina Australiensia, 6). Ed. E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, R. Scott. Sydney: 1-25.

_____ (2005) 'Justinian's Constantinople'. In: The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian, ed. M. Maas. Cambridge: 60-86.

Crow, J. (2012) 'Water and Late Antique Constantinople'. In: Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity, ed. L. Grig – G. Kelly (Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity). Oxford: 117-135.

Dagron, G. (1974) Naissance d'une capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451 (Bibliothèque Byzantine publiée sous la direction de Paul Lemerle Etudes, 7). Paris.

_____ (1984) Constantinople imaginaire: Etudes sur le recueil des Patria (Bibliothèque Byzantine publiée sous la direction de Paul Lemerle Etudes, 8). Paris.

Daube, D. (1966-1967) 'The marriage of Justinian and Theodora. Legal and theological reflections'. Catholic University Law Review 16: 380-399.

de Boor, C. (1883) Theophanis Chronographia: Volumen I Textum Graecum continens. Leipzig.

Debuisson, M. (1991) 'Jean le Lydien et les forms de pouvoir personnel à Rome'. Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz 2: 55-72.

Delancenserie, E. (2016) L' "Histoire ecclésiastique" de Socrate de Constantinople: Banque de données et autorité historiographiques pour la création d'oeuvres originales au VIe s. (Théodore le Lecteur, Cassiodore, la première version arménienne). Gent.

Dey, H. (2014) 'Urban Armatures, Urban Vignettes: The Interpermeation of the Reality and the Ideal of the Late Antique Metropolis'. In: Using Images in Late Antiquity, ed. S. Birk – T. Kristensen – B. Poulsen. Oxford: 190-208.

Dickey, E. (2012) The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana: Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephani, and Stephani (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, 49). Cambridge and New York.

Di Donato, R. (2007) 'Arnaldo Momigliano from Antiquarianism to Cultural History: Some Reasons for a Quest'. In: Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundation of the Modern Cultural Sciences, ed. P. Miller. Toronto: 66-96.

Di Marco, M. (1993) 'Note sulla simbologia dei numeri nel De Anima di Cassiodoro'. In: Cassiodoro: Dalla corte di Ravenna al Vivarium di Squillace. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Squillace, 25–27 ottobre 1990, ed. S. Leanza. Messina: 199-212.

Diefenbach, S. (2007) Römische Erinnerungsräume: Heiligenmemoria und kollektive Identitäten im Rom des 3. bis 5. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. (Millennium-Studien zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr., 11). Berlin – New York.

Dillery, J. (2015) Clio's Other Son: Berossus and Manetho. With an afterword on Demetrius. Ann Arbor.

Dillon, J.M. (2007) 'The religion of the last Hellenes'. In: Rites et croyances dans les religions du monde romain, ed. J. Schneid (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 53). Geneva: 117-138.

Dindorf, L. (1831) Ioannis Malalae chronographia (Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae). Bonn.

_____ (1832) Chronicon paschale (Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae). Bonn.

Dmitriev, S. (2010) 'John Lydus and His Contemporaries on Identities and Cultures of Sixth-Century Byzantium'. Dumbarton Oaks Papers Journal 64: 27-42.

Domenici, I. (2007) 'Introduzione'. In: Giovanni Lido: Sui Segni celesti, ed. I. Domenici - E. Maderna (Collana Le Porpore, 29). Milano: 7-43.

Ekschmitt, W. (1984) Die Sieben Weltwunder: Ihre Erbauung, Zerstörung und Wiederentdeckung. Mainz am Rhein.

Edwards, C. (1996) Writing Rome: textual approaches to the city. Cambridge.

Eigler, U. (2007) 'Drei Städte - ein Kaiser : Trier, Rom und Konstantinopel'. Der altsprachliche Unterricht : Latein, Griechisch 50: 4-11.

El Daly, O. (2005) Egyptology: the Missing Millennium: Ancient Egypt in Mediaeval Arabic Writings. London.

Favro, D. (2006) 'The iconiCITY of ancient Rome'. Urban History 33 : 20-38.

Felmy, A. (1999) Die römische Republik im Geschichtsbild der Spätantike: Zum Umgang lateinischer Autoren des 4. und 5. Jh. n. Chr. mit den exempla maiorum. Berlin.

Flintoff, E. (1976) 'Varro in the works of John of Lydia'. In: Atti del congresso internazionale di studi Varroniani: Volume II, ed. Centro di studi Varroniani. Rieti: 365-377.

Focanti, L. (Forthcoming) 'Looking for an Identity: The patria and the Greek Cities in the Late Antique Roman Empire.' Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis/Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire xxxx: xx-xx.

Franciosi, E. (1998) Riforme istituzionali e funzioni giurisdizionali nelle Novelle di Giustiniano : studi su Nov. 13 e Nov. 80 (Seminario giuridico della Università di Bologna, 185). Milan.

Fridh, Å (1956) Terminologie et formules dans les Variae de Cassiodore: Études sur le développement du style administratif aux derniers siècles de l'antiquité (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, 2). Stockholm.

Fridh, Å - Halporn, J.W. (1973) Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Senatoris opera: Pars I Variarum libri XII, De Anima (Corpus Christianorum, 96). Turnhout.

Fuchs, F. (1926) Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter (Byzantinisches Archiv begründet von Karl Krumbacher als Ergänzung der Byzantinischen Zeitschrift in zwanglosen Heften herausgegeben von August Heisenberg, 8). Leipzig.

Gabotto, F. (1911) Storie della Italia Occidentale nel Medio Evo (395-1313). Torino.

Gallonier, A. (1996) 'Anecdoton Holderi ou Ordo generis Cassiodororum: Introduction, édition, traduction et commentaire'. Antiquité tardive 4: 299-312.

Garetius, J. (1865) Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Senatoris, viri patricii, consularis, et vivariensis abbatis opera omnia (Patrologia Latina Cursus Completus, 69). Paris.

Garstad, B. (2005) 'The Tyche Sacrifices in John Malalas: Virgin Sacrifice and Fourth-Century Polemical History'. Illinois Classical Studies 30: 83-135.

Gaudenzi, A. (1886) Sui rapporti tra l'Italia e l'impero d'Oriente fra gli anni 476-554. Bologna.

Gehn, U. - Ward-Perkins, B. (2016) 'Constantinople'. In: The Last Statues of Antiquity, ed. R. Smith - B. Ward-Perkins. Oxford: 136-144.

Geiger, J. (1999) 'Some Latin Authors from the Greek East'. The Classical Quarterly 49.2: 606-617.

Giardina, A. (1993) 'Cassiodoro politico e il progetto delle Variae'. In: Teoderico il Grande e i Goti d'Italia. Atti del XIII Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Milano 2–6 novembre 1992, Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo. Spoleto: 45-76.

_____ (2006) Cassiodoro politico (Saggi di storia antica, 27). Roma.

Giardina, A. - Cecconi, G.A. - Tantillo, I. (2014a) Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore Varie: Volume I Libri I-II. Rome.

_____ (2014b) Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore Varie: Volume II Libri III-V. Rome.

_____ (2015a) Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore Varie: Volume III Libri VI-VII. Rome.

_____ (2015b) Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore Varie: Volume IV Libri VIII-X. Rome.

_____ (2015c) Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore Varie: Volume V Libri XI-XII. Rome.

Gibbon, E. (1909-1914) The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. London.

Gillett, A. (1998) 'The Purpose of Cassiodorus' *Variae*'. In: After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History. Essays Presented to Walter Goffart, ed. A. Callander Murray. Toronto: 37–50.

_____ (2001) 'Rome, Ravenna and the Last Western Emperors'. Papers of the British School at Rome 69: 131-167.

Glover, T. R. (1953) Tertullian: Apology, De Spectaculis (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge (Mass.).

Glück, M. (1967) Priscians Partitiones und ihre Stellung in der spätantiken Schule. Mit einer Beilage: Commentarii in Prisciani Partitiones medio aevo compositi (Spudasmata, 12). Hildesheim.

Goossens, G. (1948) 'Les Recherches historiques à l'époque néo-babylonienne'. Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie Orientale 42: 149-159.

Grafton, A. (1996) 'The new science and the traditions of humanism'. In: The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism, ed. J. Kraye. Cambridge: 203-223.

Gray, P.T.R. (2005) 'The Legacy of Chalcedon: Christological Problems and Their Significance'. In: The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian, ed. M. Maas. Cambridge: 215-238.

