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ABSTRACT.
The object of this Thesis is to determine the sources used by Theophanes in his *Chronographia* for the history of the Heraclian dynasty, by a detailed study not only of the work of Theophanes, but also of two other Byzantine chroniclers of the 8th and 9th centuries, the patriarch Nicephorus and George the Monk, in addition to the extant Byzantine historical sources of the seventh century, to determine their relationship to the later works, as well as the relevant non-Byzantine chronicle sources, which are chiefly Syriac but include also Armenian and Coptic works. It is necessary also to consider the considerable range of secondary work in the field of Byzantine chronography, although comparatively little of this work has been devoted to the problem now under investigation.

The detection of fragments of extant sources in Theophanes is relatively easy; reconstruction of the non-extant sources presents a more difficult problem and allows a lesser degree of certainty. Within the chronological and factual framework of the reign of each emperor of the dynasty, I propose to examine in detail Theophanes' narrative, and when possible to compare it with that of the other primary sources, then to consider any relevant secondary work, in order to establish the source of Theophanes' account.

This work therefore involves incidentally a detailed study of the Byzantine Empire in a crucial period of its history.
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Chapter One:

Introduction: The Sources and their Authors.
The object of this Thesis is to determine the nature of the sources upon which Theophanes the Confessor based his narrative of the history of the Heraclian dynasty (610-711) in his Chronographia.

Such an investigation is significant, not only in consideration of Theophanes himself, but also in the wider context of Byzantine chronography as a whole. It is of paramount importance to discover the sources which lie behind the narrative of Theophanes, for although the Chronographia is one of the principal primary sources for Byzantine history, it is essentially an unoriginal compilation, although of a very high order based upon other primary sources. Because of Theophanes' fundamental importance for our knowledge of Byzantine history, and especially for the Heraclian era, accurate assessment and judgment of the Chronographia is essential, and this can only be based upon knowledge of the older sources upon which it is constructed, in the absence of comparable literary evidence by which it could be evaluated. Some of Theophanes' sources are still extant, but others of his historical and chronicle sources have now been lost, and, although their existence in fragmentary form is well known, they can only be reconstructed from the Chronographia, or from other later works in which they are reproduced.

The determination of Theophanes' sources for the Heraclian era will also provide an accurate indication of the general state of Byzantine literature from the seventh to the ninth century; Theophanes apparently utilised all the information available to him, and it is a reasonable assumption that his sources represent the sum total of historical sources for the seventh century. That Theophanes was compelled to have recourse to epic poetry and hagiography proves that little history was in fact written in this
period, and confirms the general judgement of historians that the seventh
century in respect of literary activity was a barren period, particularly
the epoch after Heraclius, which by reason of the great paucity of sources
has rightly been called the dark age of Byzantium.

A subsidiary feature of this Thesis will be a detailed study of the
Empire in a crucial period of its history, and indeed in the history of
the whole Mediterranean world. Under the Heraclians, the first dynasty
to occupy the imperial throne, the Empire, as the result of two centuries
of barbarian incursions in the West and a century of continuous warfare
in the East against Persians, Slavs and Arabs, became territorially
reduced and ethnically more coherent; the loss of the Latin West and the
Semitic East made it Hellenic in both language and culture, so that it
was no longer the East Roman and universal, but the Byzantine Empire; the
provincial administration of Diocletian and Constantine was replaced by
the military unit of the Theme, based upon an army of smallholders with
hereditary military obligations; the increasing power of the Church made
Byzantium an Empire of soldiers and monks. Italy was settled by the
Lombards, the Balkans by Slavs and Bulgars, and Syria, Egypt, and North
Africa by the Arabs. The lack of communication between eastern and
western Christendom, evident since the sixth century, if not before, in
the seventh century became clear division. By the end of the Heraclian
era, the worlds of East and West were manifestly and irrevocably divided.

This investigation will involve a detailed study not only of the
Chronographia itself, but also of the Breviarium of the patriarch
Nicephorus and the Chronicle of George the Monk, followed by comparison
of the Chronographia with these other two Byzantine chronicle sources of the ninth century. It will also be necessary to examine the extant Byzantine historical sources of the seventh century, to determine their relevance to the problem under consideration, and their relationship to the later works. The historical poems of George of Pisidia\(^5\) commemorate the great deeds of Heraclius, while the sources collected under the title of the Analecta Avarica\(^6\) narrate the defeat of the barbarian attack upon Constantinople in 626. The Chronicon Paschale\(^7\), a chronological list with historical commentary, is of great value for the first part of the reign of Heraclius. The Life of Maximus the Confessor\(^8\) contains a condensed history of Monotheletism. Consideration of non-Byzantine sources is also relevant in this investigation. The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiou\(^9\), is important for the early years of Heraclius, although it has survived only in a mutilated condition and the greater part of the reign of Heraclius has been lost. The Account of the sack of Jerusalem in AD 614 by Antiochus Strategos\(^10\) is the only eye-witness narrative which we possess. Two eastern theologians of the eighth century provide valuable accounts of the life and teaching of Mahomed; John of Damascus, author of the De Haeresibus Liber and the Disputatio Christiani et Saraceni\(^11\), and Bartholomew of Edessa, author of the Confutatio Agareni and the Contra Mahomed\(^12\). Syriac writers also demand consideration; these include four minor anonymous contemporary Chronicles\(^13\), in addition to the Chronicle of Denis of Tell-Mahre, patriarch of Antioch\(^14\), the Opus Chronologicum of Elias Bar-Sinaya, metropolitan of Nisibis\(^15\), and the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian, patriarch of Antioch\(^16\), all of which drew on earlier sources. Another seventh century work of interest and value is the History of Heraclius by the Armenian bishop Sebeos\(^17\).
The range of secondary literature dealing with Byzantine Chronography is considerable, and I regret not only that some of the periodical publications and books which I should have liked to consult have proved to be unobtainable in this country, but also that works in Russian are inaccessible to me. While much of this secondary work has proved to be of value, investigations of the sources of Theophanes for several incidents have been made in isolation, without consideration of their place within the framework of the narrative as a whole; so that the impression has thereby been created of an unjustifiable proliferation of sources underlying Theophanes' work, which can be discounted on the basis of probability alone. Previous investigations relevant to this research will be cited and discussed in that place in the Thesis where they have especial application, in the introductory sketches of the sources involved, or in consideration of a particular incident or point, or in the final clarification and evaluation of the problem in the concluding section of each chapter.

Krumbacher, discussing the general characteristics of Byzantine Chronicles, emphasised the problems and pitfalls inherent in an investigation such as this. Chronicles were written, generally by monks, for a popular audience, and based on older historiography or chronography, on the principle that the more well-known the original source, the greater the popularity of the work in which it was reproduced. A main and a subsidiary source can generally be traced in each work, and one of the most important and at the same time one of the most difficult features of a study in this field is the establishment of the original source or examplar of a particular Chronicle. Frequently, the chief original source
is completely or partially lost, and the Chronicle in which it is found has been subject to excerpt or interpolation in later edition or translation. There is a possibility of error in attempts to isolate sources, through subjective judgement as to what constitutes certainty, probability, or possibility, and a confusion of fact and assumption in the final decision.

With these considerations in mind, after a preliminary study to characterise the sources involved and their relevance and importance in regard to the problem under consideration, it is possible to arrive at a tentative and generalised working theory as a basis for further detailed investigation.

From this, it would appear that Theophanes used three main sources in his account of the Heraclian dynasty; a World Chronicle, written in the eastern provinces of the Empire, and extending over the whole period; and two Byzantine Chronicles, written presumably in or near Constantinople, the first extending to 668, and exclusive to Theophanes, and the second, which was also a common source for Nicephorus, extending from 668 to at least the end of the period under investigation. For his narrative of the reign of Heraclius, Theophanes amplified his two main sources with four additional sources.

Nicephorus, in his narrative of events from 602 to 641, used apparently a Constantinople Chronicle as an independent source from that of Theophanes, but from 663 (there is no account of the reign of Constans), he used the
Byzantine Chronicle which formed a common source with Theophanes.

The Chronicle of George the Monk was apparently compiled, in respect of its historical material, from Theophanes' *Chronographia* and Nicephorus' *Breviarium*.

The hypothesis outlined above may require modification after detailed investigation.

The value and relevance of the *Breviarium* in this research is at once evident, but the *Chronicle* of George the Monk, written later than those of Theophanes and Nicephorus, and apparently compiled from them, is therefore of little assistance in determining the sources of Theophanes. The Byzantine works of the seventh century listed above, especially George of Pisidia and the *Vita* of Maximus the Confessor, appear in Theophanes' account of the reign of Heraclius, either by direct quotation or indirect transmission; while the *Chronicon Paschale* is apparently related to the source of Nicephorus for the history of the first half of the seventh century. The *Chronicle* of John of Nikiou is chiefly valuable to clarify, correct, or confirm the narrative of the Byzantine sources; although it is not impossible that John shared a common source with Nicephorus for the first half of the seventh century. The four minor contemporary, and the three major later Syriac chronicles, in addition to their value for comparison with the account of Theophanes, are also of assistance in determining the sources which he used; whether or not it is possible to identify precisely the author of the eastern World Chronicle, the presence in Theophanes and the Syriac sources of parallel passages at least proves
its existence. The History of Sebeos, written in Armenian, is only of value (as far as this investigation is concerned) to confirm or explain the narrative of Theophanes; any direct connection between them is highly improbable.

The most obvious framework for this investigation is that of chronology, provided by the reigns of the emperors, although it is equally obvious that the continuity of the primary sources is not affected by such arbitrary divisions. Moravcsik pointed out both the interdependence and complex relationships, and the wide variety and differing value, of the sources from which the historian derives knowledge of Byzantine history. The same comment can justly be made of the sources of Theophanes' Chronographia. It is relatively easy to trace in Theophanes the fragments of the extent sources; reconstruction of the non-extant sources presents the greater problem, and allows a lesser degree of certainty. Within each reign, I propose first to examine individually Theophanes' narrative of each event, and to compare it with the corresponding narrative of the other primary sources, in the light both of the working theory outlined above, and of the relevant secondary literature; and then to draw together the sources from which Theophanes constructed his narrative of the whole reign, in order to reach if possible a definite or at least a probable conclusion.

No adequate study has yet been made of the life of Theophanes himself, and although the Byzantines were greatly interested in the person of the chronographer, biography is combined with a large amount of legend, so
that it is difficult to determine the facts. There is, for instance, confusion over the date of his birth, 752 being suggested by Moravosik, 760 by Colonna, following Pargoire, while Krumbacher committed himself no further than the reign of Constantine V Copronymus, 741-775. The authorities are unanimous that he was born of a rich and distinguished patrician family in Constantinople. The details of his early life are equally vague; Theophanes apparently followed no official career, but came in some way to the notice of the patriarch of Constantinople. On the death of his father Isaac, Theophanes married the daughter of a Byzantine patrician, but after two years he and his wife separated by mutual consent to embrace the religious life; his wife entered a convent on the island of Prinkipo, while he came a monk and later praepositus in a monastery on the island of Calonymum. Some time later, he founded the monastery of Megalos Agros at Sigriane, on the coast of the sea of Marmora, between Cyzicus and the estuary of the river Rhyndakes. Theophanes wrote his Chronographia for the community of Sigriane, between 813 and 815. He was an opponent of the revival of Iconoclasm by Leo V the Armenian (813-820), who first attempted to win him over with bribes and promises, and then subjected him to an inquest and imprisoned him for some time, and finally exiled him to Samothrace where he died in 817. At Easter, 822, in the reign of the more moderate Michael II the Stammerer (820-829), the body of Theophanes was brought from Samothrace and was reinterred with honour at Sigriane. Theophanes is honoured by the Eastern Church as "Confessor".

The Chronographia covered the period from the accession of Diocletian in 284 to that of Michael I Rangabe in 813, and was written, according to
Theophanes' own Preface, at the request made before his death by his friend George Syncellus, to be a continuation of the latter's unfinished World Chronicle which extended to that date. Theophanes was writing for his monastic community at Sigriane, and aimed only at the collection and arrangement of facts in an orderly account, and did not aspire to the historian's higher goal of deeper understanding and perception.

Historians are divided as to the value of the Chronographia as a work of history: Ostrogorsky considered that Theophanes possessed neither historical insight nor depth of scholarship nor objectivity of approach; Krumbacher, on the other hand, declared that Theophanes manifested learning, critical judgement and mastery of huge subject matter; while Iorga denied the Chronographia's breadth of scope, stating that it neglected everything but affairs on the Danube and the great changes in Asia in the seventh century. But it is generally held that Theophanes is one of the most important Byzantine chroniclers, not least in his influence upon later writers; and that he is a valuable source for Byzantine history in his own right, and for the portions or otherwise lost historical sources for the seventh and eighth centuries which he preserved. Following the example of Syncellus, Theophanes arranged the narrative of the Chronographia in the form of annals, which he prefaced with an elaborate chronological table, although his original source material was presumably not so divided.

Theophanes' carefully calculated chronology is perhaps the most outstanding feature of his Chronographia, and is crucial for Byzantine history, providing the main basis for Byzantine chronology during the dark seventh and eighth centuries. It comprised the world year of the Alexandrian...
era, the Incarnation year, the regnal year of the Byzantine emperor, the Persian king (replaced from the second half of the seventh century by that of the Arab caliph), and of the five oecumenical patriarchs of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch and Rome (the regnal year of the pope appeared only sporadically, and that of the patriarch of Antioch ceased to be given after Arab conquest). There are, however, two periods in which the world years and indiction numbers, stated or implied, do not correspond: 609/10 (6102) - 713/14 (6206); and 725/26 (6218) - 773/74 (6265). This discrepancy has long been noted by historians, and several attempts have been made to explain it. Bury, Hubert and Hodgkin considered that the world year calculation was correct and that of the Indiction wrong; according to Bury, who explained Theophanes' error as the result of miscalculation, and Hubert, who endeavoured to prove it by comparison with the dating of papal letters, Leo III in 726/27 levied double taxation, accounting for the tenth and eleventh indictments, and Constantine V Copronymus in 772/74 remitted an imposition and thus the two years counted as one Indiction. Hodgkin postulated a reform in the Constantinople Indiction reckoning, which produced a discrepancy between the reckonings of Rome and Constantinople. Brooks first rejected this theory, then refuted these arguments by a comparison of the dating of Theophanes between 725 and 775 with that of the eastern sources of the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian and the Chronicon ad 846 pertinens, with which it corresponded, claiming that the error lay in the world year calculation which came from western sources.

Ostrogorsky finally proved that it was the calculation of the world year which was wrong, and that of the Indiction number which was correct, by a detailed study of those dates of Theophanes which could be controlled (the
regnal years of the emperors and of the patriarchs of Constantinople), and
that in consistent discrepancy the world year was one year behind the
indiction number. Further examination of the Chronographia showed that
the error arose through the division of the events of 605 and of 726 into
two years, and the contraction of the events of 714 and 715, and of 774 &
775 into one year. Dolger confirmed the findings of Ostrogorsky.

Theophanes' Chronographia was continued after his death by later Byzantine
writers. Hirsch's detailed study has shown that the six books of the
compilation known as Theophanes Continuatus, a chronicle in the form of a
biography of each Byzantine emperor from 813 to 961, were written in three
parts. Books 1 - IV were the work of a certain Leontius, a contemporary
of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetus, based on material which was supplied
by the emperor himself, and which in Book IV is closely related to and
apparently shows a common source with Joseph Genesios. Book I narrates
the reign of Leo V the Armenian (813-820); Book II, Michael II, the
Stammerer (820-829), founder of the Amorian Dynasty; Book III, Theophilus
(829-842); Book IV, Michael III (842-867). Book V, which narrates the
reign of Basil I (867-886), founder of the Macedonian Dynasty, was the
work of Porphyrogenetus himself, and is a highly laudatory biography of
his uncle, using among other sources Genesios and the Continuation of
George the Monk. Book VI falls into two parts; the first, extending from
886 to 948, deals with the reigns of Leo VI and Alexander, the minority of
Constantine Porphyrogenetos, the reign of Romanus I Lecapenus, and the
first part of the sole rule of Porphyrogenetus, and was written under
Nicephorus II Phocas (963-969) and was based almost entirely upon Simeon
Logothetes. The second part of Book VI, covering the last part of the
reign of Constantine Porphyrogenetus and that of Romanus II (959-963) is incomplete and apparently the work of an unknown contemporary chronicler.

The earlier part of the life of Nicephorus is well documented, but this is not true of the period from his resignation from the patriarchate in 815 to his death in 828; the *Vita Nicephori* of the deacon Ignatious gives little information about this period. Nicephorus was born at Constantinople, possibly in 758, of noble family. Like his father Theodore, who under Constantine V Copronymus (741-775) had been impoverished and banished for his iconodule beliefs, entered the imperial secretariat. He served as a subordinate of the first secretary Tarasius, later to become patriarch of Constantinople, and was prominent in the seventh ecumenical council of Nicaea in 787. Some time afterwards, he left the imperial secretariat and retired from the world. The reasons for Nicephorus' withdrawal to the Propontis are not clear; the implication of the *Vita* is that it was prompted by asceticism and piety and the desire to embrace the religious life; but it is more likely that it was a prudent withdrawal for political considerations, as a result of the blinding of Constantine VI and the return to power of his mother Irene in 797, for Nicephorus returned to Constantinople and was appointed head of a poor-house (perhaps the Great Orphanage) when Tarasius had become patriarch and Nicephorus I had overthrown Irene in 802. Nicephorus was appointed patriarch as the personal choice of Nicephorus I on the death of Tarasius in 806, and became a monk and was ordained priest before his consecration on Easter Sunday 806. Nicephorus had little influence upon affairs of state in the reign of Nicephorus I, although he remained loyal to him in the
abortive revolt of 806\(^5\), but he had considerable influence in the reign of Michael I Rangabe (811-813) in whose elevation he had played a part\(^5\). Leo V the Armenian, who overthrew Michael Rangabe after the disaster of Versinicia, revealed his Iconoclast convictions from his accession. From the start, Nicephorus refused to co-operate in a revival of Iconoclasm, and on the first day of Lent 815, ill and completely isolated in Constantinople, he yielded to imperial pressure and resigned his patriarchate. He was carried from the city on a litter and across the Bosporus to Chryseopolis, and never returned to Constantinople\(^5\). He lived as a monk in the monastery of St. Theodore on the Propontis, which he himself had founded, until his death in 828\(^5\). While in exile Nicephorus unlike St. Theodore Studite, the militant iconodule leader of the monastic resistance, took no further part in ecclesiastical affairs; but his restraint and moderation did nothing either to win him the respect of Theodore or to decrease the personal animosity between them, until Theodore realised that the Iconoclasts hoped to make capital out of the old enmity\(^5\). Michael II the Stammerer, who ascended the throne in 820 after the murder of Leo the Armenian, followed for secular reasons a policy of moderation and tolerance in the Iconoclast dispute; he recalled the leading Iconodules from exile, but allowed them only to reside in the area around Constantinople\(^5\). He also offered Nicephorus restoration to the patriarchate, if he would agree not to disturb the present condition of the Church and to observe complete silence on the question of images. Nicephorus refused\(^5\).

Nicephorus' main historical work, the Historia Syntomos or Breviarium, was written presumably between 775 and 789\(^\)6\), and covers the period from the
murder of Maurice in 602 to the marriage of Leo the Khazar to Irene in 769. It is preserved in two manuscripts, the London and Vatican versions; the latter the basis of De Boor's edition. The London manuscript is an earlier and more primitive version of a prototype which appears in the later Vatican codex stylistically revised and chronologically extended. The starting date of 602 is unusual; the accession of Heraclius in 610 would have been more obvious. Dr Boor considered that the proximity of the Historiae of Theophylact Simocatta and the Breviarium of Nicephorus in the Vatican codex was the result of coincidence and implied no connection between the two, but Alexander argued convincingly that Nicephorus wrote with the intention that his Chronicle should be the continuation of Theophylact. Iorga in his perhaps superficial survey commented that Nicephorus wrote his Breviarium under the inspiration of the Chronicon Paschale, but this opinion is not justifiable, although it is true that Nicephorus' early source owed much to the Chronicon Paschale. Nicephorus' narrative contains what might perhaps be termed the "highlights" of the history of Church and Empire, although one of its most puzzling features is the omission of the entire reign of Constans (641-668), for reasons which are not entirely clear. The Breviarium is written from the standpoint of a resident of Constantinople, although it is not restricted to the events in which Nicephorus himself was an interested party, but aimed at the presentation of an interesting and instructive narrative to a wide reading public; and on this account it has been criticised as having a didactic manner. It is characterised by real judgement and an objective attitude, and while it is less detailed than Theophanes' Chronographia, is of almost equal historical significance.
Nicephorus's second historical work is his Chronological Epitome, or Chronographikon Syntomon, which consists entirely of chronological tables from Adam to 828, the year of Nicephorus' death. It contains tables of the kings of the Jews, the kings of Persia, the Ptolemy's of Egypt, the emperors of the Romans, and the bishops of the five oecumenical sees - Constantinople, Rome, Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch. While it is to-day of only limited value, it was regarded by the Byzantines as a minor work of reference, and reproduced in many manuscripts, although neither Nicephorus' historical nor theological work was utilised to any large extent after his death.

The theme of Nicephorus' theological works was Iconoclasm, and only a brief survey is necessary here. His earliest theological work, the Apologeticus Minor (813-815), was a more or less official document in his capacity as patriarch of Constantinople, rebuking separatist clergy and affirming that no further debate on the problem of images was possible since it had been settled by an oecumenical council. Nicephorus' second theological work, the De Magnete, was written in 814 and presumably was intended as a statement of the orthodox viewpoint at the time when the imperial committee was preparing the iconoclastic florilegium; it was an attack on a deliberately misleading iconoclastic edition of the Apocriticus of Macarius Magnes. At the start of his exile, from 818 to 820, Nicephorus wrote three works: the first, the Apologeticus atque Antirrhetici, is a detailed refutation of Iconoclasm and in particular of its theoretical basis in the writings of Constantine V Copronymus, and an attempt to destroy the myth of a "golden age" of the Empire under the Iconoclasts; the Apologeticus Maior dealt with the question of image
worship, and the Antirrhetici I and II answered Constantine V's christological arguments which referred to images of the Virgin Mary and the saints; the Antirrhetici III refuted the iconoclastic thesis that there was no scriptural authority for the painting and worship of images. The second work of this period, the Contra Eusebium et Epiphanidem, examined and rejected sources cited by the Iconoclasts in justification of their beliefs, both as a supplement to the Apologeticus atque Antirrhetici and in rebuttal of the iconoclastic councils of Hieria (754) and St. Sophia (815). The Adversus Iconomachos is a brief and simple refutation of Iconoclasm, written to satisfy certain Iconophile inquirers. Between 820 and 828, Nicephorus wrote a work on Leo V the Armenian, the title, nature, date and content of which are most uncertain, and whose existence is known only through quotations from it in Joseph Genesius and George the Monk. Nicephorus' last great work, the Refutatio et Eversio, as yet unpublished, is an elaborate refutation of the iconoclastic florilegium, proving that each quotation did not in fact belong to the Father to whom it was attributed, or, if this was not possible since the quotation was genuine, that it was not directed against image worship. This work was probably intended to lay the foundations for a future orthodox council which would restore image worship.

Nothing is known about the person or the life of George, author of the Chronicon Syntomon, except that he was a monk (the signature of the manuscripts is either George the Monk or George Humartolus — the sinner) and that he lived in the ninth century (internal evidence shows that the Chronicle was written in the reign of Michael III, 842-867). It is now
assumed that he lived in Constantinople; it has been suggested that George the Monk and George Hamartolus were two separate people, whose writings were later combined into one chronicle; and also that George the Monk lived at Alexandria not Constantinople, and used another source for events in the capital and the History of Church and Empire; but neither of these theories are generally accepted. 80

The Chronicon Syntomómon is a World Chronicle in four books, from the creation to the author's own time, ending with the death of Theophilus in 842 and the rule of Michael III and his mother Theodora. The first book extends from Adam to Alexander the Great; the second again begins with Adam and narrated the history of the Jews; the third book, the history of Rome from Julius Caesar to Constantine the Great; the fourth book, the history of Byzantium from Constantine to Michael III. George the Monk's interests were equally divided between theology and the history of the Church and Empire. 81 The best description of the basis, aims and method of the Chronicle was given by George himself in his Preface. He used both Hellenic and Byzantine historical works, as well as Byzantine works of edification and theology, as he considered them necessary or valuable for the construction of his narrative; but he was not concerned with style or ornamentation in presentation, proudly preferring to be inarticulate in truth rather than fluent in falsehood. 82 George the Monk typifies the spirit of ninth century Byzantine monasticism, not only in his subject matter, generally of interest chiefly to monastic circles, but also in his frequent and copiously documented theological digressions and biblical and patristic quotations. 83 His approach to the history of the Empire and his narrative of events reflect not only his own monastic status, but also the
fact that he wrote for a primarily monastic audience. His Chronicle is nevertheless of great value for the cultural history of the period, for it gives a vivid picture of the interests, aspirations and tastes of the Byzantine monasteries of the ninth century; but although it is a typical product of Byzantine monastic circles, there is a rationalist tone in the citation of profane works which reveals the influence of the university in the palace of Magnaura, organised in the reign of Michael III by Caesar Bardas. The Chronicle of George the Monk formed the basis for later Byzantine chronicles of world history, being incorporated into the work of Leo Grammaticus and those Chronicles related to him; and in Slavonic translation played an equally great part in Slavonic chronicle tradition and literary history, and was the chief source of early Russian history. The manuscript tradition of George the Monk, in two editions from the author himself, and excerpted and interpolated in later centuries, is so complex and involved that the question of the authentic original text was for long one of the most difficult problems of Byzantine philology. The Chronicle survived in five manuscripts, and the authoritative edition was only produced in 1904 by De Boor.

The Chronicle of George the Monk was continued from the reign of Michael III in 842, to the death of Romanus I Lecapenus in exile on the island of Protos during the sole rule of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos in 948. The Author of the Continuation of George the Monk is unknown, and Hirsch has shown that the present text is not in its original form or condition, but has been subject to accretions which have led to the gradual formation of a new account; and also that the narrative of the Continuation from the accession of Leo VI in 886 to the fall of Romanus I
in 945 was one of the sources of the sixth book of Theophanes Continuatus. The Continuation of George the Monk has a very close resemblance to the other tenth century chroniclers Leo Grammaticus, Theodosius Melitenus and Simeon Magister and Logothetes. Hirsch postulated that the anonymous author of Georgios Monachus Continuatus might be a certain logothete Simeon, who was an imperial secretary at the time of the Arab conquest of Thessalonica in 904, but later research proved that in fact it was the Chronicle of this same logothete Simeon, which extended from the Creation to 948, the complete Greek text of which has not yet been published, which was the common source of all the tenth century chroniclers and provided the connection between them.

Little is known of the life of George of Pisidia, whose poetry is not only one of the most valuable historical sources of the seventh century, but also the most outstanding profane poetry of the Byzantine era. Originally a native of Antioch in Pisidia, a mountainous region in southern Asia Minor, he came in the reign of Heraclius (610-641) to Constantinople where he was deacon, skeuophylax and chartophylax of Hagia Sophia, and secretary and nuncio to the emperor of the patriarch Sergius. As a poet, in the brief literary renaissance in the time of Heraclius, he enjoyed the patronage both of the patriarch Sergius, his spiritual master and friend, and of the emperor Heraclius: George himself took part, probably in the court entourage, in the first expedition of Heraclius against Persia.

The literary activity of George of Pisidia falls into two distinct
periods; the first, 619–630, in which he wrote his epic encomastic historical works; and the second, 630–638 (this latter date is uncertain) when he wrote his theological-philosophical poetry. The historical epic encomium was not a literary vehicle invented by the Byzantines, but dated from Greece in the fourth century BC, so that George of Pisidia was following a tradition well established in the later Empire. His work is characterised by the sacred and profane culture of the time, showing biblical and ecclesiastical influences combined with the extensive use of Greek mythology and literature. George of Pisidia's first historical poem (chronology and titles from Pertus) was written 619–620, his "In Heraclium ex Africa redeuntam" and celebrated the overthrow of Phocas by Heraclius in 610. The Expeditio Persica, written 622–623, described in detail Heraclius' first Persian campaign, of which he was probably an eye-witness. In 626, after the failure of the Avar attack upon Constantinople itself, George wrote two poems; the In Bonum patriciurn which was dedicated to Bonus, the magister militum to whom, together with the patriarch Sergius, Heraclius had entrusted the defence of the capital on his departure for Persia; the Bellum Avaricum, also composed in 626, which gives a vivid description of the ten day siege of Constantinople by the Avars and the city's eventual miraculous deliverance. In restitutionen Sanctae Crucis was written in 630 to celebrate the restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem by Heraclius as the culmination of his Persian victory. The first two sections of the Heraclias were written at the moment of Heraclius' triumph over Persia after the death of Chosroes; the third section, partially lost, was written in 630. For reasons which will soon be obvious, it is possible to state categorically that the historical poems of George of Pisidia were used by Theophanes in his narrative of
George of Pisidia’s philosophical-theological poems were all written after 630 (chronology again from Pertusi⁹⁸, description of poems from Krumbacher⁹⁹). The first was a hymn, On the holy resurrection of Christ our God. The poem Against the godless Severus was a dogmatic doctrinal poem against the irreligious Severus who, originally a lawyer at Berytos, in 513 was appointed bishop of Antioch, but who in 536 was deposed for heresy. The unfinished Hexaemeron is a poem on the Creation of the universe, with allusions to contemporary history and frequent quotations from Christian authors, but also revealing a knowledge of Aristotle. On the vanity of life is an elegaic meditation with strong ecclesiastical characteristics; it has been attributed to the patriarch Sergius because it was found with his Akathistos; and alternatively, it has been suggested that George collaborated with Sergius in the Akathistos. The On human life is a rapture on the performance and harmony of verse. George of Pisidia also wrote several minor poems and epigram. The Ecomium on St. Anastasius the Persian, an incomplete prose epic and discourse on the herioc virtue of Anastasius who was martyred in Persia in 628, is held by Pertusi¹⁰⁰, in the face of some contrary opinion, to be the work of George of Pisidia.

Two poems of George of Pisidia have, according to Pertusi, been lost. The first, an encomium on the reconstruction of the Byzantine army before the Persian war, has been completely lost; the second, the third section of the Heraclius, narrating the second and third Persian campaigns, is preserved in fragments¹⁰¹, and can be reconstructed from Theophanes, from Suidas, from
Michael Psellus. Grosz postulated the existence of a third lost poem of George of Pisidia, recounting events between the death of Phocas and the Chosroes' dispatch of Sarbaras against the Empire which formed the basis of Nicephorus' early narrative; but Pertusi considered this to be unlikely and that such a poem, if it existed, would be the work of another contemporary poet (which again seems highly unlikely); whereas Dujcev commented that Grosz' suggestion was made on the basis of an erroneous division of the London codex of Nicephorus. Pernice suggested that a third portion of the Heraclias had been lost which, written later than the first two sections after Heraclius' return to Constantinople and possibly as a result of a conversation with him, gave a far more factual account of the first and second Persian campaigns. Sternbach was convinced not only that a third portion of the Heraclias was lost, and that it might be found in summary form within Heraclias II (lines 153-172); but also that it might be reconstructed from the narrative of Theophanes' Chronographia, and the Lexicon of Suidas. Colonna, publishing the letter of Michael Psellus to the brother of Andronicus Ducas, answering the query "Who wrote the better poetry, Euripides or George of Pisidia?", commented that the description of a battle given by George of Pisida and cited by Psellus in his judgement, was found neither in the Expedition Persica nor the Bellum Avaricum.

Of the six works which Moravcsik assembled under the title of Historia Avarica, narrating the siege of Constantinople by the Avars and Slavs in 626 and the city's miraculous deliverance, two belong to the seventh century. The most important of the two, "On the mad attack of the
barbarians on this city guarded by God, and their overthrow in shame by
the benevolence of God through the mother of God was a solemn sermon
delivered in Hagia Sophia on August 7, 627, by Theodore, priest and
syncellos. Although it is full of hatred for the barbarians and described
the attack in highly rhetorical and theological style, it is the most
complete document of the siege which we possess.110 Its author was one
of the five legates named by the Chronicon Paschale as sent to the khan to
seek peace on Saturday August 2, the fifth day of the siege.111 The
second document, The Brief History of the Dispersal of the Persians and
Avars, was an abbreviation of the Homily of Theodore Syncellos which
passed into the Synaxarium of the church of Constantinople, to be read
each year in the Office of the Akathistos on August 8, by which the Greek
Church celebrated the memory of the Avar defeat.112

The Life of Maximus the Confessor by his disciple Anastasius, although
its main interest is explicitly in the biography of the Confessor
himself,113 and it is primarily a work of hagiography, contains a valuable
history of the development of Monotheletism under Heraclius, as well as
an account of the orthodox resistance in the West in the reign of Constans,
which culminated in the Lateran Council of 649. The manuscript tradition
is complex. Unfortunately, the Vatican manuscript edited by Combefis
and printed by Migne in the Patrologia Graeca is mutilated and lacks the
account of the Lateran Council. The Moscow manuscript, edited and
translated by Muretov,114 which is complete and representative of an
older tradition with different arrangement of subject-matter, is
unobtainable. Devresse has, however, printed the material deficient in
the Vatican manuscript of the *Patriologia Graeca*, with comments upon both this and the Moscow manuscript. Maximus' own writings on theology, the Scriptures, the mystical life and the liturgy are not relevant to this investigation, although he was one of the most remarkable Byzantine theologians and spiritual writers, and was not only the chief defender of orthodoxy against Monotheletism, but also the creator of Byzantine mysticism.

One of the few contemporary sources for the early seventh century and the only chronicle source, is the *Chronicon Paschale*, a chronological Epitome from Adam to 629. Known also as the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* or *Constantinopolitanum*, or *Fasti Siculi*, the *Chronicon Paschale* received its most common name from the calculations of Christian Chronology and the Easter cycles found in the Introduction, and later Byzantine chronology from the Creation was derived from it, with only minor deviations.

