

Promotor Prof. dr. Peter Van Nuffelen

Decaan Prof. dr. Marc Boone

Rector Prof. dr. Anne De Paepe





Faculteit Letteren & Wijsbegeerte

Andy Hilkens

*The Anonymous Syriac Chronicle up to  
the Year 1234 and its Sources*

Proefschrift voorgelegd tot het behalen van de graad van  
Doctor in de geschiedenis

2014



# Acknowledgements

A great many people have contributed to this volume in one way or another. First and foremost, I owe a great deal of gratitude to my supervisor prof. dr. Peter Van Nuffelen who eagerly followed the progress of my research, reading nearly every sentence in this dissertation, and always being there to offer kind advice and suggestions for improvement, not only on a methodological level, but also as regards the melioration of my English. Similarly, I am thankful to all of my colleagues conversations with whom led me to new insights into my research. Special thanks are in order for Panos Manafis who kindly offered to check my translations from Greek.

Many thanks are also in order for the Ghent Research Fund which not only funded my research project but also graciously provided grants which allowed me to spend three semesters in Oxford in 2012-2013. During my time in Oxford, I was fortunate enough to meet many people who made it an experience I will never forget on an academic as well as on a personal level: Amaia, Anna, Carlos, Chad and Grace, David, Diego, Eva, Fergus, Frank, Harry, Jackie, Jason, John, Jonathon, Jaume, Joshua, Judy, Kelli, Natalia M., Natalia K., Pablo, Priscilla, Rad, Rich, Ryan, Salam, Sonia, Stefan, Sven, Wahid, and many others. I am also thankful to all of my friends in Belgium who have supported me over the past four years, even though they had to put up with my ramblings about obscure authors, texts and languages: Timothy, Ep(p)o, Lesley, Joris, Lize, Pieter, Leen, Marion, Filip, Katrien, Guy and Mie, and so many others.

Lastly, I owe a great debt to my parents, who have always given me the freedom to follow the academic path of my choosing and have provided the means to do this, supporting me all the way. I dedicate this volume to them.



## Preface

The subject of this dissertation is the *Anonymous Chronicle up to the Year 1234* (hereafter Chron. 1234). Chron. 1234 received this label, because the author remains unidentified and because the last event reported in the now lost defective manuscript was the Syrian campaign of Malik al-Kamil, the Ayyubid sultan of Egypt, against his brother Malik al-Ashraf, the Ayyubid emir of Damascus, which took place in AD 1234. Originally, the chronicle covered a longer period of time, but the unique – now lost – manuscript was already incomplete at the time of discovery at the turn of the nineteenth century. The original end point of Chron. 1234 is unknown, but it appears to have been written after the death of Malik al-Ashraf in 1237.

Chron. 1234 is written in (Classical) Syriac, an Eastern Aramaic dialect that was the *lingua franca* in the post-Hellenistic kingdom of Oshroene, which had as its capital the city of Edessa (Greek) or Urhoy (Syriac), nowadays called Urfa or Şanlıurfa, in South-Eastern Turkey. Though part of a Greek-speaking world and located on the frontier with the Persian empire, Edessa managed to preserve its local culture, expressed mainly by the language. Greek may have been the official language in the administration of Osrhoene, but the general population spoke Aramaic and did not know Greek. In the first Christian centuries, Edessa became an important missionary centre and, when Syriac-speaking Christians began to proselytise, Syriac spread out too, ultimately becoming the liturgical and literary language of Christians in India and even in China.

Chron. 1234 acts as a lense through which we can observe the extent of circulation of historical, biblical, apocryphal and exegetical information in the ancient and medieval Near East. Having been written in the thirteenth century AD, Chron. 1234 preserves

material from Jewish, Christian and Islamic sources, written in Hebrew, Greek, Syriac and Arabic between the fourth or third century BC and the twelfth century AD.

Bringing together all known research on this text, uncovering new evidence and correcting previous assumptions, this study analyses the historiographical and literary-historical value of Chron. 1234. In twenty-five chapters, this dissertation unravels centuries worth of intercultural exchanges, following the paths of transmission of information from Chron. 1234 back to the original sources, uncovering the existence of many now lost intermediaries along the way. This process will demonstrate the merit of this dissertation (and Chron. 1234) for the study of not only Syriac, but also Greek, Arabic and Hebrew historical, exegetical, and apocryphal literature.

# List of Abbreviations

AD = Anno Domini

AH = Anno Hijra

AM = Anno Mundi

BF = Byzantinische Forschungen

BHG = Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca

BZ = Byzantinische Zeitschrift

CFHB = Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae

CSCO = Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium

DOP = Dumbarton Oaks Papers

EI = *Encyclopaedia of Islam*

OC = *Oriens Christianus*

OCA = *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*

OCP = *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*

PG = Patrologia Graeca

PO = Patrologia Orientalis

RB = *Revue biblique*

REB = *Revue des études byzantines*

RECA = Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft

ROC = *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*

TTH = Translated Texts For Historians

ZA = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete



# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Chron. 1234: Manuscript, editions, translations .....	7
Approaching Chron. 1234.....	11
<b>Chapter 1      Text .....</b>	<b>17</b>
1.1      Author(s) .....	17
1.2      Genre.....	24
1.3      Morphology and composition.....	28
1.4      Chronology .....	30
1.5      Perspective on history .....	36
<b>Chapter 2      The Bible .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Chapter 3      The <i>Lives of the Prophets</i>.....</b>	<b>47</b>
3.1      Introduction.....	47
3.2      Chron. 1234 and the <i>Lives</i> .....	48
3.3      Conclusion.....	60
<b>Chapter 4      The <i>Book of Jubilees</i> and 1 <i>Enoch</i> (second or first century BC) .....</b>	<b>61</b>
4.1      Introduction.....	61
4.2      Newly discovered Syriac fragments of <i>Jubilees</i> in Chron. 1234 .....	66
4.2.1      The authorship of <i>Jubilees</i> ( <i>Jubilees</i> 2:1) .....	66
4.2.2      God's curse on Adam, Eve and the serpent ( <i>Jubilees</i> 3:23-5) .....	67
4.2.3      The origin of war, weaponry and slavery ( <i>Jubilees</i> 11:2).....	68
4.2.4 <i>Jubilees</i> 14:1, 4-5, 7 .....	70
4.2.5      The ten trials of Abraham ( <i>Jubilees</i> 19:8) .....	71
4.2.6 <i>Jubilees</i> 33:1 .....	72

4.3	Adaptations of traditions from <i>Jubilees</i> and 1 <i>Enoch</i> in Chron. 1234.....	72
4.3.1	Chronology from Adam to Seth ( <i>Jub.</i> 4:1-2, 7) .....	72
4.3.2	The descent of the <i>Benai Elohim</i> from Mount Hermon (1 <i>Enoch</i> 6:1-6).....	75
4.3.3	An antediluvian massacre ( <i>Jub.</i> 5:1-2, 9-10 and 1 <i>Enoch</i> 7, 9-10) .....	79
4.3.4	The inheritance of Shem and his sons ( <i>Jubilees</i> 8:12-6, 21).....	87
4.3.5	The transgression of (the sons of) Canaan ( <i>Jub.</i> 10:27, 29, 32) .....	93
4.3.6	Abraham, the ravens and the burning of the temple ( <i>Jubilees</i> 11:11-12:15) .....	96
4.4	Conclusion .....	106
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>Flavius Josephus (AD 37 – ca. 100).....</b>	<b>111</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	111
5.2	Josephus via Eusebius' <i>Chronicle</i> .....	112
5.3	The Life of Moses before the Exodus .....	112
5.4	The Siege of Jerusalem .....	118
5.5	Conclusion .....	123
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Hippolytus of Rome (d. 235) .....</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 340).....</b>	<b>133</b>
7.1	<i>Praeparatio Evangelica</i> .....	133
7.2	<i>Ecclesiastical History</i> .....	134
7.3	<i>Chronicle</i> .....	136
7.4	Conclusion .....	150
<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>The Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii (c. 350) .....</b>	<b>153</b>
8.1	Introduction .....	153
8.2	Refounding and renaming of Drepana .....	154
8.3	Dedication of Constantinople .....	154
8.4	The Persian invasion of Mesopotamia and the first siege of Nisibis.....	155
8.5	The second siege of Nisibis.....	158
8.6	Foundation of Tella/Constantia and refounding of Amida .....	159
8.7	Length of Constantine's reign.....	160
8.8	Constantine's destruction of pagan temples .....	162
8.9	Conclusion .....	163
<b>Chapter 9</b>	<b>Annianus of Alexandria (turn of the fifth century).....</b>	<b>165</b>

<b>Chapter 10</b>	<b>Socrates of Constantinople (c. 380 – c. 440)</b> .....	<b>173</b>
10.1	Introduction.....	173
10.2	Chron. 1234 and Socrates.....	174
10.2.1	Chron. 1234 and the Syriac translation of Socrates .....	175
10.2.2	Socrates through intermediaries .....	180
10.3	Socrates and the Ecclesiastical Part .....	187
10.4	Conclusion.....	189
<b>Chapter 11</b>	<b>Theodoret of Cyrrhus (c. AD 393 – c. 457)</b> .....	<b>191</b>
<b>Chapter 12</b>	<b>The <i>Breviarium</i> of John Malalas (c. AD 565)</b> .....	<b>195</b>
<b>Chapter 13</b>	<b>The <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> of John of Ephesus (c. AD 507-89)</b> .....	<b>197</b>
13.1	Introduction.....	197
13.2	The First and Second Part.....	199
13.3	Third Part .....	212
13.4	Conclusion.....	214
<b>Chapter 14</b>	<b>The <i>Miscellaneous History</i> of Pseudo-Zachariah (c. AD 568-9)</b> .....	<b>215</b>
14.1	Introduction.....	215
14.2	Chron. 1234 and PZ X 16.....	217
14.3	Chron. 1234 and PZ VII 3-6 .....	218
14.4	Chron. 1234 and PZ VIII 1 .....	225
14.5	PZ and the Ecclesiastical Part.....	225
14.6	Conclusion.....	226
<b>Chapter 15</b>	<b>Andronicus (sixth century)</b> .....	<b>229</b>
15.1	Introduction.....	229
15.2	Reconstruction of Andronicus' <i>Chronicle</i> .....	232
15.2.1	Introduction .....	232
15.2.2	Jewish chronology .....	233
15.2.3	Egyptian chronology .....	241
15.2.4	Pre-Abrahamic Chaldean chronology .....	244
15.2.5	Additional aspects of postdiluvian and pre-Abrahamic history .....	246
15.3	Andronicus' sources .....	268
15.4	Conclusion.....	273

<b>Chapter 16</b>	<b>The Book of the Cave of Treasures (sixth century?) .....</b>	<b>277</b>
<b>Chapter 17</b>	<b>Jacob of Edessa (d. AD 710).....</b>	<b>281</b>
<b>Chapter 18</b>	<b>An unidentified Greek history (seventh, eighth or early ninth century) .....</b>	<b>283</b>
18.1	Introduction .....	283
18.2	Theodore Lector and the Epitome.....	284
18.2.1	Introduction .....	284
18.2.2	Theodore in Syriac .....	286
18.2.3	Fragments of the Epitome in Chron. 1234 .....	293
18.2.4	Conclusion .....	313
18.3	Philostorgius of Borissus (c. 368 - c. 425) .....	315
18.4	Conclusion .....	319
<b>Chapter 19</b>	<b>Other points of contact between Theophanes and the later Syriac chronicle tradition for information on the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries.....</b>	<b>321</b>
19.1	Introduction .....	321
19.2	Constantine's construction of churches and anti-pagan legislation .....	324
19.3	Constantine and Licinius .....	328
19.4	A crown and coinage for Helen .....	331
19.5	Proclamation of Julian Caesar and marriage of Julian and Helen/Constantia.....	334
19.6	The proclamation of Gratian Augustus (and his appointment as consul) ....	336
19.7	An earthquake in Alexandria during the reign of Valens (21 July AD 365)...	337
19.8	Arcadius' building operations in Constantinople and foundation of Arcadioupolis.....	340
19.9	The adoption of Theodosius II by Yazdegird .....	341
19.10	The usurper John .....	344
19.11	Cyrus, prefect of Constantinople.....	347
19.12	The speech of Justin II.....	350
19.13	Conclusion .....	351
<b>Chapter 20</b>	<b>Dionysius of Tell-Mahrē (d. 845) .....</b>	<b>355</b>
20.1	Introduction .....	355
20.2	Theophilus of Edessa and the Secular Part .....	365
20.3	Chron. 819, Chron. 846 and the Secular Part .....	366
20.4	Dionysius and the Ecclesiastical Part.....	369

<b>Chapter 21</b>	<b>Arabic sources .....</b>	<b>371</b>
<b>Chapter 22</b>	<b>Ignatius III of Melitene (d. 1094).....</b>	<b>385</b>
22.1	Introduction.....	385
22.2	Ignatius and the Secular Part .....	387
22.3	Ignatius and the Ecclesiastical Part.....	395
22.4	Conclusion.....	397
<b>Chapter 23</b>	<b>Basil of Edessa (d. 1169) .....</b>	<b>399</b>
23.1	Introduction.....	399
23.2	Basil and the Secular Part .....	401
23.3	Basil and the Ecclesiastical Part.....	408
23.4	Conclusion.....	410
<b>Chapter 24</b>	<b>A twelfth-century historical source .....</b>	<b>411</b>
<b>Chapter 25</b>	<b>Remaining sources .....</b>	<b>413</b>
25.1	A source on the ancient and early Christian past of Edessa.....	413
25.2	Letters .....	415
25.3	A historical-geographical compendium .....	417
25.4	Legendary traditions about Alexander the Great .....	418
25.5	An account of the Trojan war .....	419
25.6	Saints' lives .....	420
<b>Conclusion</b> .....		<b>421</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....		<b>429</b>



# Introduction

According to an early Christian legend, King Abgar V Ukkama of Osrhoene (“the Black”) corresponded with Christ via letters, was cured by him, and Edessa, his capital, was promised eternal protection.<sup>1</sup> After Christ’s death, Addai, one of the seventy-two apostles, is said to have been sent to Edessa by the apostle Thomas and to have performed all kinds of miracles there. Throughout Antiquity, Edessa would be known as a Christian city, an example for others.