Greatrex, G. (1995) 'The composition of Procopius' Persian Wars and John the Cappadocian'. Prudentia : A journal devoted to the intellectual history of the ancient world 27.1: 1-13.

Greatrex, G. (2016) 'Malalas and Procopius'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Autor - Werk - Überlieferung, ed. M. Meier - C. Radtki - F. Schulz (Malalas Studien: Schriften zur Chronik des Johannes Malalas, 1). Göttingen: 169-185.

Gribomont, J. (1985) 'Cassiodore et la transmission de l'héritage biblique antique'. In: Le monde latin antique et la Bible, ed. J. Fontaine – C. Pietri (Bible de tous les temps, 2). Paris: 143-152.

Grig, L. (2012) 'Late Antique Cityscapes in Words and Pictures'. In: Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity, ed. L. Grig – G. Kelly (Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity). Oxford: 31-52.

Grig, L. – Kelly, G. (2012) 'Introduction: From Rome to Constantinople'. In: Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity, ed. L. Grig – G. Kelly (Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity). Oxford: 3-30.

Grigg, R. (1987) 'Byzantine Credulity as an Impediment to Antiquarianism'. Gesta 26: 3-9.

Grubbs, E. - Ann, J. (1995) Law and family in late antiquity : the Emperor Constantine's marriage legislation. Oxford.

Guillou, A. (1969) Régionalisme et indépendance dans l'empire byzantin au VIIe siècle. L'exemple de l'exarchat et de la pentapole d'Italie (Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo Studi storici, 75-76). Rome.

_____ (1981) 'Régionalisme et administration dans l'empire byzantin du VIe au VIIIe siécle'. In: La géographie administrative et politique d'Alexandre à Mahomet : actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 14-16 juin 1979. (Travaux du Centre de Recherches sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antique, 6). Leiden: 293-305.

Haarer, F.K. (2006) Anastasius I: Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World (ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs, 46). Cambridge.

Hadot, I. (2005) Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique: contribution à l'histoire de l'éducation et de la culture dans l'Antiquité (Textes et traditions, 11). Paris.

Halporn, J.W. – Vessey, M. (2004) Cassiodorus Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul (Translated Texts for Historians, 42). Liverpool.

Hanslik, R. (1971) 'Epiphanius Scholasticus oder Cassiodor? Zur historia ecclesiastica tripartita'. Philologus 115: 107-113.

Hanslik, R. - Jacob, W. (1954) Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der sogenannten Historia tripartita des Epiphanius-Cassiodor (Texte und Untersuchungen, 59). Berlin.

Hanson, A.E. (2004) '*Aphorismi* 5.28-63 and the Gynaecological Texts of the *Corpus Hippocraticum*'. In: Magic and Rationality in Ancient Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman Medicine, ed. H.F.J. Horstmanshoff - S. Stol (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 27). Leiden: 277-304.

Harper, K. (2012) 'Marriage and Family'. In: The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity, ed. S.F. Johnson. Oxford: 667-714.

Harries, J. (2012) 'Roman Law and Legal Culture'. In: The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity, ed. S.F. Johnson. Oxford: 789-814.

Heather, P. (1993) 'The Historical Culture of Ostrogothic Italy'. In: Teoderico il Grande e i Goti d'Italia. Atti del XIII Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Milano 2–6 novembre 1992, Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo. Spoleto: 317-353.

Hemmerdinger, B. (1966) 'Les lettres latines à Constantinople jusqu'à Justinien'. Byzantinische Forschungen : internationale Zeitschrift für Byzantinistik 1: 174-178.

Herklotz, I. (2007) 'Arnaldo Momigliano's 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian': A Critical Review'. In: Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundation of the Modern Cultural Sciences, ed. P. Miller. Toronto: 127-153.

Hermann, C.F. (1909) Platonis Hippias uterque, Io, Menexenus. Accedit incerti Clitopho (Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana). Leipzig.

Herzog, R. - Schmidt, P.L. (1989) Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike: Fünfter band Restauration und Erneuerung 284-374 n. Chr. München.

Heydemann, G. (2016) 'The Ostrogothic Kingdom: Ideologies and Transitions'. In: A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy, ed. J.J. Arnold - M.S. Bjornlie - K. Sessa (Brill's Companions to European History, 9). Leiden: 17-46.

Hodgkin, T. (1886) The Letters of Cassiodorus. London.

Hodgkinson, M. (1997) 'John Malalas, Licinius Macer, and History of Romulus'. Histos 1: 85-92.

Holmes, C. (2010) 'Byzantine Political Culture and Compilation Literature in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: Some Preliminary Inquiries'. Dumbarton Oaks Papers 64: 55-80.

Holmes, W.G. (1912) he Age of Justinian and Theodora: A History of the Sixth Century A.D. London.

Holum, K.G. (2005) 'The Classical City in the Sixth Century: Survival and Transformation'. In: The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian, ed. M. Maas. Cambridge: 87-112.

Honoré, T. (1978) Tribonian. London.

Hunger, H. (1969) 'On the Imitation (ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature'. Dumbarton Oaks Papers 23: 15-38.

Humfress, C. (2005) 'Law and Legal Practice in the Age of Justinian'. In: The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian, ed. M. Maas. Cambridge: 161-184.

Horden, P. (2005) 'Mediterranean Plague in the Age of Justinian'. In: The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian, ed. M. Maas. Cambridge: 134-160.

Horrocks, G. (1997) Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers. London.

Jacoby, F. (year) 'Xanthos der Lyder (765)'. In: Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker Part I-III, ed. F. Jacoby.

Janin, R. (1964) Constantinople Byzantine: Développement urbain et répertoire topographique (Archives de l'orient chrétien, 4A). Paris.

Jeffreys, E. (1990a) 'Malalas' World View'. In: Studies in John Malalas (Byzantina Australiensia, 6), ed. E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, R. Scott. Sydney: 55-66.

_____ (1990b) 'Malalas' Sources'. In: Studies in John Malalas (Byzantina Australiensia, 6), ed. E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, R. Scott. Sydney: 167-216.

_____ (2003) 'The Beginning of Byzantine Chronography: John Malalas'. In: Greek and Roman historiography in late antiquity: fourth to sixth century A.D., ed. G. Marasco. Leiden: 497-527.

Jeffreys, E. – Jeffreys, M. – Scott, R. (1986) The Chronicle of John Malalas: A Translation (Australian Association for Byzantine Studies Byzantina Australiensia, 4). Melbourne.

Jeunet-Mancy, E. (2012) Servius: Commentaire sur l'Enéide de Virgile livre VI (Collection des universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'association Guillaume Budé). Paris.

Jones, A.H.M. (1964) The Later Roman Empire 284-602: A Social, Economic and Administrative Survey Volume II. Oxford.

Jones, L.W. (1945) 'The influence of Cassiodorus on Mediaeval Culture'. Speculum 20: 433-442.

Jouanaud, J.-L. (1993) 'Pour qui Cassiodore a-t-il publié les Variae'. In: Teoderico il Grande e i Goti d'Italia. Atti del XIII Congresso internazionale di studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Milano 2–6 novembre 1992, ed. Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo. Spoleto: 721-741.

Jowett, B. (1961) 'Hippias Major'. In: The Collected Dialogs of Plato: Including the Letters, ed. E. Hamilton – H. Cairns (Bollingen Series 71). Princeton: 1534-1557.

Kaldellis, A. (2003) 'The Religion of Ioannes Lydos'. Phoenix 3/4: 300-316.

_____ (2004) 'Identifying Dissident Circles in Sixth-Century Byzantium: The Friendship of Prokopios and Ioannes Lydos'. Florilegium 21: 1-17.

_____ (2005a). 'The works and days of Hesychios the Illoustrios of Miletos'. Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 45(4): 381-403.

_____ (2005b) 'Republican theory and political dissidence in Ioannes Lydos'. Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 29.1: 1-16.

_____ (2013) 'The Making of Hagia Sophia and the Last Pagans of New Rome'. Journal of Late Antiquity 6/2: 347-366.

Karlowa, O. (1885) Römische Rechtsgeschichte: Erster Band. Staatsrecht und Rechtsquellen. Leipzig.

Kaster, R. A. (1988) Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity. Berkeley.

Kay, N.M. (2006) Epigrams from the Anthologia Latina: Text, Translation and Commentary. London.