The *Chronicon Paschale* also treated biblical chronology and the diverse world years and chronological systems of the Babylonians, Persians, Egyptians and Romans. In the historical comments and notices which filled out the chronological framework, the *Chronicon Paschale* presented a popular world history combined with ecclesiastical history. The chief value of the chronicle, which is an unoriginal compilation, lies in the determination of the sources and in the narrative of the contemporary events of the seventh century. There is no critical edition of the *Chronicon Paschale*.

The author or compiler of the Chronicle is unknown, but he was apparently
a cleric of Constantinople, perhaps in the entourage of the patriarch Sergius (610-638). The Paschal Chronicle survived in a mutilated state, and is incomplete at the beginning and at the end, extending only to 627. There has been controversy over the date of its composition and the date of its conclusion. Mommsen and Krumbacher were convinced that only two years had been lost, and that the Chronicle was written between 630 and 640, extending only to 629, in accordance with the very precise dating of the title "... until the twentieth year of the most righteous emperor Heraclius and the nineteenth after his consulate, and the eighteenth year of the emperor Heraclius neos Constantine his son, the third indiction." Pernice, however, suggested that the manuscript of the Chronicon Paschale was that of a tenth-century copyist, and that in its original form it had extended to at least 639, and that the missing material could be supplied from two notices of De Cerimoniis (11, 27, 28) of Constantine VII Porphyrogenetus; but this theory is not generally accepted. There has been much controversy over the date of the composition of the Chronicon Paschale. Gelzer rejected the theory, first propounded by Ducange in his notes on the Chronicle, that it was a continuation in the reign of Heraclius of an earlier and shorter Chronicle written under Constantius (337-361) and ending in 354, and also declared that the Codex Holsteinii which Ducange printed in proof was not a collation of this earlier chronicle but in fact a deliberate fraud by Holstein. This view was accepted by Krumbacher, Bury, and Mommsen, but Conybeare attempted to prove the existence of the disputed Codex Holsteinii, although he was unable to produce the manuscript, from a letter of Bigot, who made the collation together with Holstein, on the subject to Ducange. Five years later, however, Conybeare, having
examined the papers of Ducange in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and having considered the work of Mercati, was forced to admit that the so-called Codex Holsteinii was not based upon a separate manuscript of an earlier Chronicle, but was a collation which Holstein had made between the Vatican manuscript of the Chronicle Paschale and the edition of Raederus, and that the earlier form of the Paschal Chronicle extending to 354 did not therefore exist. It is now agreed that the Chronicle Paschale is a seventh century work based upon a compilation of earlier accounts; although it is still disputed whether the narrative of events contemporary with the author was based upon official documents, the so-called Annales Constantinopolitani, as Fruend suggested, or upon eye-witness accounts, according to Moravscik.

The Account of the Sack of Jerusalem in AD 614 by Antiochus Strategos is the only eye-witness narrative of these events which we possess. The original Greek version is lost, and the Account survives in a tenth century Armenian text, which came not from the Greek but from an Arab translation. It is an extremely detailed and valuable narrative, not only for its description of the sack of Jerusalem by the Persians, but also for the account of the captivity of the people of Jerusalem in Persia, and for the chronology of Heraclius' restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem.

Theophylact Simocatta's Historiae, which covered the reign of Maurice (582-602) in eight books, and of which Nicephorus' Breviarium was the continuation, in Chronicle form, has little relevance in a study of the
historical sources for the Heraclian period, apart from Theophanes’ few quotations in his account of the reign of Phocas. Theophylact was an Egyptian who studied at Athens before serving in the imperial secretariat under Heraclius, and who was the chief representative of historiography in the brief literary revival at the time of Heraclius. Theophylact, who also produced a short work on natural science and a collection of letters, aimed at a history extending from Justin II to Heraclius, in which he used both official sources and contemporary accounts, but only completed that of the reign of Maurice, which, despite its ornate, artificial, and affected style, is an historical source of high quality.

Little is known of the life of John, bishop of Nikiou, who at the end of the seventh century wrote a popular world history combined with ecclesiastical history and a regional history of Egypt. He was one of the leading dignitaries of the Jacobite Church in the second part of the seventh century, being rector of the bishops of Upper Egypt and director of monasteries, but he was deposed and deprived of his episcopal dignity for having exceeded his authority, and ended his life as a simple monk. He died probably soon after 700.

John of Nikiou wrote, before 700, a valuable Chronicle, the original text of which has been lost, and which is preserved only in an Ethiopic translation made at Amhara in 1601 from an earlier undated Arabic version. The Arabic version is clearly rather a paraphrase than a translation, from the often disconnected character of the work, and the mention in the index of chapters of events of which there is no account in the body of the
text. The original was written mainly in Greek, but some chapters dealing particularly with Egypt were written in Coptic, either in imitation of the Bible by the alternative use of two different languages in the same work, or more likely as a result of the nature of the sources, some Greek and some local Egyptian traditions or histories. Zotenberg considered that it was possible, despite the complexity of transmission, to distinguish the two distinct original idioms, but Noldeke considered that the whole work was probably written in Coptic, as Greek was no longer the sole literary language of Egypt after the Muslim conquest.

The Chronicle falls into two parts; the account of the Creation, of the ancient world, and of Rome, in which the chronology is largely legendary and the narrative largely mythology, and which has been much abbreviated by the Arab translator; and the second part which narrates the history of the Empire in the East from Constantine the Great to the Muslim conquest of Egypt in the reign of Constans. Chapters 99-122 narrate the events in Constantinople in the reigns of Maurice, Phocas, Heraclius and Constans, and Chapters 123-128 the Muslim conquest of Egypt. After the valuable account of the accession of Heraclius, there is no further account of his reign, due possibly to manuscript loss at this point. It is also possible that those chapters dealing solely with the Muslim conquest of Egypt were written in Coptic, although the narrative of the events in Constantinople in 641 would suggest a Greek source also. The confusion in the presentation and chronology of events in these last chapters would appear to be the result of displacement of the sheets of John's original manuscript. Despite John's Monophysite prejudice and the confusion of manuscript tradition, his narrative is useful for completion, correction
and confirmation of certain parallel accounts of Byzantine Chronicles.

Four minor anonymous Syriac Chronicles are approximately contemporary with the period concerned in this investigation. The first (in chronological order of composition) is the Chronicon Maroniticum, which survives only in fragmentary state, extending to 664, and was apparently composed not much later than this date by an unknown Maronite monk. Unfortunately that part of the Chronicle covering the period from 361-658 is no longer extant. The Chronicon Anonymum was apparently the work of a Nestorian monk, who lived perhaps in the region of Iraq or Khuzistan, and was written probably between 670 and 680 and contains a secular and ecclesiastical history of Persia until the Muslim conquest. Nothing more is known of the date or identity of the author, and the information of the text is meagre. The Chronicon miscellaneum ad 724 pertinens is a mid-eighth century compilation of the work of previous authors, the text of which survives in a very corrupt form, which has accounts of events considered worthy of note by the author, as well as a list of caliphs, a history of the council of Chalcedon and a genealogy of patriarchs. The Chronicon ad 846 pertinens contains noteworthy events in the form of brief annals, and was apparently a continuation in the second half of the ninth century by an unknown author of a Chronicle originally extending only to 795. The earlier and more detailed part of the Chronicle is a compilation of earlier work, but several folios of the manuscript have been lost and the years 610-631 are missing.
The first of the three major Syriac chroniclers to be considered, since they drew on earlier sources, is Denis of Tell-Mahre. Denis, who was born in Mesopotamia in the small village of Tell-Mahre, near to Callinicus, entered religious life and passed his novitiate in the great Jacobite monastery and intellectual centre of Qennesre, some time before its destruction by fire and the consequent dispersal of the community in 815, when he went to a monastery at Kaisoum in the region of Samosata.

In 818 a synod of 45 Jacobite bishops at Callinicus, in an effort to end the liturgical controversy then raging in the Church, deposed the patriarch Abraham and elevated in his place Denis, who at that time was still a monk. Denis, given no choice in the matter, was ordained priest then consecrated patriarch of Antioch in August, 818, at Callinicus. The deposed Abraham immediately set himself up as anti-patriarch, and the result was a schism in the Jacobite church which endured the length of Denis' patriarchate, despite the death of Abraham in 837. Denis' patriarchate was both energetic and stormy; but he achieved a union with the Jacobite patriarchs of Alexandria, and maintained good relations with caliph Abdallah III of Damascus. Denis of Tell-Mahre died in August, 845, and was buried in the rebuilt monastery of Qennesre. The account of his life is preserved not in his own work but in the Ecclesiastical Chronicle of Bar Hebraeus.

Denis of Tell-Mahre wrote, under the title of Annals, a vast work covering the history of the world from the creation to his own era, finishing in 837; the Chronicle is an abbreviated edition of this work. In his own Preface, Denis divided his Chronicle into four parts, citing the sources he had used for each; from the Creation to Constantine the Great, his
sources included Eusebius, Sextus Julius Africanus, and Josephus; the second part, from Constantine to Theodosius II, was based on Socrates; for the third part, from Theodosius II to Justin II, 408-565, his chief source was John of Ephesus; the fourth and relevant part, from Justin II to 774, was his own original work. Denis wrote within 30 years of Theophanes, but although it is possible that he knew the Chronographia, he did not apparently use it. His work was cited by Elias of Nisibus, and formed one of the main sources of Michael the Syrian.

A note at the end of the Chronography gives an outline of the life of Elias of Bar-Sinaya, its author. He was born 975, and ordained priest in the Nestorian Church of Persia; he was appointed bishop of Beit Nuhadre on the Euphrates in 1002 and metropolitan of Nisibus in 1008. Elias' main works were his Chronography and the Conferences, an apologetic written in Arabic and comparing the Muslim faith with Christianity, based on seventh debates which he had with the vizir Hosain Abulkasem in 1027; but as well as editions and abridgments of the work of the Catholicos Elias I, Elias Bar-Sinaya wrote also a Syriac grammar, a lexicon of hymns, homilies both in Syriac and Arabic, and a book demonstrating the truths of faith.

The Chronography, probably written in or soon after 1018, the year of its termination, is divided into two distinct parts; the first, a series of chronological tables with a brief canon of events; the second, a treatise of computation dealing with the calendar. The first of the chronological catalogues is biblical, followed by a list of popes and patriarchs of Alexandria to the council of Chalcedon; then lists and dates of kings of
the nations of the ancient world, of the Roman Emperors, and of the Sassanids, and finally of the Nestorian catholicos. The only extant manuscript in Europe, that of the British Museum, is unfortunately mutilated, and so the canon of events, a chronological account of memorable events year by year, is lost from 785 to 867, and from 972 to 994. The second part of the Chronography dealt with the diverse calendars of Syrians, Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, Persians and Arabs. In every notice of his canon of events, Elias cited his source; this feature of his work is of especial value in this investigation.

The biography of Michael the Syrian, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch 1166-1199, can be discovered from the last five books of his Chronicle. Having succeeded to the patriarchate in most difficult circumstances (although the Jacobite patriarchs preserved the title "of Antioch", they were only able to reside there after the Crusaders' conquest of the city), Michael concentrated on the promulgation of disciplinary decrees by reforming synods within his own community, and refused both to take part in talks between the Greeks and the Armenians with a view to the union of Churches, and to attend the third Lateran Council on the invitation of Alexander III. His patriarchate was stormy, due both to the Arab advance under Saladin and to attempts to usurp his patriarchal authority by disident bishops: but nevertheless his Chronicle, extending from the Creation to 1195, was written during this period.

His Chronicle, which is preserved in Arab and Armenian versions as well as Syriac, is one of the most precious documents of Syriac literary
history, if only for the otherwise lost Syriac sources, e.g. the Chronicle of Bar Hebraeus, which he preserved. In the list of sources which Michael gave in the Preface, Denis of Tell-Mahre is cited for the period 802–842. Michael's text, strongly Syriac and ecclesiastical in viewpoint, is divided into two unequal columns, the lefthand giving secular history, i.e. in the period under discussion, the history of the Empire; of Persia, and of the Arabs, and the righthand column narrating the history of the Jacobite Church. Appendices provided lists of the high priests of the Jews, the five patriarchs and kings and emperors, followed by a brief history of Syria with notes on the Jacobite patriarchs of Antioch, a short history of Armenia, and finally notes on the Nestorian patriarchs. His aim was to present "the succession of priesthood" and "the succession of temporal empires" from the beginning of the world.

Little is known of the life of Sebeos, the Armenian bishop who in the middle of the seventh century wrote the History of Heraclius. The title of the work is inexact, for although the war between Heraclius and Chosroes II of Persia formed its centre, it began at the beginning of the sixth century and concluded with the Arab invasions of Armenia and Persia. Sebeos wrote with the authority of an eye-witness, although he lacked critical spirit. He had much in common with the Byzantine chronographers whom he was apparently trying to imitate in style and presentation, giving no indication of his sources, citing facts without comment, narrating events with little effort to place them in coherent order. Sebeos' History reflects the disturbed condition of Armenia in the seventh century, torn both politically and religiously between
Persia and Byzantium, and was the only seventh century Armenian writer on the fall of the Sassanids and the conquest of Armenia by the Arabs.

Among the Byzantine authors of religious polemic or chronography who deal with the life and teaching of Mahomed, two Greek Syriac writers are important for this investigation.

St. John of Damascus (676-749), the last and greatest theologian of the eastern Church, was a Syrian who wrote in Greek, but who also knew Arabic and Aramaic, and who transmitted to the orthodox Church and to Islam a knowledge of each other's beliefs. He held the position of financial controller in the Arab caliphate of Damascus, as his father and grandfather had done before him, and was a book companion of the young caliph Yezid. However, in his early thirties he entered the monastery of St. Saba, near Jerusalem, where he spent the remainder of his life.

His literary output was both considerable and varied; he was renowned as a hymnologist; he was an ardent opponent of the Iconoclasm of Leo III the Isaurian (717-741) against which he wrote three essays, between 726-730; and the authorship of the romance of Barlaam and Josaphat was attributed to him. For the purposes of this study, however, only two of the works of John of Damascus are relevant. The Disputatio Christiani et Saraceni, based probably upon debates which John himself held in the presence of the caliph, was intended as an apologetic for Christianity, and also as a guide for Christians in arguments with Moslems. John of Damascus' magnum opus was the De Haeresibus Liber, a compendium of a hundred and three
Christian heresies, which included Greek philosophies and Jewish sects, and which concluded with an account of the heresy of the Ishmaelites and Saracens. It was this work which provided the source for that part of George the Monk’s narrative of Mahomet’s teaching which was more detailed than that of Theophanes.

Nothing is known of Bartholomew of Edessa, author of the Elenchus et Confutatio Agareni, and possibly of the Contra Mahometem, except that he was of Syrian race possibly born at Edessa, and certainly a monk, presumably Nestorian, of that city. It is assumed that he lived and wrote during the ninth century, although the precise dates are unknown, and no indication was provided by his writings. The uncertainties of chronology and of the authorship of the Contra Mahometem create a problem in regard to the relationship of Theophanes and Bartholemew, which cannot be resolved with certainty; whether Theophanes drew upon Bartholemew, or vice-versa; or whether both drew upon a common source.

Bartholemew of Edessa’s Elenchus et Confutatio Agareni was a refutation of Moslem arguments against Christianity, especially against the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and an attempt to establish that Mahomed was merely a false prophet. In his highly critical attacks upon Islam, Bartholemew was obviously well acquainted with the life and teaching of Mahomed, as well as the traditions and rites of the Moslem faith. There was no resemblance between the Elenchus et Confutatio Agareni and the Chronographia; but Theophanes’ account of the life and teaching of Mahomed corresponded very closely to that given by the Contra Mahometem: an account which, incidentally, was also reproduced by Constantine VII
Eichner described the *Contra Mahometem* as an undated and anonymous work, but Migne, with reservations, followed Le Moyne, who had first published the work of Bartholomew of Edessa (*Varia Sacra, Leyden 1685*), and attributed the *Contra Mahometem* to Bartholomew. Mangenot, however, considered that the problem of authorship could not be resolved with certainty. The affinity of subject matter, as well as similarity of style and spirit, and the knowledge of Islam displayed in the two works, make it possible to suggest that the *Elenchus et Confutatio Agareni* and the *Contra Mahometem* were the work of the same author; but several divergencies between them, concerning the number and names of the wives and children Mahomed, and the names of the Nestorian monk who instructed Mahomed in Christianity, and of the editors of the Koran, equally make it possible to suggest that the two works were written by different authors. But the correspondence between the *Chronographia* and the *Contra Mahometem* concerning Mahomed is unmistakable.
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Chapter Two.

The Sources of Theophanes for the Reign of Heraclius, 610-641.
Although the purpose of this Thesis is the investigation of the sources of Theophanes for the Heraclian dynasty, and consideration of his narrative of the reign of Phocas is, therefore, strictly speaking, outside its scope, the fact that Nicephorus' *Breviarium* commenced with the murder of Maurice makes such a digression permissible; and indeed it illuminates considerably the nature and scope of the contemporary seventh century historical sources, and their availability to the writers of the ninth century.

Theophanes' unidentified Constantinople Chronicle source provided part of his narrative of the events of 602-603 (AM 6095). Phocas, after his coronation, murdered Maurice and his five sons at the harbour of Eutropius near Chalcedon in November 602, and commanded that their heads be exposed both upon the tribunalium, where they might be seen by those leaving the city, and in the suburb of Hebdomon. Peter, the brother of Maurice, was also put to death on Phocas' command. Phocas then appointed his own brother Domesticius magister militum, and Priscus comes excubitorum.

Theophanes then reverted to the *Historiae* of Theophylact Simocatta, which had been one of his principal sources from the latter part of the sixth century, for a more detailed narrative, although he considerably abbreviated that of Theophylact. Constantina, Maurice's widow, and her three daughters were confined by Phocas in a convent, that of Leo, in Constantinople. At this time, the rumour became current that Theodosius, son of Maurice, had escaped Phocas' vengeance and was still alive; Chosroes II of Persia gave credence to it, in deliberate deception as part of his strategy in the war to destroy the Empire. When Phocas dispatched his envoy Biblius to Chosroes with gifts, Chosroes imprisoned him, and
replied to Phocas with insulting letters. In Alexandria, the murder of Maurice was miraculously announced in the middle of the night to a certain calligrapher, by the statues which came down from their altars; the calligrapher, a prudent man, carried the news the following day to the Augustalius, who commanded him to keep silence, and only publicly admitted the prophecy of the spirits when the news of Phocas' usurpation reached Alexandria from Constantinople nine days later.

Theophylact Simocatta concluded his Historiae in 602, the year in which Nicephorus commenced the Breviarium; but whereas Theophanes provided, from his Constantinople Chronicle and eastern World Chronicle sources, an account of the reign of Phocas, Nicephorus, the continuator of Theophylact, passed from the accession of Phocas after the murder of Maurice in 602 to the revolt of the exarch Heraclius at Carthage in 610. Since the years 602-610 were not uneventful in Constantinople, Nicephorus' silence was presumably the result of lack of historical evidence. It is, therefore, permissible to assume that Nicephorus' independent Constantinople chronicle source began in 610, and that the Chronicon Paschale and Theophanes' unknown Chronicle were the only Byzantine sources for this decade.

George the Monk gave an abbreviated account of the accession of Phocas, drawn from that of Theophanes.

Theophanes' account of the opposition to Phocas was drawn from both his Byzantine and eastern Chronicle sources; the former narrated Phocas' reign of terror and the accompanying abortive revolts within the capital; and the
Theopanes placed the abortive revolt of Germanus and Constantina to overthrow Phocas and restore Theodosius, Maurice's son whom they still thought to be alive, in 606-607 (AM 6098, 6099), but the Chronicon Paschale placed the execution of the conspirators in June, 605; and since the Chronicon Paschale was a contemporary narrative, while Theopanes' Constantinople Chronicle source was not, the date of 605 is more likely to be accurate. Partial confirmation of this date may be found in the fact that in 606 Phillipicus, Maurice's brother-in-law through his elder sister Gordia, decided to become a priest and embrace the religious life in the Monastery which he himself had founded at Chrysopolis. Germanus, who aspired to the imperial throne, attempted to gain the support of the Greens by means of the bribe of a talent of gold offered to their tribune, but this was unsuccessful, perhaps as a result of the largesse which Phocas had distributed as consul in December 603; the Greens assembled in the circus and reviled the empress Constantina who, with her children and one of the palace eunuchs, took refuge in Hagia Sophia. Phocas removed the women from the church, having sworn to patriarch Cyriacus, who at first resisted him, that he intended them no harm, and imprisoned them in a convent; he imprisoned Germanus in his own house. Constantina and Germanus, however, believing that Maurice's son Theodosius was still alive, used the maid Petronia as an intermediary in further conspiracy, unaware of the fact that she was a spy for Phocas. Under questioning by Theopemptus the city prefect, Constantina implicated the patrician Romanus, who under torture confessed the whole conspiracy; all the conspirators, including Constantina and her daughters, were executed. It seems possible that the
further conspiracy, which aimed at the murder of Phocas in the hippodrome, and which is placed by Theophanes in 609 (AM 6101)\(^{15}\) might be part of the earlier plot, from the correspondence between the names of the ring-leaders, and as the *Chronicon Paschale* made no mention of a conspiracy in that year.

In 607 (AM 6099) Phocas presided at the marriage of his daughter Domentzia to Priscus, comes exobitorum, in the palace of Marina, and held chariot-races to celebrate the occasion. When, however, Theophanes and Pamphilius, tribunes of the demes, set up the images of Priscus and Domentzia together with that of Phocas as a mark of honour, Phocas ordered that the tribunes be beheaded\(^{16}\); an action which angered and embittered Priscus and left him to support Heraclius in 610\(^{17}\). The following year, Priscus urged Heraclius, exarch of Africa, to send his son Heraclius, and Nicetas, son of Gregoras, his subordinate, against Phocas\(^{18}\).

During 608, Phocas' reign of terror in Constantinople continued, while the Persians ravaged Asia Minor, so that: "On the one hand the Persians tyrannised the Romans from outside the city; while on the other Phocas within ruled over them through murder and imprisonment"\(^{19}\). Nicephorus described the reign of Phocas in almost identical words; "From the time of Phocas' accession, affairs came to such a pitch of misery that people said that the Persians molested the Roman Empire from without while Phocas was doing worse within"\(^{20}\). It seems unlikely that these similar phrases did not have their origin in a common source, but this source cannot be determined.
Theophanes' account of the revolt of the Greens in 609 (AM 6101) which is found abridged in George the Monk, came also from the Constantinople Chronicle source. At the chariot-races, the Greens insulted Phocas, accusing him of drunkenness and insane temper. Phocas deposed Cosmas, the city prefect, and in reprisal wreaked great vengeance upon the people of the capital. The Greens in return burned the praetorium, and allowed the prisoners to escape. Phocas then dissolved the civic organisation of the Greens; from this year the Greens passed into opposition and disorder.

From the eastern World Chronicle, Theophanes took his account of the campaigns of Chosroes II of Persia (590-628) against Phocas, and of the revolts against Phocas in the eastern provinces of the Byzantine Empire. George the Monk made no reference to these events; but Theophanes' account was confirmed and expanded by the History of Sebeos.

In 603 (AM 6095) the general Narses revolted against Phocas, and established himself at Edessa in Mesopotamia. Phocas dispatched Germanus, commander at Daras, to besiege Narses at Edessa; so that Narses sought the aid of Chosroes of Persia, who had received the alleged Theodosius, son of Maurice. According to Sebeos, Theodosius fled to Persia after the murder of Maurice, and accompanied Chosroes to Edessa, where Narses admitted them to the town and crowned Theodosius as emperor of the Romans. Chosroes then brought Theodosius as emperor to Daras, which he besieged for more than a year.

In 604 (AM 6096), Germanus was forced to give battle against Chosroes'
army in Mesopotamia, and was defeated; he himself was wounded in battle, and was carried by his armour-bearers into Constantinople, where he died eleven days later. Phocas increased the agreed tribute to the khan of the Avars, to secure the Thracian frontier, in order to concentrate all his resources in Asia Minor against Chosroes and Narses. Narses, as a result, was forced to abandon Edessa and to withdraw to Hierapolis; but Chosroes advanced on Daras, and encountered and defeated the Byzantines under Leontius at Arxamun, before he himself returned to Persia after entrusting command of the Persian army to Zongoes. Phocas in anger brought back Leontius to Constantinople in chains, and appointed as general, with the rank of curapaletes, his own nephew Domentziolus. 26

In 605 (AM 6097) Chosroes sent out two armies under Kardarigas and Rousmiazas (whom Macler identified with Sarabaras) who devastated many Roman cities. Domentziolus came with his army to Narses at Edessa, and brought Narses back to Constantinople, on the assurance that Phocas intended him no harm. Narses was burned alive by Phocas, to the grief of the Byzantines but to the joy of the Persians, who feared him greatly 28.

In 605 (AM 6098) the Persians captured Daras, centre of the eastern frontier fortifications, and overran all Syria and Mesopotamia 29, and in 606 (AM 6099) they crossed the Euphrates and ravaged Syria, Palestine and Phoenicia, taking many Byzantine prisoners 30. In 608 (AM 6100) Kardarigas, who had occupied Armenia and Cappadocia in 607, advanced into Galatia and Paphlagonia, and penetrated as far as Chalcedon. 31

In 609 (AM 6101) the Jews of Antioch revolted, murdered the patriarch
Anastasius and mutilated his body, before beginning a reign of terror, murdering and looting. Phocas appointed Bonasus prefect of the East and Cottanas general, and sent them out with an army which suppressed the revolt and exacted great vengeance from the people of Antioch. Denis of Tell-Mahre described Phocas' persecution of the Jews and policy of forcible conversion to Christianity which provoked the revolt.

Theophanes drew his account of the accession of Heraclius from his Constantinople Chronicle source. Nicephorus' independent Constantinople Chronicle, which owed much to the Chronicon Paschale, gave a divergent account, while George the Monk compiled his narrative from both the Chronographia and the Breviarium. The Chronicle of John of Nikiou is of great value for the narrative of the revolt of Africa and Egypt.

In 608 (AM 6100), Priscus, because of the murder of Maurice and the insult which he himself had sustained from Phocas, appealed to Heraclius, exarch of Africa, to overthrow Phocas in Constantinople; for Africa was in a state of revolt, and the grain-ships had not been sent from this province. In 609 (AM 6101), on the summons of the Senate, Heraclius the exarch sent his own son Heraclius by sea, and his subordinate Gregoras sent his son Nicetas by land, in order that whichever of the two arrived first at Constantinople and overthrew Phocas might become emperor.

Nicephorus' account of these arrangements in Africa is similar to that of Theophanes. Zotenberg first pointed out the impossibility of such an agreement, and it is here that the Chronicle of John of Nikiou is of
especial value, for the Chronicon Paschale placed the revolt of the exarch Heraclius in 609, and the arrival of the fleet of his son Heraclius at Constantinople in October 610, but without further detail.

According to John of Nikiou, after the exarch Heraclius had revolted at Carthage, he dispatched an army under the command of Nicetas to Egypt; Phocas, hearing of this, ordered Bonosus and Cottonas to Alexandria, where Bonosus encountered the army of Nicetas and was decisively defeated.

It was only when all Egypt acclaimed Heraclius emperor after Nicetas' victory, that the exarch sent Heraclius his son by sea to Constantinople; and Heraclius gathered support for his revolt as his fleet called at coastal towns and the islands, particularly from the Greens.

On October 4 610 (AM 6102) Heraclius landed at Abydos, received the allegiance of Theodore, comes of Abydos, and of other disaffected leaders who had left Constantinople, voluntarily or involuntarily; while Domentziolus, whom Phocas had ordered to guard the Long Walls against Heraclius, abandoned them and fled to the capital on the news of Heraclius' landing. Heraclius proceeded to Hermoleia, where Stephen, metropolitan of Cyzicus, presented him with a crown from the church of the mother of God of Artaca. When he arrived at Constantinople, Heraclius' fleet, having defeated a squadron manned by the Blues at sea, anchored before the harbour of Sophia.

It is with regard to the events of October 4, 5, 6, in Constantinople, the death of Phocas and the coronation of Heraclius, that the Constantinople Chronicle source of Theophanes differed markedly from the more detailed
Constantinople Chronicle which served as a source for Nicephorus.

Theophanes (AM 6102) stated that, after the decisive engagement between Heraclius' fleet and that of the Blues, the people of Constantinople seized Phocas and killed him, burning his body in the market-place of the Bull, while Heraclius entered the city and was crowned emperor by the patriarch Sergius in the chapel of St. Stephen in the palace; and that on the same day Eudocia Fabia was crowned empress after her marriage to Heraclius. According to Nicephorus, however, Heraclius anchored his fleet before Constantinople, while dissatisfaction increased within the city. Crispus (Priscus, according to Theophanes' spelling) Phocas' son-in-law, who was then prefect of the city, secretly united with Heraclius, while the rebellious Greens fired the area around the harbour of Caesarion, and support for Phocas dwindled. Phocas was captured by Photius, whose wife he had dishonoured, stripped of his imperial garments and brought prisoner to Heraclius' ship, where, after an encounter with Heraclius himself, he was beheaded and his body mutilated, before being burned in the market-place of the Bull with those of Domentiolus (Domentziolus, according to Theophanes), Bonossus (Bonosus, according to Theophanes) and Leontius the imperial sacellarius.

The above, in broad outline, is the account also given by the Chronicon Paschale. Nicephorus gave no location for the coronation of Heraclius, which according to the Chronicon Paschale took place in Hagia Sophia. Sergius, thinking that Heraclius had come solely to avenge the murder of Maurice,
first offered the imperial crown to Crispus, who refused it, before the Senate and people proclaimed Heraclius emperor, and Sergius duly crowned him. Nicephorus made no mention of Heraclius' marriage to Eudocia; but he described Nicetas' triumphal entry into Constantinople in 612, and the erection of an equestrian statue to him in the Forum in 613 on the occasion of his betrothal to Gregoria, daughter of Heraclius.

John of Nikiou also provided an occasionally distorted narrative of events in Constantinople, presumably from a Byzantine historical source. Phocas confined Heraclius' mother Epiphaneia and his sister Fabia in a convent, and then attempted to dishonour Fabia; but they were protected by Crispus, Theodore, prefect of Cappadocia, and Elpidius; the two latter were executed in 609 (AM 6101) after an unsuccessful revolt, although John was unaware of this. The narrative of the events of October 4-6 610 was confused, but John reproduced the account of Phocas' dishonouring of the wife of Photinus (Photius, according to Nicephorus) and Phocas' consequent mutilation, before his body was burned in the Bull with those of Domentiolus, Leontius, and Bonossus. Unfortunately, manuscript loss occurred in the Chronicle after the accession of Heraclius.

Theophanes' account of the Persian advance in the first part of the reign of Heraclius came from the eastern World Chronicle, which can be traced also in Michael the Syrian; while Nicephorus' source was independent of that found in Theophanes and the Syriac chroniclers. George the Monk compiled his abbreviated narrative from that of Nicephorus. Petrusi commented that not only was the chronology of the Persian conquests obscure.
in the sources, but also that the sources did not distinguish between the two Persian armies in the field, one under Sain and Saitos, and the other under Sarbaras.

In May 611 (AM 6102), the Persian army under Sain marched against Syria and took both Apamea and Emessa, and penetrated as far as Antioch, where the Byzantine army under Priscus gave battle and was defeated, with great loss of life, although Antioch itself did not fall to Sarbaras until 615.

In 612 (AM 6103), Sain, marching northwards against Asia Minor, captured Caesarea in Cappadocia, with many thousands of Byzantine prisoners.

In 613 (AM 6105), the army of Sarbaras captured Damascus, and took a large number of Byzantine prisoners. Heraclius was forced to sue for peace, but Chosroes rejected his embassy.

In June 614 (AM 6106), the army of Sarbaras, having conquered Jordan and Palestine, captured Jerusalem itself; and there they incited the Jews, who hailed them as liberators, to kill ninety thousand Christians. Sarbaras took back the true Cross to Persia, and bore off many inhabitants of the city, including the patriarch Zacharias, into slavery in Persia. Owing to the brevity of this notice, it is impossible to judge whether or not Theophanes was acquainted with Antiochus Strategos' Account of the Sack of Jerusalem in AD 614.

In 616 (AM 6107) Sarbaras, having taken Antioch the previous year, overran and conquered the whole of Egypt and Libya to the frontiers of
Ethiopia, although the city of Alexandria held out probably until 618, and plundered the province and took many prisoners, before he withdrew to attempt the blockade of Carthage. In 617 (AM 6108), Carthage fell to the Persians.

Theophanes' narrative of the events of 617 (AM 6108) read in the original manuscripts: "In this year, the fifth indiction, the Persians marched against Chalcedon and took it in battle." De Boor, in his edition of the Chronographia, changed the reading "Chalcedon" for that of "Carthage", having considered the notice of Theophanes in the light both of the Byzantine and eastern Chronicle sources, and also in the light of the actual historical events, and of the probable Persian strategy. De Boor considered that Theophanes' original reading was "Carthage", and that it had become altered through corruption in the mediaeval manuscript codices and confusion between the forms "Carthage" and "Chalcedon". Gelzer confirmed the judgement of De Boor, and attempted to establish the chronology of the Persian conquests of imperial territory in the first decade of the reign of Heraclius. The Persian attack upon the Empire was two-fold, a fact of which Theophanes was unaware; one army advanced against Asia Minor, with the ultimate goal of capture of Constantinople, and a second army advanced against Syria, Egypt, and Africa. In 617, Sarbaras consolidated his conquest of Egypt, and renewed his unsuccessful attempt of the previous year to reduce Carthage, capital of the imperial province of Africa; while Sain, maintaining the basis of his conquest in Anatolia, made a pivot upon Caesarea in Cappadocia, conquered successively Paphlagonia and Galatia, and made an incursion as far as Chalcedon in 616. Both Carthage and Chalcedon came under siege by the
Persians at this time, although neither fell; the Chronicon Paschale and Breviarium both narrated that Sain penetrated to Chalcedon, where Heraclius negotiated with the Persian commander; and shortly afterwards according to Nicephorus, Heraclius proposed to transfer the imperial capital to Carthage. Michael the Syrian, whose account of the Persian conquest of Egypt was in almost identical terms to that of Theophanes, continued that, in the same year, the Persian Shahin besieged and captured Chalcedon, and slaughtered all its inhabitants in a cruel massacre. It therefore seems probable that Theophanes, aware that Chalcedon was not taken and sacked by the Persians, if only because his Constantinople Chronicle source made no mention of it, and unaware that two Persian armies were in the field at the same time, amended the reading "Chalcedon" in his eastern World Chronicle source, to "Carthage".