In 1144, and again in 1146, Edessa was attacked and captured by the atabeg of Mosul Zangi ʿImad ad-Din (r. 1127-46), son of Aq Sunqur, the Turkish slave commander of the Seljuq Sultan Malik Shah I (d. 1092). Edessa would never again attain its former glory nor be able to reaffirm its Christian identity. For a few decades Edessa would remain part of Zangid territory, under Zangi’s son Ghazi Sayf ad-Din and various lieutenants, until it was seized by the Ayyubid sultan Saladin, of Kurdish decent, who had ended Fatimid rule in Egypt in 1171 and who had his eye on Syria and Palestine, culminating in his capture of Jerusalem in 1187. After Saladin’s death in 1193, Edessa and other cities remained under Ayyubid rule until in 1260 was finally captured by the Mongol khan Hülegü.

The fall of Edessa in 1144 was a major blow for the Christian communities that were living there, not only Syriac Orthodox or Miaphysite Christians (i.e. those Christians who did not adhere to the decisions made during the Council of Chalcedon of 451 and

---

<sup>1</sup> On this legend, see most recently Guscini 2008 and Wood 2010, 82-92.

who emphasised the divinity of Christ) but also Franks, Armenians and Melkites<sup>2</sup> (Arabic-speaking Greek Orthodox Christians). For the Syriac Orthodox this event was an even greater tragedy because Edessa was the root of the Syriac language<sup>3</sup> and because its capture signified the end of a second period of religious freedom in Edessa, which had begun with the arrival of the Franks and their capture of Edessa in 1098.

In 214 Osroene was incorporated into the Roman empire, but Edessa remained a bone of contention between the Romans and the Persians (the Parthians, later Sasanians). It was often raided and even seized by Persian kings, as late as the 620s. During the Muslim-Arab conquest of the seventh century, Edessa was captured and remained under Muslim control until it came back in Byzantine hands in 1031-2, only to be retaken by the Turkish general Buzan in March 1087. In 1098, after centuries of Muslim (Arab and Turkish) and Byzantine rule, Edessa was finally returned into the hands of Christians who were tolerant of and acted well-disposed towards Christians who did not follow the Byzantine faith):<sup>4</sup> Baldwin I of Bologne, the later count Baldwin I of Edessa, captured the city from Thoros, the Armenian Melkite *curopalates* (i.e. Byzantine governor) of Edessa, whom he had later killed. The arrival of the Crusaders improved the living conditions of the Syriac Orthodox, because the Franks were much more tolerant of other Christians.

The fall of Edessa in 1144 thus quashed Christian hopes of the victory of Christianity over Islam (and the Franks over the Turks), and not surprisingly several Christian authors expressed their sorrow in writing, including Basil bar Shumono, the Syriac Orthodox metropolitan of the city, in a historical work that was used by the Anonymous Chronicler.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The name comes from the Syriac *ܡܠܟܝܬܝܢ*, *malkoyē*, meaning 'royals', or 'imperial'. On the Melkite Churches of Antioch, Jerusalem and Alexandria, see, Troupeau 1993, 383-407. On the Melkite Church of Jerusalem, see Griffith 2006.

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 114T, after Dion. TM.

<sup>4</sup> For Jacobite appreciations of the Franks and their religion, see Teule 1999.

<sup>5</sup> For the History of Edessa, written by Basil, metropolitan of the city, see chapter 23 in this volume. Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 6 (637-8T; vol. 3: 277V) refers to Basil's discourse (*memrō*) on its fall. For an extract from Dionysius of Amida's *word* (*ܡܠܟܝܬܝܢ*) on the fall of Edessa, a reference to two discourses (*memrē*), in the metre of Jacob of

From a literary-historical perspective, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries fall in a period which modern scholarship has labelled the Syriac Renaissance.<sup>6</sup> After the Muslim-Arab conquest of the seventh century, Arabic replaced Greek as the administrative language and the *lingua franca* and Syriac Christians gradually became Arabicised.<sup>7</sup> The Melkites even adopted Arabic as their liturgical language, and during the long tenth century, barely any Syriac literature was produced. From the eleventh century onwards, we observe among Syriac Christians, both in the Syriac Orthodox community and in the Church of the East (East-Syrian Christians in the territory of the former Persian empire who follow the dyophysite or ‘two-nature’ christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia; they are also called Nestorians, by themselves as well as by theological opponents, after Nestorius of Constantinople, who emphasised the humanity of Christ<sup>8</sup> but whose ideas were condemned in the council of Ephesus of 431), a rise of the idea that Syriac was equally, or perhaps even more capable of rendering scientific literature than Arabic.<sup>9</sup> The end date of this period is usually given as AD 1318, the year of the death of ‘Abdisho’ bar Brikha, the East-Syrian metropolitan of Nisibis. The beginning of this period is debated. Some have argued that it only covers the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but I agree with Herman Teule who suggests that AD 1026, the year in which the East-Syrian bishop of Nisibis Elias bar Shenaya<sup>10</sup> (975-1046) debated with the Muslim Wazir Ibn al-Maghribi and argued for the superiority of Syriac over Arabic, is an excellent starting point of the re-emergence of interest in writing in Syriac.<sup>11</sup>

---

Serug, on the two captures of Edessa, and to Basil’s three *memrē* on Edessa, in the same metre, see Mich. Syr. Chron. XVI 3 (631-3T; vol. 3: 266-7V). For the Armenian response of Nerses Shnorhali (catholicos of Armenia 1166-73), a *Lamentation on Edessa*, written in 1145 or 1146, see Van Lint 1999.

<sup>6</sup> Baumstark 1922, 285; Teule 2010.

<sup>7</sup> Griffith 2010. On the bible in Arabic, see Griffith 2013.

<sup>8</sup> Mary was to be called Christotokos (‘mother of Christ’) not Theotokos (‘mother of God’).

<sup>9</sup> Maronites and Melkites continued to write in Arabic. For the Arabicisation of the Melkite community in Palestine, see Griffith 1997.

<sup>10</sup> On Elias, see e.g. Samir 1977 and Samir 1988. On his chronicle, see Witakowski 2007a.

<sup>11</sup> Teule 2010, 3-5. On this debate and Elias’ arguments, see Wilde 2007, 77-9.

The Syriac Renaissance was a period in which tradition and innovation found each other. Compilations of older theological,<sup>12</sup> hagiographical,<sup>13</sup> historiographical and scientific<sup>14</sup> were produced at this time; older traditions were re-used.<sup>15</sup> At the same time, however, literary genres evolved because literary innovations were appropriated from other cultures, Muslim, but also other Eastern Christian communities and cultures. Knowledge of other languages such as Arabic, Armenian, Persian, possibly even Greek was commonplace. The greatest example of an author in whose work many cultural, linguistic and scientific traditions merged is Barhebraeus (1226 – 1286) who not only translated several Arabic scientific works into Syriac, but also fused Greco-Syriac and Arabic traditions into his own works.<sup>16</sup>

This trend is also visible in the chronicle genre. Syriac chronicle writing started with the production of a Syriac translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle* and the Syriac *Chronicle* of Andronicus, both in the sixth century. For three hundred years, Syriac chronicles continued being written, mostly by Syriac Orthodox authors, but a Maronite<sup>17</sup> *Chronicle* (*Chron. Maron.*; c.664), and a Melkite *Chronicle* (*Chron. Melk.*; between 640 and 680/1) also survive in Syriac. Chronicles do not appear to have been written by East-Syrian authors until Elias of Nisibis.

After an apparent gap in the long tenth century (843 – 1018) during which no Syriac chronicles<sup>18</sup> were produced after the *History* of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre<sup>19</sup> (d. 845) but

---

<sup>12</sup> E.g. the *Book of Treasures* of Severus Jacob bar Shakko (d. 1241), Teule 2007.

<sup>13</sup> Binggeli 2012, 50-5.

<sup>14</sup> In this context, we should perhaps also place the *Book of the Acknowledgement of Truth*, in modern literature often called *Cause of Causes*, which is an encyclopedia of theological, scientific and philosophical knowledge.

<sup>15</sup> See the liturgical example of George Warda's (thirteenth century) use of Michael Badoqa (sixth century), Reinink 2010.

<sup>16</sup> Takahashi 2005; Takahashi 2011. For instance in his *Candelabrum of the Sanctuary*, Takahashi 2002; Teule 2005a; Takahashi 2009, 80-1, 87.

<sup>17</sup> *Chron. Maron.*

<sup>18</sup> The exception may be Simeon of Nisibis who is mentioned as a source on two occasions by El. Nis. *Op. Chron.*, vol. 1, 204-5T, 97V for information regarding ice and snow that affected Mesopotamia in the early ninth century. He is only identified as "Simeon the Jacobite", there is no evidence for the claim that he was a chronicler, his work may have been of another nature.

Agapius, the Melkite bishop of Mabbug, wrote his Arabic *Chronicle*<sup>20</sup> on the basis of one or more Syriac chronicles, historiography re-emerged as an important part of Syriac literature. The bilingual Syriac-Arabic *Chronicle* of Elias of Nisibis (d. 1046) is the only known East-Syrian chronicle,<sup>21</sup> but among the Syriac Orthodox community, chronicle writing became a popular genre again. Apart from Chron. 1234, two other examples of Syriac Orthodox chronicles are preserved: the *Chronicle* of patriarch Michael I (1126 -96), and the *Chronicon Syriacum* of Barhebraeus, who also wrote an Arabic version of this text.<sup>22</sup>

Through the testimonies of these witnesses we are aware of the existence of several other histories and chronicles that have not survived, most notably the example of the *Chronicle* of Ignatius III, the Syriac Orthodox bishop of Melitene (d. 1094). Another example is a work, written by Basil bar Shumono (d. 1169), the Syriac Orthodox metropolitan of Edessa, in response to its capture by Zangi, the atabeg of Mosul, in 1144. This work has traditionally been identified as a local history of Edessa, but may have covered a larger geographical scope. Though it is unlikely to have been a chronicle per se, it was probably a Syriac Orthodox history, similar to that of Dionysius.

The author of Chron. 1234 belongs among the ranks of the historians Elias of Nisibis and Barhebraeus. The Anonymous Chronicler's knowledge of Syriac and Arabic, and his use of Muslim sources and traditions, is typical for the Syriac Renaissance.<sup>23</sup> Chron. 1234 not only attests to the Graeco-Syriac tradition of historiography, by preserving material from (Syriac translations of) Greek texts, but also to the influence of Jewish (e.g. the *Book of Jubilees* and Flavius Josephus) and Islamic Arabic sources (an unknown Arabic history).

---

<sup>19</sup> Dion. TM's work is in fact more of a history than a chronicle.

<sup>20</sup> On this text see Graf 1947, 39-40; Samir 1990, 471-3; Lamoreaux 2014.

