REVIEW–DISCUSSION

A NEW EDITION OF *THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS*

J. M. Featherstone and J. Signes-Codoñer, edd., *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur libri I–IV*. Recensuerunt Anglice verterunt indicibus instruxerunt Michael Featherstone et Juan Signes-Codoñer, nuper repertis schedis Caroli de Boor adiuvantibus. *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, 53. Boston and Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015. Pp. x + 394. Hardback, €109.95/$154.00/£82.99. ISBN 978-1161451-598.

O n the one hand, we have 'Theophanes Continuatus', arguably the most important extant historiographical source on ninth-century Byzantium (the name is conventional, and it derives from the fact that the work sets out to 'continue' the *Chronicle* of Theophanes the Confessor, ending in 813): this anonymous text in four books (each devoted to one emperor, from 815 to 867) was produced in the tenth century under the impulse of emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, and is preserved to our day in a *codex unicus* (Vat. gr. 167, of the early eleventh century), where it precedes two other famous texts, namely the *Life of Basil I* (867–86), ostensibly written by Constantine VII himself, and another anonymous history covering the span of time from 886 to 961.

On the other hand, we have two internationally renowned Byzantinists (J. M. Featherstone and J. Signes Codoñer), the standard series for this kind of edition (de Gruyter's glorious *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, Series Berolinensis), and the considerable help provided by an almost ready-to-print edition prepared several decades ago by Carl de Boor, and adventurously recovered from his *Nachlass*.

Despite these brilliant premises, the outcome is less than satisfying. To be sure, we now have a more reliable critical text of this chronicle, as well as a readable (if sometimes debatable) English translation. However, there are a number of problems in this book: we shall examine here its salient features, category by category, while trying to give the reader a glimpse of the vast amount of fascinating work that still awaits to be done. No attention will be paid here to misprints, although these are pretty frequent.[1]

---

[1] E.g. p. *19 n. 59 part of a sentence is missing, so that the general meaning is obscure; p. *30 ms. Lipsiensis I.17 of Constantine VII's *De Cerimoniis* is quoted as 'II.17'; p. 4 we find 'Teophili', 'Verpaux', and 'emmendationes' for 'Theophili', 'Verpeaux', and 'emendationes'. In the text the clerical mistakes are less numerous (e.g. I.11.34 κηρηττούσης for

a.

Let us start from an issue that some readers may consider minor, but mars in my view the credibility of the whole enterprise. Being an editor myself, I know how easy it is to make mistakes when writing in Latin, and therefore I tend to be more than indulgent with the bold colleagues who take this risk. However, *sunt certi denique fines*: it appears here that no revision has been made—for a prestigious and expensive publisher like de Gruyter, this is not acceptable. I shall append here a very selective catalogue of errors, without insisting on mere infelicities of expression, which are alas far from rare.

On p. 8 'parent' is used twice in the sense of 'apparent', and 'videri' in the sense of '(dis)cerni'; p. 10 'quasi semper' for 'fere semper'; p. 28 'Halicarnassus' for 'Halicarnassensis'; p. 40 'vinxit' for 'vicit'; p. 68 'cruxem' for 'crucem'; p. 104 'Heracleiae' for 'Heracleae'; p. 130 'nubet' for 'nubit' (coordinated with the perfect 'accepit'); p. 144 'Abrahamitorum' for '-tarum'; p. 196 'Thassum' for 'Thasum' (see also p. 74 'occissum', p. 130 'desserta'); p. 204 'punxerunt' for 'interpunxerunt'; p. 226 'Syracusae' for 'Syracusarum'; p. 236 'ad Melitenem fugit' (Melitene is a town, hence no *ad*); p. 238 'haec' instead of 'huius'; p. 248 'taciter' instead of 'tacite'; p. 272 'videntibus' is taken as the participle of 'videor', and 'illae' as the dative of 'illa'; p. 307 'in regio Deutero' (perhaps 'in regione, quae Deuteron appellatur'?); p. 315 'aedes apud Palatium Iustinano (*sic*) II imperatore constructus' rather than 'constructae'; p. 322 the genitive of 'domus' is here 'domi'; p. 327 'Foederatum' for 'Foederatorum'; p. 328 'gentes Chaldaei' (Chaldaeorum? Chaldaicae?). In more than one place do we find 'conieciendum' rather than 'coniciendum' (pp. 218, 258), and various forms of 'suspicior' instead of 'suspicor' (pp. *22, *23, 78, 248). Not only Latin grammar seems to be a problem, if the adj. Κρῆσσα (II.23.11) is listed in the Index (p. 317) under a non existent Κρῆσσος, η, ον, rather than as the usual feminine of Κρής, and (p. 310) the famous Cretan town is listed as Γορτύνη rather than Γόρτυνα.