In 617 (AM 6109), Heraclius again dispatched ambassadors to Chosroes to sue for peace; but Chosroes again rejected the embassy, refusing to negotiate with the Byzantines until they rejected Christ crucified and worshipped the sun.

In 619 (AM 6111), the army of Sain captured Ancyra in Galatia.

In 622 (AM 6113), Heraclius began his first campaign against Persia.

Nicephorus' account of the Persian conquests from 610-622, based upon his independent Constantinople Chronicle source, differed considerably from that of Theophanes. However, in part it showed some resemblance to the
narrative of the Chronicon Paschale, although the correspondence was not close. Apart from one incident, it was abridged in its entirety by George the Monk. 

Nicephorus began his narrative of the Persian advance with an account of the subsequent career of Crispus, Phocas' brother-in-law, which was entirely omitted by Theophanes. Almost immediately after his coronation Heraclius, presumably anxious to remove him from the capital, appointed Crispus general of the armies of Cappadocia (he had previously been city prefect). In 611, alarmed by the Persian conquest of Syria, Heraclius himself went to Caesarea to discuss with Crispus the defence of the province against the Persians, but Crispus received him with veiled insult and lack of co-operation, so that when Crispus returned to Constantinople in 612 to participate in the triumphal entry of Nicetas, Heraclius seized the opportunity to force him to become a monk, and confined him in the monastery of the Chora in the capital, where he died a year later. Heraclius then appointed to his command his own brother Theodore, whom he made curaphalates, and Philippicus, brother-in-law of Maurice, who at that time was a monk in the monastery of his own foundation at Chrysopolis. According to the Chronicon Paschale, however, Nicetas and not Philippicus was sent to Cappadocia.

After the fall of Egypt, according to Nicephorus, Chosroes dispatched an army under Sarbaras against the Empire, and he conquered the whole of the eastern lands, and took from Jerusalem the true Cross and the patriarch Modestus, and hastened to march on Chalcedon. George the Monk, apparently feeling the inadequacy of this account, took the narrative of
of the Persian capture of Jerusalem from Theophanes.

Nicephorus, in his account of the conquest of Egypt and the siege of Chalcedon by the Persians, was unaware that there were two Persian armies in the field and ignorant of the names of their commanders. Hence after the account of the conquest of Egypt and Alexandria by Saitos (a subordinate of Sain); not by Sarbaras, he was forced to make the rather improbable immediate transition of the Persian army from Alexandria to the siege of Chalcedon in the next year, 617. The meeting at Chalcedon between Heraclius and Saitos, who was at Chalcedon with Sain, and especially the speech of Saitos, was described in detail; Heraclius, won over by Saitos' appeal for peace, sent three ambassadors with him to Chosroes. Saitos then withdrew with part of the Persian army to Persia; once on Persian soil, he treated the Byzantine embassy as his prisoners; but he himself was flayed alive by Chosroes because he had honoured Heraclius as emperor. Sebeos, in his narrative of the encounter, gave only the speech which Heraclius made to the Persian commanders, appealing for peace; the Chronicon Paschale reproduced the letter which Heraclius' embassy carried to Chosroes.

Heraclius, since the Persians were besieging Chalcedon and the Avars in the same year were ravaging Thrace within the Long Walls and plundering the suburbs of Constantinople; and since the loss of Egypt, the richest province and granary of the Empire, had produced famine in the capital and forced devaluation of the coinage; and since plague was raging in Constantinople, determined in 618 to transfer the imperial capital to Carthage. So great was the alarm and despondency within Constantinople
that Sergius summoned Heralius to Hagia Sophia, and made him swear solemnly and publicly that he would not leave the imperial city.

Theophanes' account of the Avar incursions in the first part of the reign of Heraclius was drawn from the eastern World Chronicle; while Nicephorus' more detailed account, which was again abridged by George the Monk, came from his independent Constantinople Chronicle source.

On Heraclius' accession (AM 6103), the Avars were devastating Europe, i.e. Thrace, while the Persians ravaged Asia, but it was not until 617 that the khan of the Avars led the great raid which broke through the Long Walls, and in which Heraclius himself was nearly captured at Heraclea. The date of the raid has been fixed by Baynes as June 5, 617, despite the date of 619 in Theophanes and that of 623 in the Chronicon Paschale. Baynes refuted the suggestion of Gerland that, of the two conflicting dates of 619 and 623, that of 623 should be accepted since the Chronicon Paschale was a contemporary work, whereas Theophanes in the ninth century was using at least second-hand and imprecisely dated material. Earlier historians had accepted Theophanes' date of 619, and suggested that the Chronicon Paschale dating could be changed to Sunday June 3, to correspond to that of 619; but according to Baynes it was impossible to reject the very precise dating of the Chronicon; and equally impossible to believe that there was an attack on Constantinople in 623, which the Chronicon had confused with the earlier attack of 619, not only because the Chronicon was written in Constantinople, but also because the Homily of Theodore Syncellus made no mention of it. Baynes explained the
inaccurate year dating of the Chronicon Paschale simply as the result of misplacement of the leaves of the archetype by the scribe who produced the Vatican MS.

In 617 (AM 6110), the Avars advanced into Thrace, but the khan acceded to Heraclius' request for negotiations, so that Heraclius with his body-guard and baggage train crossed the Long Walls of Anastasius, which were then of little military value, to meet him. The Avars, however, broke the agreement without warning, so that Heraclius was forced to flee to Constantinople, abandoning his bodyguard and baggage train, while the Avars pillaged Thrace.

In 620 (AM 6111) Heraclius was forced to make peace with the khan, so that he might transfer his troops from Thrace to Asia Minor, in preparation for his Persian campaign.

Nicephorus' account of the Avar surprise was based upon his unknown Constantinople Chronicle source, which apparently owed much to the Chronicon Paschale, with which it showed correspondence. The Avar khan made overtures for peace, in response to which Heraclius sent an embassy to him. The legates, convinced that the khan genuinely wished for peace, arranged that Heraclius would meet him at Heracleia in Thrace to negotiate with him. Heraclius came to Selymbria with his body-guard and an imposing baggage-train, and the khan came to Heracleia; but the Avars treacherously attempted to ambush Heraclius in the wooded hills which dominated the Long Walls, and the emperor escaped with difficulty and fled back to Constantinople in disguise. The Avars pursued him to Constantinople,
sailed the imperial baggage train, and encamped on the plain of the
Hebdomon, from which they over-ran and plundered the suburbs of the city
before withdrawing to the north with a large number of captives, which
according to Nicephorus numbered two hundred and seventy thousand men and
women; but according to George the Monk, seventy thousand.

Nicephorus, in his account of the Avar attack upon Constantinople in 626,
gave the terms of the treaty by which Heraclius made peace with the khan,
and of which Theophanes was apparently unaware. The terms included an
annual tribute of two hundred thousand gold nomismata, and the granting of
three hostages: John Atalarichus, Heraclius' natural son, his nephew
Stephen, and another John, natural son of Bonus the patrician.

Theophanes' narrative of his history of the imperial family came from his
Constantinople Chronicle source. De Boer commented that for the reign of
Heraclius, Theophanes had two sources, one of which was an adequately
dated and exclusive account of imperial family history, and this source
probably formed part of his wider Constantinople Chronicle source.

Nicephorus' widely differing account of the imperial family came from his
independent Constantinople Chronicle, with little reference in this
instance to the Chronicon Paschale. The topic was not mentioned by George
the Monk.

On October 4 610 (AM 6102), Heraclius, immediately after his coronation,
made Buocia, and on 7 July 611, their daughter Epiphaneia was born,
and was baptised in the Church of the Virgin at Blachernae by the patriarch
Sergius on 15 August 611.92.

On 3 May 612 (AM 6103), Heraclius the new Constantine was born. On 14 August of the same year the empress Eudocia died (AM 6104).93 Epiphaneia was crowned Augusta by the patriarch Sergius in the chapel of St. Stephen in the palace on October 4, and on December 25, Heraclius Constantine was crowned by Sergius (AM 6104).94

In 613 (AM 6105), Heraclius married Martina, who was crowned empress by Sergius.95

In 614 (AM 6106), a son was born to Martina, and baptised in Blachernae by Sergius.96

On 1 January 617 (AM 6108), Heraclius Constantine, son of Eudocia, made Caesar his brother Constantine, son of Martina and Heraclius.97

On 7 November 630 (AM 6122), Heraclius' son David was born at Antioch while Heraclius and Martina were still in the East after the restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem; and, in Constantinople, Heraclius his grandson was born to Heraclius Constantine, and baptised at Blachernae on 3 November 630 by the patriarch Sergius.98

Nicephorus' independent account of the imperial family was, if less systematic concerning the birth of Heraclius' children, more comprehensive and more detailed in some respects than that of Theophanes.
Nicephorus' first notice dealt with the funeral of Eudocia in 612, after her death from epilepsy, during the course of which a certain maid servant leaning from a window to view the body as it was being borne towards burial, spat inadvertently upon Eudocia's splendid shroud, and in punishment was burned to death near the palace of Blachernai.

In the same year, Heraclius' son Constantine was crowned emperor immediately after his baptism by Sergius; and Heraclius gave Gregoria his daughter (mentioned by no other chronicler) in marriage to Nicetas.

In 613, Heraclius married Martina, his own niece, son of his sister Maria and Martinus, in the face of great opposition in Constantinople, from both the patriarch Sergius and the Greens; the attitude of the Blues, perhaps through textual imperfection in the Breviarium, is unknown. The birth of the deformed children, Flavius and Theodosius, was hailed as divine punishment of iniquity.

In 623, as Heraclius commenced his second invasion of Persia, Martina, who accompanied him, gave birth to a son, Heraclius, in Lazica; but while Heraclius was in Persia, two sons and two daughters died.

Heraclius, to seal his alliance with the Turkish Khazars against Persia, offered the khan his daughter, the augusta Eudocia, in marriage; the khan having seen her portrait, was enthusiastic for the alliance; but he was murdered by his followers before the marriage could take place. Eudocia was later offered to Amr, the Saracen conqueror of Egypt, by the patriarch Cyrus of Alexandria, although without either Heraclius' knowledge or his
On the usurpation of the Persian throne by the general Barbaras, with Heraclius' support, to seal the peace, Theodosius, the deaf son of Heraclius and Martina, was married to Barbaras' daughter Nice 108.

In 630, Heraclius brought Gregoria the daughter of Nicetas, from Pentapolis, and married her to his own son Constantine, as he had promised Nicetas during his lifetime 109.

In 630, after his return to Constantinople, Heraclius appointed Heraclius Constantine consul and Heraclius Caesar 110. In 638, after the revolt of his nephew Theodore and his natural son John Atalarichus, Heraclius crowned Heracleonas as emperor 111, and David and Marinus caesars, and Augustina and Martina, his daughters, augustas 112.

The narrative of the Chronicon Paschale, which was confined to the births and coronations of Epiphaneia and Heraclius neos Constantine, and the death of Eudocia, was not apparently either related to Nicephorus' original sources, or connected with that of Theophanes.

On Thursday 7th June 611, Epiphaneia was born to Eudocia Fabia in the palace of Hieria 113 and on 4 October 612, she was crowned augusta by Sergius in the chapel of St. Stephen in the palace of Blachernae, and was drawn on a chariot to Hagia Sophia by Philaretus, cubicularius and chartularius, and Synetus the castresius 114.
Heraclius the young Constantine was born to Eudocia in the palace of Sophiana on Thursday 3 May 612. He was crowned by Heraclius on 22 January 613, and taken to the hippodrome where he was acclaimed by the demes before being carried to Hagia Sophia by Philaretus.

The empress Eudocia died at Blachernae on Sunday 13 August 613, and the following day her body was taken by ship from the palace to the city, where she was buried in the church of the Holy Apostles.

It has long been known that Theophanes' chief, if not his only source, for Heraclius' Persian campaigns were the poems of George of Pisidia, and the survey which follows is based upon the work of Sternbach. It will be more profitable to establish first the relationship of Theophanes' narrative to George of Pisidia's historical epics, before investigating whether or not Theophanes drew upon any other sources, extant or non-extent, and before considering the accounts of the contemporary Chronicon Paschale, of Nicephorus, and others.

In 620 (AM 6112) Heraclius made peace with the Avar Khan, so that he might be able to transport his army from Thrace to Anatolia in the winter of the same year, and in 621 (AM 6113), to finance his forthcoming Persian campaign, Heraclius took possession of the gold of the churches.

George of Pisidia's Expeditio Persica provided the source for Theophanes' account of Heraclius' first campaign, 622-623. On 4 April 622 (AM 6113), Heraclius, having celebrated Easter in Constantinople and confided the
capital to the charge of the patriarch Sergius and the patrician and magister militum Bonus, left the city and crossed by sea to Pylae in Bithynia, and narrowly escaped shipwreck when rounding cape Herea. From Pylae, Heraclius moved probably to the region of Nicaea, where he spent the summer of 622, reorganising and training his army in new tactical methods especially in the use of cavalry and lightly armed mounted archery, which culminated in a simulated battle between the two halves of the army. Heraclius made his first move against Persia in autumn, 622 (AM 6113) when he set out for the frontier of Armenia. Here a Saracen chief in alliance with the Persians, attempting to spy on the Byzantine force, was taken prisoner and brought to Heraclius. At the start of winter, Heraclius penetrated into Persian territory through Pontus and Armenia, a skillful manoeuvre which forced Barbaras to abandon his position in the mountain passes of Asia Minor, from which he was threatening Cilicia, and to follow Heraclius. In January 623 (AM 6113), two weeks after a sudden eclipse of the moon had frustrated a projected surprise attack by Barbaras, the Persian and Byzantine armies met in battle in Armenia, and Barbaras' army, blinded by the light of the rising sun which shone against it, was defeated when a simulated retreat by the Byzantines enticed it into breaking formation. Heraclius, leaving his troops to spend the remainder of the winter in Armenia, returned to Constantinople with his first objective, the expulsion of the Persians from Asia Minor, fulfilled.

In his account of the first Persian campaign, Theophanes constructed his narrative by transposing the Expeditio Persiae into prose; but the relationship between George of Asadia and Theophanes' narrative of the
second Persian campaign is not equally clear, although the narrative contained poetic elements, which can be traced to the fragmentary Heraclius III; but presumably another source must also have been involved.

In 623 (AM 6113), according to Pernice, Heraclius had been forced to return to Constantinople after his victory over Sarbaras as a result of a renewed threat by the Avar khan, and he was forced to increase the agreed tribute and send the hostages named by Nicephorus, before he left Constantinople. Heraclius, together with Martina, Heraclius Constantine and Epiphaneia, came to Nicomedia where he celebrated Easter on March 27, 623 (AM 6114). On April 20, having waited at Nicomedia until he received Chosroes' reply to his overtures for peace after his victory in Armenia in January, 623, which came in the scornful letter: "Chosroes, beloved of the gods, master and king of all the earth, son of the great Aramazd, to our servant, imbecile and infirm, Heraclius," Heraclius sent his children back to Constantinople and set out for Armenia with Martina and Anianus, the magister domesticorum. This information Theophanes took probably from his Constantinople Chronicle source. Before he penetrated into Persia, Heraclius exhorted his army to bravery, in a speech which reflected the poetry of George of Pisidia. On Heraclius' invasion of Persia, Chosroes II recalled Sarbaras, who had made a fresh incursion into Bithynia, and commanded him to join forces with Sain; but Chosroes himself was nevertheless driven from Ganzak, the capital of the first Sassanid Artasir and an important religious centre for Persia, while Heraclius took not only the treasures of the town but also destroyed utterly the great fire-temple of Zorcoaster. Heraclius went on to raze Thebarma and many other towns of Media, and then wintered in Albania.
behind the Araxes, where he set free the forty thousand Persians whom he had taken captive.

In 624 (AM 6115), Heraclius returned to Persia in the spring. Theophanes' account of the exhortation which he addressed to his troops again came from George of Pisidia. Sarablagas, who had been sent against him with Chosrogetas and Perozitas, tried to occupy the passes in front of Heraclius so that his allies, Lazi, Abasgi, and Iberians, could not join him; while Sarbaras, coming to Armenia, tried to join forces with Sarablagas, and Sain came with a third army. Heraclius, determined to give battle before the Persian forces were united and, having harangued his troops, carried out a surprise attack against Sarablagas and Sarablagas, and defeated them. Despite this victory, when Heraclius was marching on Persarmenia, his Caucasian allies abandoned him, and Sain and Sarbaras pursued him, but Heraclius was able to inflict another surprise attack upon Sarbaras, whose troops were disbanding at the start of winter, before wintering himself on Lake Van in Armenia. In 625 (AM 6116), Heraclius, having crossed the Taurus mountains into Mesopotamia in seven days, crossed first the Tigris to Martyropolis and Amida, and then the Nymphius, and came to Samosata on the Euphrates, and through Germanicia to Adana on the Sarus. Here Heraclius encountered Sarbaras who retired after an indecisive battle. The account of the battle showed traces of George of Pisidia. Heraclius was forced to retire also, and withdrew as far as Pontus, wintering near Sebastea on the Halys.

Theophanes' narrative of Heraclius' third Persian campaign, 626-628, likewise contained poetic elements which can be traced to George of
Pisidia's fragmentary Heraclius III.

At the start of the campaign of 626 (AM 6117) Heraclius divided the Byzantine army into three parts: the first he left at Constantinople, for the defence of the capital; he himself set out for Lazica with the second to gain the alliance of the eastern Turks or Khazars; and the remainder he entrusted to his brother Theodore, and dispatched him against Sain, whose army was composed of new recruits and fifty thousand men drawn by Chosroes from the army of Sarbaras. When the armies met in battle, as a result of a sudden miraculous hailstorm, Sain was defeated by Theodore and subsequently died of mortification; Chosroes then vented his anger upon Sain's corpse. The Khazars, under their second chief Ziebel, penetrated by the Caspian Gates as far as Adraigan, devastating the countryside and taking prisoners; at Tiflis, Ziebel prostrated himself before Heraclius, and then departed, leaving forty thousand men behind him to continue the march into Persia. Meanwhile Sarbaras, after the failure of the Avar assault upon Constantinople, continued to besiege Chalcedon in the winter of 626.

In September 627 (AM 6118) Heraclius continued his campaign and invaded Persia and ravaged the land, although the Khazars were unable to bear the rigours of the campaign and departed. Heraclius exhorted his army, in a speech strongly reminiscent of George of Pisidia, not to be disheartened by their desertion. In October, Heraclius allowed his troops seven days rest at Chamaitha. Heraclius reached Nineveh on December 1, 627, where he was overtaken by Razates who had followed him from Gazacum and crossed the river Zaba. Razates, having been defeated in a skirmish by
Basnes, on December 12 fought Heraclius in single combat and was defeated and killed. Theophanes' description of the encounter was based upon George of Pisidia. On 21 December Heraclius, having defeated Razates' army in battle, pursued it almost to the river Zaba, together with three thousand reinforcements sent by Chosroes. George the Armenian marched forty seven miles in a single night to occupy the four bridges over the little Zaba. Heraclius camped at Issedon on 23 December, to celebrate Christmas, but Chosroes, having unsuccessfully dispatched an army to halt Heraclius' advance, was forced to take flight, first to Dastagerd and then, on 28th December, to Ctesiphon. On 1 January 628 (AM 6118), Heraclius, having destroyed Dezerdan and Rusa, pillaged at Bechal to ensure provisions for his army, before proceeding to the destruction of the palace of Bebdarch, and, on 6 January, to the pillage and looting of Chosroes' favourite palace at Dastagerd. The last troops of Chosroes were drawn up at Siarsura on the Arbas, and Heraclius therefore set out for Siarsura from Dastagerd, and crossed the river Narba, laying waste the land as he marched. Meanwhile Chosroes, who was at Selucia, ordered Kardarigas to put Sarbaras to death, in anger at the failure of the assault upon Constantinople in 626. Chosroes' letter was intercepted in Galatia, and finally transmitted by Heraclius Constantine to Sarbaras, who allied himself to the Byzantines as a result; then they inserted the names of forty Persians, as if proscribed by Chosroes, in order to detach them from a ruler hated for his blood-thirstiness. At the same time, Heraclius wrote to Chosroes, protesting his love of peace; a letter of which traces appear in the Heraclius.

In February 628 (AM 6118), Siroes, Chosroes' eldest son, who feared that
Chosroes, ill with dysentry, was about to supplant him by his brother Merdasan, conspired to throw Chosroes into prison with the support of Gundabusan, whom he had sent to inform Heraclius. Chosroes, having been deprived of food, was put to death five days later; Theophanes' description of his incarceration was apparently based on the Heraclias. Heraclius camped at Barza for a week in March, and sent out Mezizos his general for plunder; it was here that he received envoys from Siroes, announcing the overthrow and death of his father, and asking for peace. After Siroes had released the people of Jerusalem, including the patriarch Zacharias, held captive in Persia, and returned the holy Cross, Heraclius in turn repatriated, through his brother Theodore, the Persian prisoners from Edessa, Palestine, and elsewhere. Heraclius then returned to Constantinople in triumph at the victorious conclusion of seven years war; Theophanes' narrative, with its comparison with the Almighty's work of the Creation, could come from no other source than George of Pisidia.

Pernice considered that Heraclias III, which survived only in fragmentary form, was written later than the rest of the poem, definitely after Heraclius' return to Constantinople and possibly after a conversation with him; and that it therefore contained more detailed factual information than the first two parts, and provided the basis for Theophanes' narrative of the second and third Persian campaigns. From Theophanes' account of the second Persian campaign, the following have been traced in the Heraclias III: Heraclius' exhortation to his troops before the return to Persia in spring, 624; the battle on the Sarus. From Theophanes' account of Heraclius' third Persian campaign, the following have been traced in...
Heraclius III: Heraclius' three-fold division of his army, 626; his exhortation to his troops not to be disheartened at the Khazar defection, 627; the single combat of Razates and Heraclius; Heraclius' letter to Chosroes, protesting his love of peace; the death of Chosroes, 628. The crucial question now is: how much of the Heraclius III has been lost? I myself do not think that sufficient of the poem can have been lost without trace to account for the highly factual narrative of Theophanes; nor would such a narrative be in character with the rest of the poetry of George of Pisidia. But if Theophanes did not draw on George of Pisidia alone for his narrative, from which source did he then obtain it? It is not likely to have been found in his Constantinople Chronicle source, for this, as I have postulated it, was of almost annalistic brevity, and treated chiefly events within the capital. Theophanes' account could have possibly been drawn from the eastern World Chronicle, although the fact that the interest of its author was focussed mainly upon Syria, and the distortion and incompleteness of the narrative of Michael the Syrian^175 made it unlikely that the eastern World Chronicle could have provided the source for Theophanes' detailed narrative of the advance of Heraclius into Persia. Another possible source for Theophanes was the three letters written by Heraclius from Persia to Constantinople, which were read from the ambon of Hagia Sophia and one of which, according to Pertusi, formed the basis of the first two parts of George of Pisidia's Heraclias^176. Since the third letter of Heraclius announced the death of Chosroes, and was used by George of Pisidia and preserved in the Chronicon Paschale^177, Theophanes' source for the second and third campaigns was possibly the first and second letters of Heraclius, although this cannot be established with certainty. Nor is it possible to determine how Heraclius' letters were
transmitted to Theophanes in the ninth century.

Nicephorus' account of Heraclius' Persian campaigns was drawn from his independent Constantinople Chronicle source, which gave no indication that Heraclius fought three distinct Persian campaigns from 622 to 628, and provided only a confused narrative of some of the events of the second and third campaigns. The author of Nicephorus' source was apparently indebted to the *Heraclius III*, the only work of George of Pisidia which is reproduced in the *Breviarii*; or alternatively, Nicephorus himself may have known and used the poem; the former is more probable, but no certain decision is possible. Nicephorus' source in this instance apparently had little relation to the *Chronicon Paschale*.

Nicephorus wrongly attributed Heraclius' seizure of the plate & revenue of the churches to 613\(^{178}\); Theophanes placed it in 621 (AM 6113)\(^{179}\) more logically; and the *Chronicon Paschale* in 624\(^{180}\).

In 622, Heraclius, hardpressed by Persians and Avars, commended Constantinople and his children to Sergius and Bonus in the presence of the assembled Senate and people\(^{181}\), before invading Persia by way of the Euxine and Lazica, where Martina gave birth to Heracleonas\(^{182}\). Since Heraclius' proposal of alliance had been favourably received by the khan of the eastern or Turkish Khazars, a meeting was arranged at which the khan and all his people prostrated themselves before Heraclius, who in return presented the khan with rich gifts, including imperial garments, and, to cement the alliance, offered the khan his daughter Hudocia in marriage\(^{183}\).
Heraclius then invaded Persia, accompanied by the khan, and when he came to
the great fire-temple of Ganzak, with its astral ceiling upon which
Chosroes was enthroned, he destroyed it utterly. On Heraclius' invasion
of Persia, Chosroes summoned Sarbaras from Chalcedon to reinforce his army
in Persia, but Heraclius intercepted the letter, and substituted a forgery
ordering Sarbaras to continue the siege of Chalcedon, on the grounds that
Heraclius and the Khazars had allegedly been defeated in Persia.

Nicephorus' narrative of the single combat between Heraclius and Hizates
(Hizates, according to Theophanes' spelling), although not completely
corresponding to that of Theophanes, and omitting the subsequent battle
between Persian and Byzantine armies, came obviously from a common source
and was ultimately drawn from Heraclius III. Nicephorus' account
of the death of Chosroes at the hands of his son Siroes, although
briefer than that of Theophanes, corresponded closely with the latter,
and was also ultimately drawn from the Heraclius III as a common source.

The Chronicon Paschale preserved the letter of Heraclius which announced
the death of Chosroes after imprisonment in his own treasure house, and
thus provided an interesting illustration of the play of the poetic
imagination of George of Pisidia upon his original information.

In contrast to the account of Theophanes (AM 6118), Heraclius,
according to Nicephorus, was unaware of the conspiracy against Chosroes.
When he received Siroes' letter, in which he announced the death of his
father and asked for peace, Heraclius wrote in reply that he did not
approve of the deposition and murder of Chosroes, and that he himself,
after victory, would have restored Chosroes to his throne; although his death was both the vengeance of divine justice and a necessary prelude to peace between Persia and the Empire.

The concept of the universal sovereignty of the emperor, implicit in Heraclius' letter to Chosroes, was expressed also by George of Pisidia, who declared that the right of punishing Chosroes belonged to the power of the emperor alone, and by Theodore Syncello, who said that the Christian emperor had bestowed both life and rule over the Persians upon Chosroes.

George the Monk's narrative of the Persian campaigns was abbreviated from Nicephorus' Breviarium; but omitted the birth of Heracleonas in Lazica, the single combat between Heraclius and Rizates, and the history of the letter of Chosroes to Sarbaras at Chalcedon.

The source of Theophanes' brief narrative of the Persian and Avar attack upon Constantinople in 626 was, as Sternehbach showed, the Bellum Avaricum and Heraclias III of George of Pisidia; Pertusi commented that Theophanes' account was probably drawn from the Heraclias III alone, but this is unlikely because Theophanes' account contained greater detail than that surviving in Heraclias III, and it is also hard to prove because of the similarity at some points of the Bellum Avaricum and Heraclias III.

Barisic's study of the assault of 626 has been of particular value.

Before his departure from Constantinople in 626 (AH 6117) to begin his
third Persian campaign Heraclius, aware that the Avars, in alliance with the Slavs, Bulgars and Gepids, were marching upon Constantinople, and that Chosroes had dispatched Sarbaras from Persia, divided his army into three parts, one of which he left to defend the capital. Sarbaras appeared with his army before Chalcedon and burned its suburbs. The Avars, having approached the city from Thrace, invested Constantinople with siege instruments on the one hand, and at the same time filled the Golden Horn with their monoxyla for the transport of their Slav allies. After the Avars and Slavs had attacked the city in vain for ten days, they were overthrown by the power of God through the intercession of the Virgin, and forced to retreat, having suffered great losses. Sarbaras, who had played no part in the assault of Constantinople, and whose presence at Chalcedon was a diversion to paralyse the offensive of Heraclius in Armenia and to destroy the morale of the capital, continued the siege of Chalcedon during the winter of 626.

Nicephorus' account of the Avar assault upon Constantinople, taken from his independent Constantinople Chronicle source, concentrated upon the decisive operation of the ten day siege, the defeat of the barbarian fleet on Thursday, August 7. The Avars broke the treaty which Heraclius had made before he invaded Persia, and advanced to the walls of Constantinople and burned its suburbs, ravaging Thrace while the Persians ravaged Asia (a reference to the presence of Sarbaras at Chalcedon). The Avars constructed instruments, but, as they brought them against the city wall, they were destroyed by divine intervention. The decisive attack against Constantinople by both land and sea was launched by the Avar khan on Thursday August 7. The Avar
cavalry, having taken the Pteron at Blachernae, lit signal fires there as beacons for the Slav monoxyla to put out from the river Barbyzæ; but Bonus perceived this operation, and stationed biremes and triremes near the Pteron and on the other side of the Golden Horn, and lit signal fires there also. The Slavs, believing these to be the beacons of the Avars, were caught between the two Byzantine squadrons and utterly routed, so that the sea was stained with their blood. The Avar khan was forced to raise the siege and to retreat from Constantinople, while Constans and Sergius offered prayers of thanksgiving at the Church of the Virgin in Blachernæ. In 627, the Pteron wall was extended to protect the churches of the Virgin and the Holy Vessel at Blachernæ, which until then had been outside the city wall.

George the Monk gives a brief account of the advance of the Avars against Constantinople, and their defeat and withdrawal, which was abbreviated from that of the Breviarium. It is difficult to determine the relationship of Niphphorus' source to the other contemporary accounts, although they all correspond in outline; for the Chronicon Paschale is incomplete at this point, and neither George of Pisidia nor Theodore Syncelles aimed primarily at an historical narrative.

The Chronicon Paschale, which gave an eye-witness and most realistic description of the siege of Constantinople, with abundant historical detail, is unfortunately mutilated at this point, and the narrative of three days has been lost; after Monday August 4, when the Avar khan was making his final preparations for the final attack, the next day given is Friday August 8, when the Avars were in full retreat. At the
beginning of June, 626, Barbatarus with his army appeared before Chalcedon and, while he awaited the arrival of the Avar khan, burned the suburbs of Chalcedon and the houses and churches nearby. On Sunday June 29, the Avar advance guard of around thirty thousand men arrived at Adrianople, close to the Long Walls of Anastasius, and the cavalry and the remainder of the Byzantine force retreated to within the Theodosian Wall. By July 8, the Avar advance guard had reached Melantiade on the Propontis, from which town they made reconnaissances towards Constantinople. The frightened and confused Byzantine leaders had already sent the patrician Athanasius to the khan, offering to accept any terms provided solely that he would abandon the attack; but an Avar detachment of a thousand men came to Sycae, where they established contact through fire signals with the Persians at Chrysopolis on the Asiatic shore of the Bosporus.

Then the Avar khan, through the intermediacy of Athanasius, asked the people of Constantinople what terms they would offer him to cease the attack, but Bonus and the leaders, apparently repenting of their former weakness and gaining confidence from the detachment sent to the capital by Heraclius, replied that the khan would be prevented from attacking the city by force; but when Athanasius arrived in the Avar camp, he was told that the khan would not receive him and that negotiations were at an end. On Thursday July 29, the Avar khan appeared with an army of eighty thousand before the western wall of the city, and Bonus, anticipating an early battle, made a rapid inspection of his troops and final preparations. On Thursday July 31, the khan launched an attack upon the Theodosian Wall, but a Slav detachment suffered great loss at Pege, close to a church dedicated to the Virgin, and although the fighting lasted all day, the Avars could only establish some of their siege...
Instruments against the wall. On Friday August 1, the khan brought up a great number of siege instruments against the wall, but some of these were destroyed by means of a type of crane, the invention of a sailor; nevertheless, in the face of strong opposition, the khan assembled his fleet of monoxyla close to the bridge of St. Callinicus, inaccessible to the Byzantine fleet, which then took station opposite to the monoxyla. For the fourth time, Bonus offered tribute and rich compensation if the khan would raise the siege, but he again demanded that the people completely abandon the city and all their possessions. In the afternoon of Saturday August 2, the khan demanded an embassy, and after a conference between Heraclius, Constantine, Bonus, Sergius and leading senators, an embassy of five men, including Theodore Syncellos, was dispatched to the Avar camp, where they were confronted with a Persian embassy offering assistance from Sarbaras; the Byzantines stated their terms and then withdrew, but the report of the embassy on its return to Constantinople produced great disquiet in the city. The same night, three Persian emissaries were taken prisoner by the Byzantines, close to Chalae on the Bosphorus; one was put to death immediately, and the other two brought within Constantinople, to be displayed to the barbarians from the ramparts the next morning, Sunday August 3; The Byzantines cut off the arms of one and hung them round his neck, together with the head of the man killed the previous night, and sent him to the Avar khan; and they took the third in a boat to Chalcedon, and decapitated him in front of the Persian force. That evening, despite a contrary wind, a squadron of the Byzantine fleet sailed to Chalae, and at night the Slav monoxyla put out for the Asian coast of the Bosphorus to embark a Persian detachment; in the unequal battle which
ensued in the gulf of Keras, the Slav ships dispersed or sunk. Here occurs the apparent lacuna in the Chronicon Paschale, unmarked in the Bonn edition. On the morning of Friday August 8, the aftermath of the naval battle was everywhere visible; some Avar ships, having seen the fire placed in front of the door of the church of St. Nicholas and believing it to be the Avar beacon, had made towards it and were killed there by the Armenians; while a party of Avars who had managed to escape and to regain the Avar camp were killed on the orders of the khan. This day the army of the khan was in complete confusion; the Slav detachments had deserted, and the Avar cavalry took off in pursuit, and soldiers abandoned their position before the ramparts; at night the Avar army withdrew from the city walls and fired their own camp and siege instruments, and the Avar retreat from Constantinople was completed by the evening of the following day.