<sup>21</sup> On this chronicle, see Witakowski 2007a and Borrut 2009.

<sup>22</sup> For the bibliography on these two texts, see Takahashi 2005, 277-300 (Chron. Syr.), 301-13 (Chron. Arab.).

<sup>23</sup> See chapter 21 in this volume.



## Chron. 1234: Manuscript, editions, translations

The manuscript containing this text is now lost. Around the turn of the twentieth century it was part of the library of Paulos Fehim, a native of Edessa who became the town's Syriac Orthodox bishop in 1883.<sup>1</sup> He became patriarchal vicar in Istanbul in 1887, and died in 1913. The twenty-one manuscripts in Fehim's library were described by Philoxenus Yuhanna Dolabani, the later Syriac Orthodox bishop of Mardin, around 1920 in his catalogue, which was posthumously published by Yuhanna Ibrahim in 1994.<sup>2</sup> What happened to these codices after Fehim's death is not entirely certain.<sup>3</sup> Two manuscripts remained in Istanbul and were found by Voöbus in the 1960's [Meryamana 4 (= Fehim 1) and Meryamana 7 (= Fehim 3)]; four were bought by the Bibliothèque nationale de Paris (BNF syr. 395-8); five others by Yale University (Yale syr. 7-11). The ten remaining manuscripts, including the codex of Chron. 1234 (Fehim 4), are still missing.

Ms. Fehim 4 measured 24 x 16 cm, was 846 pages long and dated perhaps from the fourteenth century. It may therefore have been a copy of the original. At the time of its edition in 1904, the manuscript was already in a fragmentary state. Several folios were missing, others had been replaced much more recently.

Ephrem Rabbula Rahmani, the later Syro-Catholic patriarch who discovered the manuscript in Fehim's library in 1899, published a first edition in 1904.<sup>4</sup> This edition

---

<sup>1</sup> On Fehim, see Takahashi 2012, 158-9.

<sup>2</sup> Ibrahim 1994; Takahashi 2012, 163-5.

<sup>3</sup> Takahashi 2012.

<sup>4</sup> Rahmani 1904.

only covered secular history between Creation and the accession of the son of the caliph Mahdi in 784.

With the help of the Syriac Orthodox monk and future patriarch, Ephrem Barsaumo, the French scholar Jean-Baptiste Chabot started working on an edition of the remainder of the text, but the war made contact between the two scholars difficult, so Chabot finished the edition on his own. This edition was published in 1916, followed four years later by Chabot's re-edition of the first half of the Secular Part. This re-edition was based on the manuscript, though Chabot also took Rahmani's edition into account. Because Chabot's edition is complete and offers corrections of Rahmani's opinion, the latter has become the standard edition of this work. It is therefore also the edition that I have used for this study and for my translation, though I also take Rahmani's edition into account. More recently, Julius Çiçek re-published Chabot's edition, vocalising the text.<sup>5</sup>

In 1907 and 1908, François Nau published French translations of selections from Chron. 1234, obviously based on Rahmani's edition.<sup>6</sup> His translations, however, are often paraphrastic rather than literal and one should be careful in handling them.<sup>7</sup>

Chabot published his own Latin translation of the first volume in 1937. A French translation of the second volume was prepared by Albert Abouna and Jean-Marc Fiey, on the basis of Chabot's notes, and appeared in 1974, after the latter's death in 1947. In 2009, Abouna published an Arabic translation of this second volume.<sup>8</sup>

Excerpts from Chron. 1234 have also been translated in various modern European languages (English, French and Russian) and published in reconstructions of the *History* of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre,<sup>9</sup> in collections of material attributed to Theophilus of Edessa,<sup>10</sup> in monographs on the history of the Crusades,<sup>11</sup> and various other events.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> *The Syriac World History*.

<sup>6</sup> Nau 1907 and Nau 1908.

<sup>7</sup> See Ri 2000, 343-4 who distinguishes between Nau's translation of Rahmani's edition of Chron. 1234 and Chabot's Latin translation of his own re-edition of Chron. 1234.

<sup>8</sup> Abouna 2009.

<sup>9</sup> Palmer 1993, 111-221.

<sup>10</sup> Hoyland 2011.

<sup>11</sup> Yousif 2006.

---

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Brock 1973; Pigulevskaya 2000, 642-676.



## Approaching Chron. 1234

Chron. 1234 has been included in several overviews<sup>1</sup> of Syriac literature in general and Syriac historiography in particular, yet has never been the subject of in-depth analysis, unlike the chronicles of Michael<sup>2</sup> and Barhebraeus.<sup>3</sup> The only exceptions are Dorothea Weltecke's brief comparative studies of the structure, audience and methodologies of the three extant Syriac Orthodox chronicles of the Syriac Renaissance.<sup>4</sup>

Despite the lack of an extensive and exhaustive study of Chron. 1234, its historical and historiographical value has long since been recognised. Writing in the thirteenth century in the southeast of what is now Turkey, its author provides a wealth of often first-hand information regarding secular and ecclesiastical events that took place in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Chron. 1234 is an especially valuable source for Christian-Muslim relations,<sup>5</sup> the history of the Crusades,<sup>6</sup> and the Syriac Orthodox Church,<sup>7</sup> for information about the socio-economic environment and the daily life of

---

<sup>1</sup> Baumstark 1922 302; Chabot 1934, 129-130; de Urbina 1965, 212; Brock 1979/1980; Brock 1997, 74 (93\*); Youssif 2002, 205-37; Barsoum 2003, 147; Teule 2005b, 337-8; Bettolo 2006, 419; Weltecke 2009, 107-135; Debié/Taylor 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Weltecke 2003.

<sup>3</sup> Todt 1988; Conrad 1994; Teule 1996; Aigle 2005; El-Eid Bualwan 2011.

<sup>4</sup> Weltecke 2009 and Weltecke 2010.

<sup>5</sup> Teule 2012.

<sup>6</sup> Chabot 1917; Chabot 1924; Lüders 1964; Moosa 2003a; Moosa 2003b; Bruns 2005; Witakowski 2007b; Youssif 2010.

<sup>7</sup> Hage 1966, 5-6, and *passim*; Kawerau 1960, 6 and *passim*; Weltecke 2002; Weltecke 2008.

Syriac Orthodox Christians,<sup>8</sup> and the history of cities such as Edessa<sup>9</sup> or ar-Raqqa,<sup>10</sup> Its eye witness account<sup>11</sup> of the capture of Jerusalem in 1187 by Saladin is of particular interest.

In spite of its obvious historical value, one should approach Chron. 1234, like any historical source – whether ancient, medieval or modern, critically and not take all of their claims at face value. The reader should keep in mind that the chronicle was written from the Syriac Orthodox perspective. Appropriating material from other sources, some (ultimately) written by authors of other cultures (Jewish and Muslim) or other confessions (e.g. Theophilus of Edessa,<sup>12</sup> a Maronite<sup>13</sup>), the Syriac Orthodox author of created his own version of history, his own, Syriac Orthodox, interpretation of events, by emphasising certain aspects and diminishing others. Incorrect information could also be added, or inconsistencies or inconvenient truths could be filtered out.

As Dorothea Weltecke has emphasised, “critical accounts need just as careful source-critique as do words of praise.”<sup>14</sup> These works were obviously biased, not only towards members of other confessions, especially the Melkites,<sup>15</sup> but even towards Syriac Orthodox clerics and lay people whose actions harmed the Syriac Orthodox Church. The

---

<sup>8</sup> Weltecke 2008.

<sup>9</sup> Segal 2005.

<sup>10</sup> Robinson 2003.

<sup>11</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 200-1T, 150V. On which, see Segal 1962, 254-5; Gibb/Tritton 1933.

<sup>12</sup> Theoph. Ed. was a source for Dion. TM whose History was used by the Anonymous Chronicler, the account of the Trojan war (see chapter 25.5) may also have come from Theoph. Ed.

<sup>13</sup> The Maronite Church, of Antiochene rite, named after the fourth-century ascete Saint Marun, followed monotheletism, which was professed by Heraclius in his *Ecthesis* in 638, even after it was condemned in 680, (though Maronites themselves call themselves Chalcedonians.) On the Maronite Church in Antiquity, see Troupeau 1993, 407-11.

<sup>14</sup> Weltecke 2008, 328.

<sup>15</sup> Morony 2005, 1-3.

Anonymous Chronicler defends his patriarch Michael the Great against those who accused him of nepotism for appointing his nephew George as maphrian.<sup>16</sup>

Not only is Chron. 1234 the result of a subjective author, it is also riddled with errors, not only chronological, but also factual. Computations of years in the Pre-Constantinian Part are often incorrect and events are often misdated (with Seleucid as well as Islamic dating). To give but two examples of factual errors, Constans I, son of Constantine the Great, is said to have ruled over the East and his brother Constantius II over the West, whereas the exact opposite is true, and Tahir ibn al-Husain, general of al-Ma'mun (813-33), is said to have died in Baghdad, whereas his death actually occurred in Khorasan, as was known by Michael the Great presumably through Dionysius of Tell-Mahre.<sup>17</sup>

In my opinion Chron. 1234's historiographical value far exceeds its historical value. Writing in the second quarter of thirteenth century, at the end of more than six hundred years of Syriac chronicle writing, the Anonymous Chronicler had a wide range of sources at his disposal, not only chronicles and histories, but also apocryphal writings and saints' lives, letters and literary texts. For this reason, the bulk of this volume is devoted to an analysis of the sources of Chron. 1234. To be clear, I will mainly focus on an earlier stratum of Chron. 1234, which covers the period between Creation until 1204 and which I shall therefore call Chron. 1204.<sup>18</sup> For the period until 1195 we can compare material in Chron. 1204 with material from the *Chronicle* of Michael the Great, which ended in that year. Furthermore, because the continuation of Chron. 1204 seems to be based on the personal experience of the author rather than on written sources, it is of less interest for the purposes of this study.

Chron. 1234's usefulness for the reconstruction of now lost sources has already been proven on several occasions, most notably in the case of the *History* of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre. Nevertheless, much work remained to be done. In the process of my research, I

---

<sup>16</sup> From the seventh century onwards, the maphrian was the autonomous representative of the patriarch in the East with the power to appoint bishops. Officially, the see of the maphrianate was Takrit, but for a time in the thirteenth century, the maphrian stayed in Mosul, see Hage 1966, 22-31; Kiraz 2011.

<sup>17</sup> Comp. Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 12 (511T; vol. 2: 54V) and Tabari, vol. 2, 1063-5 (trans. vol. XXXII, 131-3).

<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, I will fairly consistently refer to Chron. 1234.

was, for instance, amazed to find that the importance of Chron. 1234 as a witness for the Syriac translations of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius and of Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History* had been overlooked and that no one had ever attempted to reconstruct the *Chronicle* of Andronicus on the basis of material provided by Chron. 1234 and other witnesses.

After the first chapter, in which I outline the genre and morphology of Chron. 1234, uncover information about its author(s), and discuss aspects of the temporal and geographical scope of this chronicle, I devote each of the following twenty-three chapters to a particular Hebrew, Greek Christian, Syriac or Islamic Arabic source. For the most part, these sources are discussed in chronological order, but when the date of a source is unsure, I include the source after those sources from the same century, which can be dated to a more specific time. There are other exceptions. For instance, I only discuss PZ after Malalas and John of Ephesus, because the latter used Malalas. Similarly, the last and twenty-fifth chapter discusses several minor sources from different periods, such as a dossier on the history of Edessa (from the thirteenth century?), Syriac translations of (forged) letters of the emperor Julian and Basil of Caesarea, and legendary traditions regarding Alexander the Great.

Some of these chapters are devoted to authors to whose works the Anonymous Chronicler never had direct access, not even in Syriac translation, for instance in the case of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Theodoret of Cyrrhus or the *Breviarium* of Malalas. This has been done in those cases in which these are ultimate sources of an unknown intermediary, or in which material from this source reached Chron. 1234 via several intermediaries. There are plenty of other examples of authors and sources to whom I have not devoted an entire chapter, such the *Refutation against the Melkites* of Simeon of Qenneshrin which is mentioned as a source for information on the life of Maximus Confessor in Chron. 1234, but was not used by the Anonymous Chronicler but by Dionysius.