κηρυττούσης; I.21.20 ἅττα for ἅττα), but in the *apparatus criticus* the line numbers are sometimes wrong (e.g. p. 106: 36 *lege* 34; p. 270: 95 *lege* 94), and misprints are not rare (e.g. p. 8, line 6 B actually has καθ᾽ἕκαστα after the lacuna of 5 letters; p. 46 we find ὑπορία for the right ὑπερορία; p. 76 the reading ἐξανατολῆς is followed by no sigla; p. 106 we find Νεοκεαισάρειαν for Νεοκαι-; p. 188 we find ἐκείνοι for—I believe—ἐκεῖνοι). The same is true for the indexes: p. 308 'Bachi' for 'Bacchi'; p. 311 'Elladis' for 'Helladis'; p. 357 'Chirst.' for 'Christ.' etc.

b. The Prolegomena (pp. *3–*32)

b.1. Manuscript Tradition (pp. *5–*9)

No description is given of the *codex unicus* Vat. gr. 167 (its seventeenth-century apograph Vat. Barb. gr. 232, always incorrectly called in this book '*Barberinianus* 232', is barely mentioned), and the reader is referred to Ihor Ševčenko and Cyril Mango's splendid introduction to the *Vita Basilii*, as well as to a learned article by Stefano Serventi.[2] Still, no less than five pages are devoted to the analysis of 'scholia by what appears to be a twelfth-century owner of the manuscript' Vat. gr. 167 (henceforth V). These marginalia are no doubt interesting in that they seem to attest to a rather eccentric reading practice, i.e. the segmentation of the text by signposting the passages that deal with the same topic throughout the narrative (and, curiously enough, the signposts take the form of a calendar date); the editors argue that the study of this system can help figure out the extent of the text lost after the final folium of the manuscript (i.e. the anonymous text copied after the *Vita Basilii*, not edited in the present volume). Still, while it is hard to believe (as Ševčenko hypothesised) that this practice should be in some way connected with readings in monastic circles, perhaps something more ought to be said about the date of the marginalia. The editors attribute them to the twelfth century, but Serventi, upon close paleographical scrutiny, identifies a very standardised *epigraphische Auszeichnungsminuskel* that could be dated any time between the tenth and the twelfth century, so theoretically also closer in date to the copy of ms. V.[3] The issue is of some interest, because in at least one case (the passages περὶ ἐπιβουλῶν: see p. *7 and *8 n. 23) this process of segmentation seems to intersect the subjects (ὑποθέσεις) designed by Constantine VII in his famous sylloge of *Excerpta* (see below b.2.c).

b.2. Sources (pp. *10–*13) and Authorship (pp. *14–*19)

In the general loss of ninth-century sources, it is very difficult to figure out how Theophanes Continuatus put together his work, and we have no clue as to his identity.[4] We find in these prolegomena some speculation on the relationship of our text with hagiographical and official sources, as well as with Genesios'

---

[2] Ševčenko (2011) *14–*29; Serventi (2011).

[3] Serventi (2011) 297: 'non andrei oltre il XII secolo'.

[4] The attempt to glean his name (Joseph or Manuel) from a quotation in Skylitzes (p. *14) is ingenious; the alleged verbal echoes with the writings of Arethas of Caesarea (p. *15 n. 43) are of course inconclusive. It should be noted that the rest of the chapter (pp. *16–*19) switches to discuss the status and possible authorship of the anonymous text preserved after the *Vita Basilii* in ms. V (once again, a text not edited here, and of clearly different origin).

Basileiai, a work virtually contemporary with ThCont and covering the same span of years: for a clear picture of the reasons of this coexistence, readers are best referred to Paul Magdalino's recent article.[5] To make a long story short, while there is unanimous consensus on the fact that both ThCont and Genesios derive from a lost 'common source', and while one can discuss Signes' valuable idea that this source existed only in the form of a dossier of loose manuscript quires, with excerpts compiled from a variety of earlier sources, at least three vital issues would have deserved some closer scrutiny.