The assault of the Avars and Slavs upon Constantinople in 626 was treated in three of the historical poems of George of Pisidia. The fragments of the Heraclias III which narrated the Avar–Persian alliance, the attack of the Avars from Thrace against the city, and its overwhelming defeat by the power of God through the intercession of the Virgin, were apparently excerpted from the Bellum Avaricum. The In Bonum patricium was a panegyric to Bonus, who defended the capital entrusted to him by Heraclius from the attack of the Persian Sarbaras at Chalcedon, and from the Avars who had conquered Adrianople before advancing in force along the Long Walls; it also invoked Heraclius, who was fighting against Persia in the East. George of Pisidia primarily commemorated the siege in the Bellum Avaricum, a poem of over five hundred iambic trimetres,
first recited before Sergius and Heraclius Constantine²³³ in 627 (Bonus died in May, 627²³⁴), which glorified the Virgin as general of the glorious defence of the city against Persian and barbarian treachery and iniquity, and extolled Sergius and Heraclius. Despite its poetic character, the Bellum Avaricum provided accurate and authentic information on the events of 626. In spite of divergencies of race and faith, Avars and Slavs found common loyalty with the Persians in an attack upon Constantinople²³⁵, and both deceitfully prepared for war while offering peace to the Byzantines²³⁶. When the Avar khan approached the western wall of the capital with an army of eight thousand men, Bonus carried out hasty preparations for the defence of the capital, and Sergius heartened the frightened people; while Heraclius, who in his years of war against the barbarians in Persia had never ceased to watch over Constantinople, sent a force to the capital's defence when he was aware of the Persian and Avar intention²³⁷. The khan demanded an embassy from Constantinople, but at the same time Sarbaras sent an embassy to the khan promising a supporting force of a thousand men, thus strengthening the khan's resolution²³⁸. The dispirited Byzantines decided to reinforce the watch on the Bosporus to prevent the passage of the Persian troops²³⁹ and that night (Saturday August 2) they captured three Persian emissaries to the khan²⁴⁰. The Avars continued their siege of the city, so that the fires of the besieging Sarbaras at Chalcedon and Chrysopolis had scarcely been extinguished by the Byzantine defenders before the new fires of the Avar ravages appeared to the west of the city²⁴¹, and the Avar cavalry took Blachernae and fortified it²⁴². The barbarians launched their final attack by both land and sea; and the Byzantines by the power of God were victorious on land, while at sea the whole barbarian fleet was sunk by
the Virgin, so that all perished and the sea was stained with their blood. One Avar sailor escaped when he feigned death and floated in the water, while others hid under capsized boats. The Almighty had dyed the Tigris and the Istros as red as the Nile; and the Scythian had killed the Slav before he in turn was killed, and, bloodied by the common slaughter, they had shared a common fate.

The Homily of Theodore Syncellus was delivered in Hagia Sophia on August 7, 726, to commemorate the Avar overthrow the previous year, and, although it was markedly theological in character and rhetorical in style, it is the most complete and most realistic description of the siege which we possess. Theodore began with a brief history of Byzantine and Avar relations, full of hatred for the barbarians. When the Avars were fugitives from the power of the Turks, they were assisted by the emperor, so that when their aged leader died, his eldest son was able to conquer the surrounding peoples. Under their third khan, the policy of external aggression was continued, and the first plans were made against Constantinople; Heraclius, seeing the danger, tried without success to avert it; the khan betrayed him at Heracliaia, and ravaged to the walls of the capital in 617, but a shortlived treaty was made in 619. Before his departure for Persia in 622, Heraclius entrusted Constantinople and his children to the Virgin and to his vice-gerent Bonus, and named the khan the guardian of his sons; but the khan immediately prepared to attack the city by land and sea, so that Heraclius was forced to return from Armenia in Spring, 623, to arrange the defence of Constantinople. On Heraclius' departure for his third campaign in 626, the khan suggested an alliance to Chosroes of Persia, and prepared for the assault; Heraclius
sent instructions to Bonus, who with Heraclius' children in Constantinople prayed for the aid of the Virgin, while Sergius each night took the ikon of Christ of Camuliana to the western gates of the city against the barbarians approaching from Thrace. On Tuesday July 29, the sight of massing Avar troops to the west was sufficient to instil fear into the beholder; Bonus made his last preparations, and Heraclius Constantine sought peace in vain, while Sergius led a procession of the dignitaries of the Church around the walls; but the day passed without battle, and the khan withdrew to his camp. On Wednesday July 30, the second day of the siege, the barbarians brought up their siege instruments and made preparations for battle, while the khan taunted the people of the city.

On Thursday July 31, the third day, the khan at dawn launched an attack on the central part of the Theodosian Wall between the Pempton and Polyantrion Gates; but the barbarians, repulsed by the Virgin, suffered great losses. On Friday August 1, the fourth day of the siege, the khan brought forward helepoles, petrobles and pyrocastles, and placed them in great numbers in the principal sectors of the attack, for he had sufficient men and materials to erect them quickly.

On Saturday August 2, the fifth day, Heraclius Constantine, having taken counsel with Bonus, Sergius and the Senate, sent an embassy to the khan, but when they reached the Avar camp they encountered a Persian embassy proffering aid to the Avars; on their return to Constantinople, special prayers were offered, and God prevented the junction of the Persian and Avar forces.

From Sunday August 3 to Tuesday August 5, the sixth, seventh and eighth days of the siege, local attacks and skirmishes continued, and the khan launched the Slav monoxiles in the bay of Keras and brought up all his siege instruments in preparation for his final assault. On Wednesday
August 6, the ninth day, the khan attacked all along the walls, and battle continued into the night, but the Avar losses were much greater than the Byzantine. On Thursday August 7, the tenth day of the siege, the decisive attack against the city was launched by the Avars on land and sea; the barbarians having suffered immense losses all along the walls, the khan embarked all his forces in his monoxyles, which filled the gulf of Keras, to attack the city; but the Virgin sank the whole fleet, so that all were drowned and the gulf filled with corpses. The khan was an eye-witness of the disaster, and the Byzantines announced the victory to the barbarian land forces by displaying the impaled heads of the dead; the army of the khan was in complete confusion, and the khan was forced to burn his camp and his siege instruments, and retreat. Barbaras continued to besiege Chalcedon during the winter, but this town too was defended by God and the Virgin, and he was forced to retire in shame. Prayers of thanksgiving were offered in Constantinople for the miraculous deliverance of the city.

The Brief History of the Dispersal of the Persians and Avars was an abbreviation of the Homily of Theodore Syncellus, which passed into the Synaxarium of the church of Constantinople. Heraclius, before his invasion of Persia, entrusted his children to patriarch Sergius; and the khan of the Avars, hearing this, attacked Constantinople, while a Persian army under Barbaras reached Chalcedon. On the third day of the siege, the Byzantine troops made a sortie and killed many Avars, but the khan prepared siege engines; while Sergius took the icons of the Virgin and Christ of Camuliana, and the true Cross and the cloak of the Virgin in procession around the walls. Heraclius Constantine sent
legates to the khan in vain. By the tenth day of the siege, the Byzantines had given up hope and the barbarians expected to take the city, but the Avars attacking by the bay of Keras were drowned by the Virgin, and on land were wounded by a great storm; suddenly a great fire encircled the city, and the Persians, seeing it from Chalcedon, thought that the Avars had taken and fired Constantinople. Both Persians and Avars were forced to retreat in shame. The History concluded with a brief account of Heraclius' campaigns in Persia, and of his triumphant restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem.

Theophanes' sources for his account of the restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem, one of the most complex chronological problems of the reign of Heraclius, were his eastern World Chronicle source and George of Pisidia's In restitutionem sanctae Crucis and Heraclius III. Nicephorus based his narrative upon his independent Constantinople Chronicle source; while George the Monk abbreviated Theophanes' account.

Antiochus Strategos, whose Account of the sack of Jerusalem in 614 is our only eye-witness and detailed narrative, dated the restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem by Heraclius on March 21, 630. Nicephorus placed it in 629, before Heraclius' return to Constantinople. Theophanes placed Heraclius' return to Constantinople from Persia in 628 (AM 6119), and the restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem in 629 (AM 6120). Baynes, after a study of the primary sources, concluded that the date of the restoration of the Cross was March 21, 629, before Heraclius' return to Constantinople, and that Theophanes' error was the result of his antedating the peace with
Persia to 627, and, since he was aware that the restoration of the Cross took place in 629, and of his subsequent displacement of Heraclius' return to Constantinople to 628. Following Baynes' work, it is possible to attempt a detailed restoration of the chronology of 628–629.

In spring 628, Heraclius made peace with Siroes, which was accounted in Constantinople on the feast of Pentecost, May 15, in Hagia Sophia. Heraclius did not return to Constantinople in 628, but withdrew to Armenia and wintered at the frontier fortress of Amida for fear of Sarbaras, who was still in Asia Minor with a large army and refusing allegiance to Artasir. The issue is further complicated by confusion concerning the succession to the Persian throne; according to Nicephorus, Siroes died soon after the conclusion of peace, and was succeeded briefly by Kaboes and Hormisdas, then by Artasir who was overthrown by Sarbaras early in 629; according to Theophanes' eastern World Chronicle source (AM 6120), the order of succession was Siroes, Adesir, Sarbaras, Boranes, Hormisdas; while Michael the Syrian, who excerpted his list from James of Edessa, and Elias of Nisibis gave two different orders of succession. Both Nicephorus and Antiochus Strategos agree that Heraclius actually received the Cross from Sarbaras; the return of the Cross had been promised by Siroes, and reiterated in peace terms by successive Persian rulers; the delay in its return was probably due to the difficulty of locating it in one of the Nestorian monasteries founded by Sirin, the Christian wife of Chosroes II.

It is clear, therefore, that Heraclius, having received the Cross from Sarbaras at Hierapolis, restored it with all ceremony to Jerusalem on
March 21, 629: negative evidence that Heraclius did not receive the Cross from Siroes and return with it to Constantinople in 628, before proceeding with it to Jerusalem in 629, as in Theophanes' narrative, was provided by the absence of any mention of the Cross in George of Pisidia's Heraclias I and II, written to celebrate the official announcement of Heraclius' triumph over Persia, and in the letter of Heraclius to Constantinople, preserved in the Chronicon Paschale. The date of March 21 given by Antiochus Strategos invalidated Pernice's acceptance of the traditional date of September 14; but the year of 630 given by Antiochus Strategos was altered by Bessas to 629, after consideration of George of Pisidia's statement that the news of the restoration of the Cross reached Constantinople on the feast of the raising of Lazarus, which in 630 was March 30, an impossibly short time for news to travel, but in 629 was April 8; confirmation of this was provided by Nicephorus, who placed the arrival of the relic at Constantinople during the second indiction, i.e. before September 629, and also by George of Pisidia, who spoke of Heraclius' return to Constantinople from Jerusalem via Mesopotamia as "Persia", thus fixing the year as 629, as the cities of the Euphrates were only evacuated by the Persians in March, 630. From Jerusalem, Heraclius turned to recover the towns evacuated by the Persians on his march back to Constantinople; Syria was evacuated by June, 639, and in July or August, 629, he met Sarabas at Arabissus Tripotamus, and negotiated a formal peace with him. Heraclius entered Constantinople in triumph in 629; George of Pisidia, speaking in allegory of Heraclius' seven year work of creation, said that he rested in the seventh year (629) after six years' labour (622-628).
Theophanes' sources for his narrative of 628-629 (AM 6119, 6120) were the eastern World Chronicle and the Heraclias III of George of Pisidia. Baynes explained the confusion of Theophanes' chronology as the result of an attempt to combine two sources; an eastern Chronicle, with little interest in events in Constantinople and the West, and which can only be reconstructed from Theophanes, with the restoration of the Cross correctly dated to 629, and a Chronicle of Constantinople, which used part of the Heraclias of George of Pisidia now lost, which can be found in George the Monk, and which, after a brief mention of the restoration of the Cross, concentrated upon Heraclius' return to Constantinople. Baynes envisaged one consequence of this hypothesis; that Theophanes took his narrative of the Persian campaigns indirectly from George of Pisidia, and that he cited as source an earlier work which had already used George of Pisidia as the basis of a prose Chronicle. This is not susceptible of proof; but a second consequence was implicit in Baynes' hypothesis, which I find unacceptable; that George the Monk, in his narrative of the reign of Heraclius, used a source independent of, and in addition to, the work of both Theophanes and Nicephorus.

Theophanes' notices of Heraclius' sojourn in the East were drawn from the eastern World Chronicle. Heraclius (AM 6120), on his way to Jerusalem, at Tiberias compelled a rich Jew, Benjamin, accused of having persecuted the Christians during the Persian occupation, to be baptised in the house of Eustathius of Neapolis. At Jerusalem, Heraclius handed over the Cross to the patriarch Zacharius, whom he had led from captivity in Persia and restored to his see, at Golgotha, and forbade Jews ever again to live in the city. On his march back to Constantinople, at Edessa.
restored to the orthodox the church seized by the Nestorians under the Persian rule. While Heraclius was at Hierapolis (AM 6121), he was approached by Athanasius, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, who seduced him into the Monothelite heresy.

Theophanes drew Heraclius' triumphal return to Constantinople (AM 6119) from George of Pisidia, reproducing the poet's image of the emperor's victory in the seventh year, after six years war in Persia, as the Almighty rested upon the seventh day of the creation. The people of the capital, led by Heraclius Constantine and the patriarch Sergius, flocked to Hierothea to meet Heraclius, waving olive branches and greeting him with rejoicing and tears, and escorted him to Constantinople.

George the Monk produced almost entirely, although without dates, Theophanes' account of the restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem, and Heraclius' return to Constantinople.

Nicephorus' account of the restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem and Heraclius' return to Constantinople came from his Constantinople Chronicle source. Heraclius, having made peace with Siroes in the spring of 628, received the Cross from Barbaras, whom he had supported in his revolt against Artasir early in 629, and brought it to Jerusalem, where he restored it to the patriarch Modestus and his clergy. The Cross had been preserved intact and inviolate, locked in its sealed golden casket, during its sojourn in Persian hands; when the casket was opened on Golgotha with the patriarch's key, all prostrated themselves and adored the Cross. From Jerusalem, Heraclius sent a fragment of the Cross to
Constantinople, where it arrived during the second indiction, i.e. before September, 629; the patriarch Sergius went out in procession from the church of the Virgin at Blachernae to receive it, and exalted it in Hagia Sophia. Soon after, Heraclius himself returned to Constantinople in triumph, and celebrated his victory by holding chariot-races.

Moreover, not only Antiochus Strategos, in his account of the return of the Cross to Jerusalem, but also the Brief History of the Dispersal of the Persians and Avars, apparently independently confirmed Nicephorus' statement that the Cross was returned to Jerusalem with the seals unbroken. Frollow considered this circumstance most improbable in the light of circumstances of the Cross' capture and sojourn in Persia, and that the statement resulted from Heraclius' deliberate attempt to authenticate a dubious or even fabricated relic in the interests of the stability of the Empire. Although the account of Nicephorus agrees with that of Antiochus Strategos, viz.-that Heraclius received the Cross Sarbaras and with unbroken seals, it is unlikely that Nicephorus' source was acquainted with Antiochus Strategos, for Nicephorus in his narrative of the fall of Jerusalem in 614 referred to the patriarch Modestus, since he was unaware that Modestus, originally abbot of the monastery of St. Theodore in Jerusalem, was patriarchal vicar while Zacharias was in captivity in Persia, and only became patriarch on Zacharias' death in 630, and made no mention of the fact that Heraclius took Martina with him to Jerusalem in 629 to restore the Cross, in the hope of reconciling the Church to his incestuous marriage.
Theophanes based his history (AM 6121) of the development of Monotheletism under Heraclius, and of the orthodox resistance in the West under Constans, on the seventh century *In vitam ac certamen sancti patris nostri ac confessoris Maximi*, by Maximus' disciple Anastasius. The Moscow manuscript of the *Vita*, edited and translated by Muretov, and which is complete and is representative of an older manuscript tradition, is unobtainable in this country; but Devreese has printed the material lacking in the Vatican manuscript, as published in the *Patrologia Graecia*, with comments upon both manuscripts. Theophanes summarised the *Vita* almost in its entirety for his long digression concerning Monotheletism under the notice of the year 629; and he also referred to it again during his narrative of the reign of Constans. The account of the *Vita Maximi* was throughout more detailed than that of Theophanes.

In 629 (AM 6121) when Heraclius was in Hierapolis in Syria, after the restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem, he was approached by Athanasius, the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, who requested that the emperor would grant him official appointment to the ecumenical patriarchate. This Heraclius promised him, provided that he would acknowledge the council of Chalcedon. Athanasius professed his willingness to acknowledge the Chalcedonian definition of two natures in Christ, but asked Heraclius whether this meant that there was a twofold will and operation in Christ. Heraclius then summoned Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, and wrote to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, both of whom concurred with Athanasius' judgement that there could only be a single will and operation in Christ.
Inevitably, the reconquest of the eastern provinces faced Heraclius with the hitherto insoluble problem of the conflict between orthodox and monophysite, centered upon recognition of the council of Chalcedon; one of the most consistent features of imperial policy after 451 was the attempt to find a solution to the Christological controversy, for the ethnic distinction and the nascent political separatism of the eastern provinces of the Empire found an outlet in theological independence of Constantinople, which became identified with resistance to the imperial government. Heraclius saw a possible way of reconciling the Monophysites with the Duophysite supporters of Chalcedon, through a compromise based on a single will in Christ, which was the function of his one person and not his two natures.

When the patriarchate of Alexandria became vacant on the death of George in 633, Heraclius appointed Cyrus, who entered into union with Theodore, the Monothelete bishop of Phara 307. Both Monophysites and Nestorians were able to ridicule the council of Chalcedon afresh, and to cite its teaching in support of their diverse heresies 308. Sophronius, appointed patriarch of Jerusalem in 635 on the death of Modestus, held a council of orthodox bishops which reaffirmed Chalcedonian belief and denounced all others, and sent a synodical letter anathematising Monotheletism, to Sergius of Constantinople and to pope John 309. Heraclius, angered but powerless in the face of Sophronius' resistance at the time of the Arab conquest of Syria, in 638 promulgated the Ecthesis, which did not define either one or two natures, but postulated a single will or operation in Christ, and which threw the Church into confusion and exposed the true faith to further ridicule 310. On the death of Sergius in 638, Heraclius appointed
the Monothelete Pyrrhus to the patriarchate of Constantinople. Heraclius himself died in 641 and was succeeded by Constantine III (Heraclius Constantine) who was soon poisoned by Martina and Pyrrhus so that Heracleonas might rule. The Senate, however, banished Heracleonas, Martina, and Pyrrhus, and elevated Constans, son of Constantine III who, himself professing Monotheletism, appointed the Monothelete Paul as patriarch of Constantinople. Theophanes omitted that part of the Vita which dealt purely with the life of Maximus. Maximus, who had at one time been first secretary to Heraclius, but who had entered a monastery at Chrysopolis to lead a more perfect life and to escape the spreading heresy of Monotheletism, after the promulgation of the Ecthesis fled to the West both to avoid contagion himself, and to confirm the faith of the weak at the start of the reign of Constans he was in Africa. The presence of Maximus in Africa and the long tradition of dissent throughout the history of the African Church, which despite changing theological occasions and outward manifestations, was based on a peculiarly African ecclesiology of provincial autonomy within the Church combined with independence from and rejection of the Byzantine Reichskirche, ensured that the African Church would be the centre of western resistance to Monotheletism.

In 646, inspired by Maximus, the bishops of the provinces of Africa Proconsularis, Byzacena, Numidia, and Mauretania, in councils condemned Monophysitism, while pope John in Rome had already in 640 held a council which condemned the Ecthesis which Heraclius had submitted to him, and which anathematised Monoletism. Pyrrhus of Constantinople, who came
to Africa, (when, and why, is not clear), was defeated in a theological
disputation by Maximus at Carthage in the presence of the exarch Gregory
and the bishops of Proconsularis; he then went to Rome and acknowledged
his previous heresy and submitted to pope Theodore, who had succeeded
John in 642; but at Ravenna, seat of the Italian exarch Pyrrhus again
relapsed into heresy, and was rewarded by Constans with reappointment to
the patriarchate of Constantinople on the death of Paul. Pope
Theodore, however, held a council at the tomb of St. Peter, which
anathematised Pyrrhus by name and all Monothelites.

It is at this point that the lacuna occurs in the Vatican MS. of the Vita
Maximi, published in the Patrologia Graeca, and it is necessary to use the
excerpt printed by Devreesse from Muretov's edition of the Moscow MS.

In Rome on the death of Theodore in 649, Martin was elevated to the
papacy. He had already refused to acknowledge Constans' Type, under
the prompting of Maximus, who had left Africa for Rome presumably as the
result of the death of the orthodox exarch Gregory, summoned the Lateran
council of one hundred and fifty bishops, which anathematised Sergius,
Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, and
Athanasius of Antioch, condemned Constans' Type, and proclaimed two
wills and operations in Christ. Theophanes omitted the summary of the
acts of the Lateran council which followed in the Vita, but noted the
dating with which it concluded; the ninth year of the emperor Constans,
grandson of Heraclius, the eighth indiction.

The narrative of the Vatican MS. resumed with the account of Constans'
vengeance, which Theophanes reproduced. In 653 Martin and Maximus, together with Anastasius, Maximus' disciple, and Anastasius, apocrisiarius of the Roman Church, were forcibly transported to Constantinople and banished after torture. Martin was exiled to Cherson. Theophanes concluded his narrative of Monotheletism with the appointment of pope Agathon and the council which he held in Rome in 680, apparently unaware that between Martin and Agathon there had elapsed a period of twenty-three years and the reigns of four popes. This statement must presumably have been drawn from the eastern World Chronicle, for it is repeated in Michael the Syrian, at the end of an account of Monotheletism from the Jacobite standpoint. Michael also preserved the letters exchanged between Heraclius and Athanasius, in which Heraclius summarised the orthodox belief and Athanasius gave a detailed statement of the Monophysite position, before Heraclius received Athanasius and a delegation of eleven Jacobite bishops at Hierapolis in 629.

Nicephorus made no mention of the development of Monotheletism in the reign of Heraclius. George the Monk took from Theophanes only the brief statement that "Heraclius was enticed into heresy by the Jacobite patriarch Athanasius and Sergius of Constantinople."

In marked contrast to Nicephorus, Theophanes was greatly interested in the biography and teaching of Mahomed, and followed the announcement of Mahomed's death in 632 (AM 6122) drawn from his eastern World Chronicle source, with an account of these, which corresponded closely to that of...
Contra Mahomedem, attributed to Bartholew of Elesa, although without reference to this author's Elenchus et Confutation Agareni. George the Monk reproduced Theophanes' narrative, with a more detailed account of Mahomet's teaching than that of Theophanes, which was partly if not entirely drawn from the De Haeresibus Liber of John of Damascus, although he did not use John's Disputatio Christiani et Saraceni.

So great was the reputation of Mahomed, leader and false prophet of the Saracens, that Theophanes considered that a detailed exposition was essential; for he had even for a long time deceived the Jews, who believed him to be their long-awaited Messiah. Mahomed and his people were descended from the tribe of Ishmael, son of Abraham, and lived as nomads in the Madanian desert. Mahomed, himself an orphan, worked as a camel driver and trader for a wealthy widow of his tribe, Chadiga, whom he later married. Mahomed's trading took him into Egypt and Palestine, where he encountered not only Jews but also Nestorian and Arian Christians, and became acquainted with their respective faiths. At this time, Mahomed became subject to epileptic fits, in which he received visions of the archangel Gabriel. When Chadiga, who was already grieved at having married an indigent husband, became aware of this, she consulted a certain monk who lived nearby, having been banished for heresy, who assured her that Mahomed's fits were a sign that he was indeed a prophet. Chadiga, who died soon after, bequeathing to Mahomed all her possessions, broadcast his reputation first among the women, but then among the men, so that it was accepted by all his people. Theophanes omitted Bartholew's summary of Mahomed's teaching, which was apparently based upon a knowledge of Islamic traditions, but concluded with an account
of the paradise of sensual pleasures and rivers of milk, honey and wine, promised to soldiers of Islam who either killed an enemy in battle or been killed themselves. 337

Nicephorus' Constantinople Chronicle source contained only a brief and undated mention of the start of the Arab incursions against the Empire from Aethribis in Arabia.338

George the Monk, on the other hand, not only reproduced, with variations in the spelling of proper names and inserted into the reign of Constans, Theophanes' account of the life and teach of Mahomed, but amplified this with a more detailed account of Mahomed's teaching and a harangue against his errors; the former was based on St. John Damascene's De Haeresibus Liber, the latter upon an unknown source, apparently exclusive to George the Monk, and, according to Eichner, ultimately of Islamic origin. The Islamic faith was a syncretism of the Old and New Testaments, of Judaism and Christian heresy, in which there was only one God, and Christ was the spirit but not the son of God, and the Virgin not the mother of God but the sister of Aaron and Moses. Observance of the Sabbath, of the Commandments of the Mosaic Law and the Gospels, and the consumption of pork and wine were prohibited; and instead of baptism, all were to be circumcised. In Mahomed's view of Paradise, only seventy thousand just were to be allowed to enter; Moses and the Israelites were to be excluded as transgressors of the law, while Christians were likewise condemned to damnation because they had proclaimed Christ the son of God; the description of the pleasure of Paradise came from Theophanes. George the Monk's attack upon the errors of
Mahomed came from an unknown source or was his own original work; John Damascene's brief mention of the Moslem worship of the Morning Star did not apparently provide the basis for the detailed description of the prayer to Aphrodite, with which George the Monk concluded his account.

Theophanes' narrative of the Arab advance against the Empire was taken from his eastern World Chronicle, which was also reproduced by Michael the Syrian, while Nicephorus took his account from the Chronicle, written in Constantinople, which was his independent source. George the Monk made no mention of it, except for an account of the battle of Yarmouk, taken from that of Theophanes, and displaced to the reign of Constans. The Arab advance under Heraclius fell into two parts: the conquest of Syria, and the conquest of Egypt. The actual course of the conquest of Syria is relatively clear, although the sources did not distinguish between the four Arab armies of Amr, Yazid, Shurahbil, and Khalid, and it is therefore difficult to establish the precise routes and dates of their various campaigns; but the chronology of Theophanes' account was detailed, and confirmed by Michael the Syrian; Nicephorus provided a list of Byzantine defeats, but without dates or places, or system, which amplifies that of Theophanes. The chronology of the Arab conquest of Egypt presents a problem; Theophanes' brief and incomplete account, taken from the eastern World Chronicle, and found also in Michael the Syrian, is contradicted by the more detailed narrative of Nicephorus, which itself is chronologically incorrect; the Chronicle of John of Nikia, although mutilated, preserves the most accurate account.
In June 632 (AM 6122) Mahomed died, having nominated the aged Abubakr, his father-in-law, as his successor.

In 633 (AM 6123), Theodore of Muchea, the imperial viceroy, forewarned of the impending attack, defeated at Mothus, at the south-east of the Dead Sea, an Arab force of three thousand men, under four emirs, sent by Mahomed to make war upon the Christians of Arabia; only Khaled escaped with the remnants of the force into the desert. As a result of this victory, and of a scarcity of corn, Heraclius ceased the subsidies which the Syro-Arab tribes south of the Dead Sea received, to keep the frontier forts and the trade routes; the Arab mercenaries therefore withdrew from the Empire to Hera, Gaza, and Sinai.

In 633 (AM 6124), Abubakr dispatched four generals against the Empire; and Sergius, patrician of Palestine, was defeated by Jezid near the Dead Sea; and, on their retreat towards Caesarea, the remnants of the Byzantine force were overtaken and annihilated. Nicephorus' undated account of the death of Sergius at the hands of the Arabs was more picturesque; because he had urged Heraclius to resist the Arab advance, and had withheld the promised tribute, Sergius was sewn into a camel-skin by the Arabs and left to starve.

In 634 (AM 6125) Abubakr died, and was succeeded by Omar; while Khaled united all the Arab forces under his command, and captured Bostra and Gabitha, which laid open the whole of Palestine to attack.

Heraclius himself took no part in the campaigns against the Arabs, but in
634 (AM 6125), he came to the East, together with Martina and Heraclonias, to direct operations, either from Antioch, or Edessa.

One of Heraclius' first actions was to dismiss as prefect of the East his brother Theodore, and to appoint in his place Theodore Trithyrius, imperial sacellarius, and Baanes, who had succeeded Sergius as patrician of Palestine; according to Theophanes, because Theodore had been defeated in battle by the Arabs; according to Nicephorus because Theodore had publically abused Heraclius and Martina. Whatever the explanation, Theodore was in command of the final army which Heraclius mustered against the Arabs, and fell on the Yarmouk in 636. If Brooks' dating of the conspiracy of John Atalarichus, Heraclius' natural son, and Theodore magister, Heraclius' nephew and son of Theodore, to 634 (following Sebeos), rather than to 638, as given by Ostrogorsky (following Nicephorus), was correct, it might perhaps provide the reason for Heraclius' temporary removal of Theodore from his command, for fear of his disaffection.

In 634 (AM 6125) Theodore was victorious at Emesa against an Arab detachment; Heraclius nevertheless decided to abandon Syria, and took the Cross from Jerusalem to Constantinople. According to Nicephorus, Heraclius commanded Theodore Trithyrius not to give battle against the Arabs, but he was ambushed and defeated in a skirmish. Michael the Syrian, however, correctly placed Heraclius' departure from Syria after the disaster of Yarmouk and the loss of Damascus, Aleppo and Antioch.

In 634 (AM 6125), Theodore Trithyrius, after his victory at Emesa, came to
Damascous and camped on the river Bardanesios, but was ordered by Heraclius
to march north to Emesa to the relief of Baanes.  

In March, 635 (AM 6126), Khaled began the siege of Damascus, which
surrendered in September of that year, after a six month siege, due to the
treachery of the civil and military authorities. Theodore Trithyrius and
Baanes marched to Damascus in an attempt to raise the siege; but Theodore
was defeated before Damascus on 23 July 635, and the army of Baanes
mutinied, proclaimed Heraclius deposed and Baanes emperor, so that
Theodore was forced to retire. The Arabs were masters of Syria to
the Euphrates.

In the following year (AM 6126) Heraclius prepared to make a final and
da decisive stand, and mustered an army of perhaps fifty thousand under
his brother Theodore; Khaled relinquished temporarily the towns of Syria,
and concentrated a force of twenty five thousand men in the valley of the
Yarmouk, the eastern tributary of the Jordan; the reconstruction of events
and the figures of the opposing forces are those of Hitti; Theophanes
said that the Arab and Byzantine armies each numbered forty thousand
men, Michael the Syrian, that the Byzantines numbered seventy thousand,
of whom forty thousand died. The identity of the Byzantine commander
also presents a problem; Theophanes, in his account of the battle, which
he placed immediately after the defeat and withdrawal of Theodore
Trithyrius and the revolt of Baanes, did not give it; Michael the
Syrian named Theodore Trithyrius, the patrician Baanes, and the son of the
Persian Sarbaras; (presumably Nicetas, upon whom Heraclius had conferred
the title of patrician in 628). But the Byzantine general fell at
Yarmouk and Theodore Trithyrius was sent by Heraclius to Egypt as supreme commander in 639, and it is hardly likely that Baanes remained in command of the imperial forces after a revolt against Heraclius, nor that the Persian was entrusted with command. The eastern World Chronicle, the source of Theophanes and Michael the Syrian, was apparently unaware of the presence of the third Byzantine army.

On 20 August 636 (AM 6126) the Arabs in a location chosen by their own generals, and aided by a strong wind which blew the desert dust against the Byzantine troops, and supported by their cavalry forces, completely routed the Byzantines and their Armenian and Arab mercenaries; those who were not slaughtered upon the battlefield were driven into the steep river bed, and the few who managed to escape across it were annihilated on the other side. Khaled reclaimed the previously conquered Syrian towns, while Amr advanced through Phoenicia to the frontier of Egypt.

In March 638, Jerusalem fell to Omar after two years' siege; but Omar promised the patriarch Sophronius that he would not damage any of the churches of Palestine. While Sophronius was guiding the aged caliph around the holy places, he was so struck by the poverty of his dress that he offered him a new garment, which the asceticism and stern character of the caliph made him most reluctant to accept.

In 639 (AM 6129) Antioch and the northern towns of Syria were taken by the Arabs, and Moawiah was named by Omar as emir of all the land from the frontier of Egypt to the Euphrates.
After Heraclius had abandoned Syria, where only Caesarea remained in Byzantine hands until 641 (AM 6133)\textsuperscript{379}, he commanded the Roman forces in Mesopotamia, Armenia, and Egypt to maintain their positions, and not to give battle against the Arabs\textsuperscript{380}.

In 637 (AM 6128), John Kateias, governor of Osroene in Mesopotamia, promised Iyad, emir of Syria, an annual tribute of a hundred thousand gold pieces if he would respect the Euphrates frontier; but Heraclius, angered by the agreement reached without his consent, recalled John, and appointed Ptolemy in his place\textsuperscript{381}.

In 639 (AM 6130), Iyad pressed the Euphrates, since the agreed tribute had not been paid; the people of Edessa not only surrendered the city to him, but forced Constantina and Daras to surrender also\textsuperscript{382}. By 640, Iyad had subdued the whole of Byzantine Mesopotamia\textsuperscript{383}.

In 640 (AM 6131), Said, who had led an army of six thousand into Persia in 638, reached Ctesiphon and seized the treasure of Hormisdas, the last Sassanid king, who vainly took flight, but was captured with his family and household, and brought to Omar at Damascus\textsuperscript{384}.