Kazhdan, A. (1991) 'University of Constantinople'. In: The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, ed. A. Kazhdan. Oxford: 2143.

Kelly, C. (2004) Ruling the Later Roman Empire (Revealing Antiquity, 15). Cambridge.

Kelly, G. (2003) 'The new Rome and the old: Ammianus Marcellinus' silences on Constantinople'. The Classical Quarterly 53: 588-607.

_____ (2012) 'Claudian and Constantinople'. In: Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity, ed. L. Grig – G. Kelly (Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity). Oxford: 241-264.

Klaassen, M. (2010) Cassiodorus' Chronica: Text, chronography and sources. Philadelphia (PA).

Kübler, B. (1934) 'Griechische Einflüsse auf die Entwicklung der römischen Rechtswissenschaft gegen Ende der republikanischen Zeit'. In: Atti del Congresso internazionale di diritto romano (Roma) I. Pavia: 79-98.

Kroll, W. - Schöll, R. (1895) Corpus Iuris Civilis: III. Novellae. Berlin.

Kulikowski, M. (2017) 'Malalas in the Archives'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Quellenfragen, ed. L. Carrara - M. Meier - C. Radtki-Jansen (Malalas Studien, 2). Stuttgart: 203-215.

LaCapra, D. (1998) History and Memory after Auschwitz. London.

_____ (1999) 'Trauma, Absence, Loss'. Critical Inquiry 25,4: 696-727.

Laistner, M.L.W. (1948) 'The influence of Cassiodorus' Ecclesiastical History'. Harvard Theological Review 41: 51-57.

Lamma, P. (1947) 'Giovanni di Cappadocia'. Aevum. Rassegna di Scienze Storiche Linguistiche e Filologiche 21: 80-100.

Lanata, G. (1984) Legislazione e natura nelle Novelle giustinianee. Napoli.

_____ (1988) 'I figli della passione. Appunti sulla Novella 74 di Giustiniano'. In: Atti dell' Accademia Romanistica Costantiniana. Settimo Convegno Internazionale. Napoli: 487-493.

_____ (1989) 'L'immortalità artificiale. Appunti sul proemio della Novella 22 di Giustiniano'. Serta Historica Antiqua 2: 259-263.

Lamberton, R. (2012) Proclus the Successor on Poetics and the Homeric Poems: Essays 5 and 6 of His Commentary of the Republic of Plato (Society of Biblical Literature: Writings from the Greco-Roman World, 34). Atlanta.

Lamma, P. (1947) 'Giovanni di Cappadocia'. Aevum : rassegna di scienze storiche, linguistiche e filologiche 21: 80-100.

Laniado, A. (1997) 'Un fragment peu connu de Pierre le Patrice'. Byzantinische Zeitschrift 90: 405-412.

Lemerle, P. (1971) Le premier humanisme byzantine: Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au Xe siècle (Bibliothèque byzantine publiée sous la direction de Paul Lemerle Etudes, 6). Paris.

Leppin, H. (2011) Justinian: Das Christliche Experiment. Stuttgart.

Lenel, O. (1889) Pelingenesia iuris civilis: Iuris consultorum reliquiae quae Iustiniani Digestis Continentur ceteraque iuris prudentiae civilis fragmenta minora secundum auctores et libros disposuit Otto Lenel volume prius. Leipzig.

Liebeschuetz, W. (2004) 'Malalas on Antioch'. In: Antioche de Syrie: Histoire, images et traces de la ville antique, ed. B. Cabouret - P.-L. Gatier - C. Saliou (Topoi. Occident-Orient, Supplément 5). Paris: 143-153.

Liebs, D. (1987) Die Jurisprudenz im spätantiken Italien (260-640 n. Chr.) (Freiburger rechtsgeschichtliche Abhandlungen N.F., 8). Berlin.

Lipps, J. - Machado, C. - von Rummel, P. (2013) (ed.) The Sack of Rome in 410 AD: The Event, Its Context and Its Impact (Palilia, 28). Wiesbaden.

Littlewood, R.J. (2002) '*imperii pignora certa*: The Role of Numa in Ovid's *Fasti*'. In: Ovid's *Fasti*: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium, ed. G. Herbert-Brown. New York: 175-197.

Longo, K. (2005) 'Le Tychai di Roma e Costantinopoli e l'allegoria del potere imperiale tardo antico'. In: L'immaginario del potere. Studi di iconografia monetale, ed. R. Pera (Serta antiqua et mediaevalia, 8). Roma: ???-???.

Lozovsky, N. (2016) 'Intellectual Culture and Literary Practices'. In: A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy, ed. J.J. Arnold - M.S. Bjornlie - K. Sessa (Brill's Companions to European History, 9). Leiden: 316-349.

Maas, M. (1986) 'Roman History and Christian Ideology in Justinianic Reform Legislation'. Dumbarton Oaks Papers 40: 17-32.

_____ (1992) John Lydus and the Roman past: Antiquarianism and politics in the age of Justinian. London.

_____ (2005) 'Roman Questions, Byzantine Answers: Contours of the Age of Justinian'. In: The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian, ed. M. Maas. Cambridge: 3-27.

Machado, C. (2009) 'Religion as Antiquarianism: Pagan Dedications in Late Antique Rome'. In: Dediche sacre nel mondo grecoromano: Diffusione, funzione, tipologie, ed. J Bodel – M. Kajava (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae, 35). Roma: 331-354.

Machado, C. - Lenaghan, J. (2016) 'Rome'. In: The Last Statues of Antiquity, ed. R. Smith - B. Ward-Perkins. Oxford: 121-135.

Madden, J.A. (1995) Macedonius Consul: The Epigrams Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by John A. Madden (Spudasmata Studien zur Klassischen Philologie und ihren Grenzgebieten Begründet von Hildebrecht Hommel und Ernst Zinn Herausgegeben von Gottfried Kiefner und Ulrich Köpf, 60). Hildesheim.

Malmberg, S. (2003) Dazzling Dining: Banquets as an Expression of Imperial Legitimacy. Ekerö.

Mango, C. (1963) 'Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder'. Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17: 53-75.

Mann, N. (1996) 'The origins of humanism'. In: The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism, ed. J. Kraye. Cambridge: 1-19.

Marano, Y. (2011) 'Variae 2.39. Cassiodoro e Fons Aponi'. In: Aquae Patavinae, Il termalismo antico nel compresorio euganeo e in Italia. Atti del I convegno nazionale, Padova, 21-22 giungo 2010, ed. M. Bassani – M. Bressan – F. Ghedini. Padova: 195-210.

Marasco, G. (2003) Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity. Fourth to Sixth Century A.D. Leiden.

Maraval, P. (2016) Justinien: Le rêve d'un empire chrétien universel. Paris.

March, J. (1998) Dictionary of Classical Mythology. Oxford.

Marenbon, J. (2003) Boethius. Oxford.

Markopoulos, A. (2006) 'Roman Antiquarianism: Aspects of the Roman Past in the Middle Byzantine Period (9th–11th centuries)'. In: Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Byzantine Studies, ed. E. Jeffreys – F.K. Haarer. London: 21-26.

Marrou, H.-I. (1964) Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité. Paris.

Marshall, B.A. – Beness, J.L. (1987) 'Tribunician agitation and aristocratic reaction 80-71 B.C.'. Athenaeum: studi periodici di letteratura e storia dell'antichità 65: 361-378.

Martindale, J.R. (1980) (ed.) The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire: Volume II A.D. 395-527. Cambridge.

_____ (1992) (ed.) The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire: Volume III A.D. 527-641. Cambridge.

Maslakov, G. (1983) 'The Roman Antiquarian Tradition in Late Antiquity.' In: History and Historians in Late Antiquity, ed. B. Croke - A.M. Emmett. Sydney: 100-106.

McCail, R.C. (1969) 'The Cycle of Agathias: New Identifications Scrutinised'. The Journal of Hellenic Studies 89: 87-96.

McCluskey, S.C. (2013) 'Natural Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages'. In: The Cambridge History of Science: Volume 2 Medieval Science, ed. D.C. Lindberg - M.H. Shank. New York: 286-301.

McEvoy, Meaghan. (2010) 'Rome and the transformation of the imperial office in the late fourth-mid-fifth centuries AD'. Papers of the British School at Rome 78: 151-192.