b.2.a

First of all, no mention is made here of the only overt reference to an earlier source within this text, namely the mysterious historiographical work by Theognostus the grammarian, quoted by Theophanes Continuatus in II.27.22 and credited by some scholars with an important role in the framework of middle Byzantine historiography.[6]

b.2.b

The 'word-for-word citations from antique Greek historians' (p. *15) represent one of the most distinctive features of Theophanes Continuatus, and they are duly registered in the *apparatus fontium.* Now, I am not sure if the simple expression κατὰ πολυτρόπων ἀνδρῶν (IV.23.9) should really be considered as a reference to Homer's *Odyssey* 1.1, nor am I convinced that it is wise to list a long series of passages from both paroemiographical and literary texts every time a common, everyday proverb appears in the text.[7] What I know for certain is that many of the borrowings from ancient sources have been missed by the editors (something hard to justify in the age of TLG), and that this state of affairs makes this edition an unreliable starting-point for any serious study of the literary dimension of Theophanes Continuatus. I append here a selection of random hits.[8]

---

[5] Magdalino (2013) 200–2.

[6] Treadgold (2013) 79–90.

[7] I refer to such obvious expressions as—amongst others—πάντα κάλων σείειν/κινεῖν (III.9.39 and 26.2), ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἑστώς (III.33.9), Μυσῶν λεία (III.39.6), or Trophonius' cave (IV.8.7). The proverb on lions and harts in I.6.49–50 is obviously not found in 'Stephanus Byz. 961E l. 11' (?), but rather in 'Plut. *soll. anim.* 961E11'.

[8] It is my impression that the 'patchwork'-like composition is more characteristic of book I than of the later ones, but this of course needs to be verified through a closer, systematic study.

I.9.2–10: this passage, relating the proclamation of Leo, has to be quoted in full (the numbering of the pericopae is mine): ¹προσπεσούσης δὲ ταύτης (scil. the ἀναγόρευσις), ἡ μὲν πόλις πρὸς τοιοῦτον ἄγγελμα μικροῦ δεῖν ἔκφρων γενομένη μόλις ἑαυτὴν συνεῖχεν¹, ²τοὺς ἐμφυλίους κατορρωδοῦσα πολέμους, ἐξ ὧν πολλάκις αὔτανδροι πόλεις κατεβαπτίσθησαν²· ³ὁ δ' αὐτοκράτωρ ἐξεπλάγη μὲν τὴν ψυχήν, οὐκ ἐταράχθη δὲ τὴν γνώμην³, ἀλλ' ἀχαριστίαν αὐτοῦ μόνον κατεγνωκώς, ἠρέμα πως ὑποψιθυρίσας ὡς καλὸν τῷ θείῳ θελήματι ἔπεσθαι, ⁴ἀφῄρει τῆς πόλεως τὸ περιθαμβὲς καὶ ταραχῶδες⁴, ἅπαντας προτρεψάμενος χωρῆσαι τούτου πρὸς ἀπαντήν, ἵνα μένουσαν σώζῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν ⁵ἐμφυλίου αἵματος ἄχραντόν τε καὶ καθαράν⁵. The editors signal here only the quotations of Plut. *Cat. Min.* 59.1 and 2 (respectively pericopae 1 and 4), but the passage is in fact a real patchwork, for pericopae 2, 3, and 5 are taken respectively from Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.60.2, from Herodian 3.11.8, and from Plut. *Arat.* 9.3.

I.13.1–4 ὡς δὲ τὸν τῶν Βουλγάρων ἄρχοντα τῇ προτεραίᾳ νίκῃ φρονηματιζόμενον διακήκοεν καὶ αὖθις δηοῦντα μὲν τὴν γείτονα γῆν, κείροντα δὲ καὶ λεηλατοῦντα τοὺς ἀγροὺς καὶ πολλὰ μὲν σώματα πολλὰ δὲ βοσκήματα καθαρπάζοντα: here the *apparatus fontium* detects only Diod. Sic. 12.48.3 for the first ten words, but it misses Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 3.57.5 for κείροντα καὶ λεηλατοῦντα, and Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.63.3 for the last seven words.

I.13.27–8 Leo wins over the enemies τὰ τέκνα τούτων ταῖς πέτραις καὶ τῇ γῇ προσκροτῶν: see *Psalm.* 136.9 μακάριος ὃς κρατήσει καὶ ἐδαφιεῖ τὰ νήπιά σου πρὸς τὴν πέτραν (remarkably enough, Greg. Naz. *in sanctum Pascha* PG 36.644c paraphrases this verset with the verb προσκροτέω, which shows he probably read κροτέω instead of κρατέω in his LXX text).