In the same year (AM 6131), Omar instituted the keeping of a state register within the caliphate\textsuperscript{385}.

Theophanes' account of the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs came likewise from his eastern World Chronicle source, and was also reproduced by Michael the Syrian\textsuperscript{386}.
In 636 (AH 6126), after the battle of the Yarmouk, the victorious Arab forces occupied Phoenicia to the frontier of Egypt, and Cyrus, patriarch of Alexandria, bought them off with an annual tribute of two hundred thousand denarii. Cyrus, however, was denounced to Heraclius as a traitor; and in 639 (AH 6126) Heraclius summoned him to Constantinople and appointed the Armenian Manuel as augustalis, with orders to refuse the tribute. As a result, the Arabs invaded Egypt, defeated Manuel and captured Alexandria, and Heraclius was forced to send Cyrus back to Egypt, to negotiate the Arab withdrawal under the terms of the original agreement, but this they refused to do.

Nicephorus' account, drawn from his independent Constantinople Chronicle source, was again deficient in chronology, and apparently incomplete, and cannot be reconciled with that of Theophanes. Heraclius, while he was still in the East, dispatched John of Barkaina to Egypt, where he was defeated and killed by the invading Arabs; and then Marinus, commander of the Thracian troops, who was likewise defeated, although he escaped with his life. Cyrus had negotiated a truce with the Arabs on payment of tribute, and arranged the marriage of the Augusta Eudocia to Amr on his conversion. Marianus the cubicularius, sent as general by Heraclius, and aware of the emperor's disapproval of the treaty, broke with Cyrus, gave battle against the Arabs, and was defeated. Heraclius held Cyrus responsible for the loss of Egypt, a charge which the patriarch strenuously denied, and summoned him to Constantinople, where he was imprisoned.

The fall of Alexandria in October, 641, is not found in Nicephorus, possibly owing to some manuscript loss in the Breuiarium at this point. This question will be discussed fully in the chapter dealing with the
sources for the reign of Constans.

Neither the account of Theophanes nor Nicephorus can be reconciled with that of John of Mikioi, which, according to Zotenberg and Brooks, is the most accurate narrative of the Arab conquest of Egypt, despite the confusion of the last chapters of the Chronicle, due probably to displacement of the sheets in the original manuscript. Amr entered Egypt in December, 639, and defeated John of Barkaina, who fell in battle; and Heraclius sent out Theodore Trithyrius as supreme commander. In July, 640, Theodosius, the commander of Egypt, and Anastasius, the Augustalius, were defeated at Heliopolis, and in September both Alexandria and the great fortress of Babylon were under siege by the Arabs. Babylon fell to the Arabs in April, 641, and Alexandria in October, 641. In September, 640, the last Byzantine forces evacuated Alexandria. John of Mikioi made no mention, however, of the exile of Cyrus by Heraclius after he had negotiated with the Arabs on his own initiative, on which Theophanes and Nicephorus agree; according to John, he was escorted to Constantinople to confer with Constantine III, and returned to Alexandria in September, 641, in the reign of Heracleonas (which is confirmed by Nicephorus), and negotiated the final truce with Amr at Babylon in October 641. The account of the Egyptian and contemporary John of Mikioi is more likely to be accurate than that of Theophanes' Syriac and ninth century Chronicle source.

Theophanes took from his eastern World Chronicle the two brief notices of 632 (AM 6121), of the civil wars in Persia, and of the congratulations
sent by the king of the Indians to Heraclius on his Persian victory.

The eastern World Chronicle also provided Theophanes' information on the earthquake in Palestine in 633 (AM 6124), and the sword-shaped meteor which remained in the sky for thirty days, stretching from south to north, as a portent of the power of the Arabs. This phenomenon was described also by Denis of Tell-Mahre and Michael the Syrian, and was taken from Theophanes by George the Monk.

The narrative of Nicephorus contained several events of the reign of Heraclius which were not found in Theophanes, and which were also omitted by George the Monk.

The first of these, which illustrated both the local (i.e. Constantinople) character of the Chronicle source, and of Nicephorus' own interests, was the account of the injustice and oppression of a certain candidatus Boutelinus towards the peasants of an unknown locality, who had invoked his arbitration in a dispute over boundaries. A country woman, whose son had been forcibly seized by Boutelinus, together with those of the other peasants, and had subsequently died, rushed out in front of Heraclius' horse in an effort to secure his personal intervention. The emperor at first refused, but when Boutelinus later appeared in the hippodrome, ordered him to be taken and tortured by the city prefect, and then executed.

Nicephorus also gave the more important account of the relations between
Heraclius and the Bulgar chief Kouvrat. According to Bessevliev, this account came from the common source of Theophanes and Nicephorus for the history of the Bulgar people, but is more likely that it came from Nicephorus' independent Constantinople Chronicle source, since it is not found in Theophanes, but is found in John of Nikiou, and examination of the narrative of the events of 641 suggests a relationship between the Greek source of John of Nikiou and the Constantinople Chronicle source of Nicephorus. In 619 Organas, lord of the Bulgar tribes living in Pannonia under Avar sovereignty, came to Constantinople with his chiefs, and was baptised and received imperial honours. In 635, his nephew Kouvrat, who had spent his childhood in Constantinople, revolted against his Avar overlord with Heraclius' encouragement, and then made a life-long alliance with the Empire.

In 637, after the fall of Syria to the Arabs, Heraclius took up his residence in the palace of Hieresia, on the coast of Asia Minor, and refused to return to Constantinople, despite the entreaties of his counsellors, and of the Senate and people. He remained there for some time, before he could be persuaded to overcome his hydrophobia sufficiently to cross the Bosphorus. A bridge consisting of ships moored side by side, was made for the purpose, with a palisade of branches on either side, to hide the view of the sea. Heraclius, according to Nicephorus, finally determined to cross to Constantinople only after the discovery of the conspiracy of John Atalaricus and Theodore; but this chronology has been questioned, and Sebeos placed the conspiracy against Heraclius, which had Persian support, in 634. The date of Heraclius' eventual return to the capital is not known, but it must have been before 638, when he
crowned Heracleonas as emperor; but the actual month in which the coronation took place is also unknown.

Theophanes' brief statement of the death of Heraclius; that he died of dropsy in March, 641 (AM 6132), after a reign of thirty years and ten months, came from his Constantinople Chronicle.

Nicephorus' independent Constantinople Chronicle source provided a detailed account of Heraclius' suffering in his last illness, the divine retribution for his incestuous marriage with Martina, (which was reproduced by George the Monk and of the provisions of Heraclius' will, by which Constantine and Heracleonas were declared joint emperors. Heraclius died at the age of sixty-six, after a reign of thirty years, four months, and six days, and his body, after laying in state for three days, was buried in the church of the Apostles in Constantinople.

In conclusion, therefore, it has been shown that Theophanes used five sources in his narrative of the reign of Heraclius; a brief Chronicle, written in or near Constantinople; a World Chronicle, written in the eastern provinces of the Empire; the historical poems of George of Pisidia; Anastasius' Vita Maximi; and the letters of Heraclius from Persia to Constantinople (probably indirectly). It is impossible to be certain of the relationship between the Chronographia and the Contra Mahometem.

The Chronicle, written in or near Constantinople, provided the source of
Theophanes' account of the opposition to Phocas within the capital, the succession of Heraclius, and the history of the imperial family. The World Chronicle, written in the eastern provinces of the Empire and appearing also in Michael the Syrian, provided the brief account of the Avar advance and the more detailed account of the Persian advance against the Empire in the first part of the reign of Heraclius, and an account of the Arab conquest of Syria and Egypt in the second part of the reign of Heraclius; and in addition the order of succession to the Persian throne after the death of Chosroes, Heraclius' journey to Jerusalem with the Cross, and the natural phenomena which occurred in the reign. The Expeditio Persica of George of Pisidia provided Theophanes' sole source for Heraclius' first Persian campaign; and the Heraclias, supplemented by the more factual information of Heraclius' first and second letters from Persia to Constantinople, was the source for the second and third Persian campaigns. George of Pisidia's Bellum Avaricum was the source for the assault on Constantinople in 626 by Avars, Slavs, and Persians, and the In restitutionem sanctae Crucis for Heraclius' restoration of the Cross at Jerusalem and triumphant return to Constantinople in 626. For the history of Montheletism, Theophanes' incorporated into his narrative a summary of Anastasius' Vita Maximi. In regard to the life and teaching of Mahomed, there is correspondence between the Chronographia and the Contra Mahometem, attributed to Bartholemew of Edessa, but it is impossible to determine the precise relationship between these narratives.

For the reign of Heraclius, Nicephorus used a Chronicle, written in or near Constantinople, presumably in the mid-seventh century, judging by its resemblance to the Chronicon Paschale, and its relationship to the
Greek historical source of the Chronicle of John of Nikiou. This chronicle was an independent source from that of Theophanes. The interests of its author were apparently the events in the capital and the personal achievements of Heraclius.

George the Monk compiled his historical narrative of the reign of Heraclius from both the Chronographia and the Breviarium. This was the judgement of both Krumbacher and Moravcsik; but Ostrogorsky nevertheless considered that the earlier years of the Chronicle of George the Monk up to 813, at which date the Chronographia concluded, had been written up entirely from Theophanes.
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Chapter Three:

The Sources of Theophanes for the reigns of Constantine III and Heracleonas
Theophanes' brief account of the reigns of Constantine III (March – May, 641) and Heracleonas (May – September, 641), with the exception of one notice from the eastern World Chronicle source, was taken from his Constantinople Chronicle source.

In March 641 (AM 6132), Constantine III succeeded his father Heraclius, but after he had reigned for three months, he was poisoned by Martina and the patriarch Pyrrhus, and Martina's son Heracleonas became emperor and ruled with his mother.

In September 641 (AM 6133), the Senate deposed Heracleonas and Martina, ordered their mutilation and banishment, and then elevated to the imperial throne Constans, eleven year old son of Constantine III and grandson of Heraclius, who ruled for twenty seven years. Heracleonas' nose was cut off, and Martina's tongue cut out, as a sign that they were unfit to hold further office; the first time this Oriental custom of mutilation was utilised in Byzantium.

The World Chronicle, written in the eastern provinces of the Empire, was the source for Theophanes' notice of the capture of Caesarea in Palestine by Moawiah in 641 (AM 6133) after a seven years' siege, and with the loss of seven thousand Roman lives. Michael the Syrian's detailed account gives the length of the siege as seven months, from December 640 to May 641, but according to Hitti, highly Hellenised Caesarea resisted seven years of intermittent siege, while the Arabs subdued the rest of Syria, receiving help by sea which the Arabs could not intercept, before surrendering to Moawiah through the treachery of a Jew within the city.
walls. It is thus possible to reconcile the conflicting accounts of Theophanes and Michael concerning the duration of the siege of Caesarea.

George the Monk, drawing probably upon Theophanes rather than Nicephorus, although it is impossible to be certain of this on account of the brevity of the narrative, said only that after Heraclius, Constantine his son reigned for a year, and was poisoned by his servants. He was apparently unaware of the reign of Heracleonas, for he commenced the narrative of the reign of Constans with the statement that after Constantine, his son Constans ruled for twenty seven years.

The remainder of George the Monk's narrative of the events of the reign of Constantine III owed more to legend than to history. In Constantinople, a certain rich man, when he attempted to revoke a gift of thirty pounds of gold which he had made to the poor in anticipation of his own death, died immediately afterwards. At Alexandria, the bishop received a message from beyond the grave from a pagan philosopher Evagrius, whom he had converted to Christianity. In Cartagena in Africa, a dissolute and adulterous soldier returned from Hell to warn those on earth against falling into similar evils; this last provided an occasion for a long dissertation upon the fate of the souls of men after death.

Nicephorus' independent Constantinople Chronicle source provided the only detailed account of the reigns of Constantine III and Heracleonas, which is at variance with that of Theophanes. Despite the confusion in the
Chronicle of John of Nikiou at this point, there is sufficient resemblance between this and the Breviarium to suggest a relationship between the source of Nicephorus and the Greek Chronicle source of John of Nikiou.

In his will, Heraclius had nominated Constantine, his son by Eudocia, and Heraclonas, his son by Martina, as co-emperors; and, to insure the position of Martina, he had declared that she should be honoured by both as mother and empress. At the same time, he had before his death given Pyrrhus a share in the government, so that Martina might not exclude Constantine from the succession. This delicate balance of power constructed by Heraclius upon the imperial throne could not long endure. Immediately after the publication of Heraclius' will, Martina made an attempt to establish her power, but she was excluded from all participation in the government by the people of the city on the ground that she was a woman. The inevitable result was a rift within the imperial family, which was reflected in the life of the capital; Constantine III favoured the Blues, unlike his father Heraclius, and was orthodox in religion; Heraclonas favoured the Greens and was Molothelite in sympathy.

Constantine III, already in ill-health, left the capital for the palace which he had built at Chalcedon, and removed the Monothelite Pyrrhus from public administration, entrusting it instead to his sacellarius Philagrius. When it became obvious that he had not long to live, Constantine, through Philagrius and his armour-bearer the Armenian Valentine Arsacidus, endeavoured to secure the support of the army for the succession of his own children against Heraclonas and Martina. Constantine died at Chalcedon on May 25, 641, after a reign of three months, apparently of
consumption; a fact which is confirmed by John of Nikiou.

Heracleonas became sole ruler at the age of fifteen, although in fact Martina seized power, and brought to Hagia Sophia from Chalcedon the crown taken by Constantine from the tomb of Heraclius. Although Martina punished or exiled the most prominent supporters of Constantine III (Philagrius was exiled to the remote fortress of Septem in North Africa, close to the Pillars of Hercules), opposition to Heracleonas continued to grow. The clergy objected both because it was unfitting that the imperial throne should be occupied by the son of an incestuous union, and because of the heretical sympathies of Heracleonas and Martina—the ardent Monothelite Cyrus was restored to the patriarchate of Alexandria. The senatorial aristocracy, leaders of the Blues, were alienated when Heracleonas and Martina reverted to Heraclius’ policy of favouring the Greens.

Finally, the army of Asia Minor, incited by Valentinus Arsacidus, revolted and appeared before Chalcedon. Heracleonas swore to protect the children of Constantine, and accused Valentinus of desiring the imperial throne for himself; but neither the people of Constantinople, nor Valentinus, whom he had approached at Chalcedon, would accept his assurances, and Heracleonas was forced to crown Constans, son of Constantine III, as co-emperor. Pyrrhus, who was to be deposed from the patriarchate on the fall of Heracleonas and Martina, was forced to flee to Chalcedon to escape the violent hatred of the mob of the capital. Valentinus was then reconciled to Heracleonas and Martina, and received the rank of comes excubitorum, while the troops of Asia Minor were given a gratuity and withdrew from
Chalcedon. Thus the revolt ended; Nicephorus' account is confirmed by the more detailed narrative of John of Nikiou.

Nicephorus' account of the reign of Heracleonas ended here, and after a mention of the appointment of Paul to the patriarchate of Constantinople, he went on to narrate the murder of Constans in Sicily in 668. The problem of this apparently abrupt conclusion of Nicephorus' narrative will be discussed fully in the following chapter, that relating to the sources for the reign of Constans.

John of Nikiou, however, continued his account of the reign, presumably from the same source. The accord was short-lived; there was hostility between Heracleonas and Constans, and opposition to Heracleonas from the army, particularly from the troops of Asia Minor and Cappadocia. A letter was circulated, purporting to have been written by Pyrrhus and the logothete David, commander in Armenia, urging him to crush the dissident forces, to marry Martina, and to dispossess Constans. The people of Constantinople considered Kouvrat, lord of the Bulgars, instigator of the conspiracy; the troops of the city garrison, under a certain Theodore, rose and pursued David to Armenia where he was defeated and killed. Theodore then returned to Constantinople, where he deposed, mutilated and banished Heracleonas and Martina, and proclaimed Constans emperor.

For his narrative of the reigns of Constantine III and Heracleonas, Theophanes relied almost exclusively (apart from the notice of the capture of Caesarea by the Arabs, which came from the eastern World Chronicle)
upon his Constantinople source Chronicle, which was of annalistic brevity. This was in marked contrast to the Chronicle, also written in Constantinople, which provided Nicephorus' independent source, and which gave a far more detailed and often divergent account of the three month reign of Constantine III and the four month reign of Heracleonas. This source can be traced in the Chronicle of John of Nikiou, from which it is possible to supplement tentatively Nicephorus' incomplete narrative. George the Monk gave only a brief statement of the accession and death of Constantine III, taken probably from Theophanes, although it is impossible to be certain of this on account of the brevity of the notice.

The narratives of Theophanes and Nicephorus concerning the reigns of Constantine III and Heracleonas illustrate clearly the divergent nature of the Chronicle sources which they used, although both these sources originated in Constantinople. At this point, therefore, it may be profitable to attempt to characterise the sources upon which Theophanes and Nicephorus based their histories of the period 610 - 641.

Moravcsik comments that, although the sources of Theophanes for the history of the seventh century were doubtless contemporary works, they cannot be known with certainty; but the contrasting nature and style of Theophanes' original sources can be traced in the Chronographia. The existence of a Chronicle, written in or near Constantinople, and extending to 641, which Theophanes used in the narrative of the reigns of Heraclius, Constantine III and Heracleonas, emerges clearly from a study of the Chronographia. De Boor noted that, for the reign of Heraclius, Theophanes had two sources, one of which contained an adequately dated and exclusive
account of the history of the imperial family\textsuperscript{29}; Gelzer confirmed this judgement\textsuperscript{30}. It is logical to assume that Theophanes' narrative of events in Constantinople was drawn from the same source.

A tentative identification of Theophanes' Byzantine source for the first half of the seventh century can be made with a vulgar Chronicle, a history in the style and type of John Malalas, which was continued, presumably in Constantinople itself, from beyond Malalas' termination at the end of the reign of Justinian, to at least the reigns of Phocas and Heraclius. Grégoire, following Krumbacher\textsuperscript{31}, asserted that this vulgar Chronicle was still extant in the mid-ninth century, when a polished edition in learned language was produced by John of Antioch\textsuperscript{32}. It is possible that this Chronicle was also known to Theophanes; but this hypothesis cannot be established with certainty.

It is generally agreed that Theophanes' source material was not originally divided up into annalistic form interspersed with chronological data\textsuperscript{33}, and therefore the source of Theophanes' chronological tables requires investigation. De Boor pointed out that Theophanes' Chronicle source for imperial family history in the reign of Heraclius gave a fixed dating of the world year and the regnal years of the emperors and of the patriarchs of Constantinople\textsuperscript{34}. Ostrogorsky commented that the regnal years of the popes and of the three Oriental patriarchs did not belong to Theophanes' chronological framework for the seventh and eighth centuries, since errors in these were not duplicated in the regnal years of emperors, patriarchs of Constantinople, and Arab caliphs\textsuperscript{35}; he then repeated the hypothesis of De Boor that these were in fact later interpolations into the
Chronographia from Nicephorus’ Chronographikon Syntomon. Krumbacher suggested it was likely that Theophanes used one of a group of old consular lists, with the greater detail of a state Chronicle of Constantinople; and he was followed in the first statement by Iorga, and in the second by Colonna; but Hubert commented that Theophanes’ errors in chronology in the eighth century proved that he did not use official sources. The source of Theophanes’ chronological canon of regnal years of the emperors and of the patriarchs of Constantinople from 641 to 711 is unknown; it was not related to the source of Nicephorus’ Chronographikon Syntomon, in which the list of emperors of the seventh century is incomplete (Constantine III and Heracleonas are omitted), and in which the regnal years of the patriarchs of Constantinople of the mid-seventh century do not correspond with those given by Theophanes.

Krumbacher considered that it was impossible to name Nicephorus’ sources for the Breviarium; but Burckhardt postulated an unknown historical source by an unknown author as Nicephorus’ source for 602-614, and a second unknown work and unknown author, common source with Theophanes, for 614-711. Grosz rejected Burckhardt’s theory that the London manuscript of the Breviarium was not written by Nicephorus himself, but consisted of excerpts drawn by Nicephorus from two lost sources; but he accepted that the narrative of events preceding Sarbaras’ first offensive against the Empire in 614 revealed marked stylistic divergencies between the London and Vatican manuscripts, which he attributed to the character of Nicephorus’ source, a lost poem in iambic trimetres, perhaps by George of Pisidia, which Nicephorus transposed into prose. Dujcev rejected the theory of an independent source of Nicephorus, which was unknown to
Theophanes, on the grounds that the demarcation of the narrative of the
Breviarium at 614 was artificial; while Pertusi rejected the existence
of another lost epic of George of Pisidia, and considered that such a
work, if it existed, would be that of another contemporary poet. No
evidence is available to substantiate the existence of this hypothetical
second poet, contemporary with Heraclius. But Grosz’s theory is fatally
weakened by its failure to explain the undoubted independence of the
narrative of Nicephorus to the conclusion of the reign of Heracleonas.

From comparison of the narrative of the Chronographia and the Breviarium
from 602 to 641, it is clear that Nicephorus used a source independent
from that of Theophanes. The source of Nicephorus for the reign of
Heraclius was a Chronicle, written in Constantinople itself; this is
apparent from the "local" character of several incidents which it narrated.
This "local" character is even more marked in the account of the reigns
of Constantine III and Heracleonas, and the great detail thereof suggests
that its author was an eye-witness of the events which he described. That
Nicephorus’ source was written in the mid-seventh century can be inferred
from the similarity of the narrative at several points to that of the
Chronicon Paschale, contemporary with Heraclius; as well as its apparent
relationship to the Greek source of the Chronicle of John of Nikiou.

Barisic noted that Nicephorus’ narrative of the barbarian assault upon
Constantinople in 626 was drawn from an earlier Chronicle source than that
abridged by Theophanes. Freund identified Nicephorus’ source with the
Megas Chronographos, the last surviving fragment of which dealt with the
reign of Constantine V Copronymus (741-775), which was the final edition
of the state Chronicle of Constantinople, made either under Leo IV the
Khazar (775-780) or in the minority of Constantine VI (780-790). The Megas Chronographos was therefore compiled a short time before Nicephorus composed the Breviarium, according to Alexander, probably between 775 and 797. Spintler, following Freund, suggested that for the seventh century the Chronicon Paschale was a combination of eye-witness accounts and official annals, of the type of the Megas Chronographos. It is possible therefore, that the similarity of the narrative of the Chronicon Paschale and the Breviarium for the reign of Heraclius can be attributed to Nicephorus' use of the Megas Chronographos as source for the history of the first part of the seventh century.

The nature of the World Chronicle source, written in the eastern provinces of the Empire, upon which Theophanes based his account of the Arab advance against the Empire, will be discussed fully in the next chapter. De Boor commented that one of Theophanes' sources for the reign of Heraclius was a very compressed account of the Avar and Persian advance against the Empire, which, in its account of the Persian conquest of Egypt at least, showed a common source with the Syriac Chroniclers. Gelzer again concurred in this judgement. Krumbacher also noted that Theophanes showed a Greek Syriac source in his narrative of Mahomed and the caliphs, but felt that its nature and authorship could not be determined with much accuracy. The existence of Theophanes' eastern Chronicle source is incontrovertible; and detailed study of the Chronographia and the Syriac Chronicles allows speculation concerning its nature and authorship.
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Chapter IV:

The Sources of Theophanes for the reign of Constans, 641-668.
A considerable problem is presented with regard to the sources of Theophanes for the reign of Constans (641-668). Brooks commented that for the secular history of the descendants of Heraclius we have no contemporary authority, and that the period is therefore one of the most obscure in the history of the Empire; our knowledge is dependent upon the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian, and the *Chronographia* of Theophanes, since Nicephorus reproduced in shorter form one of the sources of Theophanes, and the later Greek writers reproduced either Theophanes or his source. A preliminary examination of the sources suggested that Theophanes' history of the reign of Constans was drawn from his two principal sources; his exclusive Constantinople *Chronicle* source, extending to 668, containing the narrative of events in the capital and the history of the imperial family; and the World *Chronicle*, written in the eastern provinces of the Empire, almost certainly in Syria, which concentrated chiefly upon the Arab advance against the Empire and upon the internal history of the Caliphate. On a second examination, however, a close resemblance emerged between the narrative of Theophanes and that of the eastern chroniclers, particularly Michael the Syrian, but also Elias of Nisibis and the minor Syriac chroniclers, such as events in Constantinople and in the West during the reign of Constans and at the start of the reign of Constantine IV, a correspondence that could not be explained by the former hypothesis. This unexpected correspondence has led to the assumption that Theophanes' Constantinople *Chronicle* source terminated in 641, and further, that in default of other Byzantine historical material, he was compelled to rely entirely upon the narrative of the eastern World *Chronicle* source.

Nicephorus' *Breviarium* made no mention of the reign of Constans, and the
reasons for this complete omission cannot be established with certainty. The historical narrative of the reign of Constans in the Chronicle of George the Monk was compiled from that of Theophanes.

From his Constantinople Chronicle source, Theophanes received his account of Constans's accession, which was not found either in Nicephorus or Michael the Syrian, and was not reproduced by George the Monk.

In September 641 (AM 6134) the Senate deposed Heracleonas and Martina, and elevated to the imperial throne Constans, son of Constantine III and grandson of Heraclius, who was then eleven years old. Constans, upon his accession, addressed the Senate, acknowledging that it had been responsible for the deposition of Heracleonas and Martina, and committing himself to its guardianship. Theophanes' direct quotation from Constans' speech, apparently authentic in tone, and genuine in style and language, possibly indicated its origin either in the Constantinople Chronicle or even in an official source.

In October, 641 (AM 6133), the patriarch Pyrrhus was deposed, and in his place was appointed Paul, oeconomus of Hagia Sophia, who filled the patriarchate for twelve years. This notice apparently marked the conclusion of the Constantinople Chronicle source; that of Paul's death in 653 (AM 6145), and Constantine's reappointment of Pyrrhus, who reigned only for five months before his death, when he was succeeded by the Monothelite Peter, was drawn probably from Anastasius' Vita Maximi, and the date, which was lacking in the Vita, was provided by the unknown source of
Theophanes chronological canon of the regnal years of emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople in the mid-seventh century.

The basis of the unusual degree of correspondence between Theophanes and the Syriac chroniclers for the reign of Constans must be sought in the eastern World Chronicle which constituted a common source between them. Detailed study of its nature would require thorough investigation of mediaeval Syriac Chronicle literature, and therefore is beyond the scope of this Thesis, which aims only at establishing the fact of its existence, and its relationship to Theophanes.

A study of the history of the Heraclian dynasty in Theophanes and Michael the Syrian has suggested that the unidentified eastern World Chronicle, which served as their common source, provided a narrative of usual annalistic brevity, which was maintained for the reign of Constans, and provided Theophanes' source for the Arab advance against the Empire, revolts against Constans in the provinces of the Empire, and notices of natural phenomena during the reign. But within this characteristic framework and subject matter, we may distinguish three passages of greater length and detail, which apparently did not belong to the original World Chronicle, but were a later interpolation within it, possibly from another complete Chronicle. These three interpolated passages narrated the battle off Phoinike in Lycia in 655, from which Constans barely escaped with his life; the revolt of Saborius Persogenes in Armenia in 667, and his attempt to secure the support of Moawiah; Constans' actions which forced him to flee from Constantinople, and his murder in Syracuse and the subsequent
revolt of Mizizios in Sicily in 668.

For the reign of Constans, therefore, the narrative of the eastern world Chronicle source can be separated into two parts, which must be studied separately. It will be more profitable to consider first the more detailed narrative of the three interpolated passages, before proceeding to consider the narrative of annalistic brevity, which is customary form of a World Chronicle.

In 654 (AM 6146), Moawiah, governor of Syria, having previously captured Cyprus, Rhodes, and Cos, prepared at Tripolis in Phoenicia a fleet against Constantinople itself; but two brothers, sons of a Byzantine trumpeter (buccinator), freed the Roman prisoners held at Tripolis, and led them in a revolt in which the Arab governor of the city was killed and Moawiah’s fleet burned, before they escaped to imperial territory. The narrative of Theophanes corresponded entirely with that of Michael the Syrian, and also with that of Elias of Nisibis, who cited as his source the work of Jesudena, metropolitan of Basra. Moawiah’s preparations, however, continued unchecked. In 655 (AM 6146), Moawiah himself marched against Caesarea in Cappadocia, while the combined Arab fleets of Egypt and Syria sailed to Phoinike in Lycia, where Constans had taken command of the Byzantine navy. Although on the eve of battle, Constans had a dream which was interpreted as a portent of defeat, he gave battle the following day. In the ship to ship combat which ensued between the Arab and Byzantine fleets, the Byzantine navy was completely destroyed, and the sea stained with blood. Constans himself was saved only by exchanging clothes with the ubiquitous and heroic son of the trumpeter, who continued
to command the imperial flagship until he fell in battle, while the emperor fled in disguise to Constantinople. This narrative, which was reproduced exactly by Michael the Syrian, but not by Elias of Nisibis, contained elements of a popular historical epic, as observed by Ostrogorsky; unfortunately Ostrogorsky made no further identification.

In 667 (AM 6159), Saborius Persoganes, governor of that part of Armenia still under Byzantine rule after the secession of Theodore Astuni to the Arabs in 651 (AM 6143), revolted against Constans, and dispatched Sergius his general to seek alliance with Moawiah. Constantine, eldest son of Constans, who was then in Sicily, on hearing this sent Andrew the cubicularius to Moawiah, to persuade him not to assist the traitor. At Damascus, where Sergius and Andrew encountered each other in Moawiah's presence, Moawiah promised his support to the one who would give him the greater tribute. The reported dialogue between Sergius, Andrew and Moawiah bore all the hallmarks of authenticity; perhaps a tentative indication that the more detailed passages of the Chronicle interpolated into the eastern World Chronicle source were written in Damascus itself, possibly by an author close to the caliph's court. Andrew withdrew from Damascus, while Sergius received Moawiah's promise of an army to aid Saborius; but Andrew captured Sergius in ambush in the defiles near Arabissus Tripotamus, mutilated & crucified him. Constantine had meanwhile sent out the patrician Nicephorus with an army against Sergius, who was, however, killed by a fall from his horse in Adrianople. Thus the revolt ended; the Arab force under Fadalad and Yezid ravaged Phrygia, taking Amorium, and penetrated as far as Chalcedon before it withdrew. It was in 667, according to Pertusi, and obviously as a result of this revolt,
that the theme of Armenia, composed of frontier fragments of the former province, was established. Michael the Syrian reproduced, from the common eastern Chronicle source, the narrative of the revolt of Armenia, under the leadership of Sabour Aparastigan; Peeters, following Chabot explained the difference of name in an otherwise corresponding account, as the deformed Armenian name of Pasagathes, who according to Theophanes had led the revolt of 653; Michael the Syrian, who made no mention of the earlier revolt, had identified the two men.

In Theophanes' narrative of the events of 668 (AM 6160) can be seen the account which the more detailed Chronicle interpolated into the annalistic eastern World Chronicle provided of the events of the reign of Constans in Constantinople. Theophanes reproduced, in its entirety, before the notice of the murder of Constans and the revolt of Mezizos in Sicily, material which he had previously fragmented and inserted into the appropriate years of his annalistic framework. This narrative was reproduced from the common source, at some points with a lesser degree of correspondence, by Michael the Syrian, and can also be traced in other Syriac Chroniclers. Theophanes' history of events in Constantinople and in the West in the reign of Constans was therefore not drawn from a Byzantine historical source.

In 661 (AM 6153), had abandoned Constantinople and settled in Syracuse in Sicily on account of the hatred which the Byzantines felt towards him. This had been principally aroused by his murder of his brother Theodosius in 660 (AM 6151), after he had first compelled him to become a priest, in order to safeguard the rights of his children.
Constantine, Tiberius, and Heraclius, as co-emperors, Elias of Nisibis, (drawing on Jesus of Basra), said that Constans murdered Theodosius his brother, because the latter wished to reign with him; Michael the Syrian's account concluded with the comment that the people of Constantinople called Constans a second Cain, a remark that is reproduced also by the anonymous author of the Chronicon Maroniticum. Constans' efforts to enforce acceptance of Monotheletism had also earned him the hatred of the orthodox; in 655 (AM 6150), he banished pope Martin, transported to Constantinople by the Italian exercitus Calliopas in 653, to Cherson, where he died of hunger and privation in 656; in 657 (AM 6149) he exiled Maximus the Confessor, who had refused to recant, after he had cut out his tongue and cut off his right hand; and in the same year he also tortured and exiled Anastasius, Maximus' disciple, and another Anastasius, apocrisiarius of the Roman Church. Michael the Syrian, with diametrically opposed religious conviction to Theophanes, also narrated the mutilation and exile of Maximus, and the exile of Martin. Once he had reached Syracuse, in 661 (AM 6153), Constans summoned his wife and three sons to Sicily, but the people of Constantinople, led by Andrew the cubicularius and Theodore of Colonia, would not allow their departure. According to Michael the Syrian, the people of Constantinople acclaimed Constans' three sons autokrators, and compelled them to live in the imperial city; while Theodore Colonia of Armenia was a friend of pope Agathon, with the rank of comes, who persuaded Agathon to convocate the council at Rome in 660 which confirmed the teaching of Maximus the Confessor. In September 668 (AM 6160) after he had lived in Sicily for six years, with being able to halt the Lombard incursions into Byzantine Italy, and the Arab incursions into Byzantine North Africa (the
real motivation of his removal to the West), Constans was slain in his bath by a chamberlain, and the Armenian Mizizios, Comes obsequii, was proclaimed emperor. Constantine IV came from Constantinople at the head of a large force to suppress the rebellion at Syracuse, and Mizizios and his chief supporters were executed. Michael the Syrian's narrative closely corresponded to that of Theophanes, and could only have come from a common source.