Some of the Anonymous Chronicler's sources are fragmentarily preserved or available in other languages or in later adaptations, but most are now lost. Though the Anonymous Chronicler mentions some of his sources, for the most part, the process of identification of his sources is done by close reading and textual comparisons with other texts. These texts can be the source in question, whether in the language in which it was

used by the Anonymous Chronicler (Syriac and Arabic; e.g. the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus and the history of at-Tabari), in the original language (Greek, Arabic or Hebrew; e.g. the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates of Constantinople or the *Chronicle* of Agapius of Mabbug), or in translation (Latin, Armenian and Ethiopic; e.g. the Ethiopic translation of the *Book of Jubilees* or the Armenian translation of the chronological canons of Eusebius).

More often than not, however, we are forced to compare information in Chron. 1234 with material from other sources, dependants of his own sources. For the most part, the *Chronicle* of Michael the Great is the first source we must turn to, because it is largely dependent on the same sources as Chron. 1234, as in the case of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, Ignatius of Melitene and Basil of Edessa. In certain instances, comparison with more than one source is necessary. By comparing Socrates, Michael and Chron. 1234, for instance, I will show that certain paraphrases of Socrates in these Syriac sources go back to a Syriac intermediary, different from the Syriac translation of Socrates. Similarly, for the reconstruction of the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus, a comparison of XZ, Michael and Chron. 1234 is necessary, sometimes even in conjunction with the *Breviarium* of Malalas.

On occasion we can even go deeper, to the level of a source that underlies the Anonymous Chronicler's and Michael's source. In those cases, we turn towards Michael as well as secondary sources, texts that were used by Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's common source, or in some cases even authors who are somehow dependent on a source that was used by this common source. Our investigation of the influence of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius and its Antiochene continuation on Chron. 1234, for instance, requires a comparison with a series of Arabic, Syriac, Latin and Greek witnesses. The most famous example is that of Theophilus of Edessa, or rather the Semitic source or sources that seem to have influenced not only Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, but also Agapius of Mabbug and Theophanes the Confessor. In this volume, however, I also use Agapius and Theophanes in an entirely different context. Along with Isho'dad of Merv, Agapius is a crucial dependant of the sixth-century Syriac author Andronicus whose *Chronicle* also influenced the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael. Theophanes, on the other hand, will be suggested to be reliant on the same Greek

history, a collection of material from Socrates, Philostorgius of Borissus, the seventh-century Epitome of Church Histories and other sources, as an unknown Syriac historian whose work was used by the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael.

For these reasons, this investigation of Chron. 1234 and its sources is not only directly relevant for the study of Michael's *Chronicle* and its sources, but for the entire history of Syriac and, as we shall see, even Greek and Arabic historical writing.

# Chapter 1 Text

## 1.1 Author(s)

The appearance of colophons in the middle of the text has often been adduced as evidence that the chronicle as it lies before us now was the product of the work of two authors. In the Secular Part, a colophon appears between the account of the failed siege of the fortress of Qattina (near Homs) by Mahmud Ibn Muhammad al-Malik as-Salih Nasir ad-Din, the Artuqid governor of Amida, and the outbreak of an epidemic in Egypt in AG 1515/AD 1203-4.

“We have written this until today, which is year 1514 (of the Greeks). May Our Lord help us in his compassion and let rule harmony and peace in his people and his Church. Amen.”<sup>1</sup>

A colophon in the Ecclesiastical Part dates the end of this section of the text more specifically to February AG 1515/AD 1204.<sup>2</sup> Chron. 1234 was clearly conceived in two phases, but whether it was written by two chroniclers is uncertain. After the colophon the Secular Part continues as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 213-4T, 160V.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 340T, 253V.

“In this year 1515, after the great and terrible famine that took place in the land of Egypt and the great epidemic that was with it, as we have described above, the river Nile came up as usual and inundated the land.”<sup>3</sup>

The phrase “as we have described above” suggests that the chronicle was simply continued by the same author.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, there is no real difference in subject matter in Chron. 1204 and its continuation: the focus on Edessa (in the Secular and the Ecclesiastical Part) and the succession of Armenian Catholicoi (in the Ecclesiastical Part) continues. On the other hand, the fact that the chronicler of 1204 witnessed Saladin’s capture of Jerusalem in 1187 and accompanied maphrian Gregory on his journey to Takrit in Iraq in 1189 (see below) makes it perhaps unlikely that he survived the death of Malik al-Ashraf in 1237. Ultimately, we cannot be certain if the chronicler of 1204 and the continuator are one and the same, but in a way, the question whether the Chronicler of 1204 continued his own work is irrelevant for the purposes of this dissertation, because it is an investigation into Chron. 1234’s sources and because its narrative from the 1190s onwards appears to be largely based on personal experience rather than written sources anyway. Nevertheless, in order to keep all options open, I will refer to the author of Chron. 1234 as the Anonymous Chronicler, and to the author of the continuation as the Continuator.

A minimum of information regarding the identity and social and geographical milieu of the Anonymous Chronicler and the Continuator can be extracted from Chron. 1234. That both were Syriac Orthodox Christians can already be deduced from the identity of the sources themselves, e.g. Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, Ignatius of Melitene and Basil of Edessa. The Chronicler of 1204 refers to the members of his faith as *Suryoyē*, Syrian (ܣܘܪܝܝܐ) which is a term of confessional affiliation, not of place of origin<sup>5</sup> as Jacobites,

---

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 214T, 160V.

<sup>4</sup> Baumstark 1922, 302.

<sup>5</sup> See most clearly, Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 140T, 105V: “metropolitan of the Suryoyē” or Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 168.22-3T, 126V, referring to the Syriac Orthodox deacon ‘Abdun, who was a secretary in the palace of emir Sayf ad-Din of Mosul (a nephew of Nur ad-Din). On this term, see Debié 2009a, 108-10.

after the non-Chalcedonian bishop Jacob Burd<sup>c</sup>oyo/Baradaeus of Edessa<sup>6</sup> (r. 542-578), and as Severians, after bishop Severus of Antioch<sup>7</sup> (r. 512-38), sometimes after his sources, sometimes of his own accord (one reference to the Jacobites for instance replaces John of Ephesus' use of the term 'orthodox'<sup>8</sup>).

The Anonymous Chronicler admits that he wrote "other books" about Athanasius Denha, the successor of Basil bar Shumono (d. 1169) as metropolitan of Edessa, and the troubles in the Edessan church during his pontificate.<sup>9</sup> These works were probably written in Syriac, but he also knew Arabic. He was also present in Jerusalem together with bishop Athanasius, the brother of patriarch Michael I, with the Edessenian monk Sahda, Athanasius' successor, and Theodore bar Wahbūn, Michael's assistant, between 20 September and 2 October AD 1187, at the time of Saladin's capture of the city.<sup>10</sup> In 1189 the Anonymous Chronicler visited Takrit in the entourage of Gregory, the maphrian of Tagrit and Michael's nephew, returning with him to Mosul via the cities of Shigar and Khabura/Circesium.<sup>11</sup>

This author's mobility raises questions about his position in ecclesiastical ranks. To be sure, Chron. 1204 was not written by an abbot, bishop, metropolitan, maphrian nor a patriarch, like the majority of the preserved Syriac Orthodox chronicles.<sup>12</sup> Given that he was in the retinue of the maphrian and had access to the library of the monastery of Mor Barsaumo (see below), he was probably some kind of minor cleric, perhaps functioning as a secretary or a translator.

Although he seems to have travelled around in Michael's entourage, the Anonymous Chronicler's main residence was located somewhere in Northern Mesopotamia, or the South East of present-day Turkey. He appears to have been best informed and most

---

<sup>6</sup> On whom, see Kleyn 1882; Bundy 1978 and Brock 2011.

<sup>7</sup> On Severus, see Brock/Fitzgerald 2013, 1-8.

<sup>8</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 213.29T and Joh. Eph. HE, part 3, III 56 (181-2T; 135-6V)

<sup>9</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 324T, 242V.

<sup>10</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 200T, 150V.

<sup>11</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 318-24T; 238-42V.

<sup>12</sup> Debié/Taylor 2012, 171-2.

interested in the history about Edessa, but in a wider perspective probably the region encompassed in the triangle Edessa/Harran, Melitene and Maipherqat/Amida.

The monastery of Mor Barsaumo near Melitene appears to have been a place of residence of the Anonymous Chronicler, at least for some time. The Anonymous Chronicler's access to the library of this monastery is suggested by his use of certain sources, including a particular manuscript<sup>13</sup> (tradition) of the History of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre (d. 845) and two letters, written by Michael.<sup>14</sup> Chron. 1234 also preserves a long description of the capture of the monastery by count Joscelin II of Edessa.<sup>15</sup> There is also a short account of a flood in AG 1474/AD 1162-3.<sup>16</sup>

Equally telling is an editorial remark, which reveals his knowledge of the region of Samosata and which at the same time also offers us some information about now lost inscriptions, possibly of Antiochus I of Commagene (first century BC):

“This Antiochus built bridges, astonishing of wonder, one over the river Singa and another over the river Sebastu in the land of Samosata, when he went to worship the elevated place which is on the high mountain above Gokhtay at the frontier (of the territory) of the monastery of the blessed Mar Barsaumo; the inscriptions that are written on great stone tablets and on the pillars that stand on the bridge until this day inform us of these things.”<sup>17</sup>

On the other hand, Edessa appears prominently throughout Chron. 1234. It is incorrectly identified as the first Seleucid foundation, even before Antioch.<sup>18</sup> Chron. 1234's focus on Edessa is mainly due to the use of sources such as Dionysius of Tell-

---

<sup>13</sup> See chapter 20.

<sup>14</sup> See chapter 25.2.

<sup>15</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 151-3T, 113-5V (§436).

<sup>16</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 159-60T, 120V.

<sup>17</sup> On this passage, see Honigmann 1944, 151. Chabot (Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 85V, n. 2) believed this note concerns Antiochus III the Great, perhaps because of the testimony of Mich. Syr. Chron. V 6 (80T; vol. 1: 122V) who states that Antiochus III the Great “captured the roads, constructed paved roads (ܡܢ ܕܘܪܘܟܝܢ), stone bridges over rivers and crossings to cross (these) paved roads”.

<sup>18</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 105.15-6T.

Mahre and Basil of Edessa (d. 1169), but this interest in the history of Edessa in Chron. 1234 does not begin nor end with his use of those authors. The Anonymous Chronicler appears to have had access to a dossier on the ancient and early Christian history of Edessa,<sup>19</sup> and his focus on Edessa continues well after the years 1146, 1150 and 1159, the possible years in which Basil's work could have ended.<sup>20</sup>

Most of the Anonymous Chronicler's information on Edessa in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (after Basil) may stem from first-hand knowledge, but he also mentions eye witness accounts (e.g. for the retreat of a group of Bedouins after their defeat by Qutb ad-Din, governor of Edessa, in April AD 1488/AG 1177<sup>21</sup>).

Among events that he describes on the basis of the same sources as Michael,<sup>22</sup> the Anonymous Chronicler often inserts episodes of Edessan history that were seemingly unknown to Michael (or in which he was uninterested). For example, after a shared account of the death of Nur ad-Din in May AG 1485/AD 1174, a portrait of his qualities, the accession of his son Malik as-Salih and the death of Amaury I of Jerusalem, all of which taken from the same source as Michael, the Anonymous Chronicler continues with a description of the (partial) destruction of the Haghia Sophia, the Church of the Apostles and the sanctuaries of saint Stephen and the Forty Martyrs in Edessa.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, the Anonymous Chronicler also knows of two sieges of Edessa by Sayf ad-Din in AG 1486/AD 1174;<sup>24</sup> and Saladin<sup>25</sup> in AG 1494/AD 1183 and there are many more examples.

In that section of the Secular Part that covers the period between 1194, the year in which Michael ended his *Chronicle*, and 1234, Edessa features quite prominently among other cities and regions such as Mardin, Melitene, Egypt, Damascus, Jerusalem and Akhlat. For this period, the Anonymous Chronicler seems to rely on his personal

---

<sup>19</sup> On which, see Chapter 25.2.

<sup>20</sup> On Bas. Ed., see chapter 23 in this volume.

<sup>21</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 186T; 140V.

<sup>22</sup> See the previous chapter.

<sup>23</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 170-1T, 128V (§452).

<sup>24</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 171T, 128-9V (§453).