I.21.8: πρόλαλόν τε καὶ ἰταμόν: from Aelian, fr. 22 H. (preserved today only in Suid. γ 392).

II.19.33–5: the three lines on John Exaboulios are entirely taken from Polyb. 15.37.1 B-W on Antiochos (preserved today only in *Exc. Const. Virt.* II.143.17).

II.19.45 ἐξέπλει φρενῶν: see Aelian. fr. 36 H. (preserved today only in Suid. ε 578).

IV.44.22 ἀφασίᾳ καταληφθῆναι πολλῇ: from Herodian. 2.12.3.

b.2.c

Finally, a crucial point is not properly addressed in the Prolegomena, namely the relationship of this enterprise with Constantine VII's *Excerpta*: whether or not we share Magdalino's idea that the emperor was behind the very compilation of the aforementioned 'common source', one must bear in mind that the proem of Theophanes Continuatus speaks of Constantine VII's activity in the following terms: ἧς <τάς τε> καθ' ἕκαστα ὑποθέσεις ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς

Κων<στ>αντ<ῖνος> φιλοπόνως συνέλεξε καὶ εὐσυνόπτως ἐξέθετο <πρὸς εὔκρι>νῆ τοῖς μετέπειτα δήλωσιν. Should we really understand here ὑποθέσεις as 'dossiers of source material',[9] or should we recall that the same word is a key term of Constantine's preface to the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, where it indicates the various 'subjects' in which the *Excerpta* are divided?[10] Furthermore, one wonders why the reader is never referred to András Németh's important study of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' method, and to his dissertation (and forthcoming monograph) on the place of this gigantic work in middle Byzantine historiography. The aforementioned occurrences (b.2.b) of quotations from lost historians in Theophanes Continuatus (*inter alios* Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and even the lost sections of Aelian and Polybius) show that the interests and the readings of this author were very close to those of Constantine's encyclopedia, and this is certainly not the fruit of chance.

b.3. Reception (pp. *20–*6)

This section ought to have been called 'Indirect tradition', for it deals with the parallel sources that editors of Theophanes Continuatus can use when constituting the text. Philologically speaking, this is a very interesting case, for while the *codex unicus* is written by a rather careless scribe, much can be gained from the comparison with parallel accounts in Genesios (see above b.2) and above all in later historiographical sources that demonstrably drew on Theophanes Continuatus and on Genesios: I refer to the *Historical Synopsis* of John Skylitzes and the *Chronicle* of Ps.-Symeon Logothete.[11] Despite some confusing slips (e.g. on p. *22 the reading of I.10.22 ascribed to ms. V is incorrect), the synopsis of all the various cases of agreement between ThCont and one or more other sources is interesting,[12] and the stemma proposed on p. *28 is no doubt useful as a bird's-eye-view of the complicated relationships among a series of different

---

[9] So Magdalino (2013) 201: see the Prolegomena, p. *12.

[10] See Németh (2010) and (2013); Pontani (2015) 352–3. More doubts come to mind: could these ὑποθέσεις be the fruit of a '*capitulatio*' of book I (ἧς may well refer to 'the kingdom of Leon the Armenian' rather than to the Χρονογραφία as a whole), to be replicated in the following books (πρὸς δήλωσιν always requires a genitive of the object which is illustrated, hence one might rather keep the transmitted τῶν μετέπειτα 'of the following books/subjects' against Kambylis' conjecture τοῖς μετέπειτα 'for the later generations')? It should also be remembered that in ms. V the only book with marginal summaries of the narration is precisely book I (ff. 1v–12r: Serventi (2011) 285).

[11] It should be remarked here that the label 'Ps-Symeon' pops up on p. *21 without any previous mention or clarification: another proof that the reader without a deep knowledge of Byzantine historiography may find it hard to read these Prolegomena.

[12] Particularly so the cases in which the very tradition of the parallel sources is split in two or more readings: on similar cases see now Bucossi (2016).

historiographical works—this, however, is by no means a philological stemma, but it (dangerously?) combines in one and the same picture both the strictly philological derivation of manuscripts and the filiation of contents from one historiographical work to the other.

c.1. The Text and the *Apparatus Criticus*

The book's greatest *atout* is the heritage of de Boor's edition, which benefited from a systematic comparison with Skylitzes' text, and appears characteristically learned and sober, sometimes even ingenious (e.g. II.15.13 ἐναπορράνας from V's ἐν ἀπεράνας; II.23.6 λέγων from V's λαβών). The choices of the modern editors, while occasionally convincing,[13] are sometimes problematic: I shall append here a short selection of doubtful passages.