The question of whether or not Constantine IV suppressed the revolt of Mizizios at Syracuse in person, is one of the most complex of Byzantine historiography, not least because the paucity of primary sources. Brooks rejected the testimony of Theophanes and Michael the Syrian, from the common source, and attributed the suppression of the revolt to the Italian exarch, who remained loyal to Constantine IV, with the support of pope Vitalian. Gregoire, on the other hand, accepted the direct statement of Theophanes, and considered that Constantine IV made a rapid journey to the West, before being recalled to Constantinople by the threat of the Arab army under Fadlal and Yazid, which wintered at Chalcedon in 668-669. Ostrogorsky explicitly, and Vasiliev, however, implicitly accepted the hypothesis of Brooks. Theophanes and Michael the Syrian, both concluded their narratives with the statement that Constantine IV returned to Constantinople, where he ruled with his brothers, Tiberius and Heraclius.

The detailed Chronicle narrative which was incorporated into the eastern World Chronicle source, contained an account of the rejection of Monothelitism and the re-establishment of the orthodox faith, which was
reproduced by Theophanes and Michael the Syrian from divergent religious convictions, and therefore presented little correspondence. According to Michael, a council was held at Rome by pope Martin, which propagated the heresy of two wills and operations in Christ, and anathematised the emperor Heraclius and the patriarch of Constantinople, because they would not accept it. Theophanes and Michael both narrated the fate of Martin and Maximum at Constans' hands. In describing the council which Pope Agathon convoked at Rome in 680, both Theophanes (AM 6121) and Michael the Syrian were apparently unaware of the interval of four popes and twenty three years between the reigns of Martin and Agathon; a common error which could only have come from a common source.

However, from the accession of Constantine IV, when a Byzantine historical source was again available to him, Theophanes made no further use of the eastern World Chronicle for the narrative of events in the West.

Ostrogorsky commented that in the seventh century the Byzantines showed little knowledge of, or interest in, events in the West, citing the infrequent allusions in the chronicles of both Theophanes and Nicephorus, which were based on seventh century sources and which contained only meagre references to the West, in striking contrast to the detailed information which they provided about the East. Ostrogorsky was perhaps not justified in concluding from this that the main interest of Theophanes and Nicephorus was in the East; the more probable explanation was that they simply, through lack of sources, knew nothing of the West in the seventh century.

The eastern World Chronicle source, in its characteristic annalistic
brevity, provided Theophanes' source for his notices of the revolts against Constans in the provinces of the Empire, and it is reproduced in part, by Michael the Syrian.

In 644 (AM 6136), patrician Valentinian, instrumental in the accession of the eleven year old Constans, revolted against Constans and according to Theophanes, was deprived of his command and executed.\(^{47}\)

John of Nikiou, however, said that Valentinus, who had wished to usurp the imperial throne, was forced to abandon his dignity of Caesar, to give his daughter to Constans in marriage, and to swear a solemn oath of allegiance to Constans, before being trusted with the command of an army against the Arabs.\(^{48}\) The statement of John of Nikiou that Valentinus took part in the unsuccessful Byzantine counter-offensive to regain Alexandria, under Manuel, in 645\(^{49}\), was partially confirmed by that of Denis of Tell-Mahre that in this year the patrician Valentinus, overcome by fear, fled from the Arab army and abandoned his treasure.\(^{50}\) According to Michael the Syrian, Valentinus finally fell in battle against the Arabs in Armenia.\(^{51}\)

In 646 (AM 6138), Gregory, orthodox exarch at Carthage, revolted against Constans with the support of the people of the Byzantine province, and of the Berber tribes.\(^{52}\) In 647 (AM 6139), the Arabs of Egypt under Abdallah, having occupied the Pentapolis, attacked Byzantine North Africa; Gregory fell in battle, and the Arabs, having sacked his capital Sufetula in south Byzacena, exacted tribute from the province, and then withdrew.\(^{53}\) Michael the Syrian reproduced the account of the revolt of Gregory at Carthage, and the subsequent Arab conquest of Pentapolis and invasion of the province of Africa, but wrongly concluded that Gregory again
submitted to Constans in 647.

In 651 (AM 6143) according to Theophanes, Pasagnathes, patrician of the Armenians, revolted against Constans and submitted to Moawiah, giving him his son as hostage. Constans, on hearing this, went to Caesarea in Cappadocia, in a vain attempt to retain the allegiance of Armenia. Peeters demonstrated the inaccuracy of Theophanes' narrative, and established that the correct amount was that given by the Armenian Sebeos; the patrician Pasagnathes, if he did in fact exist, was a subordinate of Theodore Rustuni, who in the tenth year of the reign of Constans negotiated the secession of Armenia to Moawiah; despite the efforts of Constans to retain the loyalty of the province, in the next year Armenia submitted to Arab domination. Michael the Syrian omitted the notice of this revolt, although as Peeters pointed out, it came from the eastern common source Chronicle.

The revolt of the Armenian Saborius Persoganes in 667 (AM 6159) has already been discussed.

The eastern World Chronicle, in its customary succinct form, was the source for Theophanes' narrative of the Arab advance against the Empire in the reign of Constans. It can be traced occasionally in Denis of Tell-Mahre, and more frequently in Michael the Syrian.

In 643 (AM 6135), Omar erected a mosque in Jerusalem, but the building collapsed. This the people of Jerusalem attributed to the fact that there
was a cross surmounting the church on the Mount of Olives, opposite to the location of Omar's mosque. This cross was subsequently removed, and the mosque was completed and endured. Michael the Syrian's notice of the incident corresponded to that of Theophanes, and concluded with the comment that from this time the Arabs became the enemies of the Cross.

In December, 644 (AM 6137), the Caliph Omar was stabbed in the midst of his own congregation at Mogair by the poisoned dagger of a Persian renegade, and died three days later. Othman, son of Affan, succeeded his father Omar. Michael the Syrian's account of the death of Omar at the hands of a Christian slave, to whom he had neglected to give justice, was substantially the same as that of Theophanes.

In 647 (AM 6139), Abdallah, who for a short period replaced Amr as governor of Egypt, marched upon the imperial province of Africa, whose exarch, Gregory, had the previous year revolted against Constans and transferred his capital to Sufetula in southern Byzacena, in anticipation of Arab attack. Gregory was defeated in battle, and the Arabs plundered and levied tribute upon the province before they withdrew. Michael the Syrian also narrated the Arab occupation of the Pentapolis and invasion of Byzantine North Africa; his notice concluded with the statement that in the following year, Gregory again submitted to Constans. Theophanes made no mention of Gregory's fate; but according to Ostrogorsky, he fell in battle against the Arabs in 647.

In 649 (AM 6140), Moawiah, governor of Syria, conquered the strategic Byzantine naval base of Cyprus, with a force of one thousand seven hundred
ships from Alexandria, the main base of the Arab fleet, and devastated the capital, Constantia. Constans dispatched a fleet under Gacorizus the cubicularius, but Moawiah withdrew from Cyprus only to blockade Arados, a small island off the Syrian coast; he was, however, unsuccessful, despite the efforts of Thomarios, bishop of Apamea, to persuade the people of the island to submit. As winter approached, Moawiah abandoned the siege and returned to Damascus. In 650 (AM 6141), Moawiah resumed the blockade and succeeded in reducing Arados, which he devastated and depopulated. The prominence given by the eastern World Chronicle source to the detailed narrative of the capture of the unimportant island of Arados illustrated its local Syriac origin. Michael the Syrian’s account of Moawiah’s first naval expedition, and conquest of Cyprus and Arados, corresponded substantially with that of Theophanes. Denis of Tell-Mahre also narrated briefly Moawiah’s capture of Cyprus and Arados.

In 651 (AM 6142) Bursur led an Arab force in an invasion of Isauria, and after pillage and slaughter he withdrew with five thousand prisoners. After the conquest of Cyprus, the southern coast of Asia Minor was the logical target for Arab attack. Constans was forced to sue for peace with Moawiah through a certain Procopius; a two-year truce was made at the cost of heavy tribute and the sending of Gregory, patrician and sacellarius, son of Theodore and nephew of Heraclius, as hostage to Moawiah at Damascus. In 652 (AM 6143), the Armenians under Theodore Estuni voluntarily submitted to Moawiah. In 653 (AM 6144), Gregory died in captivity at Heliopolis, and his body was embalmed, and was then transported to Constantinople for solemn burial in the capital.
In 654 (AM 6145), Moawiah, who during the three year's truce had increased his fleet, captured and pillaged Rhodes; the statue of Helios, the Colossus, was destroyed, nearly fourteen hundred years after its erection, and two years later was sold to a Jewish merchant of Byzessa for its brass, and carried away upon nine hundred camels. According to Michael the Syrian, Cos was taken in the same year and Crete was pillaged, before Rhodes was captured; the account of the destruction of the Colossus was more detailed than that of Theophanes. In the same year (AM 6145) the Syrian general Habib, who according to Michael the Syrian had been entrusted by Moawiah with half the Arab army, defeated Maurianus, the Byzantine general in Armenia, and drove him as far as the Caucasus. In 655 (AM 6146), Moawiah himself, despite the destruction of his fleet at Tripolis in Phoenicia in 654, invaded Cappadocia with the second Arab army, and captured Caesarea. Michael the Syrian's account of the fall of Caesarea to Moawiah was more detailed than the brief notice of Theophanes; but, like the narrative of the invasion of Armenia by Habib, was undated.

The defeat of Constans, by the Arab fleets of Syria and Egypt under Abdallah, off Phoinike in Lycia in 655 (AM 6146), has already been discussed.

In June 656 (AM 6147), the caliph Othman was murdered at Medina by Mahomed, son of Abubakr, after a rebellion in Egypt, and Ali, leader of the rebels, cousin and son in law of Mahomed, was proclaimed caliph. Moawiah at Damascus withheld his homage from Ali, and was supported by the Arabs of Syria. In the civil war which followed between the Arabs of Arabia and
Iraq, and those of Syria, in July 657 (AM 6148), Ali's troops were defeated at Barbalissa on the Euphrates through lack of water; but the conflict continued until the murder of Ali in 661. In 659 (AM 6150), Moawiah was forced to make peace with the Empire, because of the strife within the Caliphate, at the cost of a daily tribute of one thousand nomismata, a horse, and a slave. In January, 661 (AM 6151), Ali was killed at Kufah in Iraq by a blow from a poisoned sabre; his son Hasan succeeded him, but renounced the caliphate in May 661, so that Moawiah proclaimed himself caliph at Jerusalem, and ruled at Damascus for twenty-four years. Denis of Tell-Mahre noted the outbreak of civil war in the caliphate and the sole rule of Moawiah on the death of Ali; as did Michael the Syrian, whose account of the disaffection which led to the murder of Othman, and of the ensuing civil war between Ali and Moawiah, did not correspond to that of Theophanes.

In 661 (AM 6152), the sect of the Charurgites among the Arabs of Persia was suppressed by Moawiah, as the start of a general policy of aggression against the Iraqi supporters of Ali, in favour of the Syrian Arabs; the Charurgites or Heracites were allowed a subsidy amounting only to thirty nomismata a year, whereas the Isamites of Syria were allowed up to two hundred nomismata.

In 662 (AM 6154), the annual plundering incursions against imperial territory were resumed by the united Caliphate, when the Arabs marched into Asia Minor, and took prisoners and devastated the land before they withdrew. Michael the Syrian made no mention either of this raid, or of those following, which became regular annual events; although the Arabs
never achieved a permanent foothold in non-Semitic Asia Minor.

In 663 (AM 6155), a fleet of two hundred ships from Alexandria sacked Sicily and prisoners were deported from the island to Damascus91.

In 664 (AM 6156), Abderahman, son of Khaled, having plundered and depopulated several provinces of Asia Minor, wintered on Byzantine soil92. In the same year (AM 6156), a Slav detachment of five thousand, transported by Constans to Asia Minor after his expedition of 658 in the Slav-occupied Balkans, deserted to Abderahman, and went with him to Syria, where they were settled in the region of Apamea in the village of Seleucobolos93.

In 665 (AM 6157), Bursur invaded the Byzantine Empire94.

In the same year (AM 6157), Thomarichos, bishop of Apamea, who in 649 (AM 6140) had attempted to persuade the people of Arados to surrender to Moawiah95, died; and the bishop of Emesa was burned to death96. That Theophanes was compelled to reproduce from the eastern World Chronicle source such notices of purely Syrian and local significance, was a clear indication that he in fact possessed no Byzantine historical source, and little information of events in Constantinople, for the reign of Constans.

In 666 (AM 6158), Bursur, together with Fadalad, made a second incursion into the Empire and ravaged the region around Hexapolis; Bursur retired, while Fadalad wintered on imperial territory97.

In 667 (AM 6159) Moawiah despatched an army to the aid of Saborius
Persoges, the Byzantine prefect of Armenia, who had revolted against Constans and sought his alliance. Saborius had meanwhile died as the result of a fall from his horse in Adrianople, and Constantine, son of Constans, had dispatched an army under the patrician Nicephorus to quell the revolt. At Chalcis, Fadalad, after he had ravaged Phrygia and captured Amorium, was joined by Yezid, son of Moawiah; Fadalad returned to Syria with prisoners, while Yezid penetrated as far as Chalcedon in 668, the first Arab commander to do so. In the winter of 667, Andrew the cubicularius was sent by Constantine into Phrygia, and he recaptured Amorium and slaughtered the garrison of five thousand Arabs which Fadalad had established there.

The eastern World Chronicle, in its customary annalistic brevity, provided Theophanes' source for Constans' expedition into Sclavinia (i.e. the Slav-occupied Balkans) in 658, when he seized the opportunity offered by the civil war within the Caliphate to launch the first Byzantine offensive against the Slavs since the reign of Maurice (582-602).

In 658 (AM 6149), Constans made war against the Slavs, and took many prisoners, and compelled the Slavs to acknowledge his sovereignty. Elias of Nisibis, but not Michael the Syrian, reproduced this brief notice of Constans' Slav campaign, citing once more Jusdenah of Basra.

Theophanes, however, made no direct mention of Constans' resettlement in Asia Minor of the Slav tribes which had seceded to Abderrahman in Asia Minor in 664 (AM 6156); presumably because he was unaware of it; yet another
indication of the localised interests of the eastern Chronicle source, and absence of a Byzantine source.

Theophanes' account of the various natural phenomena which occurred in the reign of Constans, came from the eastern World Chronicle source.

In December, 645 (AM 613b), there was an eclipse of the sun.

In 647 (AM 6139) there was a great wind which uprooted trees, and tore down even the pillars of the stylites. Michael the Syrian reproduced the notice of this violent storm.

In 652 (AM 6144), ashes rained down from heaven, and great fear overcame all men.

In May 659 (AM 6150), there was an earthquake which caused great destruction in both Palestine and Syria. Elias of Nisibis, again citing Jesudenah of Basra, reproduced the notice of this earthquake.

In the winter of 667 (AM 6159), there was a great flood at Edessa, in which many lost their lives and a comet appeared in the sky. Michael the Syrian also narrated the flood at Edessa, in more detail than Theophanes, but with no mention of the comet.

The historical narrative of George the Monk for the reign of Constans,
except for the foundation of the sect of the Paulicians in Armenia by Constantine Silvanus 110, was excerpted from Theophanes.

George the Monk reproduced Theophanes' narrative of the great storm and violent wind of 647 (AM 6139) 111.

Despite Brooks' opinion that the narrative of the naval action of 655 (AM 6164) showed that Theophanes and George the Monk independently used the same western historical source, rather than that George the Monk drew directly from Theophanes 112, it is not convincing, in the light of a study of the Chronicle sources for the whole of the seventh century, that George the Monk did anything but abridge the Chronographia of Theophanes for his narrative of Constans' defeat by, and escape from, the Arab fleet off Phoinike in Lycia in 655 113. Brooks' assertion of the existence of a western (i.e. Byzantine) historical source for this event was not adequately substantiated.

George the Monk also reproduced from Theophanes the notice of the year 668 (AM 6160), in which Theophanes described the reasons for the hatred of the Byzantine people towards the emperor, which forced him to leave Constantinople for the West, as also the murder of Constans and the revolt of Mizizios at Syracuse, and its suppression by Constantine IV in person 114.

According to George the Monk, the sect of the Paulicians originated in Armenia, from whence they spread into Macedonia, under the leadership of Constantine Silvanus. Their doctrines were those of Mani, but they called themselves Paulicians, rather than Manichaean, after their founder, Paul.
of Samosata. Their teaching was based upon the true Gospel, distorted by the unwritten heresy of Constantine Silvanus. The Paulicians accused the Orthodox of heresy, because they honoured the Virgin as the mother of God, received Christ present in bread and wine, honoured the Cross of Christ, and St. Peter as the first apostle. In their corruption, the Paulicians persecuted orthodox believers, and defended their heresy by citing in its support the holy Scriptures and the oecumenical councils of the Church.

De Door considered the problem of the source of George the Monk's account of the Paulicians, which was found neither in Theophanes, from whom George the Monk drew his narrative of the reign of Constans, nor in the eleventh century George Cedrenos, who drew upon George the Monk and whose account of the reign of Constans corresponded. Two narratives concerning the Paulicians, one by the patriarch Photius, and the other by Peter Siculus or Higoumenus, are extant. Correspondence between the accounts of Photius and George the Monk suggested that the narrative of the Paulicians might be an interpolation into the original Chronicle, either into the archetype, which would involve deviation equivalent to the establishment of a separate manuscript tradition, or alternatively into a later edition. It is more probable, however, that George the Monk, who often combined two sources, and Photius, both drew upon the history of Peter Higoumenus. Grégoire later established that the work of Peter of Sicily was the fundamental source from which all narratives of the history and teaching of the Paulicians derived.

Nicephorus' Breviarium completely omitted the accession and the reign of
Constans, moving from the conclusion of the revolt of Valentinus against Heracleonas and Martina in 641, to the murder of Constans in Sicily in 668. This lacuna in the narrative of the Breviary presented another problem, which cannot be resolved with certainty.

The most obvious and simple explanation is that of manuscript loss, postulated by Brooks to account for Nicephorus' silence concerning the fall of Alexandria to the Arabs in October 641; that, either in Nicephorus' history, or in the text as we have it at present, there was a gap extending from October 641 to 668. It is, therefore, important to attempt to establish whether or not manuscript loss took place, and, if so, at what time and to what extent.

It is true that Nicephorus' hitherto detailed narrative of the reigns of Constantine III and Heracleonas ended abruptly and inconclusively with the submission of Valentinus in the summer of 641, while John of Nikiou narrated the final overthrow of Heracleonas and Martina in September 641. John of Nikiou's narrative, although distorted in transmission, was almost certainly drawn from his Greek source, which was apparently related to the source of Nicephorus for the reign of Heraclius; Moravcsik in fact declared that Nicephorus and John of Nikiou shared a common source, on the basis of their corresponding accounts concerning Kobratos, lord of the Bulgars. It is also probable, although it cannot be proved, owing to the confusion of the last chapters of the Chronicle, that John of Nikiou's account of the revolt of Valentinus against Constans, and Valentinus' share in the unsuccessful Byzantine attempt to regain Alexandria in 645, was drawn from his Greek source also. It would,
therefore, seems probable that Nicephorus' Chronicle source continued to the accession of Constans in October 641, and possible that some limited manuscript loss from the Breviarium has occurred.

However, the critical point is whether or not Nicephorus' narrative of the twenty seven year reign of Constans has been lost. George the Monk, whose Chronicle drew partly upon Nicephorus for the reign of Heraclius, gave only a bare mention of the accession and reign of Constantine III, and omitted that of Heracleonas, before excepting his narrative of that of Constans from Theophanes. The Chronicle of George the Monk, therefore, can provide no conclusive indication as to the state of the Breviarium, and the nature of its narrative, at this point during the mid-ninth century. However, the account of Nicephorus' Breviarium given in the Bibliotheca of the patriarch Photius is significant, but not conclusive. The Bibliotheca, written before Photius' appointment to the patriarchate of Constantinople in 858, was a synopsis of, and commentary upon, secular and ecclesiastical authors read by Photius and his circle of friends, for the benefit of Photius' absent brother. There was no reference to Nicephorus' narrative of the reign of Constans in the Bibliotheca; from which it is possible to infer that such a narrative was not present. Photius' silence concerning Nicephorus' account of the reign of Constans becomes more significant in conjunction with the fact that in the Bibliotheca, the History of Theophylact Simocatta (No. 65) immediately preceded the Breviarium (No. 66), the order in which the two works are found in the Vatican codex (Vat. Graec. 977), suggesting that the manuscript in Photius' library contained the two works in one codex, which was possibly the prototype of the Vatican codex. It is, therefore,
permissible to assume that the form in which Photius knew the Breviarium was approximately that in which it is extant today. Moreover, the manuscript tradition of the Breviarium itself provides definite refutation of Brooks' theory that the narrative of the entire reign of Constans has been lost. The Breviarium is extant in two manuscripts; the Vatican (edited definitely by De Boor\textsuperscript{129}) and the London (studied, partly edited, partly collated by Grosz\textsuperscript{130}) manuscripts, which are not derived from the same archetype, but are two distinct versions of the Breviarium by Nicephorus himself. The London codex is a late ninth century manuscript of an earlier version of the prototype which appears in the eleventh or twelfth century Vatican codex stylistically revised and chronologically extended, but neither version contains an account of the reign of Constans.

Patzig suggested that Nicephorus deliberately omitted an account of the reign of the heretic Constans from the Breviarium, since he was included in the Chronographikon Syntomon\textsuperscript{131}; but this hypothesis is not convincing. It is conceivable, but not probable, that the Constantinople-orientated Nicephorus found nothing to interest him in the reign of Constans; but this is highly unlikely, when the Syriac Chroniclers thought it worth while to record the main events of the reign. Considering the character of these events, it is equally unlikely that Nicephorus would not have been interested in them.

Since it is certain that Nicephorus' silence concerning the reign of Constans was not due to subsequent manuscript loss, and probable that it was not due to deliberate omission on Nicephorus' part, there is only one
alternative explanation remaining; that for the reign of Constans there existed no Byzantine historical sources whatever. Brooks did not succeed in substantiating his assertion of the existence of a western historical source for the reign of Constans, which was used independently by George the Monk, and in combination with an eastern source by Theophanes. On the contrary, detailed study of the history of the reign of Constans in the Chronographia has proved that Theophanes derived his narrative from the eastern (i.e. Syrian) World Chronicle source.

The conclusion that there were in fact no Byzantine historical sources for the reign of Constans is supported by our limited knowledge of the lost seventh century Byzantine Chronicle sources. The Megas Chronographos, which has unfortunately survived only in a fragmentary state, was the last edition of the state Chronicle of Constantinople, made under Leo IV the Khazar or during the minority of Constantine VI, and was identified by Freund as the source of Nicephorus for the reign of Heraclius. A tentative identification is possible between the Byzantine Chronicle source of Theophanes for the reign of Heraclius, and the vulgar Chronicle which was used by John of Antioch, in the mid-ninth century. Grégoire, following Krumbacher, established that there existed a history in the style and type of Malalas, which was continued, presumably in Constantinople, beyond Malalas' termination at the end of the reign of Justinian, to at least the reigns of Phocas and Heraclius, and that this vulgar Chronicle was still extant in the mid-ninth century, when a polished edition in learned language was produced by John of Antioch. That the Byzantine Chronicle, which served as a common source for both Theophanes and Nicephorus from the accession of Constantine IV, and which
can be probably identified with the Chronicon Syntomon of the patrician Trajan, commenced in 668 is another indication that there were no Byzantine historical sources for the reign of Constans; the general characteristics of Byzantine chronography would suggest that the author would, if possible, commence his work immediately after the termination of the Chronicle which he proposed to continue. That Nicephorus made no mention of the reign of Constans in the Breviarium was therefore due to the fact that there was no Byzantine historical source for the reign from which he could gain any information.

It has been suggested as probable, although not conclusively proved, owing to scarcity of original sources, that Theophanes constructed his history of the reign of Constans solely from his eastern World Chronicle source, in default of Byzantine historical material; and further, that this eastern World Chronicle source contained at this point three passages of greater length and detail, which apparently did not belong to the original World Chronicle, but were an interpolation within it, possibly from another complete Chronicle.

The question of the precise nature of the World Chronicle, written in the eastern provinces of the Empire (probably Syria) and providing one of Theophanes' chief sources for the history of the seventh century, has not yet been adequately considered. Its general form is that of annalistic brevity, into which has been interpolated at this point a more detailed narrative. It is impossible to characterise or to define with certainty the extent and origin of this interpolated source, presumably a Chronicle, or to
identify its author. It is likewise impossible to arrive at certainty in these respects with regard to the larger eastern World Chronicle, of which it formed a part. An essential preliminary to such an investigation would be a detailed study of Syriac Chronicle literature, which is beyond the scope of this Thesis.

Brooks traced a common source between Theophanes, Michael the Syrian, and the Chronicon ad 846 pertinens of the monk of Karthamin. The author of this source, in Brooks' opinion, was possibly either the Syrian John, son of Samuel, or Theophilius of Edessa, writing not long after 746 and citing an unknown Chronicle written in 724-731; the source was transmitted to Theophanes through the intermediary of a Melchite monk of Palestine, writing in Greek c. 780, whose work was brought to Constantinople after the destruction of the Syrian monasteries in 813; it was transmitted to Michael the Syrian through Denis of Tell-Mahre. The basis and application of Brooks' theory is unfortunately not sufficiently wide; the position is complicated by the fact that several folios of the Chronicon ad 846 pertinens, extending from 611 to 692, have been lost; but Brooks did not consider the narrative of the whole of the seventh century, and especially of the reign of Constans, in which there was not only a far greater degree of correspondence between the narratives of Theophanes and Michael the Syrian than he admitted, but also between those of Theophanes, Michael the Syrian and Elias of Nisibis.

The presence of three passages of unusual length and detail within the eastern World Chronicle source, which were reproduced by Theophanes in his history of the reign of Constans, has been proved. In addition to these
three passages, which narrated the battle between Arab and Byzantine fleets off Phoinike in Lycia in 655, the revolt of Saborius Persogenes in Armenia in 667, and Constans' actions in Constantinople, and his murder and the revolt of Mizizôs in Sicily in 668, it is possible that this more detailed narrative can be traced in Michael the Syrian's account of Constantine IV's association of his brothers in the Empire on his accession in 668, and their deposition in 681; but this cannot be proved. It is possible that these passages formed part of a complete Chronicle now lost, which was incorporated into the annalistic World Chronicle. The date of the composition of this interpolated Chronicle & its author, are unknown. All that can be said with certainty is that it must have been written before the early ninth century, the probable date of the compilation of the larger World Chronicle of which it formed a part.

The detailed and apparently authentic narrative of the encounter at Damascus in 667 before Moawiah of Sergius, emissary of Saborius Persogenes and Andrew, emissary of Constantine, would suggest Damascus as its place of origin; as would also the account of Moawiah's naval preparations which culminated in the battle off Phoinike in Lycia; but portions of this narrative were reproduced by Elias of Nisibis, who cited as his source Jesudenah, metropolitan of Basra in Mesopotamia. Little light is shed on the problem by the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian. The only source which Michael cited by name was Denis of Tell-Mahre; but Denis' Chronicle was obviously not the sole source for the more detailed and comprehensive narrative of Michael. Chabot commented that the confusion in the chronology of events of the mid-seventh century described by Michael the Syrian was apparently partly due to the divergent nature of the sources which he used; but these sources cannot be identified or dated. It is
possible that the author of the interpolated Chronicle was Jesudenah of Basra, whose work was cited as source in all those places where there was correspondence with Theophanes and Michael the Syrian; but this cannot be proved with certainty, as the date when Jesudenah wrote, and the full extent of his work, are unknown. It is also likely that this Chronicle, as did the World Chronicle, originated in Syria. Alternatively, it is possible that it was the work of either the Antiochene John of Djebel, or of John of Kaisoum, authors of two lost undated sources cited by Michael the Syrian, but these suggestions cannot be substantiated.

The eastern World Chronicle source of Theophanes was therefore a compilation, based upon other non-extant sources, which was written in the early part of the ninth century; it can be inferred that 806 was the year of its composition, from Michael the Syrian's discussion of the errors promulgated by the council of Constantinopæ (680-681) one hundred and twenty-five years previously. This Chronicle, which incorporated both the unknown Chronicle of the reign of Constans, and that which served as common source for Theophanes, Michael the Syrian, and the monk of Karthamin, was clearly written in Syria, from the degree of detailed local knowledge which it displayed throughout the narrative of the history of the period of the whole Heraclian dynasty. For the reign of Constans, this local knowledge was revealed in the capture and depopulation of Arados, and the deaths of the bishops of Apamea and Emesa, and in its lack of knowledge of the targets of the annual Arab incursions into imperial territory. It extended over the whole of the seventh century, and was reproduced by Theophanes and Michael the Syrian in occasionally parallel, but more often corresponding or related passages; in this
connection it is necessary to consider that the Chronographia was written in Greek in the ninth century, and the Chronicle written in Syriac in the eleventh century.

In his narrative of the reign of Constans, Theophanes was, therefore, compelled, in default of any Byzantine historical sources for the reign, to rely entirely upon his eastern World/source. The sum total of Nicephorus' information, contained in the Breviarium, was reproduced from the brief entry in the Chronographikon Syntomon, that Constantine, son of Heraclius, ruled for twenty-seven years, and was murdered in Sicily.

It is a strange coincidence that two independent Byzantine Chronicle sources, written in Constantinople, should conclude in 641, but nevertheless this is true. Both were contemporary sources, written in the mid-seventh century. The next Byzantine historical source of which we have any direct information, is the Chronicle of the Patrician Trajan, written at the start of the eighth century, and which based its account of the seventh century (from 668) upon oral narrative, and then eye-witness testimony. What Pertusi described as the brief literary renaissance of the reign of Heraclius is made more striking by the complete absence of literary activity during the reigns of his successors.
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Chapter V.

The Source of Theophanes for the reign of Constantine IV, 668-685.
For the reigns of Constantine IV and Justinian II (668-711) Theophanes, although he continued to make use of his eastern World Chronicle, once more was able to draw upon a Byzantine historical source. It is probable that this Byzantine source was the Chronicon Syntomon of the most Christian and orthodox patrician Trajan, who according to Suidas, lived at the time of Justinian Rhinotmetus, which extended to 713. It is highly probable (for reasons which will be discussed below) that this Chronicle came to Theophanes only mediately, through the unknown Chronicle which served as his source for the eighth century. This Byzantine Chronicle was a common source of both Theophanes and Nicephorus, although often altered considerably in reproduction, and Nicephorus' sole source for the period. By reason of the brevity of his narrative, it is difficult to be certain whether George the Monk drew independently from the common source Chronicle of Theophanes and Nicephorus; but from the character of the rest of the Chronicle for the seventh century, it is most probable that he continued to draw upon the Chronographia alone, but in abbreviated form.

George the Monk gave to Constantine IV the surname of Pogonatus — the bearded. Brooks disregarded the testimony of Constantine Manasses and Joel that the title was awarded to Constantine because he left Constantinople for Sicily in 668 to avenge his father's murder, without a beard, but returned from Syracuse with a long beard, in favour of the testimony of Byzantine coinage, and attributed the surname instead to Constans, who apparently favoured a particularly long and luxuriant beard. The fact that the title is not found in Theophanes, George the Monk's source, but only in the twelfth century Manasses and
the thirteenth century Joel, suggests that the surname might be an interpolation into the manuscript tradition of George the Monk.

Theophanes' account of the relations between Constantine IV and his brothers was constructed, according to Brooks, upon whose work the following analysis is based, from both his western (i.e. Byzantine) and eastern sources.

In 668 (AM 6160), after the murder of Constans in Sicily, Constantine reigned with Tibarius and Heraclius, his brothers. In 669 (AM 6161), the army of the Anatolic theme marched to Chrysopolis, to demand the coronation of the younger brothers; Constantine treacherously enticed the leaders into Constantinople, and hanged them at Synae, whereupon the insurgents dispersed, and Constantine finally secured his position by cutting off his brothers' noses. In 681 (AM 6173), Constantine deposed his brothers and reigned alone with his son Justinian. The narrative of AM 6161 was inaccurate, for the dating of the acts of the council of Constantinople in 681 proved that the younger brothers were crowned by Constans in 659; while the entries for AM 6161 and AM 6173 were mutually contradictory, for since the object of mutilation was to render the victim unfit to hold office, there would have been no necessity for the deposition of the brothers twelve years later.

Michael the Syrian also narrated these events. At the time of Constans' departure for Sicily, the people of Byzantium refused to allow his sons to leave also, and proclaimed all three autokrators. In 668, after the
murder of Constans, Constantine IV ruled with his brothers, Tiberius and Heraclius. The same year, Constantine summoned the Romans and commanded that all three brothers be recognised as emperors, that their effigies be placed upon the coins, and that they should receive equal honours. In 681, Constantine deposed his brothers to ensure the succession of his son, attempting to quiet opposition by bribery; the patrician Leo, refusing to consent, was mutilated and executed; but when Tiberius and Heraclius attempted to assert their rightful position of co-emperors, the bribed Senate withheld its support, and they were deposed and Constantine reigned alone.

Nicophorus made no mention of the brothers of Constantine IV, but George the Monk recorded an abbreviated account of the revolt of the soldiers of the Anatolikon theme at Chrysopolis, and the subsequent execution of the leaders and the mutilation of Constantine's brothers. The narrative was probably reproduced from Theophanes; but even if it were not, the fact that George the Monk placed these events after the seven year siege of Constantinople by the Arabs is of no significance for the chronological problem, for George placed the council of Constantinople, which he dated accurately to 630, at the start of his narrative of the reign.

The confusion and inaccuracy of Theophanes' narrative was due to the fact that he combined two sources. From the eastern source came the notice of AM 6160, reproduced also by Michael the Syrian, that Constantine IV reigned with his brothers; and from the western source came the undated notice of the revolt of the Anatolians, which Theophanes unintelligently (for the march to Chrysopolis would have been unthinkable while the war...
continued) attributed to the same year. The eastern World Chronicle source, reproduced fully by Michael the Syrian, but only partially by Theophanes, narrated Constantine's public acknowledgment of the association of his brothers in the Empire in 668, and their deposition by Constantine in 680-681 to secure the succession of his son. Theophanes presumably disregarded this notice, because of its similarity to the revolt he had earlier described in the battle-cry of the insurgents, "We worship the Trinity, let us acknowledge three emperors", and retained only the notice, here correctly dated, of the deposition of Tiberius and Heraclius. There is no evidence for the association of Justinian with his father in the Empire at this time.