Mecella, L. (2017) 'Malalas und die Quellen für die Zeit der Soldatenkaiser'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Quellenfragen, ed. L. Carrara - M. Meier - C. Radtki-Jansen (Malalas Studien, 2). Stuttgart: 73-98.

Meier, B. (1989) Gregor von Nazianz über die Bischöfe (Carmen 2,1,12): Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums Forschungen zu Gregor von Nazianz, 7). Paderborn.

Meier, H.-R. (2013) 'The Medieval and Early Modern World and the Material Past'. In: World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives, ed. A. Schnapp – L. von Falkenhausen – P. Miller – T. Murray. Los Angeles: 249-272.

Meier, M. (2001) 'Der 'Kaiser der Luppa' : Aspekte der Politischen Kommunikation im 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr.'. Hermes 129: 410-430.

_____ (2009) Anastasios I. Die Entstehung des Byzantinischen Reiches. Stuttgart.

Meier, M. - Radtki, C. - Schultz, F. (2016) 'Einleitung: Zur Entwicklung der Malalas-Forschung - einige Orientierungslinien'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Autor - Werk - Überlieferung, ed. M. Meier - C. Radtki - F. Schulz (Malalas Studien: Schriften zur Chronik des Johannes Malalas, 1). Göttingen: 7-23.

Métivier, S. (2006) 'La création des provinces romaines dans la *Chronique* de Malalas'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas II, ed. S. Agusta-Boularot - J. Beaucamp - A.M. Bernardi - E. Caire (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 24). Paris: 155-172.

Meurant, A. (2003) 'Quelques observations sur Celer, un autre double maudit de Romulus'. In: Hommages à Carl Deroux IV - Archéologie et histoire de l'art, religion, ed. P. Defosse (Collection Latomus, 277). Brussel: 484-494.

Meyer, H. (1975) Die Zahlenallegorese im Mittelalter: Methode und Gebrauch (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 25). München.

Meurant, A. (2003) 'Quelques observations sur Celer, un autre double maudit de Romulus'. In: Hommages à Carl Deroux 4: Archéologie et Histoire de l'Art, Religion, ed. P. Defosse (Collection Latomus, 277). Brussels: 484-494.

Michel, A. (1978) 'Le philosophe et l'antiquaire ; à propos de l'influence de Varron sur la tradition grammaticale'. In: Varron, grammaire antique et stylistique latine, ed. J. Collart (Publ. Sorbonne Études, 14). Paris: 163-170.

Miller, P. (2007) (ed.) Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of The Modern Cultural Sciences. Toronto.

_____ (2007a) 'Introduction: Momigliano, Antiquarianism, and the Cultural Sciences'. In: Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundation of the Modern Cultural Sciences, ed. P. Miller. Toronto: 3-65.

_____ (2007b) 'Writing Antiquarianism: Prolegomenon to a History'. In: Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China 1500-1800, ed. P. Miller – F. Louis (The Bard Graduate Center Cultural Histories of the Material World). Ann Arbor: 27-57.

_____ (2007c) 'Comparing Antiquarianisms: A View from Europe'. In: Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China 1500-1800, ed. P. Miller – F. Louis (The Bard Graduate Center Cultural Histories of the Material World). Ann Arbor: 103-145.

Miller, P. – Louis, F. (2007) 'Introduction: Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China'. In: Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China 1500-1800, ed. P. Miller – F. Louis (The Bard Graduate Center Cultural Histories of the Material World). Ann Arbor: 1-24.

Mistry, Z. (2015) Abortion in the Early Middle Ages c. 500-900. Cornwall.

Moatti, C. (1997) 'La crise de la tradition à la fin de la République romaine à travers la littérature juridique et la science des antiquaires'. In: Continuità e trasformazioni fra Repubblica e Principato, ed. M. Pani. Bari: 31-45.

Moffatt, A. (1990) 'A record of Public Buildings and Monuments'. In: Studies in John Malalas (Byzantina Australiensia, 6), ed. E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, R. Scott. Sydney: 87-109.

Molland, A.G. (2013) 'Mathematics'. In: The Cambridge History of Science: Volume 2 Medieval Science, ed. D.C. Lindberg - M.H. Shank. New York: 512-531.

Momigliano, A. (1950) 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian'. Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 3/4: 285-315.

_____ (1960) 'Gli Anicii e la storiografia latina del VI seculo D.C.'. In: Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici, ed. A. Momigliano. Roma: 231-253.

_____ (1966) 'Cassiodorus and the Italian Culture of his Time'. In: Studies in Historiography, ed. A. Momigliano. London: 181-210.

_____ (1990) 'The Rise of Antiquarian Research'. In: The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography, ed. R. Di Donato (Sather Classical Lectures, 54). Berkeley and Los Angeles: 54-79.

Mommsen, T. (1882) Iordanis Romana et Getica (Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctores antiquissimi, 5.1). Berlin.

_____ (1894) Chronica minora: Saec. IV. V. VI. VII. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctores antiquissimi, 11). Berlin.

Nardi, E. (1971) Procurato aborto nel mondo Greco Romano. Milan.

Nelson, C. A. S. (1970) Regionalism in Visigothic Spain. Lawrence (KS).

Nora, P. (1984) 'Entre Mémoire et Histoire: La problématique des lieux'. In: Les Lieux de Mémoire: vol. 1 La République, ed. P. Nora. Paris: xvii-xlii.

Nicks, F. (2000) 'Literary culture in the Reign of Anastasius I'. In: Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity, ed. S. Mitchell – G. Greatrex. Swansea: 183-203.

O'Donnell, J. (1979) Cassiodorus. Berkeley.

_____ (1981) 'Liberius the patrician'. Traditio 37: 32-71.

Pabst, A. (1986) Divisio regni : Der Zerfall des Imperium Romanum in der Sicht der Zeitgenossen (Habelts Diss.-Dr. R. Alte Gesch., 23). Bonn.

Panitschek, P. (1990) 'Numa Pompilius as Schüler des Pythagoras'. Grazer Beiträge Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft 17: 49-65.

Pasco-Pranger, M.C. (1999-2000) 'Vates operosus : vatic poets and antiquarianism in Ovid's « Fasti »'. The Classical World 93.3: 275-291.

Passalacqua, M. (1987) Prisciani Caesariensis Opuscula, I: De figuris numerorum, De metris Terentii, Praeexercitamina (Sussidi eruditi, 40). Rome.

Pazdernik, C. (2005) 'Justinianic Ideology and the Power of the Past'. In: The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian, ed. M. Maas. Cambridge: 185-212.

Peglau, M. (2000) 'Varro und die angeblichen Schriften des Numa Pompilius'. In: Hortus litterarum antiquarum: Festschrift für Hans Armin Gärtner zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. A. Haltenhoff – F.-H. Mutschler. Heidelberg: 441-450.

Peretto, E. (1993) 'Papa Agapito I e la mancata fondazione della "Schola Christiana" vagheggiata da Cassiodoro'. In: Cassiodoro: Dalla corte di Ravenna al Vivarium di Squillace. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Squillace, 25–27 ottobre 1990, ed. S. Leanza. Messina: 213-220.

Perrin, B. (1914) Plutarch's Lives with an English Translation by Bernadotte Perrin in Ten Volumes: I Theseus and Romulus, Lycurgus and Numa, Solon and Publicola (The Loeb Classical Library), Cambridge (Mass.).

Pizzani, U. (1993) 'La cultura Musicologica di Cassiodoro'. In: Cassiodoro: Dalla corte di Ravenna al Vivarium di Squillace. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Squillace, 25–27 ottobre 1990., ed. S. Leanza. Messina: 27-60.

Praet, R. (2016) 'Re-anchoring Rome's Protection in Constantinople: The pignora imperii in Late Antiquity and Byzantium'. Sacris Erudiri Journal of Late Antique and Medieval Christianity 55: 277-319.

Price, R. (2007) 'The Three Chapters Controversy and the Council of Chalcedon'. In: The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean, ed. C. Chazelle - C. Cubitt (Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 14). Turnhout: 17-37.

Procee, B. (2014) Cassiodorus' Chronicle.

Purpura, G. (1976) 'Giovanni di Cappadocia e la sua composizione della commissione del primo codice di Giustiniano'. Annali del Seminario Giuridico della Università di Palermo 36: 49-67.

Rackham, H. (1961) Cicero De natura deorum, Academica (The Loeb Classical Library). London.