I.prooem.11: we find here the syntactically untenable καταπρανοῦς φερόμενοι 'moving on all fours' (καταπρανῶς? καταπρανεῖς?), and the apparatus states 'καταπρανοῦς V', a puzzling note since this is precisely the reading adopted in the text: perhaps the editors originally wished to follow their predecessors in printing in the text a more perspicuous κατὰ πρανοῦς?

I.1.26: a long interpolation by a certain 'Goar' suddenly appears in the apparatus, leaving the reader puzzled for no mention of this name has ever been made in the volume.[14]

I.3.29: we learn in the apparatus that a τῇ has been deleted by de Boor (and by the second hand of ms. V): it should then figure in the text in curly (or square) brackets.

I.4.33: emperor Leo renews his bonds of friendship with Michael τοῦ σὺν αὐτῷ δὴν τραφέντος, 'who had of old grown up with him', but this δήν (editors' conjecture on V's δεῖν) actually means 'for a long time', and it is very doubtful that mention should be made here of a 'long-standing education' (de Boor wisely adopted the Barberinianus' συντραφέντος).

I.11.17: the *gnome* φιλεῖ γὰρ ἕκαστος τὸ φιλοῦν ἐκπομπεύειν τοῖς φιλουμένοις makes hardly any sense in the context (Michael was not showing off his love, he was in bad need of help and counsel in a difficult situation), whereas de Boor and previous editors all accept the easy correction τὸ λυποῦν.

I.23.7: the mother of emperor Leo adduces her πολυετῆ χρείαν ('the usage of many years') as a reason for not eating meat: this reading is closer to ms. V's πολυετήχρειαν, but much less plausible than de Boor's easy correction πολυετῆ χηρείαν, 'long-standing widowhood'.

---

[13] E.g. πυρὸς for πρός in I.21.42; ὀψέ for ὅτε in III.40.4.

[14] On the French Dominican Jacques Goar, and his aid to Combéfis, see Ševčenko (2011) 87.

II.14.21: a general dispatches certain men as a vanguard, κρίνας τούτους κατὰ γῆν τε καὶ θάλασσαν ἅμα ποιεῖσθαι τὰς προσβολάς, 'choosing them for attacks both by land and by sea': vanguards are normally not sent so that they may move attacks by land and by sea, and the sentence becomes clear only once we get rid of the editors' τούτους and restore (or at best, following de Boor, delete) V's τοῦ: 'evaluating the opportunity of attacking …', 'deciding to attack …'.

II.27.4–5: ἐπεὶ τὸ παράδειγμα οὐ πόρρωθεν εἶχεν κωλῦον οὐδ' ἀποτρέπον: since the meaning is 'since he had the example which hardly hindered nor forbade', it is clear that an οὐ is missing before κωλῦον, as integrated by de Boor and previous editors.

III.1.30: we read in the apparatus 'ἐπαινεῖν V Boor: fortasse ἐπαινετόν scribendum', but what we find in the text is precisely ἐπαινετόν: a very strange usage.

III.3.12–13: τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν προκειμένοις τῶν βουλομένων ἐξωνήσειν presents an unprecedented active form of ἐξωνέομαι, conjecturally restored by the editors: V has ἐξώνησιν, which can easily be emended in <εἰς> ἐξώνησιν (see e.g. Th. Cont. 359.4 Bekk.) or in ἐξωνήσει (de Boor).

III.32.21: τῷ δ' ἀμεραμνουνῇ ἀκηκοότι νίκης οὐ μικρᾶς καὶ κατὰ τοῦ Ἀμορίου καταδρομῆς: that the genitive καταδρομῆς (V has καταδρομή, which de Boor accepts postulating a larger lacuna on the basis of Skylitzes' text) should not be coordinated with νίκης (and thus not depend on ἀκηκοότι), but rather refer to αἰτία in the line above, is syntactically implausible.

III.36.2: ἐξιᾶσιν, adopted in the text, comes from ἐξίημι, but the meaning here is 'came out', so we should follow de Boor and others in printing ἐξίασιν.

IV.27.32: the Arab scholars are presented as τοῦτο λέγοντες τοιαύτην ἔχοι τὴν κλῆσιν καὶ τοιαύτην τὸ ἕτερον, and this ἔχοι is justified on p. 351 as an *optativus obliquus,* but—in the lack of a conjunction—it is clear that we have here the quotation of a direct speech: hence, following Bekker, we should print ἔχει.