The actual course of the insurrection of 681 can be determined by combination of the independent accounts of the Byzantine and eastern sources. The Anatolikon revolted, to prevent the deposition of the brothers, and marched to Chrysopolis, where their leaders were persuaded, through treachery, to enter Constantinople to confer with Constantine and the Senate (Theophanes) 15. The patrician Leo, strategos of the theme, was mutilated, paraded through the streets, and then executed, while the Senate had been bribed by Constantine to ensure its support (Michael the Syrian) 16. Finally, the other leaders of the revolt were hanged, and Tiberius and Heraclius deposed and mutilated 17.

Theophanes' narrative of the seven year assault by the Arabs upon Constantinople, 672-678, came from the Byzantine Chronicle which he had as common source with Nicephorus, and which was much abbreviated.
In 672 (AM 6164), an Arab fleet under Mohamed, son of Abdallah, captured Smyrna and wintered there; while a second fleet under Qain occupied the coasts of Lycia and Cilicia; and Moawiah dispatched a third force under Khaled for their support in an attack upon Constantinople itself. Constantine IV, in 673 (AM 6164), cognizant of the threat, prepared boats as fire-ships in the Proclianisium harbour of Caesarius, and equipped other light vessels to carry siphons. It was these "siphonophore" ships that were ultimately responsible for the defeat of the Arab fleet; from these was hurled the explosive compound known as Greek fire, which burned even on water and ignited when it struck the vessels of the enemy, causing havoc among the Arab fleet. Greek fire was the invention of Callinicus, a refugee from Hierpolis in Syria.

In 670 (AM 6162), an Arab fleet under Padalad had captured the peninsula of Cyzicus, thus providing a base in the sea of Marmora for the final assault upon Constantinople, which began in April 674 (AM 6165) when the Arab fleet stationed itself between the promontory of Magnaura, to the west of the Hebdomon, and the eastern promontory called Cyclobium. Daily engagements between the two fleets continued until September, when the Arabs withdrew to winter at Cyzicus. Hostilities were resumed in the spring of each year, but the Arabs were unable to defeat the Byzantine fleet and reduce the city, and suffered heavy losses from battle casualties and disease in 678, the last year of the siege. At the end of the year, having retreated from Cyzicus, the remainder of the Arab fleet was almost totally destroyed in a severe storm off Syllaeum in Pamphylia; while in the same
year the Arab army was severely defeated in Asia Minor. In 678 (AM 6169) Moawiah was therefore forced to sue for peace, and Constantine, through the patrician John Pitzigaudius, negotiated a thirty years' truce on annual Arab payment of three thousand gold pieces, fifty prisoners, and fifty horses.

Nicephorus' account of the seven year assault upon Constantinople was taken from the Byzantine Chronicle which he had as a common source with Theophanes. As Ostrogorsky has pointed out, the actual attack upon the city lasted only five years, but both Theophanes and Nicephorus reckoned from the capture of Cyzicus. Nicephorus' version corresponded almost completely with that of Theophanes, with the omission only of Callinicus and his discovery of Greek fire. Theophanes' notice of the defeat of the Arab army in Asia Minor came from his eastern World Chronicle source, and is therefore not found in Nicephorus.

George the Monk abbreviated his account of the Arab assault and its eventual failure from that of Theophanes, and omitted both Callinicus and the peace treaty.

Theophanes' notice of the sixth ecumenical council of Constantinople in 681 came from the Byzantine Chronicle which he had as a common source with Nicephorus, and which Nicephorus also reproduced. George the Monk, however, in this instance produced an independent account.

In November, 680 (AM 6171), after a synod had been convoked by pope
Agathon at Rome, the sixth ecumenical council of the Church met at Constantinople. It was summoned by Constantine IV who, since he had secured external peace for the Empire, thought it fitting to secure the peace of the Church, disrupted since the time of his great-grandfather Heraclius. The two hundred and eighty nine bishops, in eighteen sessions, promulgated five degrees defining the doctrine of the two wills and two operations in Christ. The council ended in September 681.

Theophanes' notice for AM 6172 repeated in shorter form the information concerning the council of Constantinople contained in that for AM 6171, quoted above. The reasons for this duplication are not clear. A possible explanation may be found in Theophanes' chronological framework which, in imitation of George Syncellus, was based upon both the reckoning of the Alexandrian world year, obsolete in the ninth century, and upon the reckoning of the Byzantine indiction-cycle. Grumel claimed that Theophanes adhered to the Alexandrian reckoning and regarded the world year as beginning on March 25; but Ostrogorsky considered that Theophanes followed the indiction reckoning, and that therefore the world years of the Chronographia commenced on September 1. Examination of these conflicting theories is not relevant here; whichever of the two is correct, Theophanes in strict accordance with his chronological canon would have been justified in extending the narrative of the council over two years, from its commencement in AM 6171 to its conclusion in AM 6172.

Alternatively, it is possible that Theophanes, having taken the more detailed narrative of the council from the Byzantine Chronicle, which he had as common source with Nicephorus, then carelessly reproduced the notice of the eastern World Chronicle source (which is found in Michael
the Syrian^{35} concerning the council of Constantinople. Both these
explanations, however, presuppose that Theophanes had no other information
for the events of the year AM 6172, and was therefore compelled to
reproduce his narrative of the previous year, in order to maintain the
annalistic character of the Chronographia, rather than leave a blank year.
This is yet another indication of the lack of historical sources for the
second part of the seventh century.

Nicephorus' account of the council of Constantinople, which was drawn from
the Byzantine common source Chronicle, was as usual less detailed than
that of Theophanes. It lacked both the date of the council, and the
number of bishops who participated; but provided the additional information
that the originators of Monotheletism were anathematised^{36}.

George the Monk's account of the council of Constantinople was not only
far more detailed than those of Theophanes and Nicephorus, but also
noticeably divergent from them. In 680, under the inspiration of
Constantine IV, there assembled at Constantinople a council of a hundred
and seventy bishops, under the leadership of the legates of pope Agathon,
the patriarch of Constantinople, and representatives of three oriental
patriarchates, then under Arab domination, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and
Antioch. Macarius of Antioch attempted to defend Monotheletism, and was
excommunicated and deposed; on his death, which occurred soon after, the
council appointed Theophanes in his place. The council anathematised by
name pope Honorius and the respective patriarchs of Constantinople and
Alexandria responsible for the dissemination of Monotheletism; and
proclaimed the doctrine of two innate wills and operations in Christ^{37}. 
Such an account could not have been drawn from the Chronographia, nor is it likely that it was derived directly from the Theophanes-Nicephorus common source. It is possible that George the Monk in this instance drew upon a synodicon of the same form as the later Synodicon Vetus, the type of source to which he would almost certainly have had access. Another question raised by George the Monk's account is that of its peculiar similarity to Michael the Syrian's; but a common source is impossible.

Theophanes' narrative of the Arab advance against the Empire, and the internal history of the Caliphate in the reign of Constantine IV, came from the eastern World Chronicle source, and can be traced also in Michael the Syrian. Nicephorus, using only the Byzantine common source Chronicle, inevitably made no mention of this topic, and George the Monk did not reproduce it from Theophanes.

In 669 (AM 6161), the Arabs pillaged Byzantine Africa and withdrew with eighty thousand prisoners. According to Michael the Syrian, at the start of the reign of Constantine IV, the Arabs invaded Africa and took twenty-four thousand captive.

In 670 (AM 6162) Fadalad wintered in the peninsula of Cyzicus, which he had occupied that year, despite the fact that in 669 he and Yazid had been forced to raise the siege of Chalcedon. This was a very severe winter, in which many men and animals died.

In 671 (AM 6163), Bursur again raided Asia Minor, and withdrew, having
taken captives.  

In 672 (AM 6164), a fleet under Mahomed, son of Abdallah, captured Smyrna and wintered there, while a second fleet under Qain, occupied the coasts of Lycia and Cilicia. The following year, Moawiah dispatched Khaled with a third fleet, for the support of Mahomed and Qain in the assault upon Constantinople. Michael the Syrian reproduced an undated notice of the Arab pillage and occupation of Lycia and Cilicia.

The great Arab assault upon Constantinople 674-678 (AM 6165) was drawn by Theophanes from his Byzantine Chronicle source, and not from the eastern World Chronicle, and has already been discussed.

In 675 (AM 6166) Abdallah, son of Qain, and Wadalad wintered in Crete.

In 678 (AM 6165), the Arab army under Sufian, son of Auf, which was pillaging Asia Minor (probably Lycia and Cilicia) was defeated by a Byzantine force under Florus, Peter and Cyprian, and thirty thousand Arabs fell in battle. Michael the Syrian also reproduced the notice of the Arab defeat in Lycia by three patricians of the Romans.

Also in 678 (AM 6169), the Mardaites, a Christian tribe of guerrilla fighters, who owed allegiance to the Byzantine Empire, occupied the highlands of Lebanon, and struck fear into Moawiah and his emirs. Michael the Syrian narrated the arrival of the bandit Mardaites in the region of Amanus, from whence they pillaged the countyside in support of the Romans who had sent them, until they were suppressed by the Arabs.
who killed some and blinded the others.  

In 679 (AM 6170), Moawiah, as a gesture of conciliation towards the Christian subjects, rebuilt the ambon and cupola of the church of Edessa, which had been destroyed in that year in a great earthquake in Mesopotamia. Michael the Syrian also recorded the rebuilding of the ruined church by Moawiah.

In April 680 (AM 6171), Moawiah died at Damascus, after a reign of twenty four years, and was succeeded by his son Yezid. Michael the Syrian recorded the death of Moawiah, and Yezid's three year reign.

In 682 (AM 6174) Moktar revolted in Persia. Michael the Syrian's more detailed notice of the revolt at Babylon described it as part of the disturbance in the Caliphate after the death of Yezid, who left a young son as his heir.

In November 683 (AM 6175) Yezid died at Damascus, and was succeeded by his son Moawiah. Abdallah, son of Zubeir, was nominated in Moawiah's place by the Arabs of Ethribos at Mecca, while at Damascus Hasan, emir of Palestine, gave his support to Marwan, son of Hakem. Marwan ruled for nine months, and was assassinated at Damascus. Abdelmalik his son succeeded him in September 685, and put to death Abdallah and his supporters. Michael the Syrian's account of the disturbance in the Caliphate after the death of Yezid was fuller than that of Theophanes. Abdallah ibn Zobeir was proclaimed caliph at Mecca, the Arabs of Damascus rallied to the children of Yezid, and those of Syria and Phoenicia.
followed Dhabhaq ibn Qais. Marwan, son of Hakan, was proclaimed at Damascus after he had been designated by lot, but died after nine months, and further war ensured before Abdelmalik his son became caliph.

In 684 (AM 6176) the irregular troops of the Mardaites again ravaged the Lebanon, on the Arab-Byzantine frontier, and their raids, in conjunction with a famine and the civil war in the Caliphate, forced Abdelmalik on his accession to sue for peace on the same terms as had been negotiated between Constantine IV and Moawiah in 678. Michael the Syrian was unaware of these negotiations, or else confused them with the later truce arranged between Abdelmalik and Justinian II.

Theophanes' account of the origin and racial history of the Bulgars, inserted in the reign of Constantine IV as a prelude to that emperor's Bulgar campaigns, was drawn from the Byzantine Chronicle which he had as common source with Nicephorus. Beseliev has studied the character of this common source and concluded that, although the account of the origin of the Bulgar kingdom came from a contemporary seventh century Bulgar source, which incorporated earlier oral tradition, it was inserted into Byzantine chronography in the eighth century, as the style and language of the unknown source can be traced in the narrative of the Bulgar campaign of Constantine V Copronymus in 765. A more accurate explanation of the similarity of style might be the fact that the seventh century Byzantine source for Bulgar history was transmitted to Theophanes and Nicephorus by a late eighth century author.
Moravosík has constructed a brief summary of the complicated early racial history of the Bulgarian and Hungarian peoples from Byzantine sources. In the mid-fifth century, the Onogurs from western Siberia, ancestors of the Danube Bulgars and Hungarians, settled in the region of the Caucasus, near Kuban, on the north shore of the Euxine, north of the Caucasus mountains and east of lake Maiotis. In the second half of the sixth century, the Onogurs came under the rule of the western Turks, and at the end of the century, of the Avars. At the start of the seventh century, Koubrat founded Great Bulgaria, the kingdom of the Onogur Bulgars, but in the middle of the century, due to the advance of the Khazars, the kingdom of Koubrat disintegrated; one group of tribes under Isperich came to Danubian Bulgaria in 679, another under Bâtan remained in the original homeland under Khazar domination, and another, the Volga Bulgars, migrated to the north-east; race-splinters of the allied Kutigura, were settled in Avar Pannonia and Byzantine Italy. The Onogurs of lake Maiotis were the Danubian Bulgars of Theophanes and Nicephorus.

The narrative of Theophanes and Nicephorus of the origin of the Bulgar kingdom corresponded almost completely, although Theophanes' description of the location of the Bulgar homeland was more detailed, and there were variations in the spelling of names. Besevliev has published minor variant readings of De Boor's edition of the Chronographia, concerning the emergence of the Onogur-Bulgars, but they are not relevant here.

In 679 (AM 6171), the Bulgars invaded Thrace. Great Bulgaria, the homeland of the Onogur-Bulgars and the Kotragi, was situated in the Caucasus, to the north of the Euxine sea, to the east of lake Maiotis.
where the river Tanais joined the Atel, and from whence the Kouphias flowed into the sea of Pontus near Necropolis at Criou Metopen, and extended as far east as Phanagoria. Nicophorus began his narrative with the statement that Great Bulgaria lay around lake Maiotis. In the reign of Constans, Krobatos ruled both Bulgars and Kotragi, and on his death he bequeathed the kingdom to his five sons, on condition that they would not divide the realm or leave the ancestral homeland. Nicophorus' account, except for the spelling Kobraos, was identical. The eldest son, Batbaian, remained in the ancestral homeland, which was invaded by the Khazars from Berzilia, so that Batbaian was forced to pay tribute. Nicophorus' account was again identical, except for the spelling of the names Baian and Berulia. The second son, Kotragos, migrated to the west bank of the Don. This too is repeated by Nicophorus. According to Moravcsik, it is clear from this that when Krobatos founded greater Bulgaria after his rebellion against the Avars, he freed the Kutiguri west of the Don from Avar rule, and incorporated them into his kingdom. The fourth son crossed the Danube and lived under Avar domination in Pannonia, and the fifth settled in the Pentapolis, the environs of Ravenna, under Roman sovereignty. Again Nicophorus is in agreement. According to Moravcsik, a chronological error was here revealed in the common source; the people of the fourth and fifth sons of Krobatos represented race-splinters of the Kutiguri, whose tribal alliances split in the sixth century, who were ancestors of the Bulgars in Avar Pannonia and Roman Italy. Asparuch (the Bulgarian Isperich) crossed the Dniester and the Dnieper to the Lower Danube, and settled the easily defensible Danube estuary around Oglon. Nicophorus' account again corresponded to that of Theophanes. Moravcsik has demonstrated that Kotragos was not an
historical figure as the common source of Theophanes and Nicephorus described him, but the lord of the Kutiguri, whose son Kobrat or Krobat founded Great Bulgaria and included within it the Kutiguri from west of the Don.

George the Monk excerpted only a brief statement of the invasion of Thrace by the Bulgars from lake Maitis on the northern shores of the Euxine.

In 679 (AM 6171), Constantine IV, secure after his victory over the Arabs, and in the realisation of the threat posed by the Bulgar incursions across the Danube frontier, transported cavalry to the Danube region from Thrace, and assembled a large fleet under his own command, which crossed the Euxine and anchored off the Danube estuary. The Byzantine army was unable to take advantage of its superior strength owing to the marshy nature of the ground, while the Bulgars refused to give battle and withdrew behind their fortifications. When Constantine was forced to leave his army to continue the siege, while he himself retired to Mesembria with gout, the dispirited Byzantine force retreated, and when crossing the Danube was attacked by the Bulgars and suffered heavy losses. The Bulgars then pursued the defeated Byzantine army and broke into the district of Varna.

Nicephorus' account of Constantine IV's Bulgar expedition, taken from the common source was less detailed but substantially corresponded in style and factual content, to that of Theophanes. George the Monk's account, abbreviated from that of Theophanes, was briefer and less detailed than
either of the others\textsuperscript{37}.

In 680 (AM 6171), as a direct consequence of the Byzantine defeat and the Bulgar penetration of the Empire, the seven Slav tribes who lived between the Danube and the Balkan mountains were forced to become tributaries of the Bulgars\textsuperscript{38}, while the Severi were settled by the Bulgars to guard the mountain passes against the Byzantines and the eastern flank against the Avars\textsuperscript{39}. The establishment of the Bulgar domination in the former province of Moesia, described by Nicephorus from the common source in an account closely corresponding to Theophanes\textsuperscript{90}, was, not, according to Ostrogorsky, completed in the single year 679/680, as implied by Theophanes, but probably continued into the summer of 681\textsuperscript{91}. Thus the Slavs of the Balkan peninsula, who in 678 (AM 6169) had, together with the Avar khan, acknowledged imperial suzerainty after Constantine IV's repulse of the Arab assault upon Constantinople\textsuperscript{92} (an event described by Nicephorus on corresponding terms to Theophanes\textsuperscript{93}), became incorporated into the Bulgar kingdom.

In 680 (AM 6171), Constantine IV was forced to make a treaty with the Bulgars, and to pay an annual tribute to them; the first time an independent kingdom had been recognised as established upon imperial territory. Nicephorus took from the common source only the fact of the peace treaty\textsuperscript{94}; but Theophanes reproduced the chronicler's reflection of the reactions of the Byzantine people; that although Constantine himself considered that the peace was of the providence of God, it was a great disgrace for the Empire, and a source of wonder to all men, that the emperor, who had so recently made all peoples of East and West and North
and South his tributaries, should be conquered by such a loathsome and upstart race.  

Theophanes' narrative of natural phenomena that occurred in the reign of Constantine IV came from the eastern World Chronicle source, which can be traced in Michael the Syrian and the Chronicon ad 846 pertinens. George the Monk did not reproduce these notices from Theophanes.

In 669-670 (AM 6162), there was an extremely harsh winter, so that many men and beasts perished from the cold. Michael the Syrian recorded the harsh winter which, in Syria and Mesopotamia, withered the vines.

In March 673 (AM 6164), a rainbow appeared in the sky, so that all men feared that the end of the world was at hand. According to Michael the Syrian an eclipse of the sun occurred in December 672; but in 678, a rainbow appeared in the sky at night, contrary to all the laws of nature, which seemed to signify the end of the world.

In 673 (AM 6164), there was a great plague in Egypt.

In 676 (AM 6167), a sign appeared in the sky on a Saturday. Theophanes did not specify the nature of the sign, but Michael the Syrian described it as a terrible comet that remained in the sky for sixty days.

In 677 (AM 6168), there was a great plague of locusts in Syria and Mesopotamia. Michael the Syrian recorded the plague of locusts in
Syria, in the year after a plague of rats in Syria and Phoenicia had destroyed the crops and caused great famine.\(^{105}\)

In 679 (AM 6170), there was a great earthquake in Mesopotamia, which destroyed the ambo and cupola of the church at Edessa.\(^{106}\) According to the more detailed notice of Michael the Syrian, on Easter Day 679, there was a violent earthquake, in which Batna of Saroug crumbled, and the church of Edessa was destroyed, to be rebuilt by Moawiah, who saw it as a symbol of the Caliphate, which he himself had restored after the civil war with Ali.\(^{107}\) According to the monk of Karthamin, on Easter Day 679, there was a violent earthquake in which Batna of Saroug and the old church of Edessa were destroyed, and many people died.\(^{108}\) According to Denis of Tell-Mahre, on the third Sunday in April 679, there was a great earthquake which destroyed Batna-Saroug and the Church of Edessa, and in which a large number died.\(^{109}\) This is one of the parallel passages cited by Brooks, whose study had already been discussed in detail, to prove his contention that the Chronographia, the Chronicle of Michael, and the Chronicon of the monk of Karthamin drew on a common source.\(^{110}\)

In 686 (AM 6176) there was a great famine and plague in Syria.\(^{111}\)

It has been shown, therefore, that Theophanes had a Byzantine Chronicle source for the reign of Constantine IV, and that this Chronicle was a common source for Nicephorus also. It will be shown that this is also true for the reign of Justinian II. In attempting to identify this source, it is necessary to bear in mind the fact that it has long been
known that there were only two major sources in Byzantine Chronography for the eighth century; that of Leo Grammaticus, and the chroniclers who shared a common source with him, and that Chronicle which formed a common source for Theophanes and Nicephorus.

The common source of Theophanes and Nicephorus for the reigns of Constantine IV and Justinian II (668-711) can most probably be identified with the Chronicon Syntomon of the patrician Trajan, which extended to 713. From this Chronicle, Theophanes drew the narrative of the relations of Constantine IV with his brothers, and the revolt of the Anatolic theme, of the seven year Arab assault upon Constantinople, of the origin of the Bulgar people, and the establishment of the Bulgar kingdom in the Balkans, and of the sixth ecumenical council of Constantinople. Nicephorus reproduced the notices of these events, with greater or lesser detail, from the common source.

The identification of the Byzantine common source Chronicle of Theophanes and Nicephorus with that of the patrician Trajan presents two principal problems. The first is the question of transmission; Theophanes and Nicephorus also shared a common source for the history of the eighth century; and the assumption that Theophanes and Nicephorus separately used two independent and consecutive common sources, even granted the poor state of Byzantine chronography in the second part of the seventh and in the eighth centuries, would appear highly coincidental. The second problem, related to the first, is posed by the narrative of the Bulgar campaigns of Constantine IV and Justinian II, and those of Constantine V Copronymus (741-775); Basievlev put forward the hypothesis, which was
substantiated after examination of the relevant portions of the
Chronographia and the Breviarium, that Theophanes’ account of the Bulgar
campaigns of 763 (AM 6254)\(^{113}\) and 773 (AM 6265)\(^{114}\), and Nicephorus’
account of that of 763\(^ {115}\), displayed the style and language of the unknown
common source for the Bulgar history of the seventh century\(^{116}\). It would
seem probable, therefore, although it cannot be established with certainty,
that the author of the unknown common source of Theophanes and Nicephorus
for the reigns of Leo III the Isaurian and Constantine V Copronymus
(717-775) incorporated into his work or consciously continued the
Chronicon Syntomon of Trajan; the theory that the two Chronicles were
preserved in proximity in the same manuscript codex would not account for
the resemblance of language and style noted by Besevliev, which can only
be explained by the transcription of the earlier work (that of Trajan) by
the author of the later eighth century common source Chronicle.

It has long been known that for the reigns of Leo III the Isaurian and
Constantine V Copronymus Theophanes and Nicephorus shared a common
source, and attempts have been made to characterise it. Alexander first
rejected Uspenskii’s hypothesis that this common source was an
iconoclastic Chronicle, written under Constantine V Copronymus, the
iconoclastic bias of which Theophanes and Nicephorus attempted to correct;
and then proved, after comparison of the narrative of the Chronographia
and the Breviarium and the Antirrhetici III, concerning the plague of
747, that in all probability this common source was an iconophile Chronicle
written after the death of Constantine in 775 by an iconophile monk\(^ {117}\).

It is also necessary to consider the relationship of the Scriptor Incertus
to Theophanes. Written in the first half of the ninth century, it survives in two fragments, one narrating the disastrous Bulgar campaign of Nicephorus I in 811, and the other concerned with Leo V the Armenian. The date of the commencement of the Scriptor Incertus is unknown; it is not certain whether it was in fact a Chronicle or a contemporary history, and although the existence of a Chronicle, extending from the mid-sixth century to the second decade of the ninth century, which served as a source for other chroniclers, has long been postulated by historians. Grégoire judged the Scriptor Incertus to be the best source for the ninth century, and possibly the best of the Byzantine Chronicles; written soon after the death of Leo V the Armenian in 820, it was the continuation of another work of the style and type of Malalas, which extended to the second decade of the ninth century. The Scriptor Incertus shared a common source with Theophanes for the Bulgar expedition of Nicephorus I, and, according to Grégoire, gave a superior narrative thereof. Moravcsik commented that the Scriptor Incertus was clearly hostile to the religious policy of the iconoclast Leo V the Armenian.

From such limited information, no definite conclusion can be attained. It is possible that the common source of Theophanes and the Scriptor Incertus for Nicephorus I was a later portion or a continuation of the chronicle which served as a common source for Theophanes and Nicephorus for the reigns of Leo III the Isaurian and Constantine V Copronymus; the existence of this source obviously cannot be traced beyond 769, the date of the termination of the Brevarium. Alternatively, the common source of Theophanes and the Scriptor Incertus could have commenced in 775 with the reign of Leo IV the Khazar. But the existence of a Chronicle,
extending unbroken from the mid-sixth century to the second decade of the
ninth century, is definitely questionable; while our meagre knowledge
concerning the Scriptor Incertus is sufficient to throw light upon the
nature of the unknown common source of Theophanes and Nicephorus.

The eastern World Chronicle source, reproduced by both Theophanes and
Michael the Syrian, provided, with its characteristic brevity, Theophanes' source for the notices of the internal history of the Caliphate, and its external expansion at the expense of the Empire, as well as those of the natural phenomena which occurred in the reign of Constantine IV.

It is clear that, despite the brevity of his account, and despite the opinion of Brooks, that for the history of the seventh century George the Monk's was an independent Chronicle which was based also upon the western chronicle source of Theophanes, that George the Monk excerpted his historical narrative of the reign of Constantine IV from the Chronographia of Theophanes, with the exception of that of the council of Constantinople.
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Chapter Six:

The Sources of Theophanes for the reign of Justinian II, 685-711.
Theophanes' chief source, and Nicephorus' only source, for the reign of Justinian II Rhinotmetus, and the intervening reigns of Leontius and Apsimarus-Tiberius II (695-705) was the unknown Byzantine Chronicle source which has been identified with the Chronicon Syntomon of the patrician Trajan. The Chronicon Syntomon, which treated the reign of Justinian III in greater detail than that of Constantine IV, provided the source for Theophanes' narrative of events within Constantinople itself, and was characterised by a wide-ranging interest in events of which Trajan was a contemporary, and possibly an eye-witness. It was also characterised by marked hostility towards Justinian II, which produced distortion in its narrative of the atrocities of Justinian II, and exaggeration in the numbers of those who were the victims of his vengeance. This bias was inevitably reflected in the work of both Theophanes and Nicephorus; but Nicephorus, whose Breviarium was on the whole characterised by greater objectivity than the Chronographia, had sufficient critical sense to reject some of the more improbable brutalities attributed to Justinian II. Nicephorus' account of the reign, drawn from the common source, was as usual less detailed than that of Theophanes; while George the Monk excerpted his account of the reign of Justinian II from that of Theophanes.

In September 685 (AM 6177), Constantine IV died of dysentry after a reign of seventeen years, and his son Justinian came to the imperial throne at sixteen years of age. Nicephorus drew from the common source the accession of Justinian II at sixteen, but George the Monk contented himself with the brief statement that after Constantine IV, his son Justinian reigned for ten years.
After narrating Justinian II's military expeditions against the Slavs and Bulgars (which will be discussed below), the Byzantine Chronicle, common source of Theophanes and Nicephorus, returned to events within Constantinople.

In 694 (AM 6186), Justinian II built the triclinium named after him, and the Lausicus in the imperial palace. Neither Nicephorus nor George the Monk mentioned Justinian II's buildings in the Great Palace.

Theophanes also inserted in the notice of 694 (AM 6186), Justinian II's appointment of two especially ruthless and brutal fiscal administrators, although the original notice in the Byzantine common source Chronicle was probably undated, and the appointment was possibly made before this year. Stephen the Persian, sacellarius, magister and chief eunuch, was noted for his bloodthirstiness and cruelty; after his ill-treatment of the workmen, presumably engaged upon the building operations at the Great Palace, in Justinian's absence from Constantinople, he did not spare even Anastasia, mother of the emperor. Theodotus, originally a hermit on the Bosphorus, was appointed logothete tou genikou, and was merciless in his extortion, from both the aristocracy and the ordinary citizens. The excesses of Stephen and Theodotus increased the people's hatred for Justinian.

Nicephorus' account, drawn from the common source, corresponded closely to that of Theophanes; but George the Monk made no mention of this.

Also in 694 (AM 6186), Justinian determined to demolish a church dedicated to the Virgin near the imperial palace, in order to erect in its place a
fountain for the Blues. The emperor compelled the unwilling patriarch Callinicus to offer prayers at the occasion of the demolition of the church, which was later rebuilt and consecrated by Justinian II himself at the Petrion.

George the Monk reproduced this notice from Theophanes; but Nicaeanus omitted it from the common source.

In 695 (AM 6187), Justinian commanded the patrician and general Stephen Rusius to slaughter during the night all the people of Constantinople, beginning with the patriarch Callinicus. This order was the signal for revolt. The patrician Leontius, formerly strategos of the Anatolikon theme, who had been appointed strategos of the newly created theme of Hellas after three years' imprisonment, on condition of his immediate departure from Constantinople, was urged by his friends to depose Justinian and take possession of the imperial throne. Leontius seized the prætorium through guile, and released and armed the prisoners, whom he sent to summon the people of the city to Hagia Sophia, where Callinicus was persuaded to join him. The next day, the mob seized Justinian, and brought him bound to the Hippodrome, where his nose was cut off and his tongue cut out, before he was banished to Cherson, in the Crimea. Theodotus and Stephen were dragged through the streets of the city, then burned in the forum of the Bull. Thus Leontius was proclaimed emperor.

Nicephorus' account of the revolt of Leontius, drawn from the Byzantine common source, corresponded to that of Theophanes, but omitted Justinian's projected slaughter of the people of the capital, and added that Leontius
spared Justinian II’s life on account of the latter’s kindness to his own father.\(^{12}\)

The brief statement of George the Monk, that the patrician Leontius revolted and was proclaimed emperor by the Blues, and that he mutilated and banished Justinian into Cherson\(^{13}\), presented a problem. Maricq has discussed this passage, and used it to prove that Justinian, like Heraclius, supported the Greens and was an opponent of the Blues, and also that the demes were an important factor in Byzantine politics beyond the reign of Heraclius to the start of the ninth century;\(^{14}\) but unfortunately he did not identify the source of George the Monk’s assertion. Nowhere in the Byzantine Chronicle source, as preserved by Theophanes and Nicephorus, was it said that Leontius was raised to the imperial throne by the Blues. Nor was there any direct evidence in the narrative of Theophanes from which this inference could be drawn; and from the character of George the Monk’s concise account of the reign of Justinian II, it was apparently excerpted from the Chronographia; while from the character of George the Monk’s narrative of the seventh century as a whole, its author was not notably distinguished by independence of thought. Michael the Syrian alone said that Justinian was the enemy of the aristocracy, against whom he pursued a policy of extermination, and who were therefore compelled to unite and dethrone him;\(^{15}\) but it is certain that there was no common source between Michael the Syrian and George the Monk.

Theophanes’ account of the short reign of Leontius came from the Byzantine Chronicle source. In 698 (AM 6190), the Byzantine fleet under the
patrician John, driven from Carthage by the Arab conquest of Byzantine North Africa, mutinied at Crete and proclaimed emperor the Gotho-Greek Apsimar, drungarius of the Cibyraeot or maritime theme, who adopted the name of Tiberius II. Apsimar's fleet sailed to Constantinople and anchored off Sycae, while the city, where bubonic plague had been raging after Leontius' clearance of the Neorion harbour, remained loyal to Leontius, until the garrison of the wall of Blachernae admitted Apsimar and his supporters through treachery. Leontius was mutilated (his nose was cut off) and confined in the monastery of Deimatos, his subordinates imprisoned or exiled, and Apsimar was proclaimed emperor.

Nicephorus' account of the revolt of Apsimar against Leontius, drawn from the common source, was less detailed, but otherwise corresponded closely to that of Theophanes. George the Monk, whose narrative was extremely brief at this point, abbreviated his account from that of Theophanes.

The Byzantine Chronicle, common source of Theophanes and Nicephorus, provided little information on events in Constantinople during the reign of Apsimarus, 698-705. In 699 (AM 6190), Apsimar appointed his brother Heraclius as general in Cappadocia. In 702 (AM 6194), Apsimar banished Philippicus, son of the patrician Nicephorus, to the island of Colphallonia in the Adriatic, because he had boasted that in a dream he had seen his head overshadowed by an imperial eagle. This was Philippicus Bardanes, who was to overthrow Justinian II in 711.

Neither of these incidents was mentioned by Nicephorus or George the Monk.
In 705, Justinian II Rhinotmetus returned to Constantinople and regained the imperial throne. The Byzantine common source Chronicle of Theophanes and Nicephorus provided a detailed account of Justinian in exile. In 704 (AM 6196), the people of Cherson, alarmed at Justinian's proclaimed intention to rule again, and fearing reprisals from the imperial government, determined either to hand him over to Apsimar, or to kill him. Warned of this, Justinian fled to Daras, where the khan of the Khazars received him with great honour, and bestowed upon him in marriage his sister, who became a Christian and took the name of Theodora.

Justinian then settled in Phanagoria, but the khan, acceding to the request of Apsimar, arranged his murder; Theodora, however, discovered the conspiracy, and Justinian killed his would-be assassins, before sending Theodora back to Khazaria, and himself taking flight to Tomis. From there, Justinian sailed to Symbolum, where he took on board his supporters from the town of Cherson, and sailed first to Necropela, and then across the estuaries of the Dnieper and Dniester, and finally, after surviving a great storm, arrived at the mouth of the Danube. Here he negotiated an alliance with Tervel, lord of the Bulgars, who, in return for tribute and the hand of the emperor's daughter in marriage, accompanied Justinian with an army of Slavs and Bulgars to Constantinople. In autumn 705 (AM 6197), Justinian and Tervel encamped between the Charengate and Blachernae, but for three days the people of Constantinople scornfully rejected his claim to the throne. On the third night, Justinian crawled through an aqueduct into the city, aroused some supporters, and took possession of the palace of Blachernae in a surprise attack.
closely corresponded to that of Theophanes, although as usual it was slightly less detailed; the names of Justinian's assassins at Phanaguria, and of his supporters at Symbolum, were omitted, as well as the account of the violent storm encountered in the crossing of the Euxine.