_____ (1944) Pliny Natural History: Volume I Praefatio, Libri I, II (The Loeb Classical Library). London.

Radtki, C. (2016) 'The Senate at Rome in Ostrogothic Italy'. In: A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy, ed. J.J. Arnold - M.S. Bjornlie - K. Sessa (Brill's Companions to European History, 9). Leiden: 121-146.

Ramires, G. (2003) Servio Commento al libro VII dell' Eneide di Virgilio: Con le aggiunte del cosiddetto Servio Danielino (Testi e manuali per l'insegnamento universitario del Latino Collana diretta da Alfonso Traina, 78). Bologna.

Rapp, C. (2005) 'Literary Culture under Justinian'. In: The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian, ed. M. Maas. Cambridge: 376-399.

_____ (2008) 'Hellenic Identity, Romanitas, and Christianity in Byzantium'. In: Hellenisms: Culture, Identity and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity, ed. K. Zachariah. Aldershot: 127-147.

Ratti, S. (2006) 'Epiphane traducteur dans l'Historia Tripartita: contresens et déformations'.
Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft 9: 21-35.

_____ (2010) Antiquus error. Turnhout.

Rawson, E. (1972) 'Cicero the Historian and Cicero the Antiquarian'. The Journal of Roman Studies 62: 33-45.

_____ (1985) 'Antiquarianism'. In: Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic, ed. E. Rawson. London: 233-249.

Reinhold, M. (1970) History of Purple as a Status Symbol in Antiquity (Collections Latomus, 116). Brussel.

Riché, P. (1976) Education and Culture in the Barabarian West: Sixth through Eight Centuries. Columbia.

Riddle, M. (1981) 'Illustration of the Triumph of Joseph the Patriarch'. In: Byzantine Papers: Proceedings of the First Australian Byzantine Studies Conference Canberra, 17-19 May 1978, ed. E. Jeffreys - M. Jeffreys - A. Moffatt (Australian Association for Byzantine Studies Byzantina Australiensia, 1). Canberra: 69-81.

Riga, P.J. (1986-1987) 'Divorce in the Justinian Code: Harbinger of Things to Come?'. Whittier Law Review 8: 918-933.

Roberto, U. (2011) 'Romolo, Foca e la morte del tiranno: Racconto storico e tensione emotiva nell'opera di Giovanni di Antiochia'. Ὅρμος Richerche di Storia Antica 3: 257-273.

_____ (2013) 'L'immagine di Augusto nella « Historia Chroniké » di Giovanni di Antiochia e la tradizione di Cassio Dione'. Paideia rivista di filologia, ermeneutica e critica letteraria 68: 409-434.

_____ (2015) 'La memoria inquietante del tiranno: la mancanza di castità/ sophrosyne di Ottaviano Augusto nel dibatto politico tardoantico'. In: Il bimillenario augusteo: Atti della XLV settimana di studi aquileiesi, ed. G. Cuscito (Antichità Altoadriatiche, 81). Trieste: 123-140.

_____ (2016) 'John Malalas as a source for John of Antioch's Historia Chroniké'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Autor - Werk - Überlieferung, ed. M. Meier - C. Radtki - F. Schulz (Malalas Studien: Schriften zur Chronik des Johannes Malalas, 1). Göttingen: 267-286.

Rojas, F. (2013) 'Antiquarianism in Roman Sardis'. In: World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives, ed. A. Schnapp – L. von Falkenhausen – P. Miller – T. Murray. Los Angeles: 176-200.

Rochette, B. (1997a) Le latin dans le monde grec : recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain. Brussel.

_____ (1997b) 'Justinien et la langue latine: A propos d'un prétendu oracle rendu à Romulus d'après Jean le Lydien'. Byzantinische Zeitschrift 90: 413-415.

_____ (1998) 'Jean le Lydien, Caton, Varron et Servius (Jean le Lydien, De magistratibus, I, 5)'. Byzantinische Zeitschrift 91: 471-474.

_____ (2012) '« Latinum est: non legitur » Lire le latin et traduire le latin en grec en Orient'. In: Scrivere e leggere nell'Alto Medioevo. Spoleto, 28 aprile – 4 maggio 2011, ed. Fondazione CISAM. Spoleto: 317-348.

Rohrbacher, D. (2002) The Historians of Late Antiquity, New York.

Rood, T. (2014) 'The Reception of Thucydides' Archaeology', In: A Handbook to the Reception of Thucydides, ed. C. Lee – N. Morley. Chichester: 474 – 492.

Roscher, W.H. (1884-1886) Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie: Erster Band, Erste Abteilung Aba-Evan. Leipzig.

Rosenblum, M. (1961) Luxorius: A Latin Poet among the Vandals. New York and London.

Roueché, C. (1998) 'Provincial Governors and Their Titulature in the Sixth Century'. Antiquité Tardive 6: 83-89.

Rubin, B. (1960) Das Zeitalter Justinians: 1. Band. Berlin.

Salamon, M. (1979) 'Priscian und sein Schülerkreis in Konstantinopel'. Philologus : Zeitschrift für antike Literatur und ihre Rezeption 123: 91-96.

Saliou, C. (2006) 'Statues d'Antioch de Syrie dans la *Chronographie* de Malalas'. In: Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas II, ed. S. Agusta-Boularot - J. Beaucamp - A.M. Bernardi - E. Caire (Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, 24). Paris: 69-95.

_____ (2013) 'La Porte des Chérubins à Antioche sur l'Oronge et le développement de la ville'. Anatolia Antiqua 21: 125-133.

_____ (2016) 'Malalas' Antioch'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Autor - Werk - Überlieferung, ed. M. Meier - C. Radtki - F. Schulz (Malalas Studien: Schriften zur Chronik des Johannes Malalas, 1). Göttingen: 45-57.

Santrot, J. (1996) 'Bronzes et fers de Dax, Landes : la cachette d'un « antiquaire-restaurateur » au 4e s. après J.-C.'. Gallia: archéologie de la France antique 53: 251-343.

Schamp, J. (2006a) Jean le Lydien : Des magistratures de l'état Romain Tome I 1ère partie Introduction générale texte établi, traduit et commenté par Jacques Schamp (Collection des universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Paris.

_____ (2006b) Jean le Lydien : Des magistratures de l'état Romain Tome I 2e partie Introduction générale Livre I texte établi, traduit et commenté par Jacques Schamp (Collection des universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Paris.

_____ (2006c) Jean le Lydien : Des magistratures de l'état Romain Tome II Livres II et III texte établi, traduit et commenté par Jacques Schamp (Collection des universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Paris.

_____ (2008) 'Remarques sur Jean le Lydien et le lexique latin à Constantinople'. In: Lexicologica byzantina. Beiträge zum Kolloquium zur byzantinischen Lexicographie. (Bonn, 13.-15. Juli 2007), ed. E. Trapp − S. Schoenauer. Göttingen: 37-54.

Schanz, M. - Hosius C. - Krüger, G. (1920) Geschichte der Römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian von Martin Schanz. Vierter Teil: Die römische Litteratur von Constantin bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk Justinians. Zweite Hälfte: Die Litteratur des fünften und sechsten Jahrhunderts. München.

Schimmel, A. (1993) The Mystery of Numbers. Oxford. 1993.

Schnapp, A. (2007) 'The Many Dimensions of the Antiquary's Practice'. In: Antiquarianism and Intellectual Life in Europe and China 1500-1800, ed. P. Miller – F. Louis (The Bard Graduate Center Cultural Histories of the Material World). Ann Arbor: 58-80.

_____ (2013) (ed.) World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives. Los Angeles.

_____ (2013a) 'Introduction: The Roots of Antiquarianism'. In: World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives, ed. A. Schnapp – L. von Falkenhausen – P. Miller – T. Murray. Los Angeles: 1-10.

_____ (2013b) 'Conservation of Objects and Monuments and the Sense of the Past during the Greco-Roman Era'. In: World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives, ed. A. Schnapp – L. von Falkenhausen – P. Miller – T. Murray. Los Angeles: 159-175.

Schulz, F. (2016) '*Fragmentum Tusculanum II* und die Geschichte eines Zankapfels'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Autor - Werk - Überlieferung, ed. M. Meier - C. Radtki - F. Schulz (Malalas Studien: Schriften zur Chronik des Johannes Malalas, 1). Göttingen: 153-166.