IV.29.5: Leo the Philosopher is said to have mastered 'Rhetoric and Philosophy and learning of numbers whilst on the island of Hyatros' (ῥητορικὴν δὲ καὶ φιλοσοφίαν καὶ ἀριθμῶν ἀναλήψεις κατὰ τὴν νῆσον Ὕατρον γενόμενος). The name of the island (a small place opposite the shores of Bithynia) is here the fruit of de Boor's conjecture: the apparatus reads: ' Ὕατρον coni. Boor in app., verbis τῇ χέρσῳ ταύτης ad Andrum insulam non spectare videntibus [*sic*: 'seeming'?], cf. Vita Ignatii col. 496–497 de insula Hyatro et monasteriis illae [*sic*: *lege* illi] proximis'. It would have been perhaps useful to provide the reader

with at least one bibliographical reference[15] discussing the plausibility of Andros as a place of learning in these times, and the possible reasons for preferring such an obscure place as Hyatros.

IV.44.18: the dodecasyllable pronounced by emperor Michael III reads in ms. V as: δεύτερον δὲ συμφυὲς πέλει στέφος. The line is clearly missing the first syllable, whether it be τό or (more likely, as in Skylitzes) καί: it is thus unwise to follow here the manuscript rather than the indirect tradition and all previous editors.

c.2. The Translation

I.22.7: the Sibylline oracle about Leo V, as found in a book of the imperial library, is described as follows: ἦν οὖν Λέων θηρίον μεμορφωμένον χῖ στοιχεῖον κεχαραγμένον ἔχων ἀπὸ τῆς ῥάχεως μέχρι τῆς γαστρὸς αὐτοῦ: 'Leo was represented as a beast with the letter Ch inscribed between its backbone and its belly'. Leaving aside that the letter reproducing the pertinent shape is in fact X (not 'Ch'), it is very unlikely that the subject should be Leo, for the *Witz* is on the representation of a lion (λέων with no capital lambda), while the homonymy with the emperor is only explained later, towards the end of the paragraph (ὡς Λέοντος οὕτω καλουμένου βασιλέως).

II.2.1: Michael is released τῆς ἐκ τοῦ παπίου φρουρᾶς (whereby de Boor's ἐκ τῆς reads certainly better), not 'from the prison by the papias', but at best 'from the papias' prison/surveillance'.

II.21.45: Apochaps' troops are surprised at the general's decision to set fire to the ships upon landing in Crete: but they changed their mind ἐπεὶ δὲ κατήκουσαν ἃ πάλαι ὠδίνοντο, which is translated here 'but then they heard the things that they had bewailed formerly', a gross confusion (perhaps with Combéfis' ὠδύνοντο?) instead of the right 'after they heard the plans that had been conceived long before' (*scil.* by Apochaps).

II.27.3–4: Euphemios is seized by erotic desire for a young nun, καὶ διὰ πολλοῦ ἐποιεῖτο τὸν αὐτοῦ ἔρωτα ἐκπληρῶσαι τὴν παρθένον λαβών πως εἰς γαμετήν. This sentence does not mean 'and after trying for a long time to fulfil his desire he succeeded somehow in taking the virgin to wife' (a story which, incidentally, is narrated later in the paragraph), but rather 'and he attached great importance to the act of fulfilling his love by somehow marrying the virgin'.

III.14.16: the quarrel between Theophanes and emperor Theophilus about the correct quotation of scriptural authority is summed up in this sentence: ὡς δὲ νενοθεῦσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ οὐ ταύτην δὴ μόνον ὁ ἅγιος ἐπεβόα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσας

---

[15] Angelidi (1998).

τὰς εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ χεῖρα βίβλους ἐληλακυίας, ἐκείνην ἔλεγε προστεθῆναι πρὸς αὐτὸν τὴν κατὰ τὴν πατριαρχικὴν ἐν τῷ Θωμαΐτῃ κατὰ τήνδε τὴν θέσιν κειμένην βιβλιοθήκην εἰς τῶν λεγομένων βεβαίωσιν. This is the translation provided by the editors: ‘And when the holy Theophanes cried out that not only this one but all the books which had come into his hands had been corrupted, Theophilus said that the book containing this passage deposited in the patriarcal library in the Thomais should be brought to him for confirmation of the words.’ Let us set aside the wrong toponym ‘Thomais’ for ‘Thomaites’; when Theophanes argues that the books ‘had been corrupted’, the translation ought not to omit the complement ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, ‘by him’, for only this detail gives the real dimension of the charge levelled by Theophanes at the iconoclast emperor, namely the charge of tampering with the holy text. Furthermore, the reference to a book ‘in a specific place’ (κατὰ τήνδε τὴν θέσιν) is an important detail in order to clarify the well-ordered nature of the imperial library in Theophilus’ times, and thus it should by no means be omitted. Finally, the infinitive προστεθῆναι (‘to be added’) is the editors’ shaky conjecture on V’s προστιθείς (much better Kambylis’ προτεθῆναι ‘to be presented’ or, in a different construction, de Boor’s προστιθεὶς <ἰέναι>).