George the Monk provided only an outline narrative of Justinian's flight from Cherson, his alliance with the Bulgars, and his return to Constantinople, reproduced from that of Theophanes.

Once he had regained his throne, in 705 (AM 6189), Justinian rewarded Tervel with gifts before he left Constantinople. Apsimarus, who had taken flight to Apollonia, was captured and brought back to Constantinople, where he and Leontius were first paraded through the city in chains, then after the chariot race thrown down in the hippodrome before Justinian, who tramped them underfoot before ordering them to be beheaded in the kynegion. Heraclius, the brother of Apsimarus, and his commanders were hanged from the city walls. The patriarch Callinicus was blinded and banished to Rome, because he had crowned Leontius; and in his place Justinian appointed Cyrus, a monk from the island of Amastris, who had prophesied his return to the imperial throne. Justinian then inaugurated a systematic reign of terror to revenge himself upon his former opponents, and indiscriminately against the people of Constantinople. At the same time, Justinian dispatched a fleet to Khazaria, under the cubicularius Theophylact, to bring his wife Theodora and his son Tiberius, born during his absence, to Constantinople. The fleet encountered a great storm, in which many ships were sunk and many lives lost. On his arrival at Constantinople, Justinian crowned his son...
Tiberius co-emperor.

Nicephorus' narrative of Justinian's restoration to the throne and revenge upon the people of the capital, drawn from the common source, corresponded closely with that of Theophanes, although he gave a fuller description of the gifts and public homage bestowed in Constantinople upon Tervel as caesar (in spite of this, Bessevliev commented that Theophanes was nearer to the common source concerning the part of the Bulgar's in the restoration of Justinian II, and Nicephorus less faithful to it, because of the brevity and summary nature of the latter's account), but a less detailed description of Theodora's journey from Khazaria to Constantinople, with no mention of the ships engulfed in the storm.

George the Monk gave only a brief account of Justinian's vengeance upon Apsimarus, Callimicus, and the people of the capital.

The Byzantine common source Chronicle also provided the account of Justinian's vengeance upon the city of Cherson, which was to cost him his throne and his life. In 710 (AM 6203), Justinian sent, as a punitive expedition against Cherson, in revenge for the conspiracy of its people against him during his exile, a fleet of one hundred thousand men under the patricians Maurus and Stephen Asmiktos, with Elias the spatharius, who was to be governor of the city, to slaughter all the inhabitants of Cherson. When they captured Cherson, only the youths were spared as slaves for the soldiers; Toudounus, the Khazar representative, Zoilus, the first citizen, and forty others of the leading citizens were sent to the emperor; another seven prominent men were burned to death, and twenty more were
drowned in the harbour. But Justinian, enraged that the slaughter had
not been complete, commanded that the youths also be sent to him, but the
fleet carrying them, which left Cherson in October, was sunk in a great
storm, and seventy three thousand lives were lost. Justinian, not
unduly perturbed, prepared a second fleet against Cherson; while the
people of that city, led by Elias the governor, and Philippicus Bardanes,
who had been driven from Caphallenia, made alliance with the khan of the
Khazars. Justinian sent out a force of three hundred men, under the
patrician and chief logothete George Syrus, the eparch John, and
Christopher the tourmarch of Thrace, with Toudounus and Zoilus of Cherson,
to win over the people of Cherson, and to persuade the khan to cease his
support of the rebels, and surrender Elias and Bardanes. However, the
people of Cherson killed George and John, and handed over their troops to
the Khazars, who put them to death, as well as Zoilus, while they were taking
them to the khan; Toudounus died on the way. The people of Cherson and the
Crimea then revolted against Justinian, and proclaimed Bardanes emperor.

When news of the revolt reached Constantinople, Justinian revenged himself
upon Elias by killing his children and forcing his wife to marry her
Indian cook, and sent out a third fleet against Cherson under the
patrician Maurus Bessus to raze to the ground the whole city and put
all its inhabitants to the sword. At Cherson, Maurus had succeeded
in demolishing part of the city wall, when the Khazars arrived to
raise the siege. The disorganised Byzantine expedition, not daring to
return to Constantinople, united with the people of Cherson and the
Khazars, and acclaimed Philippicus Bardanes. Justinian, apprehensive at the
expedition's delay, assembled the soldiers of the Thracian and Opsikion
themes under Barisbakuris, comes of the Opsikion, and came to Sinope.
In the interval, Philippicus Bardanes had been received by the people of Constantinople, so that Justinian fled to Damatrys, where his troops under the influence of Elias, who had pursued him to that place, abandoned him. Justinian was beheaded by Elias, and his head sent to Rome and Ravenna and publicly exposed; Tiberios, his son and co-emperor, was murdered in Constantinople by Maurus Bessus and John Struthus, despite the pleas of the empress Anastasia for her grandson's life; and Barisbakurius was also put to death.

Nicephorus' account of Justinian's vengeance which provoked the revolt of Cherson, and the final deposition of Justinian II, drawn from the common source, closely corresponded to that of Theophanes, apart from minor stylistic variations and differences in the spelling of proper names: Tondounos, archon of Cherson, and Barasbakurius, comes of Opsikion. Nicephorus, however, reproduced one item of information which Theophanes omitted; that in 711, after his third punitive expedition had made common with the people of Cherson and the Khazars, and had acclaimed Philip Bardanes, Justinian again made alliance with Tervel, and received a force of three thousand Bulgars.

George the Monk excerpted from Theophanes a concise account of Justinian's punitive expedition against Cherson, which cost the emperor both his throne and his life.

Theophanes' narrative of the history of the Bulgars and Slavs in the reign of Justinian II, was drawn from Byzantine common source Chronicle,
which was also reproduced by Nicephorus. George the Monk drew his
narrative from that of Theophanes.

In 688 (AM 6180), Justinian led an expedition against the Slavs and
Bulgars, breaking the peace treaties made by his father with the Bulgars,
in which he penetrated into the Slav-occupied Balkans as far as
Thessalonica. The Slavs who either voluntarily joined the emperor or were
captured by him were settled as stratiotai in the Opsikion theme in the
region of Abydus.

Nicephorus' account of this campaign in Scalavinia, taken from the common
source, closely corresponded to that of Theophanes.

George the Monk merely said that Justinian made war on the Slavs of the
West.

In 692 (AM 6184), Justinian, having provoked a conflict with the Arabs
the previous year (AM 6183) by resettling the population of Cyprus on the
peninsula of Cyzicus, to rectify the heavy loss of man-power resulting
from the seven year Arab assault upon Constantinople, incorporated a
military levy of thirty thousand of these colonised Slavs into the
Byzantine army which fought the Arabs at Sebastopolis in Armenia. Twenty
thousand of the Slavs deserted to the Arabs in battle, so that the
Byzantine army was severely defeated. In reprisal, Justinian ordered the
slaughter of all the Slavs settled in Bithynia, at Leucata on the
Nicomedian bay. In 694 (AM 6186), these Slavs, who had been settled by
the Arabs in Syria, ravaged imperial territory while serving with the
Arab forces. Ostrogorsky, however, declared that it is impossible to credit Theophanes' statement of Justinian's massacre of all the Slavs of Bithynia as vengeance.

Nicephorus gave only a brief and undated account, drawn from the common source Chronicon, of the Slav desertion in battle at Sebastopolis, and their subsequent alliance with the Arabs.

George the Monk's narrative, reproduced from Theophanes, of the battle at Sebastopolis, and of Justinian's reprisal on the Slav tribes, was more detailed than that of Nicephorus, and concluded with the reflection that Justinian's defeat was a divine retribution for his impious breaking of the treaty with the Arabs.

The role of the Bulgars in the restoration of Justinian II to the imperial throne in 705 (AM 6196, 6197) has already been discussed.

In 708 (AM 6200), Justinian broke the peace with Tervel, transported the cavalry to Thrace, and launched a campaign against the Bulgars. Having reached Anchialus, he stationed the fleet in the harbour, while the army imprudently scattered upon the plains to forage. Seeing this the Bulgars made a surprise attack which completed routed the disordered Byzantine force. Justinian with the remainder of his troops, took refuge in fortified Anchialus, from which he escaped with difficulty after three days' siege.

Ostrogorsky argued, but insufficiently substantiated, that this notice of Theophanes was not reliable, especially in view of the fact that Tervel aided Justinian II in 711, as he had done in 705. The
information that Tervel aided Justinian in 711 came from Nicephorus' Breviarium, and hence from the Byzantine common source Chronicle; but Nicephorus, who also reproduced a slightly briefer but closely corresponding account of Justinian's disastrous Bulgar campaign of 708\(^6\), stated that Justinian in 711 again requested alliance with Tervel, before Tervel in reply dispatched three thousand troops to his aid\(^6\). Nicephorus, who, unlike Theophanes, reproduced both notices, did not apparently consider them mutually contradictory; and, in the light of previous Byzantine-Bulgar relations, it is not inconceivable that Tervel, who despite the campaign of 692 had been induced to support Justinian in 705, should have done so again in 711, if sufficient incentive was offered.

George the Monk made no mention of Justinian's Bulgar campaign of 708.

Theophanes' narrative of Arab relations with the Empire in the reign of Justinian II was drawn both from the Byzantine and Eastern World Chronicle sources; while that of the internal history of the Caliphate came solely from the eastern World Chronicle. The sources of individual portions of the narrative can be distinguished by their occurrence either in Nicephorus, from the Byzantine common source Chronicle, or in Michael the Syrian, from the eastern World Chronicle. For some incidents, independent accounts are found in Theophanes and Nicephorus on the one hand, and in Michael the Syrian on the other. George the Monk abbreviated his narrative from that of Theophanes. The information provided by the Byzantine Chronicle, which was common source for Theophanes and Nicephorus, will be considered first.
The Byzantine Chronicle provided Theophanes' source for Justinian's defeat at Sebastopolis in Armenia in 692 (AM 6184). Justinian, disregarding solemn treaties, transported a cavalry force and a Slav military levy to Armenia; but the Arabs, unwilling to break the peace, marched under Mahomed, brother of Abdelmalik, to Sebastopolis, where they asked Justinian to abide by the treaties, as they themselves were willing to do. Justinian rejected their requests, and attacked. The battle at first went against the Arabs, but Mahomed won over Justinian's Slav troops by bribery, so that they deserted and the emperor was severely defeated. Byzantine Armenia again came under Arab rule, and Arabs and Slavs together ravaged imperial territory.

Nicephorus' account, drawn from the common source, was as usual less detailed than that of Theophanes; and Nicephorus said that Justinian broke the peace negotiated between the Arabs and his father, because he was unaware of the renewal of this treaty by Abdelmalik and Justinian in 686 (AM 6178), a fact which Theophanes found in his eastern World Chronicle source.

George the Monk's narrative of the campaign was reproduced from that of Theophanes.

The next notice which the Byzantine Chronicle source provided on the Arab advance was that of the conquest of Byzantine North Africa. In 697 (AM 6190), the Arabs invaded the province and captured Carthage, seat of the exarch. Leontius immediately sent out the Byzantine fleet under the patrician John, who drove the Arabs from Carthage and the coastal fortresses, and then, on the instructions of Leontius, wintered at
Carthage. The next year, however, the Arabs returned with a larger force which defeated the Byzantine fleet at Carthage, and compelled John to abandon the province and to withdraw to Crete, where the fleet mutinied and proclaimed Apsimaros emperor in 698.67

Nicephorus' account of the Arab conquest of Byzantine North Africa closely corresponded, apart from minor stylistic variations, with that of Theophanes 68.

George the Monk reproduced from Theophanes only a brief statement of the loss of North Africa, as a prelude to the fall of Leontius 69.

In 709 (AM 6201), the Arabs captured Tyana, one of the most important fortresses on the Cappadocian frontier, and the Byzantine common source Chronicle again provided Theophanes' narrative. In 709 (AM 6201) Maslamas and Abbas besieged Tyana and wintered there. Justinian sent out an army under Theodore Karterukan and Theophylact Salibas to raise the siege, but the Byzantine commanders disagreed between themselves, attacked the Arabs rashly, and were heavily defeated. The inhabitants of Tyana, seeing the Byzantine army in retreat, surrendered to the Arabs, who did not keep their word, but drove the people into the desert or took them into slavery, so that Tyana was deserted 70.

Nicephorus' account of the Arab conquest of Tyana, from the common source, was substantially the same as that of Theophanes; the Arab commanders were named as Maslamas and Solymas, while the names of the Byzantine generals were omitted 71. Nicephorus, however, concluded with an item of
information omitted by Theophanes; that the capture of Tyana encouraged
the Arabs to pillage imperial territory without fear of opposition, and
that a small Arab detachment penetrated as far as Chrysopolis, where they
put the inhabitants to the sword and burned some ships. 

George the Monk did not reproduce Theophanes' notice of the Arab capture
of Tyana in 709.

The bulk of Theophanes' account of the Arab advance against the Empire,
and of the internal history of the Caliphate, was drawn from the eastern
World Chronicle source. This can also be traced in Michael the Syrian,
although Michael's chronology of the last decade of the seventh and the
first decade of the eighth century is confused, perhaps owing to the
combination of divergent sources.

In 686 (AM 6178), Abdelmalik, because of the internal dissensions ravaging
the Caliphate, and the incursions of the Mardaites of Lebanon into Syria,
was forced to make a peace treaty with Justinian; the tribute arranged in
the treaties between Constantine IV and Moawiah and Abdelmalik was
increased to one thousand nomismata, a horse, and a slave, each day; the
taxation revenues from Cyprus, Armenia, and Iberia were to be divided
between Byzantines and Arabs; and the Mardaites, guerrilla forces
supported by Byzantine subsidy, were to be reclaimed from Lebanon, where
they were gradually becoming assimilated to the Arab majority, and
resettled in Armenia. Michael the Syrian also reproduced the terms of
the treaty between Justinian and Abdelmalik on their accession.
In 686 (AM 6178), Abdalmalik sent Said, the brother of Moawiah, into Persia, to quell the insurrection of Moktar, who had revolted in 682 (AM 6174), declaring himself a prophet. Said was defeated and fell in battle against Moktar, so that Abdalmalik was forced to take the field against him in person. In 688 (AM 6180), Abdallah ibn Zobeir, the claimant to the Caliphate at Mecca in 684 (AM 6175), sent his brother Musab against Moktar, who was defeated and forced to flee to Syria, where Musab overtook and killed him. Abdalmalik then defeated and killed Musab, thus securing his dominion over Persia. In 689 (AM 6181) Abdalmalik sent Chagan (Hajjaj ibn Yussuf) into Arabia against Zobeir; Chagan reduced Mecca after a siege in which the holy Mosque and the Kaba were damaged, and killed Zobeir. Chagan was then sent as viceroy to Persia, where disaffection against the Umayyad Caliphate of Damascus was still rife. In 690 (AM 6182), Abdalmalik was recognised as Caliph by the whole Arab world. Michael the Syrian gave only a brief account of Abdalmalik's gradual victory over the rival claimants to the Caliphate, and of the capture of Mecca and the execution of Zobeir by Hadjdjadj.

In 686 (AM 6178), despite the recent peace treaty with Abdalmalik, Justinian II sent an army into Armenia under the strategus Leontius, who defeated the Arabs and levied tribute upon Armenia, Iberia, Lebanon, Balkania and Media. Abdalmalik in reprisal occupied Cercesium and Theopolis in Armenia.

In 687 (AM 6179) Justinian settled twelve thousand Mardaites from Lebanon into Armenia, in accordance with the peace treaty. Vasiliev accepted, but Ostrogorsky rejected, Theophanes' judgement that the
resettlement of the Mardaites was a pointless exposure of the Empire's eastern frontier; but both agreed that the Mardaites were settled as seafarers in the Peloponese, the Ionian islands and Pamphylia, and not in Armenia. Michael the Syrian also recorded the transmigration of the Mardaites from Lebanon into Armenia.

In 691 (AM 6183), in defiance of the treaty with Abdelmalik, Justinian II attempted to transfer the population of Cyprus to Cyzicus, in order to increase the number of seamen in an area whose manpower had been much reduced by the seven year Arab assault upon Constantinople in the reign of Constantine IV; but the attempt was unsuccessful, due to sickness and a great storm encountered during the voyage, which carried off the majority of the Cypriots, while the remainder returned to Cyprus. Ostrogorsky again rejected the testimony of Theophanes, suggesting that the Cypriots returned to Cyprus later. When Abdelmalik protested against the violation of the treaty, Justinian refused to accept the agreed Arab tribute, because it was paid in unfamiliar coinage, thus provoking war.

Michael the Syrian reproduced from the eastern World Chronicle source not only the reasons for the outbreak of hostilities in 691, but also the Byzantine defeat at Sebastopolis in Armenia in 692, owing to the Slav defection during the course of the battle. Theophanes did not use this account, preferring to follow that given independently by the Byzantine Chronicle which he had as common source with Nicephorus; and he therefore omitted the information, reproduced by Michael the Syrian, that after the battle the Slav deserters were settled by the Arabs in Syria around Antioch and Cyrrhus.
In 693 (AM 6185), as the consequence of the imperial defeat of the previous year, Sabbatius, prefect of Byzantine Armenia, was forced to surrender the province to the Arabs; while Sabinus, commander of Khurasan, was defeated by Hajjah\textsuperscript{93}.

In 694 (AM 6186), Mahomed ravaged the Empire, using the Slav deserters of Sebastopolis, and took many prisoners\textsuperscript{94}.

In 691 (AM 6183), Abdelmalik, proposing to build a mosque at Mecca, determined to use in its construction the pillars of Gethsemane, but he was dissuaded from doing so by Sergius son of Mansur, the Christian logothete of the treasury, and friend of Abdelmalik, and the Patrikios Clausus, who persuaded Justinian II to provide alternative materials\textsuperscript{95}. It is possible, since there is no reference in any of the Syriac sources to the building of this mosque at Mecca, that Theophanes is here referring to the Dome of the Rock, which Abdelmalik built in Jerusalem, on the site of the earlier mosque erected by Omar in 643 (AM 6135)\textsuperscript{96}, in the construction of which he used materials derived from existing Christian buildings, and employed native and Byzantine workmen. The request for the assistance of the emperor of Constantinople illustrates the tradition of Byzantine artistic and architectural co-operation with the Caliphate even in time of war, studied by Gibb\textsuperscript{97}.

Michael the Syrian did not mention the building of a mosque by Abdelmalik, but elsewhere spoke of a Chalcedonian Sergius, son of Manour, the secretary of Abdelmalik\textsuperscript{98}. Sarjun (Greek: Sergius) ibn Mansur, financial controller in the Caliphate of Damascus, was the son of Mansur ibn Sarjun, financial
controller in the Byzantine administration of Syria who retained this position under the Arab Caliphate after he had played a leading part in the surrender of Damascus to the Arabs in 635 (AM 6126)⁹⁹, and father of St. John of Damascus, who was for a time also financial controller in the Caliphate and boon companion of the young Caliph Yezid.¹⁰⁰

In 694 (AM 6136), Abdelmalik ordered the slaughter of all the pigs in Syria.¹⁰¹ Michael the Syrian recorded this edict, but without dating it.¹⁰² It was also reproduced in the Chronicon ad 846 pertinens, but under the year 704.¹⁰³

These notices were cited by Brooks, in order to establish and to identify a common source underlying the Chronographia, the Chronicle, and the Chronicon ad 846 pertinens; as were the following notices from Michael the Syrian and the Chronicon, which were not reproduced by Theophanes.

In 695, the Romans entered the plain of Antioch, but were defeated and dispersed by an Arab army; the Chronicon added the name of the Arab commander as Dinar, son of Dinar.¹⁰⁵

In 697, according to Michael the Syrian, the Arabs minted dinars, zuze, and obols, which bore no images, but only inscriptions.¹⁰⁷ The Chronicon recorded that, in 697, the Arabs minted zuze and denarii which bore not the cross, but inscriptions.¹⁰⁸ Brooks' theory, by its very nature, cannot be conclusively substantiated, but it has not yet been refuted. Brooks did, however, overlook the notice of Elias of Nisibis which, citing Jesudenah of Basra, recorded that in 695 Abdelmalik son of Marwan minted drachmae.
and denarii as Arab coinage. Elias of Nisibis' dating of 695 was correct; for Hitti established that Abdemalik struck at Damascus in 695 the first gold dinars and silver dirhams which were purely Arabic (i.e. not imitations of Byzantine or Persian coinage), and that Hajjaj minted silver coins at Kufah in Iraq the following year.

In 695 (AM 6187), the year in which Michael the Syrian and the Chronicon noted the defeat of the Romans on the plain of Antioch, according to Theophanes, Mahomed invaded fourth Armenia with an Arab army, and took many prisoners before he withdrew.

In 697 (AM 6189), Alid invaded imperial territory and withdrew after he had taken many prisoners.

In the same year (AM 6189), Sergius of Barucium, patrician of Lazica, revolted against Leontius, and handed over the region to the Arabs.

In 699 (AM 6191), Abdemahan, the Iranian governor of Sijistan, revolted in Persia against Hajjaj (Greek: Chagan), the despotic viceroy of Persia and Iraq, whom he drove from the country. In the next year (AM 6192), however, Abdemalik sent his brother Mahomed to Hajjaj's aid; the revolt in Persia was suppressed, Hajjaj restored, and Abdemahan defeated and killed in battle. Michael the Syrian, who narrated the appointment of Hajjaj as governor of Iraq and Persia in 698, and his despotic rule, placed the revolt of Abdemahan against Abdemalik in 704, but with no mention of its suppression. From the statement of Hitti that Abdemahan was sent by Hajjaj in 700 against a Turkish tributary king in
Afghanistan, Michael the Syrian's dating of Abderrahman's revolt to 704 rather than 699 was probably correct.

In 700 (AM 6192) a Byzantine army invaded Syria and penetrated as far as Samosata, pillaging and looting the countryside, and killed two hundred thousand Arabs before they withdrew. Michael the Syrian also narrated the Roman raid upon the region of Samosata, but with the more convincing figure of five thousand Arab dead.

In 701 (AM 6193) Abdallah invaded imperial territory, and vainly besieged Tarentum, before withdrawing to Mopsuestia in Cilicia, where he left an Arab garrison. Michael the Syrian placed the Arab capture of Mopsuestia in 704, under Maslamas, and added that in 706 the Arabs rebuilt and fortified the town, and established a permanent garrison there on the Byzantine frontier.

In 702 (AM 6194), Baanes surrendered fourth Armenia to the Arabs.

In 703 (AM 6195), the Armenians revolted against Arab rule, killed all the Arabs in Armenia, and appealed to Apsimarus for support. Mahomed, brother of Abdimalik, entered Armenia with a large Arab army and suppressed the revolt, by the simple expedient of rounding up all the Armenian nobles and burning them alive. Michael the Syrian narrated, without mention of the accompanying revolt, that Mahomed, son of Marwan, resolved to emulate Hajjaj's despotic government in his province, and to this end assembled all the Armenian chiefs in a church and burned them to death; but that, despite these measures, the Christian chiefs still continued to
direct the government in town and country.

At this time (AM 6195) Azhar invaded Cilicia with an Arab force of ten thousand, but was encountered by Heraclius, brother of Apsimar and commander in Cappadocia, and defeated; the majority of the Arabs were killed in battle, and the rest sent by Heraclius as prisoners to Apsimar in Constantinople.

In 704 (AM 6196), Azid invaded Cilicia and besieged the fortress of Sisio, where he was encountered and defeated by Heraclius, in a battle in which twelve thousand Arabs were killed.

In 705 (AM 6197), Abd el Malik died, and was succeeded by his son Walid. According to Michael the Syrian, Abd el Malik either died, or was killed, at Mopsuestia.

In 707 (AM 6199), Walid seized from his Christian subjects the basilica of St. John at Damascus, and upon its site built the Omayyad mosque, into which he incorporated part of the existing church. Michael the Syrian gave an undated account of the destruction of the cathedral of Damascus by Walid, who hated Christians, so that he might build a mosque.

In the same year (AM 6199), Walid ordered that the public registers of the Caliphate at Damascus should no longer be written in Greek, but in Arabic, although he still found it necessary to employ Greek-writing notaries in their compilation. Michael the Syrian reproduced the notice of Walid's change in the language of the state registers of the
Caliphate, but under the year 711\textsuperscript{134}.

The eastern World Chronicle provided the source for Michael the Syrian's account of the Arab capture of Tyana\textsuperscript{135}; but Theophanes in his notice for 709 (AM 6201) took his narrative, which has already been discussed, from the Byzantine Chronicle, which he had as common source with Nicephorus\textsuperscript{136}.

In 710 (AM 6206), Abbas pillaged imperial territory and withdrew, with many prisoners, to the region of Heliopolis in Syria, where he began the building of Garis\textsuperscript{137}.

In 711 (AM 6203), Othman invaded Cilicia, and Camachum and other towns surrendered to him\textsuperscript{138}. The towns of Cilicia said by Michael the Syrian, as having been taken for the Arabs by Maslama in 711\textsuperscript{139}, are difficult to identify with accuracy.

Theophanes' narrative of natural phenomena occurring in the reign of Justinian II, was drawn from the eastern World Chronicle.

In 687 (AM 6179), there was a great famine in Syria, so that many were forced to migrate into imperial territory\textsuperscript{140}.

In October 696 (AM 6186), there was an eclipse of the sun which lasted for five days\textsuperscript{141}. Michael the Syrian recorded an eclipse of the sun in October, 694\textsuperscript{142}. Elias of Nisibis, citing either Khuwarizmensis or Jesudanah of Baara, recorded an eclipse of the sun in October, in his
In 700 (AM 6192), there occurred a great plague, the location of which was unspecified by Theophanes. Denis of Tell-Mahre noted the incidence of a great plague in 705, which was so severe that the living were unable to bury the dead. Michael the Syrian recorded for 705 a plague so devastating that a third of the human race disappeared from the face of the earth.

In conclusion, therefore, it has been shown that Theophanes' chief source for the reign of Justinian II, and the intervening reigns of Leontius and Apsimaros, was the Byzantine Chronicle which he had as common source with Nicephorus, and which has been tentatively identified as the Chronicon Syntomon of the patrician Trajan, which extended to 713. This Byzantine Chronicle provided a narrative not only of events in and around Constantinople, but also of the more important events within the Empire as a whole. From it, Theophanes drew his account of events in Constantinople, and especially the revolts of Leontius against Justinian in 695, and of Apsimaros against Leontius in 698, and Justinian's return to the imperial throne in 705 after his exile in Cherson and Khazaria, and the revolt of Cherson and Philippicus Bardanes in 711. The Byzantine Chronicle also provided the source for Theophanes' account of the relations of the Empire with the Bulgars and Slavs, and a selective account of the relations of the Empire with the Arabs; Justinian's defeat at Sebastopolis in Armenia in 692 after breaking the treaty with Abdelmalik, the Arab conquest of Byzantine North Africa in the reign of Leontius, and the Arab
Niccephorus' account of the reign of Justinian II was drawn entirely from the Byzantine common-source Chronicle, and was in general less detailed than that of Theophanes, with which it otherwise showed close correspondence. Although Niccephorus abbreviated, and occasionally omitted, portions of this Chronicle, its original form can be seen more clearly in the Breviarium than in the Chronographia; for Theophanes fragmented it to insert it into his annalistic framework, and incorporated with it another Chronicle source.

Nothing is known concerning Trajan himself, or the Chronicle of which he was the author, apart from the brief notice in the Lexicon of Suidas that the most Christian and orthodox patrician Trajan lived at the time of Justinian Rhinotmetus and wrote a Concise Chronicle; but study of its reproduction by Theophanes and Niccephorus allows a certain amount of conjecture. Trajan's Chronicon, covering a period of forty five years, provided a more detailed and wider-ranging narrative of the reign of Justinian II than that of Constantine IV, suggesting a greater knowledge of, and interest in, events of which he was a contemporary, if not an eye-witness. However, the fact that Trajan was an eye-witness does not mean that his accounts of the atrocities of Justinian II, and the number of those who were the victims of his vengeance, were not grossly exaggerated. In the reign of Constantine IV, one of the Chronicon Syntomon's most outstanding features was its detailed account of the origin of the Bulgar people, based, according to Moravosik, upon a contemporary seventh century Bulgar source. In the reign of Justinian II, the
emphasis of the narrative shifted, after the deposition of Justinian by Leontius in 689, from events in Constantinople to Justinian's exile at Cherson and in Khazaria; and after Justinian's restoration, the emphasis was again upon the three punitive expeditions which Justinian launched against Cherson, and the revolt in that city which brought Philippicus Bardanes to the throne in 711. The fact that there is little account of events in Constantinople from 695 to 705 might be due simply to the fact that the reigns of Leontius and Apsimaros were uneventful; or alternatively, due to the fact that Trajan himself was not in Constantinople during this decade. But if, as it is possible to suggest, Trajan followed, or was forced to follow, Justinian II into exile at Cherson in 695, then Trajan's clear hostility to Justinian II, and his detailed knowledge of events in Cherson 710-711, would equally make it possible to suggest that Trajan again left Constantinople soon after Justinian's restoration in 705, either voluntarily or involuntarily, for the Crimea, as a result of Justinian's systematic reign of terror and pathological cruelty towards the people of the capital. If Trajan was a companion of Justinian during his exile and restoration with Bulgar aid, this hypothesis would provide an explanation for his Bulgar source for the folk-history of the Bulgars and the origin of the Bulgar state. However, this theory is not susceptible of proof.

The World Chronicle, written in the eastern provinces of the Empire, and reproduced also by Michael the Syrian, with traces in the Chronicon ad 846 pertinens, Denis of Tell-Mahre, and Elias of Nisibis, provided the source for the greater part of Theophanes' narrative of the external expansion and internal history of the Caliphate. It was also the source for
Theophanes' notices of the natural phenomena which occurred in the reign of Justinian II.

George the Monk excerpted his brief narrative of the reign of Justinian II from Theophanes' *Chronographia*. 
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Chapter Seven:

Conclusion: The Sources of Theophanes for the Heraclian Dynasty.
In conclusion, it may be more convenient and illuminating to present the results of this investigation of the sources of Theophanes for the Heralian dynasty in summary tabulated form.

Within each chapter of the Thesis dealing with the historical sources for the reigns of the Heralian emperors, I have stated Theophanes sources for each incident or topic, and endeavoured to justify this decision through a brief synopsis of the account of Theophanes, and then of the relevant Byzantine and non-Byzantine sources with comments, where appropriate, from secondary literature. In the final section of each chapter Theophanes' sources, extant and hypothetical, have as far as possible been identified and characterised.

A written concluding chapter, therefore, would be liable to become merely an unnecessary repetition of previous discussions, and the conclusions derived therefrom. Justification of the results tabulated below can be found in the concluding section of the appropriate chapter.

The tables which follow show the sources from which Theophanes and also Nicephorus and George the Monk, compiled their narratives of the history of the Heraclian Dynasty.
The Sources of Theophanes for the history of the Heraclian Dynasty.

Heraclius
610-641

Constantine III and Heraclonas
March-Sept. 641

Constans II
641-668

Constantine IV
668-685

Justinian II
685-711

Constantinople Chronicle, from
602-641

History of imperial family:
Events in the capital:

Epic poetry of
George Pisidia

Letters of
Heraclius from
Persia

Persian wars

Vita Maximi
of Anastasius

Monotheletism

Contra Mahometem
(of Bartholomew
of Edessa?)

Life and teaching
of Mahomed

Eastern (i.e. Greek Syriac) World Chronicle, anonymous ninth century source

Persian and
Avar advance:

Events in
Constantinople
and the West:

Provincial history of the Empire: External expansion and internal history of the Caliphate; Natural Phenomena: for whole of the seventh century.
The Sources of Nicephorus for the History of the Heraclian Dynasty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heraclius</th>
<th>Constantine III and Heracleonas</th>
<th>Constans II</th>
<th>Constantine IV</th>
<th>Justinian II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>610-641</td>
<td>March-Sept. 641</td>
<td>641-668</td>
<td>668-685</td>
<td>685-711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constantinople Chronicle, from 610-641**
*Independent of Theophanes.*

**Events in the capital:**
Heraclius' personal policy and achievements:
Struggle for the throne, 641

**Byzantine historical sources lacking.**

**Chronicon Syntomon of Trajan 668-711**
Common source with Theophanes

**Events in Constantinople:**
"Highlights" of history of the Empire as a whole:
Establishment of Bulgar realm:
The Sources of George the Monk for the History of the Heraclian Dynasty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heraclius</th>
<th>Constantine III</th>
<th>Constans II</th>
<th>Constantine IV</th>
<th>Justinian II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>610-641</td>
<td>March-Sept. 641</td>
<td>641-668</td>
<td>668-685</td>
<td>685-711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breviarium of Nicephorus

Chronographia of Theophanes, for the history of the whole seventh century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De Haeresibus Liber of John Damascus Teaching of Mahomed</th>
<th>Peter Higoumenos Teaching of Paulicians</th>
<th>Synodicon History and teaching of Paulicians</th>
<th>Council of Constantinople</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Abbreviations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Author/Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Analecta Avarica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Antiochus Strategos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Bartholemew of Edessa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cad8</td>
<td>Chronicon ad 846 pertinens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Chronicon Maroniticum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Chronicon Paschale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7f</td>
<td>Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTM</td>
<td>Denis of Tell-Mahre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Elias of Nisibis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>George the Monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>George of Pisidia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>John of Damascus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JN</td>
<td>John of Nikiou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Michael the Syrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nic</td>
<td>Nicephorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Photius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Suidas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Sebeos of Armenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Synodicon Vetus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Theophanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Theophylact Simocatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMC</td>
<td>Vita Maximi Confessoris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Anastasius
Invitam ac certamen sancti patris nostri ac confessoris Maximi
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Antiochus Strategos
Account of the Sack of Jerusalem in AD 614
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