<sup>25</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 194-5T, 146V (§478).

experiences, discussing a siege and the rule of al-Malik al-Ashraf, the son of al-Malik al-<sup>◌</sup>Adil Sayf ad-Din over Mesopotamia and Diyarbakir;<sup>26</sup> Turkish troops from Mardin spend the winter in Edessa, Sarug and Resh <sup>◌</sup>Ayna are added to the territory of the governor of Edessa (§500);<sup>27</sup> Malik al-<sup>◌</sup>Adil comes to Edessa with his son Shihab ad-Din Ghazi Malik al-Muzaffar (§513);<sup>28</sup> a famine and a drought cause Edessans to plead God for rain, with Rabban Barsaumo (§514-6bis).<sup>29</sup>

Despite the lacunar nature of the Ecclesiastical Part, the focus on Edessa is evident, amongst the Anonymous Chronicler's discussion of patriarch Michael I's actions and even ecclesiastical matters of the Armenian Apostolic Church, especially the succession of catholicoi. The Anonymous Chronicler describes in detail the troubles that occurred in the Edessan Church after the death of Basil bar Shumono, between the faction in favour of archdeacon Denha, the later bishop Athanasius, and that in favour of deacon Sahda bar Shumono, led by the priest Barsaumo of Melitene.<sup>30</sup> This rivalry lasts for two years, during which patriarch Michael even separates the diocese of Sibaberek from that of Edessa and appoints Iwanis to that position.<sup>31</sup> Eventually, Athanasius Denha is appointed bishop in AG 1482/AD 1171 and succeeded by Basil Fares after Athanasius' death in October or November AG 1503/AD 1191.<sup>32</sup> The pontificate of Athanasius is only touched upon very briefly, because the Anonymous Chronicler refers to another one of his works, in which he described the events from that time in detail. In contrast, Basil Fares is criticised for lending money from others, instead of using his own wealth, thus causing the debts of the Edessan Church, which were apparently already very high, to grow even larger.

After 1194 the Edessan Church remains the most important subject. Patriarch Athanasius, Michael's successor, is said to have visited Edessa, but more importantly,

---

<sup>26</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 211-2T, 158-9V (§498).

<sup>27</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 213T, 159-60V (§500).

<sup>28</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 221-2T, 166-7V (§513).

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 222-6T, 167-70V (§514-6bis).

<sup>30</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 308-10T, 230-2V.

<sup>31</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 310T, 232V.

<sup>32</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 324-6T, 242-3V.

the Anonymous Chronicler describes at length, the circumstances of the appointment of Abraham, who had been bishop of Amida (appointed by Theodore bar Wahbun, counter-patriarch to Michael I) and Khabur, to the see of Edessa, and the discord that existed in Edessa between the members of the church of Mor Theodore and the church of the Theotokos, during which Abraham chose the side of the former.<sup>33</sup> Similarly, the Anonymous Chronicler discusses Edessa's lack of an archpriest after the deaths of the deacon Constantine and his brother Sliwa.<sup>34</sup> The last Edessan ecclesiastical matters that we are informed on are a failed attempt to reconcile the two parties in AG 1518/AD 1207,<sup>35</sup> and the fact that Abraham had apparently left Edessa and may have received the diocese of Mardin, and that a certain Theodore was now bishop of Edessa.<sup>36</sup>

All this having been said, we cannot qualify the Anonymous Chronicler's relationship to Edessa. One must keep in mind that "Edessa was central for the identity of the Syriac Orthodox Christians in the twelfth century" and its fall affected them and other Christian communities (e.g. the Armenians) directly.<sup>37</sup> Although his knowledge of the ancient history of Edessa probably stems from a written source, possibly a geographical compendium, his knowledge of its (near-)contemporary history seems to be due to his own observations and experiences. Possibly his clerical duties led him to this city in a later stage of his life.

At the same time, the Anonymous Chronicler seems to have known sultan Malik al-Ashraf personally. He speaks of the sultan "from good memory because of the goodness of his will and his good intentions towards everyone,"<sup>38</sup> and mentions "a commander who was much-loved by the king."<sup>39</sup> He also knows many details about the battle of Arzinjan on 10 August AD 1230 between Jalal ad-Din Khwarazm-shah (1220-31), and the

---

<sup>33</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 341-4T, 254-7V.

<sup>34</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 348-9T, 259-60V.

<sup>35</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 347-8T, 259-60V.

<sup>36</sup> In the context of an account of the synod in the monastery of Mar Barsaumo to elect a successor for Athanasius, Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 349-50T, 260V.s

<sup>37</sup> Weltecke 2010, 103.

<sup>38</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 229.19-21T, 172.16-7V.

<sup>39</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 230T, 173V.

combined forces of Malik al-Ashraf and Kay-Qubad I, the sultan of Rum, during which the former was defeated.<sup>40</sup>

On a more personal level, the Pre-Constantinian Part reveals a particular interest in ancient Greek culture, especially ancient (Greek) wisdom<sup>41</sup> and philosophy.<sup>42</sup> With respect to the latter his praise of Aristotle is worth noting.<sup>43</sup> Similarly, he seems to have been interested in medicine, the sciences and even poetry, as is shown by his references to the physicians Hippocrates and Galen, to a book on astronomy, written by the caliph al-Ma'mun, and the expression of his admiration for the Arabic poet al-Mutanabbi (d. 965), who was attached to the court of Sayf ad-Dawla in Damascus.<sup>44</sup>

The Chronicler was clearly also interested in sieges of Eastern cities, or at least thought siege accounts from his sources worth transmitting in full to his readers. Unlike Michael, who often paraphrased siege accounts, the Anonymous Chronicler copied them in full. The clearest example of his interest in sieges of famous cities is the lengthy account of the Trojan War, taken from an unknown source, possibly Theophilus of Edessa, and based on the *Epic Cycle*.<sup>45</sup>

## 1.2 Genre

The Anonymous Chronicler himself calls his work ܩܘܒܠܐ ܕܩܝܡܐܘܬܐ, the Syriac equivalent of the Greek χρονογραφία, a “writing of times.” However, Chron. 1234 is not a

---

<sup>40</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 235-6T, 176-7V. Worth noting in this account is the fact that, even though the three groups in question are Turks and Mongols, they receive different epithets: the forces of Malik al-Ashraf are called Tayyoyē, used in late antiquity to denote Arabs, the forces of Jalal ad-Din are called “Persians” and the Mongols are called Tatars or “Turks.”

<sup>41</sup> Antaeus, Daedalus, Prometheus and Atlas.

<sup>42</sup> Note the explicit reference to philosophers in the preface, Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 26.8T.

<sup>43</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 104.28-105.9T.

<sup>44</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 40T, 29V.

<sup>45</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 66.8-78.24T. On which, see Hilkens 2013 and Chapter 25.5 in this volume.

χρονογραφία, such as the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus or the first part of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius of Caesarea. Such works are chiefly “concerned with chronology, but in a mathematical or computistic and apologetic manner, and (...) composed of chronological calculations, detailed analyses and arguments, digressions, and regnal lists, not the setting forth of history year by year or ‘uno in conspectu’.”<sup>46</sup>

In spite of its great length, its divisions (see below) and its occasional a-chronological digressions, Chron. 1234 is essentially a late and developed example of a universal chronicle in the Eusebian tradition, covering the history of the Christian world from Creation until the author’s own lifetime. The *Chronicle* of Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 340), together with a fourth-century Antiochene continuation of this work, was translated into Syriac in the sixth century and significantly influenced the Syriac (Orthodox) historiographical tradition, most notably with the adaptation of either the *Chronicle* with the continuation or of the Syriac translation by the sixth-century Syriac chronicler Andronicus.<sup>47</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler places himself and his work squarely in the Eusebian tradition, explicitly mentioning Eusebius and Andronicus in his preface. Two other inspirators that are identified are Jacob of Edessa (d. 710) and George of the Arab tribes (d. 724)<sup>48</sup> These references are peculiar, because there is no evidence that Jacob directly influenced the Anonymous Chronicler,<sup>49</sup> neither as a source nor from a literary perspective.<sup>50</sup> In addition, there is no indication that George of the Arabs wrote a chronicle, though he often wrote on astronomical and chronological matters.<sup>51</sup>

As in the case of the last Greek chronicles, the *Chronicon Paschale* (c. 630) and the *Chronographia* of Theophanes the Confessor (d. 818), and the examples of post-Eusebian

---

<sup>46</sup> Burgess/Kulikowski 2013, 30.

<sup>47</sup> On whom, see chapter 15.

<sup>48</sup> See the preface in Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 26-7T.

<sup>49</sup> Only one fragment from Jac. Ed. Chron. (281-2T; 211V) appears in Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 119.29-120.8T and seems to have reached the Anonymous Chronicler via a later intermediary.

<sup>50</sup> The Eusebian system of chronological canons, which was continued by Jac. Ed., is completely abandoned in Chron. 1234.

<sup>51</sup> Ryssel 1893.

Syriac chronicle writing, the scale of Chron. 1234 was far greater than Eusebius' chronicle or any ancient or late ancient example. In consequence it lacks one of the central characteristics of the ancient chronicle, brevity.<sup>52</sup> Chron. 1234 includes large chunks of narrative material, usually longer narratives copied from narrative sources, mainly but not exclusively ecclesiastical histories. Unlike many later Byzantine chronicles, Chron. 1234 is not a breviarum or a 'chronicle epitome', a term adopted by Burgess and Kulikowski.<sup>53</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler does abbreviate some of his sources, but at the same time, he creates his own narrative by fusing material from different sources. For the Pre-Christian period, for instance, he supplements Eusebian material with information from Malalas, the *Lives of the Prophets*, the *Cave of Treasures* and the *Book of Jubilees*. For Chron. 1234 and the later Syriac chronicles, the most suitable term remains that of the 'developed chronicles', coined by Witold Witakowski and not only applied to Chron. 1234, but also to Chron. Zuqn., Michael's *Chronicle* and the *Chronicon Syriacum* of Barhebraeus.<sup>54</sup>

For future reference, I also provide here a list of the preserved Syriac chronicles, with authors, to which I will often refer in this volume.<sup>55</sup> I have included the *Chronicle* of Agapius, the Melkite bishop of Mabbug (c. 941-2), and the *Chronicle of Seert* (tenth century) in this list.<sup>56</sup> Though these chronicles were written in Arabic, they are largely based on Syriac sources and therefore crucial witnesses for the reconstruction of now lost Syriac chronicles.

---

<sup>52</sup> Burgess/Kulikowski 2013, 231.

<sup>53</sup> Burgess/Kulikowski 2013.

<sup>54</sup> Witakowski 1987, 83.

<sup>55</sup> For a most extensive list, see Debié/Taylor 2012. For a detailed discussion of most of these chronicles, see also Palmer 2009 (short chronicles) and Weltecke 2009 and Weltecke 2010 (Syriac Orthodox chronicles of the Syriac Renaissance).

<sup>56</sup> I have only turned towards the latter on very few occasions.

Source	Abbreviation	Author
Chronicle of Edessa	Chron. Ed.	Unknown (540s)
Chronicle up to the Year 636 (preserved in the Chronicle of 724)	Chron. 636	Thomas the priest
Maronite Chronicle	Chron. Maron.	Unknown (c. 664)
Melkite Chronicle	Chron. Melk.	Unknown (641 - 680-1)
Chronicle of Jacob of Edessa	Jac. Ed. Chron.	Jacob of Edessa (d. 710)
Chronicle of 724	Chron. 724	Unknown
Chronicle up to the Year 775	Chron. 775	Unknown
Chronicle of Zuqnin (775)	Chron. Zuqn.	Unknown
Chronicle up to the Year 813	Chron. 813	Unknown
Chronicle of Qartmin up to the Year 819	Chron. 819	Unknown
Chronicle up to the Year 846	Chron. 846	David of Harran?
Chronicle of Agapius of Mabbug	Agap. Chron. (in Arabic)	Agapius of Mabbug (c.941-2)

Chronicle of Seert	Chron. Seert	Unknown (tenth century)
Chronicle of Elias of Nisibis	El. Nis. Op. Chron.	Elias of Nisibis (975-1046)
Chronicle of Michael the Great	Mich. Syr. Chron.	Michael the Great (1126-1199)
Chronicon Syriacum of Barhebraeus	Barhebr. Chron. Syr.	Barhebraeus (1226-1286)

### 1.3 Morphology and composition

The text as it lies before us now is divided into two main parts: a Pre-Constantinian and a Post-Constantinian Part. The Pre-Constantinian Part consists of a narrative on the story of Creation, based on material from the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Cave of Treasures*, followed by a description of time from the birth of Adam until the reign of Constantius Chlorus. The Post-Constantinian Part is further divided into a Secular and an Ecclesiastical Part. The division between pre- and post-Constantinian history may be due to the influence of the *Chronicle* of Ignatius of Melitene (d. 1094), whose chronicle covered the time between Constantine the Great until c. 1090.<sup>57</sup> On the other hand, it may be that the Anonymous Chronicler divided history between a pre-Constantinian and a post-Constantinian period because Constantine was the first Christian emperor.