III.27.26: the section on a woman’s prophetic dreams is rounded off by this enigmatic sentence: καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὧδέ πῃ κατὰ Πλάτωνα, ‘So it was with these things, after the manner of Plato’. No indication is given of what these words should refer to, except that in the *apparatus fontium* one finds a clumsy reference to Hesychius ε 123 (where an irrelevant passage of the *Sophist* is quoted), and in the *Index nominum* the very identity of this Plato is questioned (p. 323: ‘philosophus?’). Now, it may well be that Theophanes Continuatus is here connecting visions and divination with Plato (much as Ps.Plut. *plac. philosoph.* 904D-E), but one ought at least to consider the possibility that the allusion might be of a merely formal kind, i.e. the concluding formulas typical of Plato such as ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω, or ὧδέ πως and the like.

IV.26.12: Bardas’ goal was to restore the study of secular doctrine, καὶ γὰρ ἦν τῷ τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ παραρρυεῖσα, which is translated ‘for at that time it had disappeared from memory’, while what is actually meant is ‘for it had been obliterated by the passing of such a long time’.

IV.32.11–12: Michael III is persecuting Ignatios and the priests: ThCont is speaking of what the emperor did attempting ‘to be second to no other man’ (δεύτερος τῶν ὄντων ἐπὶ γῆς): κατὰ πάντων τῶν ἱερέων ἐνεανιεύσατο (the verb is in the singular), ‘the ludicrous things he devised against all priests’, not—as we read in the translation—what ‘*they* wantonly devised’ (the subject becomes here the Roman *locum tenentes*), so that *they* ‘might prove second to none’.

d. The Indexes

The Indexes are disappointing. The *Index nominum propriorum*, constellated of a number of misprints (including in the very title on p. 306: '*proriorum*'), is extremely laconic in explaining the names involved: even aside from the few items left with no comment at all,[16] no genealogy or context is given for the characters,[17] and very few geographical or topographical details are offered.[18] Similarly, the *Index rerum Byzantinarum* would be extremely useful if only some kind of translation or paraphrasis had been given: leaving completely aside the usual infelicities (e.g. 'icona' on p. 331, but 'icon' on p. 337), some of these words are certainly obscure to the non-specialist, and sometimes they are bound to remain obscure even after looking up the passage in the text: for example, $\pi\alpha\pi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ occurs many times in the text, but in the English translation it is simply translitterated, so that one definitely needs the *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität* or Du Cange's *Glossarium* in order to understand what the word means; and what is a 'kleisourarch'? what is a 'protomandator'? what can the entry '$\beta\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}o\nu$ ($\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\iota\kappa\grave{\alpha}$ $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$)' possibly refer to?

The *Index grammaticus* is simply a list of peculiar syntactical features, with several infelicities,[19] some omissions,[20] and some demonstrably wrong choices.[21] Finally, the *Index locorum* obviously lacks the parallel passages that

---

[16] E.g. what is $\Sigma\tauo\acute{\nu}\delta\iotaο\varsigma$? is it different from the $\mu o\nu\grave{\eta}$ $\tauο\hat{\nu}$ $\Sigma\tauο\nu\delta\acute{\iota}ο\nu$ listed immediately below? what is the $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nuο\varsigma$ Ἀναργύρων?

[17] Does an item like 'Ξέρξης: Perses' (*sic*) really help? or 'Κραμβωνιτῶν, ἡ γενεὰ τῶν: gens Crambonitum' (*sic*)? who are the 'Athingani', or the 'Amalecites' (*sic*: perhaps 'Amalecitae')? why pervicaciously repeat the odd 'ameramnounes' instead of 'caliph'?

[18] Do indications such as 'Δαζημών: locus' or 'Κελάριον: ager' really help the reader?

[19] E.g. p. 342 'dativus agens' rather than 'agentis'; p. 345 'antecedentem' for 'antecedens'; p. 348 'imperfecti' for 'imperfectum'; p. 351 'concesivo'; p. 355 'periphraseis', 'tempore imperfectivo'.