Schweizer, F. (2007) 'Konstantinopel : das neue Rom am Bosporus'. Antike Welt: Zeitschrift für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte 38: 31-34.

Scott, R. (1972) 'John Lydus on some procedural changes'. Byzantina 4: 441-451.

_____ (1981) 'Malalas and Justinian's Codification'. In: Byzantine Papers: Proceedings of the First Australian Byzantine Studies Conference Canberra, 17-19 May 1978, ed. E. Jeffreys - M. Jeffreys - A. Moffatt (Australian Association for Byzantine Studies Byzantina Australiensia, 1). Canberra: 12-31.

_____ (1990a) 'Malalas' View of the Classical Past'. In: Reading the Past in Late Antiquity, ed. G. Clarke. Oxford: 147-164.

_____ (1990b) 'Malalas and his Contemporaries'. In: Studies in John Malalas (Byzantina Australiensia, 6), ed. E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, R. Scott. Sydney: 67-85.

_____ (2017) 'Malalas' Sources for the Contemporary Books'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Quellenfragen, ed. L. Carrara - M. Meier - C. Radtki-Jansen (Malalas Studien, 2). Stuttgart: 217-233.

Siorvanes, L. (1996) Proclus: Neo-Platonic Philosophy and Science. Edinburgh.

Smelser, N.J. (2004) 'Psychological Trauma and Cultural Trauma'. In: Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity, ed. J.C. Alexander - R. Eyerman - B. Giesen - N.J. Smelser - P. Sztompka. Berkeley - Los Angeles - London: 31-59.

Smith, R.R.R. (2016) 'Statue practice in the late Roman empire: Numbers, costumes, and styles'. In: The Last Statues of Antiquity, ed. R. Smith - B. Ward-Perkins. Oxford: 1-27.

Squillace, G. (year) 'Charax of Pergamon (103)'. In: Brill's New Jacoby, ed. I. Worthington.

Staesche, M. (1994) Das Privatleben der römischen Kaiser in der Spätantike: Studien zur Personen- und Kulturgeschichte der späten Kaiserzeit (Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe III Geschichte und ihre Hilfswissenschaften, 784). Berlin.

Stein, E. (1937) 'Deux questeurs de Justinien et l'emploi des langues dans ses novelles'. Bulletin de la classe des lettres de l'Academie royale de Belgique 5.23: 365-390.

Stenhouse, W. (2013) 'The Renaissance Foundations of European Antiquarianism'. In: World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives, ed. A. Schnapp – L. von Falkenhausen – P. Miller – T. Murray. Los Angeles: 295-316.

Stewart, P. (2007) 'Continuity and Tradition in Late Antique Perceptions of Portrait Statuary'. In: Statuen in der Spätantike, ed. F. Alto Bauer – C. Witschel (Kunst im ersten Jahrtausend Reihe B: Studien und Perspektiven, 23). Wiesbaden: 27-42.

Stevenson, A.J. (2004) 'Gellius and The Roman Antiquarian Tradition.' In: The Worlds of Aulus Gellius, ed. L. Holford-Strevens. Oxford: 118-155.

Stirling, L. (2014) 'Collections, Canons, and Context: The Afterlife of Greek Masterpieces in Late Antiquity'. In: Using Images in Late Antiquity, ed. S. Birk – T. Kristensen – B. Poulsen. Oxford: 96-114.

Stol, M. (2009) 'Embryology in Babylonia and the Bible'. In: Imagining the Fetus: The Unborn in Myth, Religion and Culture, ed. V.R. Sasson - J.M. Law (American Academy of Religion Cultural Criticism Series). Oxford: 137-155.

Stothers, R.B. - Rampino, M. (1983) 'Volcanic Eruptions in the Mediterranean Before A.D. 630 From Written and Archaeological Sources'. Journal of Geophysical Research 88: 6357-6371.

Sviatoslav, D. (2010) 'John Lydus and His Contemporaries on Identities and Cultures of Sixth-Century Byzantium'. Dumbarton Oaks Papers Journal 64: 27-42.

Szymanski, L. (1955) The syntax of the nominal forms of the verb in the Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita of Cassiodorus-Epiphanius, Book 1. Washington.

_____ (1963) The translation procedure of Epiphanius-Cassiodorus in the Historia Tripartita, Books 1 and 2. Washington.

Tate, J. (2008) 'Inheritance Rights of Nonmarital Children in Late Roman Law'. Roman Legal Tradition 4: 1-36.

Thesz, J.M. (2016) 'Die christliche Paideia des Johannes Malalas'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Autor - Werk - Überlieferung, ed. M. Meier - C. Radtki - F. Schulz (Malalas Studien: Schriften zur Chronik des Johannes Malalas, 1). Göttingen: 27-43.

Thilo, G. (1923) Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii: Vol. II Aeneidos librorum VI-VII commentarii. Leipzig.

Thurn, H. (2000) Ioannis Malalae Chronographia (Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae. Series Berolinensis, 35). Berlin.

Toye, D.L. (year) 'Eumelos of Corinth (451)'. In: Brill's New Jacoby: Second Edition, ed. I. Worthington.

Treadgold, W. (2007a) The Early Byzantine Historians. London.

_____ (2007b) 'The Byzantine World Histories of John Malalas and Eustathius of Epiphania'. The International History Review 29.4: 709-745.

Troncarelli, F. (1981) Tradizioni Perdute: La 'Consolatio Philosophiae' nell'Alto Medioevo. Padova.

_____ (2008) 'Boezio a Costantinopoli: testi, contesti, edizioni'.Litterae Caelestes 3: 211-231.

Tsirpanlis, C.N. (1995) 'Marriage, family values and 'ecumenical vision' in the legislation of Justinian the Great (527-565)'. Patristic and Byzantine Review 14: 59-69.

Turfa, J.M. (2012) Divining the Etruscan World: The *Brontoscopic Calendar* and Religious Practice. Cambridge.

Usener, H. (1887) Epicurea. Leipzig.

Van de Vyver, A. (1931) 'Cassiodore et son oeuvre'. Speculum: A Journal of Mediaeval Studies 6.2: 244-292.

Van Hoof, L. - Van Nuffelen, P. (2011) 'Pseudo-Themistius, Pros Basilea : A False Attribution'. Byzantion 81: 408-419.

_____ (2017) 'The Historiography of Crisis: Jordanes, Cassiodorus and Justinian in mid-sixth-century Constantinople'. The Journal of Roman Studies 107: 1-26.

Van Nuffelen, P. (2015) 'Introduction: historiography as a cultural practice'. In: Historiographie tardo-antique et transmission des savoirs, ed. P. Van Nuffelen - P. Blaudeau (Millennium-Studien, 55). Berlin: 11-20.

_____ (2016) 'There's always the sun. Metaphysics and antiquarianism in Macrobius'. In: Bilder von dem Einen Gott : die Rhetorik des Bildes in monotheistischen Gottesdarstellungen der Spätantike, ed. N. Hömke - G. Chiai - A. Jenik (Philologus. Supplemente, 6). Berlin: 127-143.

_____ (2017) 'Malalas and the Chronographic Tradition'. In: Die Weltchronik des Johannes Malalas: Quellenfragen, ed. L. Carrara - M. Meier - C. Radtki-Jansen (Malalas Studien, 2). Stuttgart: 261-272.

Vardi, A. (2004) 'Genre, Conventions, and Cultural Programme in Gellius' Noctes Atticae.' In: The Worlds of Aulus Gellius, ed. L. Holford-Strevens. Oxford: 159-186.

Van de Woestijne, P.E.K. (1953) La Periégèse de Priscien: Édition critique. Bruges.

Ver Eecke, M. (2008) La république et le roi: Le mythe de Romulus à la fin de la République romaine (De l'archéologie à l'histoire). Paris.

Vessey, M. (2004) 'Introduction'. In: Cassiodorus Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul, ed. J.W. Halporn - M. Vessey (Translated texts for Historians, 42). Liverpool: 1-100.

Viscido, L. (1992) Ordo generis Cassiodororum: Excerpta (Università degli studi di Salerno. Quaderni del dipartimento di scienze dell'antichità, 9). Napoli.

Vittorio Piacente, D. (2012) Aurelio Arcadio Carisio : Un giurista tardoantico (Biblioteca tardoantica, 7). Bari.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1983) Suetonius: The Scholar and His Caesars. New Haven and London.