The Secular Part breaks off in 1234, hence the name Chron. 1234. The Ecclesiastical Part is even more fragmentarily preserved. Not only does it break off in 1207 and is it

---

<sup>57</sup> See chapter 22. Jac. Ed. Chron., a continuation of Eus. Chron., also started with the reign of Constantine, but the Anonymous Chronicler does not appear to have used Jac. Ed. Chron.

missing its narrative from the time of Constantine until the 550s, the material in between is often also only fragmentarily preserved, especially towards the end. The division of subject matter in secular and ecclesiastical history that is typical for the later Syriac Orthodox chronicle tradition is due to Dionysius of Tell-Mahre (d. 845) whose *History*, which covered the period between 582 and 842, was also divided in a Secular Part and an Ecclesiastical Part, which were both divided into eight books. Dionysius felt this division in subject matter was appropriate, because Muslim overlordship over Syriac Orthodox Christians in Syria, Anatolia and Northern Mesopotamia and the isolation of the Syriac Orthodox community from the Byzantine empire effectively meant a separation between ecclesiastical and secular history.<sup>58</sup>

Chron. 1234 also contains titles, which were inserted by the Anonymous Chronicler himself. This can be deduced from the fact that they often include source references, for instance to John of Ephesus and Dionysius of Tell-Mahre.<sup>59</sup> Titles were almost exclusively used to introduce longer narratives or lists; they often break up longer accounts taken from a single source. The Pre-Constantinian Part has barely any, because it only has a few of these narratives and lists. Sometimes titles do not match the contents of the ‘chapter’.

From the start of the reign of Constantine onward, this use of titles becomes somewhat like a division into numbered chapters, though the numbering system is incomplete and often incorrect. The first longer narrative in the Secular Part is

---

<sup>58</sup> Dion. TM’s innovations would leave their imprint on the morphology of the extant later Syriac Orthodox chronicles. Not only the Anonymous Chronicler, but Michael and Barhebraeus conceived their works in similar ways. Michael traced history in work, dividing his subject matter in three columns (chronological canons probably being the fourth column), pertaining to secular and ecclesiastical history, keeping one column for various events, most notably natural disasters and miracles. It is worth noting that unlike the Anonymous Chronicler, Michael used this three-column system from the moment of Creation onwards, not from the reign of Constantine the Great like the Anonymous Chronicler. Barhebraeus’ division, on the other hand, was more rigorous: he wrote two separate works, a *Chronicon Syriacum* and a *Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, devoted to secular and ecclesiastical history respectively. One wonders if Ign. Mel. also followed Dion. TM’s division, because at that time Melitene and Antioch, the nominal see of the Syriac Orthodox patriarch, were part of a Christian empire once more.

<sup>59</sup> E.g. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 185.17T (Joh. Eph.) and vol. 2, 257.22-3T, 193.30V (Dion. TM).

identified as 'chapter' 22. Some titles have received numbers and others have not. On occasion, some numbers are skipped or repeated. It may be that these numbers are not original to Chron. 1234 were not added by the chronicler himself, but by a later copyist.

## 1.4 Chronology

Chron. 1234 covers the history of the world from Creation until the author's own lifetime. From the chronicler's perspective, the time between Creation and AD 1234 would have covered 6734 years: the birth of Christ is dated to AM 5500, year 5500 after the birth of Adam, after the early Christian calculation of this event by Hippolytus of Rome and Julius Africanus.<sup>60</sup> Unlike some of his sources, the Anonymous Chronicler did not have a millenaristic perspective on history, he did not believe that AM 6000 was the year in which the world would end.<sup>61</sup> Though he indicated the dates of the first, third, fourth and fifth millenaries, he ignores the sixth. It is thus more likely that for the Anonymous Chronicler this system of millenaries had become an indicator of the elapsing of time before the birth of Christ.

The Anonymous Chronicler used a variety of chronological systems, most of which provided by his sources and copied indiscriminately. For the period before Alexander the Great and Seleucus I Nicator, the main method of dating events was dating them a year in the reign or the life of a biblical patriarch, judge, king or prophet. When there was no ruling Jewish king, he used the years of the the reign of an Assyrian or Persian king, or years of the Captivity. There is also one attested case in which the Anonymous

---

<sup>60</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 116.4-5T. See also Mich. Syr. Chron. V 10 (90T; vol. 1: 142V) and Georg. Sync. Chron. 381.23-382.4. See Witakowski 1990a.

<sup>61</sup> Witakowski 1990a, 100ff.

Chronicler uses the Jewish system of jubilees, for the date of the death of Adam. This information ultimately goes back to *Jubilees* 4:29.<sup>62</sup>

From the reign of Seleucus I Nicator onwards, the main dating system, apart from the regnal year of kings and emperors, became the Seleucid era, a dating system which Syriac Orthodox Christians have used up to this day. Aside from their writing in Syriac, the use of this Hellenistic Greek era is perhaps the strongest identity marker of all: “through the rejection of the local Antiochene as well as the Byzantine eras officially used in the Empire (...) Syrian Christians could assert their Greek ‘Syrian’ identity in relation to either fellow Christians (Byzantines, Armenians and, later, Franks), who used other computational systems (such as indictions, the Byzantine world era, the Antiochene era, the Armenian era and cycle, the Christian era), and the non-Christian kingdoms of the Arabs, Turks and Mongols.”<sup>63</sup>

The reference point for this dating system is 312 BC, the year in which Seleucus returned to Babylon after his conquest of Gaza and the start of his sole rule.<sup>64</sup> The starting point of the dating system is 1 October, the equivalent of the Macedonian month Dios, the month in which the Macedonian year started. In Chron. 1234 years in this system are referred to as “year of the Greeks,” (= *Anno Graecorum* = AG) or much more rarely as “year of Seleucus”<sup>65</sup> or “year of Alexander.”<sup>66</sup> More often than not, however, they are abbreviated to “year.”

The second most important dating method, which the Anonymous Chronicler used quite often in Chron. 1234 for the period between AD 625 and AD 854, and once for AD 1094, is the Muslim Era (= *Anno Hijra* = AH). The reference point for this dating system is AD 622, the year of the *Hijra*, the migration of Muhammad and his followers from Mecca to Medina. The Anonymous Chronicler, however, refers to the Muslim era before the

---

<sup>62</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 32.24T.

<sup>63</sup> Debié 2009a, 101-2.

<sup>64</sup> On which, see Grumel 1958, vol. 1, 209.

<sup>65</sup> Chron. 1234, vol.1, 121.11-2T: in the context of the material on the correspondence between Abgar and Christ.

<sup>66</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 268.4-5T.

death of Mohammed as “year of Mohammed”<sup>67</sup> and after Mohammed’s demise as “year of the Tayyoyē,”<sup>68</sup> i.e. the Arabs.<sup>69</sup> In three cases it is simply abbreviated to “year”.<sup>70</sup>

Only once does the Anonymous Chronicler use “the year of the coming of Lord” as a dating method, for the arrival of the Franks and the First Crusade.<sup>71</sup> This use is extremely rare in Syriac historiography.

All this having been said, there are many dating errors throughout Chron. 1234 and the calculation of pre-Christian chronology is riddled with inconsistencies and errors. Though it is not always clear if these are due to scribal errors or to miscalculations, the former occurs quite often. Ultimately, chronology was not the most important element for the Anonymous Chronicler. Often he simply copied the dates from his sources, to the point where dates from different sources did not match each other. Thus, Chron. 1234 still dates the division of the earth among the sons of Noah in year 120 of Peleg,<sup>72</sup> like Andronicus, but in Chron. 1234’s (implicit) calculation, which agrees with Annianus, this would have occurred in AM 2893, not in AM 2916 (Andronicus).

A similar example is the case of the dates of the death of the biblical patriarchs before the Flood. For the dates of their births, the Anonymous Chronicler follows Annianus (see the relevant chapter), but the dates of their deaths were copied from the *Cave of Treasures*.

---

<sup>67</sup> In four cases: Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 231.19T (year 3), 235.2 (year 7), 238.2T (year 8) and 238.20T (year 9).

<sup>68</sup> E.g. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 248.23T, 254.23T, 255.28T; vol. 2, 10.28T, 7.10V: “year 197 of the Arabs”; Abouna often translates this very freely as “of the Hijra,” see Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 22.26T: “year 214 of the Arabs” (16.1V: “de l’Hégire”). Brock 2005, 277 records the use of the following terms for the Muslim era in Syriac manuscripts: of the Tayyoyē, of the Ishmaelites, of the *mhaggroyē* (perhaps the equivalent of the Arabic *muhājirun*), the children of Hagar, and the Hijra.

<sup>69</sup> The exact meaning of the term Tayyoyē is difficult to assess. It appears to mainly have a geographical component, as it can be applied to Christian as well as Muslim Arabs. At the same time, however, in Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 237T, 178V (§525) it is even used for Ayyubid troops from Egypt to Nisibis.

<sup>70</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 12.4T, 8.6V; Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 39.7T, 28.9V; Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 54.8T, 39.26V.

<sup>71</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 54T, 39V.

<sup>72</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 46.28-29T.

Patriarch	<i>Cave of Treasures</i>	Chron. 1234	Correct computation of Annianus <sup>73</sup> (and thus Chron. 1234)
Adam	135 of Mahlalalel	135 of Mahlalalel	135 of Mahlalalel
Seth	20 of Enoch	20 of Enoch	20 of Enoch
Enosh	53 of Methuselah	53 of Methuselah	53 of Methuselah
Kenan	65 of Lamech (9:9)	65 of Lamech	91 of Lamech (1545 - 1454)
Mahalalel	34 of Noah (10:9)	34 of Noah	48 of Noah (1690 - 1454)
Yared	366 of Noah (13:8)	370 of Noah	466 of Noah (1920 - 1454)
Methuselah	79 of Shem (17:2)	79 of Shem	112 of Shem (2256 - 2144)
Lamech	68 of Shem (14:6)	68 of Shem	87 of Shem (2231 - 2144)

I will not focus on chronology in more detail because the numbers are very confused in Chron. 1234. However, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly investigate the list of Babylonian kings that underlies Chron. 1234. Chron. 1234 refers to eight Babylonian kings, most in passing in entries taken from the Eusebian canons, entries dealing with Babylonian raids on Jerusalem. Only the start of Sennacherib the Younger's reign is connected to the reign of a Jewish king.

---

<sup>73</sup> Based on information provided by El. Nis. Op. Chron.

Babylonian kings mentioned in Chron. 1234	Regnal years	Synchronisms
Tiglath-Pileser	?	
Salmanassar	?	
Sennacherib	?	
Sennacherib the Younger	31	year 36 of Manasseh
Nebuchadnezzar	? (at least 21)	
Awel-Marduk	5	
Belshazzar	3	
Darius the Mede	1	

Agapius and Michael mention the same kings, in fact even several more, and provide more information about the lengths of their reigns and synchronisms with Jewish chronology. The congruences demonstrate their reliance on the same source.

Agapius <sup>74</sup>			Michael <sup>75</sup>		
King	Regnal years	Synchronisms	King	Regnal years	Synchronisms
Pul	35	Year 6 of Oziah	Pul		
Tiglath-Pileser	35	Year 41 of Oziah	Tiglath-Pileser	35	Year 41 of Oziah
Salmanassar	14	Year 8 of Achaz	Salmanassar	14	Year 8 of Achaz
Sennacherib	9	Year 6 Hezekiah	Sennacherib	9	Year 6 Hezekiah
Esarhaddon	3		Esarhaddon	3	Year 15 of Hezekiah
Marduk-Baladan	48	Year 15 of Hezekiah	[Marduk]-Baladan		Year 18 of Hezekiah
Sennacherib the Younger	31	Year 39 of Manasseh	Sennacherib the Younger	31	Year 36 of Manasseh
The Mage	33	Between year 1 and year 6 of Josiah	Nabopolassar the Mage	33	Year 2 of Amon

<sup>74</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 181-210.

<sup>75</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IV.15-21 (; vol. 1: 78-101V).

Nebuchadnezzar	45	Year 3 of Eliakim	Nebuchadnezzar	40 [= 45?]	Year 3 of Jehoiakim [= Eliakim]
Awel-Marduk	1		Awel-Marduk	1 or 3 <sup>76</sup>	
Belshazzar	? [2 or more]		Belshazzar	2 or 5	
Darius the Mede and the Persian	?		Darius the Mede	?	