[20] E.g. if one keeps $\kappa\alpha\theta$' $\epsilon\hat{\iota}\varsigma$ ('one by one') in III.11.2 one ought at least to spend a word on this eccentric *iunctura* (as does e.g. Paul Speck commenting on Theodore Studites, *iamb.* 25.5: see Speck (1968) 95). And why not spend a word on (or at least register) terms that look like *hapax legomena* or very rare words, e.g. I.21.30 $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\acute{ο}\sigma\kappa\eta\mu\alpha$, II.21.19 $\pi\rhoο\sigma\kappaο\rho\acute{\epsilon}\nu\nu\nu\mu\iota$, etc.?

[21] E.g. on p. 342 the concordance between an accusative and a nominative is mentioned, but the only passage invoked (I.2.4–6) has no nominative at all, as $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\theta\nu\nuο\acute{\nu}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ and $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\rho\alpha\beta\epsilon\nuο\acute{\nu}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ refer to the prayers, $\epsilon\vec{\nu}\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$; p. 345 we find III.9.6 $\tau\hat{\eta}$ $\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ $\tauο\acute{\nu}\tauο\nu$ $\sigma\nu\mu\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nuο\nu\tau\alpha$ as an example of demonstrative pronoun used as reflexive, but the subject is in fact the general, and the heresy is Theophilus', so there is no reflexive relation at all; p. 346 the imperfect $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\eta$ is presented as an aorist.

had not been identified in the *apparatus testimoniorum* (see above b.2.b), but also shows some limits in the choice of the editions used.[22]

❧

The problems of this edition (which was not produced in haste, as the preface—pp. vii–viii—informs us) are all the more striking if one compares it with its obvious predecessor, namely Ihor Ševčenko's *Vita Basilii*, printed posthumously in 2011 under the expert care of Cyril Mango:[23] it will suffice to compare the indexes of the two books in order to have an idea of the different niveaus of scholarship involved. Let us hope that this volume, which has the undoubted merit of presenting for the first time to a wider audience such a crucial text for the study of Byzantine history, will appear in a strongly revised version in the near future.

FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI

Università Ca' Foscari, Venezia   f.pontani@unive.it

---

[22] E.g. Diodorus Siculus quoted after the old Teubner rather than the new Belles Lettres volumes; *Etymologicum Magnum* quoted after Kallierges (1499!) rather than Gaisford; Euripides' fragments quoted after Nauck rather than Kannicht.

[23] See above n. 2 and Kaldellis' review (2012).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angelidi, C. (1998) 'Le séjour de Léon le Mathématicien à Andros: réalité ou confusion?', in Εὐψυχία. *Mélanges Ahrweiler*, vol. 1 (Paris) 1–7.

Bucossi, A. (2016) 'The Use of an *Apparatus Collationum Fontium* for the Critical Edition of a Patristic Anthology', in E. Göransson et al., edd., *The Arts of Editing Medieval Greek and Latin: A Casebook* (Toronto) 34–53.

Kaldellis, A. (2012) review of Ševčenko, I., ed., *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur liber quo Vita Basilii imperatoris amplectitur* (De Gruyter, 2011), *BMCR* 2012.04.25 (http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2012/2012-04-25.html)

Magdalino, P. (2013) 'Knowledge in Authority and Authorised History', in P. Armstrong, ed., *Authority in Byzantium* (Farnham) 187–209.

Németh, A. (2010) *Imperial Systematization of the Past: Emperor Constantine VII and his Historical Excerpts* (Diss.; Budapest).

—— (2013) 'The Imperial Systematization of the Past in Constantinople: Constantine VII and his Historical Excerpts', in J. König and G. Woolf, edd. *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Cambridge and New York) 232–58.

Pontani, F. (2015) 'Scholarship in the Byzantine Empire (529–1453)', in F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, and A. Rengakos, edd., *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, vol. 1 (Leiden and Boston) 297–455.

Serventi, S. (2011) 'Il Vat. Gr. 167, testimone della Continuatio Theophanis e i marginalia di un anonimo lettore bizantino', *Aevum* 75: 267–302.

Ševčenko, I., ed. (2011) *Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur liber quo vita Basilii imperatoris amplectitur* (Berlin).

Speck, P. (1968) *Theodoros Studites. Iamben auf verschiedene Gegenstände* (Munich).

Treadgold, W. (2013) *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (New York).