Ward-Perkins, B. (2012) 'Old and New Rome Compared'. In: Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity, ed. L. Grig – G. Kelly (Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity). Oxford: 53-78.

_____ (2016) 'The end of the statue habit, AD 284-620'. In: The Last Statues of Antiquity, ed. R. Smith - B. Ward-Perkins. Oxford: 295-308.

Ward-Perkins, B. - Machado, C. (2013) '410 and the End of New Statuary in Italy'. In: The Sack of Rome in 410 AD: The Event, Its Context and Its Impact, ed. J. Lipps - C. Machado - P. Von Rummel (Palilia, 28). Wiesbaden: 353-364.

Watts, E. (2004a) 'Justinian, Malalas and the End of Athenian Philosophical Teaching in A.D. 529'. The Journal of Roman Studies 94: 168-182.

_____ (2004b) 'Student Travel to Intellectual Centers: What Was the Attraction?'. In: Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity: Sacred and Profane, ed. L. Ellis - F.L. Kidner. Aldershot: 13-25.

Weissengruber, F. (1972) Epiphanius Scholasticus als Übersetzer: Zu Cassiodorus-Epiphanius Historia Ecclesiastica Tripartita (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften philosophisch-historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte, 283). Wien.

_____ (1993) 'L'educazione profana nell'"Expositio Psalmorum"'. In: Cassiodoro: Dalla corte di Ravenna al Vivarium di Squillace. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Squillace, 25–27 ottobre 1990, ed. S. Leanza. Messina: 61-72.

Wendrich, W. (2013) 'Antiquarianism in Egypt: The Importance of Re'. In: World Antiquarianism: Comparative Perspectives, ed. A. Schnapp – L. von Falkenhausen – P. Miller – T. Murray. Los Angeles: 140-158.

Wiegels, R. (2007) 'Imperiale Herrschaft und provinziales Leben : Integration und Regionalismus im römischen Reich des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.'. In: Europa und seine Regionen : 2000 Jahre Rechtsgeschichte, ed. A. Bauer - K. H. L. Welker. Köln: 13-47.

Winkelmann, F. (1990) 'Rang- und Ämterverzeichnisse' In: Quellen zur Geschichte des frühen Byzanz (4.-9. Jahrhundert) Bestand und Probleme, ed. F. Winkelmann – W. Brandes. Amsterdam: 336-347.

Wiseman, T.P. (1995) Remus: A Roman Myth. Cambridge.

Vitiello, M. (2006) '"Cassiodoriana": Gli Excerpta Valesiana, l'"aduentus" e le "laudes" del principe Teoderico'. Chiron 36: 113-133.

_____ (2015) '"Cassiodoriana": Gli Excerpta Valesiana, l'"aduentus" e le "laudes" del principe Teoderico'. Klio 98: 645-663.

Weinstock, S. (1950) 'C. Fonteius Capito and the Libri Tagetici'. Papers of the British School at Rome 18: 44-49.

Witschel, C. (2007) 'Statuen auf spätantiken Platzanlagen in Italien und Africa'. In: Statuen in der Spätantike, ed. F. Alto Bauer – C. Witschel (Kunst im ersten Jahrtausend Reihe B: Studien und Perspektiven, 23). Wiesbaden: 113-169.

Wood, J. R. (1980) 'The myth of Tages'. Latomus: Revue d'études Latines 39: 325-344.

_____ (1981) 'The Etrusco-Latin Liber *Tageticus* in Lydus' *De Ostentis*.'. Museum Philologum Londiniense 5: 94-125.

Wünsch, R. (1898) Joannis Laurentii Lydi liber de mensibus. Leipzig.

Wyatt, J.A. (1976) The History of Troy in the Chronicles of John Malalas: The English translation and Literary Analysis of the Greek and Slavonic Texts of Malalas' Fifth Book. Berkely.

Young, G. K. (2004) 'Emesa in Roman Syria : resistance, rebellion and regionalism in the third century A.D.'. Prudentia : a journal devoted to the intellectual history of the ancient world 36: 31-48.

Zecchini, G. (1985) 'Il 476 nella storiografia tardoantica'. Aevum 59: 3–23.

# Resume

The aim of this dissertation was to ascertain the cultural meaning of antiquarianism in the sixth century AD. Starting with an exploration of the different types of texts which might aspire to the label of antiquarianism, one specific form of antiquarianism was selected for the purpose of the analysis, as it proved to be a driving force behind the engagement with the past in the sixth century. This Roman antiquarianism was centred on Rome and the Roman Empire, idealised the past as a model of moral excellence, and exhibited an acute awareness of the growing distance between the past as a declining standard of moral excellence and present-day life. The main thesis of this dissertation was formulated on the basis of this unease generated by the growing distance between the idealised past and the present: antiquarianism in the sixth century was an expression of and a means to come to terms with the cultural unease engendered by one of the fundamental transformations of Late Antiquity, namely, the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople.

A study of antiquarianism as an attestation to and means to deal with cultural unease benefited from the nascent field of cultural trauma studies, such as developed by J.C. Alexander and Dominick LaCapra. In order therefore to pursue this hypothesis, this dissertation proceeded with an analysis of the different factors which are, according to the frameworks of J.C. Alexander and D. LaCapra, necessary prerequisites for the development of cultural trauma: the traumatic event (chapter 2), the different carrier groups which create and negotiate the discourse of cultural trauma (chapter 3), and the different strategies which were used to articulate and come tot terms with the cultural trauma (chapters 4-7).

In the second chapter of this dissertation, I gave an analysis of the event which generated the cultural unease in the sixth century: the transfer of power and prestige from Rome to Constantinople, a gradual process which culminated in the devastation of Rome during the Gothic wars in the sixth century. The ending of this process triggered the awareness of the "fall" of Rome in the antiquarian imagination in the sixth century.

Starting from the biographies of the three authors I selected for scrutiny, namely Cassiodorus, John Malalas and John Lydus, I gave, in the third chapter of this dissertation, an analysis of the dense network of educated bureaucrats in sixth-century Constantinople which carried the discourse of cultural trauma. This network, which centred around the educational context of the university of Constantinople, was densely interconnected but not unified in its approach to the cultural unease of the transfer from Rome to Constantinople: different groups, divided and united among different lines of ethnic solidarity, dynastic loyalties and bureaucratic codes of conduct, competed with each other for the enhancements of their power,

prestige and imperial favour. This competition also reflected on the ways in which the discourse on cultural unease was articulated; different views on the position and destiny of Rome and Constantinople shaped a contemporary debate and cultural negotiation of the discourse of cultural trauma, as the following analysis showed. The interconnectedness of these groups of bureaucrats was reflected in the texts which these bureaucrats produced. An analysis of the similarities and differences in the approaches of the three authors to antiquarian material showed that they implicitly engaged in a dialogue with each other, attesting to a common culture of antiquarian erudition.

The lion's share of the dissertation was devoted to the analysis of the strategies which the three authors used to engage with the cultural unease of the transfer from Rome to Constantinople. This analysis was divided in two triptychs.

The first triptych, chapter four of this dissertation, considered the different strategies which the three authors employed in their depiction of Rome and Constantinople. We saw how authors with a Constantinopolitan perspective assimilated Constantinople to Rome in their antiquarian *memoryscape*, whereas westerners such as Cassiodorus resisted such assimilations. Furthermore, John Lydus and John Malalas enhanced the image of Constantinople by comparing her favourably to Rome - this meant discrediting Rome through a critical scrutiny of her edgy earliest history. Finally, we saw how the transfer from Rome to Constantinople forced the three antiquarians to define their *Romanitas* in terms of transferable emblems of empire, such as statues, the Latin language, and the colour purple.

The second triptych, chapters 5 to 7 of this dissertation, analysed how the three authors sought to partially replace Rome as the centre for the generation of historical meaning by formulating alternatives to the eternal city. One of these alternatives was the foregrounding of the own region of origin as new centre of the antiquarian *memoryscape*. These instances of antiquarian localism were embedded in the social reality of different ethnic groups vying for imperial favour, and interacting with the same instances of antiquarian localism in imperial legislature. A second alternative to Rome was the own bureaucratic department. The analysis showed how the antiquarian interest in the own department of the state was a literary expression of the social reality of inter- and intra-departmental feuding, a competition which was also fired on by the imperial power. The third and final alternative to Rome was formulated by a new place of the person of the antiquarian in his emphasis on personal issues which otherwise remained in the shadows, namely women and children.