A comparison with the names preserved in the Armenian chronological canons and Jerome's *Chronicle* shows that an unknown Syriac chronicler completed the Eusebian list of Babylonian kings with names of kings from biblical and non-biblical sources. After Belshazzar he added Darius the Mede, the king who threw Daniel in the lion's den and was eventually defeated by Cyrus the Persian (*Daniel* 6-9). In the period between Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar, he added Esarhaddon (2 *Kings* 19:37), Marduk-Baladan (2 *Kings* 20:12), Sennacherib the Younger and Nabopolassar the Mage. The first two kings are also mentioned in three earlier Syriac Eusebian witnesses, Chron. 724,<sup>77</sup> Chron. Zuqn.<sup>78</sup> and Chron. 846,<sup>79</sup> although none of them mentions both, which suggests that the references to Esarhaddon and Marduk-Baladan may go back to a Syriac version of Eusebius' *Chronicle*. Sennacherib the Younger<sup>80</sup> and Nabopolassar, however, are only mentioned by Agapius, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler. They must therefore be reliant on the same source, an unidentified Syriac chronicler. Given the identity of the sources, one assumes the involvement of either Andronicus or John of Litharb, but this is merely conjecture at this point.

<sup>76</sup> 17 years in total, with a co-regency with Nebuchadnezzar after his insanity.

<sup>77</sup> Marduk-Baladan: Chron. 724, 85T, 69V.

<sup>78</sup> Marduk-Baladan: Chron. Zuqn. a. 1293 (vol. 1, 34T, 27V).

<sup>79</sup> Esarhaddon (=Sarahedom): Chron. 846, 162T, 126V.

<sup>80</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 202 (year 39); Mich. Syr. Chron. IV.18 (54T; vol. 1: 88V); and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 94.10-1T.

## 1.5 Perspective on history

Chron. 1234 fairly traditionally recounts the history of the world from the Creation and the birth of Adam until the author's own lifetime. For the period of the Old Testament, the author follows the succession of biblical patriarchs, judges, Jewish kings, the Assyrian kings during the captivity, followed by the succession of Persian kings until the time of Alexander. Alexander bridges biblical history and pagan history,<sup>81</sup> leading the Anonymous Chronicler to the succession of the Seleucids, the successors of Seleucus I Nicator, until the rise of the Roman empire. The Roman imperial succession then becomes the main focus of Chron. 1234. Unfortunately, the section of the Pre-Constantinian Part that dealt with the 'succession' of the Seleucids by the Romans is missing, but we can assume that the Anonymous Chronicler presumed that the Roman empire began with Caesar who is in Syriac sources incorrectly identified as a Roman emperor.<sup>82</sup> The succession of Roman emperors is followed from Caesar and Augustus until the time of Diocletian and Constantius. After the reign of Constantius there is a caesura: his son Constantine was the first Christian emperor. The succession of Roman and Byzantine emperors is followed fairly consistently until the time of Heraclius, but Valentinian III (425-55) is the last Western Roman emperor to be mentioned, after his death the focus on the Western Roman empire disappears almost completely. That the deposition of emperor Romulus Augustus by Odoacer in 476 goes unmentioned is sufficient evidence for the chronicler's disinterest in the Western Roman empire.

From the reign of Heraclius onwards, the Anonymous Chronicler appears to be more concerned with specific events and their implications for the local population, in particular the Syriac Orthodox community, than the succession of rulers.<sup>83</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler mentions Byzantine emperors and Islamic caliphs and more

---

<sup>81</sup> Debié 2009a, 100.

<sup>82</sup> E.g. Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 253; El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 39.11T, 23.30V; Mich. Syr. Chron. V 8 (84T; vol. 1: 132-3V).

<sup>83</sup> Weltecke 2009, 122-3.

attention is devoted to the former than to the latter, at least until the time of al-Mutasim (833-42), because Syrian Christians were under Muslim rule and no longer part of the Byzantine empire (until a brief period in the tenth and eleventh century), when the Byzantines reconquered Northern Syria and Northern Mesopotamia and the Seljuqs arrived in the West.

Nonetheless, these Byzantine, Arab and Seljuq rules are only mentioned when their existence or rule is relevant for a certain event. From the dissolution of the Great Seljuq empire after the death of Malik Shah I in 1092, for instance, there is more attention to local emirs and governors than to Seljuq sultans. The clearest example are in fact the Frankish rulers and regents of the county of Edessa, on whom, due to his reliance on Basil, the Anonymous Chronicler was very well-informed and in which he was clearly very interested. Nevertheless, the Anonymous Chronicler has no interest whatsoever in their origins; Western Europe is not relevant for this description of history.

The Chronicler's views on history and historical events are fairly traditional. Like many of his predecessors, he adopts the biblical view of God's operation in history. God is said to have intervened in the history of mankind on numerous occasions. An additional aspect of this world view and this perspective on history is the idea that afflictions such as earthquakes, invasions, famines and droughts were caused by sin.<sup>84</sup> One can quote biblical examples such as the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, but an interesting case in Chron. 1234 is that of the fall of Troy, which is said to have occurred because "the Lord was angry with Ilion and with its inhabitants. He handed them over to destruction, plundering, captivity and perdition in the hands of the Greek kings and their armies."<sup>85</sup> The reason for God's anger is not specified but could be Helen's and Paris' unlawful marriage,<sup>86</sup> or the idolatry of the Trojans, which is symbolised by the Palladium, the statue of Athena that functioned as the city's protector.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> Morony 2005, 7.

<sup>85</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 78.1-4T.

<sup>86</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 69.20T: And thus was concluded this unlawful marriage, that brought forth terrible things."

<sup>87</sup> Hilkens 2013, 310.

To give but one example from more recent times, the Anonymous Chronicler, copying Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, states that the invasion of the “sons of Ishmael,” i.e. the Muslim-Arab conquest of the seventh century, was caused by God and directed towards to the Romans who were suppressing the Syriac Orthodox.<sup>88</sup> Similarly, the invasion of the Mongols is seen as the result of God’s wrath,<sup>89</sup> and the capture and fall of Edessa in 1144 and 1146 is said to have occurred because the Edessan women married Turkish men.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 237T.

<sup>89</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 236T, 177V.

<sup>90</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 132T, 99V.

## Chapter 2 The Bible

Ultimately, the main source for pre-Christian history was the Bible. Chron. 1234 preserves citations from, reference and allusions to it. When speaking of the philosophical teachings of Aristotle, the Chronicler refers to the Bible as a whole as “the holy Scriptures, in which the hope of the Christians hangs.”<sup>1</sup> The New Testament is never referred to as a whole, only separate books are mentioned. Several references to the gospel occur in Chron. 1234, sometimes in copies of entries from the *Cave of Treasures* (e.g. 43:12), but some references were added by the Anonymous Chronicler himself.<sup>2</sup> The Acts (ܐܡܘܨܐ) of the twelve holy apostles are mentioned together with the Gospel and “books of the orthodox doctors” as a source for “everything that was done from the time of the ascent of Our Saviour until the end.”<sup>3</sup>

The “Old Testament” (ܐܘܪܫܠܝܡ ܐܘܪܫܠܝܡ, “books of the Old [Testament]”) is referred to as a whole, as the source in which “the remainder of all the things that occurred to the Jews from Abraham to Christ” “are described eloquently.”<sup>4</sup> The author, after Eusebius and other predecessors, knows of the discrepancies in chronological computations between the Syriac, Hebrew, Greek (Septuagint) and Samaritan version of the Old

---

<sup>1</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 105.7T.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. CT 45:22 is based on Mt 2:8, which was recognised by Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 116.29T which adds “as is written in the worshipped Gospel.”

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 125.8-9T.

<sup>4</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 86.3-7T.

Testament.<sup>5</sup> On several occasions the chronicler also refers to “the book of the Hebrews” or “the books of the Hebrews,” but only three of these instances can be interpreted as references to the Hebrew bible. All three came to the Anonymous Chronicler via a chronographic source to which Michael also had access. The first remark concerns the Hebrew Bible’s (and thus the Peshitta’s) lack of mention of Qainan, son of Arphaxad, which originated from the work of an adaptor or continuator of Eusebius.<sup>6</sup> The second remark focuses on the discrepancy in the length of the lives of several biblical patriarchs in the Hebrew bible and in the Septuagint.<sup>7</sup> The third reference concerns the translation of the Hebrew Old Testament in Greek during the reign of Ptolemy.<sup>8</sup> Interestingly, the fourth reference to “the book(s) of the Hebrews” does not introduce a biblical but a Targumic tradition, that Nimrod “threw Abraham in a fiery furnace, because he was not observing the cult of idols. The fire of the furnace was changed into a pleasant dew.”<sup>9</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler copied Eusebius’ reference<sup>10</sup> to the Pentateuch as “the five books of Moses,”<sup>11</sup> but the book of Genesis is mentioned independently as well.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 26.19-22T: “The computation of years of the world is written down in another way in the Book of Creation according to the Syrians and according to the Hebrews; in another way in the translation of the Seventy; in another way in that according to the Samaritans.”

<sup>6</sup> Comp. ‘the books of the Hebrews do not count this Qainan nor the sum of his years in the succession of years’ (Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 46.4-6 ) and ‘Eusebius does not count this Qainan and the sum of his years in the succession of years, not in the Hebrew book, nor according to ours’ [Mich. Syr. Chron. II 2 (8T; vol. 1: 16V)]. Cf. Georg. Sync. Chron. 36.32-37.1 (trans. 49): ‘Now Eusebius did not count in his genealogy this Cainan, who begot Sala in the 130<sup>th</sup> year of his life.’

<sup>7</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.16-8T and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (11T; vol. 23V).

<sup>8</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 108.26T and Mich. Syr. Chron. V 4 (75T; vol. 1: 117V).

<sup>9</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 48.9-13T, cf. Genesis Rabbah, comm. on Gn 11.28 (Neusner 1985, vol. 2, 55-7) and the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel (Etheridge 1865, 192). On which, see Bowker 1969, 187-189.

<sup>10</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.162.545; Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.46<sup>a</sup>; cf. also Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 24.7-10T, 19.17-9V; Mich. Syr. Chron. III 7 (25T; vol. 1: 45V).

<sup>11</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 65.3T.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 26.20T.

The historical books of the Old Testament are adduced as sources as well. The “book of Kings” (ܟܘܢܝܩܝܡܐ) is mentioned twice. Once, the Anonymous Chronicler cites it for the reign of Athalia (2 *Kings* 11:1-4).<sup>13</sup> Another reference to it, in fact to the Septuagint version, appears in a fragment from Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, in which Dionysius cites it as evidence for the reign of “Bar Hadad, king Syria” who “gathered his army and went up to Samaria.”<sup>14</sup>

In the margin of the manuscript, “the book of Paralipomenon” (ܟܘܢܝܩܝܡܐ ܕܡܪܝܚܐ = 1 and 2 *Chronicles*) is cited as a source for the story of the penitence of Manasseh.<sup>15</sup> It is not clear if this is a later interpolation or a remark of the Anonymous Chronicler’s own hand.

The prophetic books of the Old Testament are mentioned only once as a whole, in a copy of an entry from the *Chronicle* of Eusebius.<sup>16</sup> Only the books of Daniel and Jonah are mentioned separately (“his (Jonah’s) prophecy”<sup>17</sup> and “the book of his (Daniel’s) prophecy”<sup>18</sup>), as more detailed sources for the adventures of Jonah and Daniel than the *Lives of the Prophets*, though in the case of Daniel the Anonymous Chronicler seem to refer to the pseudepigraphical book of *Daniel* 14 (see below).

Chron. 1234 preserves two references to the Maccabean books, to “the books of the Maccabees (...) that also describe the (hi)stories until the time of the Romans”<sup>19</sup> and to “the third book of the Maccabees,”<sup>20</sup> copies of Eusebian entries.<sup>21</sup> To the latter entry the

---

<sup>13</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 89.13T. Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.178.1116; Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.78.12-4; Chron. Zuqn. a. 1116 (vol. 1, 30.13-4T, 24.16-7V); Chron. 846, 160.29T, 125.29V, all without the reference to 2 *Kings*.

<sup>14</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 113.22T.

<sup>15</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 94T, n. 1.

<sup>16</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 103.13T. Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.193.1572; Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.113<sup>a</sup>; Mich. Syr. Chron. V 2 (68T; vol. 1: 109V).

<sup>17</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 91.26T.

<sup>18</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 96.30T.

<sup>19</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 103.14T. Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.193.1572; Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.113<sup>a</sup>; Mich. Syr. Chron. V 2 (68T; vol. 1: 109V).