As this dissertation has shown, the antiquarian writing produced in the sixth century was no bookish product of knowledge for the sake of knowledge. On the contrary, Roman antiquarianism in the sixth century was to a high degree conditioned by the sociological circumstances in Constantinople which determined the life of the intellectualist bureaucrats writing antiquarian treatises. Antiquarianism in the

sixth century functioned within the high competition of different ethnic groups, within the inter- and intra-departmental feuding of Roman officials, and in close interaction with the legislative initiatives of the central imperial power.

# Samenvatting

Deze dissertatie stelde zich tot doel om de culturele betekenis van antiquarianisme na te gaan in de zesde eeuw n.C. Na een voorafgaande studie van de verschillende teksttypen die in aanmerking kunnen komen voor het label antiquarianisme, werd een specifieke vorm van antiquarianisme uitgekozen voor de analyse -een vorm die geschikt bleek voor deze analyse, gezien die een drijvende kracht bleek voor de omgang met het verleden in de zesde eeuw. Deze vorm van antiquarianisme, namelijk Romeins antiquarianisme, was gericht op Rome en het Romeinse rijk, idealiseerde het verleden als een model voor morele excellentie, en gaf blijk van een scherp bewustzijn van de toenemende afstand tussen het verleden als een afnemende standaard van morele uitmuntendheid enerzijds, en het hedendaagse leven anderzijds. De these van deze dissertatie werd geformuleerd op basis van het onbehagen dat deze groeiende afstand tussen het geïdealiseerde verleden en het heden veroorzaakte: antiquarianisme in de zesde eeuw was zowel een uitdrukking van als een middel om om te gaan met het culturele onbehagen dat veroorzaakt werd door een van de fundamentele transformaties van de late oudheid, namelijk, de overdracht van macht en aanzien van Rome naar Constantinopel.

Deze studie van antiquarianisme stoelde op het zich ontwikkelende onderzoeksgebied van *cultural trauma studies*, een onderzoeksgebied dat werd ontwikkeld door J.C. Alexander en D. LaCapra. Om de hypothese na te gaan, werd er in deze dissertatie een analyse gemaakt van de voorwaarden die noodzakelijk zijn om van een cultureel trauma te kunnen spreken: de traumatische gebeurtenis (hoofdstuk 2), de verschillende draaggroepen (*carrier groups*) verantwoordelijk voor de ontwikkeling en onderhandeling van het discours rond het cultureel trauma (hoofdstuk 3), en de verschillende strategieën die aan de dag werden gelegd om uiting te geven aan het cultureel trauma en om ermee in het reine te komen (hoofdstukken 4-7).

In het tweede hoofdstuk van deze dissertatie werd er een analyse gemaakt van de gebeurtenis die aan de basis lag van het cultureel onbehagen in de zesde eeuw, namelijk, de overdracht van macht en aanzien van Rome naar Constantinopel. Dit was een proces van geleidelijke aard dat culmineerde met de teloorgang van de stad Rome tijdens de Gothische oorlogen van de zesde eeuw. Dit eindpunt van het proces veroorzaakte een bewustzijn van de "val" van Rome in de antiquarische verbeelding van de zesde eeuw.

In het derde hoofdstuk maakte ik, vertrekkende van de biografische gegevens van de drie auteurs die ik selecteerde voor het onderzoek -met name Cassiodorus, Johannes Malalas en Johannes van Lydië - een analyse van het dichte netwerk van intellectuele bureaucraten dat in het Constantinopel van de zesde eeuw het discours van cultureel trauma in stand hield. Dit netwerk was, met haar centrum

in de universiteit van Constantinopel, zeer dicht met elkaar verbonden, hoewel het verschillen vertoonde in haar benaderingen van het cultureel onbehagen dat door de transfer van Rome naar Constantinopel werd veroorzaakt; verschillende groepjes, die verenigd en verdeeld waren volgens etnische afkomst, dynastieke loyaliteit en bureaucratische gedragscodes, beconcurreerden elkaar om de uitbreiding van hun macht, om hun prestige en om keizerlijke gunsten. Deze competities hadden hun impact op de manieren waarop het discours rond het cultureel trauma werd gearticuleerd. Verschillende visies op de positie en de toekomst van Rome en Constantinopel gaven gestalte aan een eigentijds debat en een culturele onderhandeling over het discours van cultureel trauma. De innige verwevenheid van deze bureaucratische netwerken is merkbaar in de teksten die deze bureaucraten produceerden. Een analyse van de gelijkenissen en de verschillen in de behandeling van antiquarisch materiaal door de drie auteurs laat zien dat deze drie auteurs impliciet met elkaar in dialoog gingen, en dus blijk geven van een gemeenschappelijk gedragen cultuur van antiquarische eruditie.

Het leeuwendeel van deze dissertatie was gewijd aan de analyse van de verschillende strategieën die de drie auteurs gebruikten om in het reine te komen met het onbehagen dat veroorzaakt werd door de transfer van Rome naar Constantinopel. Deze analyse telt twee drieluiken.

Het eerste drieluik, tevens het vierde hoofdstuk van deze dissertatie, ging in op de verschillende strategieën die de drie auteurs gebruikten bij hun beeldvorming van Rome en Constantinopel. Auteurs die het perspectief van Constantinopel innamen, assimileerden Constantinopel aan Rome in hun antiquarisch imaginair landschap (*memoryscape*), terwijl westerlingen zoals Cassiodorus zich tegen deze assimilaties verzetten. Daarenboven verfraaiden Johannes van Lydië en Johannes Malalas hun beeld van Constantinopel door haar positief te vergelijken met Rome -hetgeen betekende dat Rome in diskrediet diende gebracht te worden door een negatief-kritische lezing van haar vroegste geschiedenis. De overgang van Rome naar Constantinopel noopte de drie auteurs er tenslotte toe om hun *Romanitas* te herdefiniëren in termen van overdraagbare emblemen van het keizerrijk, zoals standbeelden, de Latijnse taal en de kleur paars.

Het tweede drieluik, hoofdstukken 5 tot 7, geeft een analyse van hoe de drie auteurs poogden om Rome, als centrum voor de creatie van geschiedkundige betekenis, althans gedeeltelijk te vervangen door het formuleren van alternatieven voor de Eeuwige Stad. Een van deze alternatieven was een hernieuwde aandacht voor de eigen thuisregio als nieuw centrum van de antiquarische *memoryscape*. Deze vormen van intellectueel regionalisme waren ingebed in de sociale realiteit van verschillende etnische groepen die elkaar beconcurreerden om keizerlijke gunsten, en die in dialoog gingen met gelijkaardige vormen van antiquarisch regionalisme in keizerlijke wetgeving. Een tweede alternatief voor Rome was het eigen administratief departement. Deze antiquarische interesse in het eigen departement was tevens een literaire uitdrukking van een sociale realiteit: vetes binnen het eigen de-

partement en tussen departementen, die tevens werden aangewakkerd door de keizer. Een derde en laatste alternatief voor Rome werd ingenomen door een nieuwe plaats van de persoon van de antiquarische intellectueel doorheen zijn nadruk op persoonlijke thematieken die niet op de voorgrond traden: vrouwen en kinderen.

Deze dissertatie toont aan dat de antiquarische productie van de zesde eeuw geen boekenwijsheid omwille van de boekenwijsheid was. Romeins antiquarianisme werd integendeel in hoge mate gevormd door de sociologische context van Constantinopel die het leven van de intellectuelen-bureaucraten, die antiquarische traktaten schreven, determineerde. Antiquarianisme functioneerde in de zesde eeuw in een context van hoogoplopende competitie tussen verschillende etnische groepen en verschillende departementen, met een nauwe dialoog met de keizer en zijn wetgeving.

# *Curriculum Vitae*

After studying classics at Ghent University (2007-2011), Raf Praet (Beveren-Waas, 1989) worked as a research assistant to the Database of Byzantine Book Epigrams (DBBE), under the supervision of Prof. dr. Kristoffel Demoen (2011-2013). This dissertation is the result of his PhD-research at Groningen within the context of the project 'Finding the Present in the Distant Past. The Cultural Meaning of Antiquarianism in Late Antiquity', under the supervision of dr. Jan Willem Drijvers, Prof. dr. Peter Van Nuffelen and Prof. dr. Onno van Nijf. The project is the fruit of a collaboration between the university of Groningen and Ghent University.