<sup>20</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 108.14T.

<sup>21</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.134<sup>b</sup> refers to 3 Mc as the source for events during the reign of Antiochus the Great, but Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.202 refers to 1 Mc [see also Georg. Sync. Chron. 344.5-6 (trans. 413) and Mich. Syr. Chron. V 6 (79T; vol. 1: 122V)].

Anonymous Chronicler, or a Syriac intermediary between Eusebius and Chron. 1234, added a reference to the “book of Ezra the scribe”.

On one occasion, the Anonymous Chronicler attached a reference to a “Book of the Covenant of the Lord with his servant Moses” (ܟܩܘܒܬܐ ܕܩܘܒܬܐ ܕܩܘܒܬܐ ܕܩܘܒܬܐ) to material from the *Cave of Treasures*, which in itself referred to “the Holy Gospel.”<sup>22</sup> This Book of the Covenant is said to have told the Israelites (how or when?) to celebrate Passover. The identity of this book is uncertain, but there may be a connection with the Book of the Covenant (ܟܩܘܒܬܐ ܕܩܘܒܬܐ), mentioned in *Exodus* 24:7. The meaning of this title is equally uncertain, but may refer the collection of laws and customs that God imposed on the Israelites, written down in *Exodus*, *Leviticus* and *Deuteronomy*.

From the chronographic origin of most of these references to the scriptures can be deduced that like most of his predecessors, the Anonymous Chronicler only rarely used the Bible directly. For information regarding to the succession of the biblical patriarchs, judges and kings the Anonymous Chronicler mainly turned to chronographic and apocryphal sources, who had already moulded the biblical information into a chronographic format. The Anonymous Chronicler refers to the chronological computation “according to the Hebrews” and “according to the Syrians”, but he copied these indications from (a) chronographic source(s). Similarly, he mentions the postdiluvian patriarch Qainan, who does not even appear in the Peshitta, only in the Septuagint and from there in the Greek and Syriac chronicles.

Although the majority of the biblical information reached the Anonymous Chronicler via historiographical (Eusebius, Annianus, Andronicus ) and apocryphal sources (the *Cave of Treasures*, *Jubilees*), Chron. 1234 does demonstrate a direct use of the Bible in a few cases. The most obvious example is the chronicler’s use of the *Book of Ruth* (in the Peshitta version), which he copied almost completely (a few words from *Ruth* 1:12 are missing) and almost without error.<sup>23</sup> One could argue that the discussion of the ancestry of David (*Ruth* 4:16-22) was the reason for the inclusion of *Ruth* 1-4 into Chron. 1234, but the arguments against this are convincing. On the one hand, the Anonymous Chronicler

---

<sup>22</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 102.22-3T.

<sup>23</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 78.30-85.5T with the Syro-Hexaplaric version (Rordam 1861, 187-201).

chose to copy this entire book, not just a summary, indicating his interest in the historical background that *Ruth* provided. On the other hand, the genealogy of David was also available to him in *Cave of Treasures* 23:12, but the Anonymous Chronicler consciously decided to include the story of *Ruth*.

On several occasions, the Anonymous Chronicler seems to have supplemented biblical verses from *Genesis* and the *Gospels of Matthew* and *Luke* in *Jubilees*, Eusebius and the *Cave of Treasures* with additional verses from the same biblical books. Chron. 1234's version of God's conversation with Adam and Eve, after their having eaten the deadly fruit, is a combination of *Jubilees* 3:23-5, (possibly) *Cave of Treasures* 5:5 and *Genesis* 3:8a.9-13, possibly (but unlikely) also 3:16-17.<sup>24</sup> Peculiarly however, the equivalent of *Genesis* 3:10 in Chron. 1234 contains a Greek reading. When God asks Adam why he hid himself (*Genesis* 3:9), Adam answers (*Genesis* 3:10): "I was afraid (ⲁⲗⲗⲁⲓ)." <sup>25</sup> This reading differs from the reading in the Peshitta as well as in the *Cave of Treasures* 4:20, which both have ⲁⲗⲗⲁ, "I saw," but agrees with the Septuagint. This element may reveal the influence of either the Syro-Hexapla or the involvement of a Greek chronographic intermediary, but there is one other Syriac witness to the same passage: in his factual commentary on *Genesis* 3:10 Dionysius bar Ṣalibi also says that Adam "was afraid,"<sup>26</sup> whereas his spiritual commentary on the same verse has "I saw."

Chron. 1234's description of the birth and childhood of Christ is also a combination of material from the *Cave of Treasures* (45:2-3, 20-2; 46:5-6, 12, 14; 47:9, 15-27), entries from Eusebius' *Chronicle*<sup>27</sup> and phrases from the *Gospel of Matthew* (2:2-3, 8, 10-17, 19-23) and the *Gospel of Luke* (1:11-17, 65).

Apart from these larger biblical excerpts, single biblical verses appear throughout Chron. 1234 as well. The biblical remark that "Noah was 600 years old when he entered

---

<sup>24</sup> For a closer inspection of this material, see the chapter on *Jubilees*.

<sup>25</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 30:15T.

<sup>26</sup> Dion. Bar Salib. Comm. Gen., 114.

<sup>27</sup> Two brief references to the length of the reign of Herod (Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 119.1T) and the beginning of the reign of his son Archelaus (Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 119.15-6T), Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.210.1984, Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.160.1-9 and Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.212.2012, Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.170.5-8 respectively.

the Ark,” (*Genesis* 7:6) was introduced between *Cave of Treasures* 18:2 and 18:10, even though it does not match the chronological computation in *Chron.* 1234. Paraphrases of *Genesis* 14:14, 16, verses that replaced their equivalents from *Jubilees* (13:24-25). Between two passages of *Jubilees* (33:8 and 9), we find *Genesis* 49:4a: “And he cursed him and said: ‘Like waters, you go astray, you will not remain.’” This biblical verse was clearly adduced as evidence of how “Jacob was very angry with Ruben, because he had slept with Bilhah and [because] had had uncovered the covering of his father” (*Jubilees* 33:8). Similarly, a passage from the Testament of Ruben was introduced after *Jubilees* 33:9 in order to demonstrate how Ruben felt guilty and imposed a fast on himself: “[a]nd Ruben imposed a fast on him[self] not to eat flesh or drink wine because of his transgression.”<sup>28</sup> Information from *Luke* 4:25 was also implemented to complete the account on Elijah in the *Lives of the Prophets* and the story of Jonah in *Chron.* 1234 is a combination of material from several different sources including the *Lives of the Prophets* and *Jonah* 1:1-12, 15, 17; 2:1, 10; 3:3-6, 10.

Biblical citations were not only used as ‘historical’ evidence for the Pre-Christian period, but also used as literary expressions. One example of this process in *Chron.* 1234 is a quotation of *Exodus* 9:12 in *Chron.* 1234’s account of Zangi’s siege of Edessa in 1144.<sup>29</sup> Whether the quote came from Basil of Edessa (d. 1169) or is a later interpolation by the Anonymous Chronicler cannot be determined. Similar examples are his use of a quote from Paul’s letter to the Romans (9:16<sup>30</sup>).

Through allusions to certain events, we can also deduce the Anonymous Chronicler’s familiarity with other books from the Old Testament, such as *Numbers*, through his reference to Balaam and the mule (*Num* 22). One could suspect his familiarity with the pseudepigraphical biblical books of Daniel as well, due to the references to Susannah (*Daniel* 12), the fact that Nebuchadnezzar threw Hananiah, Azariah and Mishael in the fiery furnace (*Daniel* 13), the refusal of Daniel and his companions to worship Nebuchadnezzar’s statue (Daniel and the dragon; *Daniel* 14:1-22) and Daniel’s stay in the

---

<sup>28</sup> *Chron.* 1234, vol. 1, 56.5-6T.

<sup>29</sup> *Chron.* 1234, vol. 2, 122T, 91.38-9V.

<sup>30</sup> *Chron.* 1234, vol. 2, 322.27-8T, 241.10-2V.

lion's den (*Daniel* 14:30-42).<sup>31</sup> However, since the Anonymous Chronicler's version of the story of Daniel and Susannah displays several extra-biblical elements, it may be that he in fact used an intermediary, an unknown apocryphal or exegetical text. The Anonymous Chronicler says that Daniel was 12 years old at the time, mentions the names of the "corrupt priests who were lying about Susannah" as Naamai and Abba and says that "fire descended from Heaven and consumed" them.<sup>32</sup>

In this respect, one other exegetical tradition in Chron. 1234 may be mentioned here. Among material from the *Cave of Treasures*, the Anonymous Chronicler describes Noah as the second Adam.<sup>33</sup> This tradition was known to several Syriac authors ranging from Narsai in the fourth century until George Warda in the thirteenth.<sup>34</sup> It is also attested in the *Memar Marqah*, a Samaritan commentary on the Pentateuch.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> After the reference to Daniel's stay in the lion's den the Anonymous Chronicler adds the reference to "the book of his prophecy."

<sup>32</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 96.17-21T.

<sup>33</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 40.30-1T.

<sup>34</sup> Frishman 1992, 57 (Narsai) and Pritula 2009, 194 [3.7] (George Warda).

<sup>35</sup> On which, see Lebram 1965, 200-1. I am thankful to prof. dr. Abraham Tal for pointing this witness out to me.



## Chapter 3    *The Lives of the Prophets*

### 3.1 Introduction

Like the author of Chron. 846, Agapius and Michael, the Anonymous Chronicler expanded the brief Eusebian references to the Old Testament prophets with extra-biblical traditions. The bulk of this information regarding the deeds, genealogical origins and the circumstances of the births and deaths of these prophets was taken from the *Lives of the Prophets*, a pseudepigraphical text, of uncertain date and origin (Jewish or Christian<sup>1</sup>), which survives in Greek, Syriac, Ethiopic (Ge'ez), Latin, Armenian and Arabic.<sup>2</sup> The Greek and Syriac versions are often wrongly attributed to bishop Epiphanius of Salamis (d. 403).

The Syriac version of the *Lives*, which was translated from a now lost Greek *Vorlage*, survives in several witnesses that Sebastian Brock<sup>3</sup> classified in five categories: (1) a group of early manuscripts (and later copies of earlier manuscripts), (2) manuscripts from the later East-Syrian tradition, (3) Melkite,<sup>4</sup> West-Syrian and East-Syrian abbreviated texts, (4) the West Syrian chronicle and exegetical<sup>5</sup> tradition, and (5) the East-Syrian exegetical tradition. The inclusion of material from the *Lives* into

---

<sup>1</sup> Satran 1995 argues that the *Lives* originated in Byzantine Palestine in the fourth or fifth century.

<sup>2</sup> Chabot 1937, 69, n. 1 and 71, n. 1 already noted this on account of Zechariah and Micah.

<sup>3</sup> Brock 2006, 22-5.

<sup>4</sup> Sinai Syr. 10, see Lewis 1894, 4-7 (ed.) and Schermann 1907, 105-6 (Lat. trans.).

<sup>5</sup> E.g. Barhebr. Thes. Myst., see Brock 2006, n. 21.

historiographical texts seems to be a fairly late development in West-Syrian historiography. Our earliest West-Syrian historiographical witness dates from the ninth century (Chron. 846<sup>6</sup>); the other witnesses are Michael<sup>7</sup> and Chron. 1234. The *Chronicle* of Agapius<sup>8</sup> is an additional witness to this tradition.

Because of the lack of a critical edition of the Syriac *Lives*, this brief investigation of the relation between the *Lives* and Chron. 1234 will mainly rely on Nestlé's edition<sup>9</sup> of the *Lives*, which is based on the three oldest Syriac manuscripts (BL Add. 14,536, Add. 17,193 and Add. 12,178), but mainly on the former manuscript.<sup>10</sup> In some cases, however, a comparison with an English translation<sup>11</sup> of the late nineteenth-century East Syriac NY Union Theological Seminar Ms. Syr. 16 is necessary.

## 3.2 Chron. 1234 and the *Lives*

The influence of the *Lives* on Chron. 1234 was first noted by Chabot (for information on Zechariah<sup>12</sup> and Micah<sup>13</sup>), but it has never been discussed in detail. In an article, in which he catalogued the afterlife of the *Lives* in Syriac, Sebastian Brock<sup>14</sup> noted the Anonymous

---

<sup>6</sup> Chron. 846, 160-5T, 125-9V.

<sup>7</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 12 (39-40T; vol. 1: 68V [= Elijah]; IV 13 (40-1T; vol. 1: 69V) [= Obadiah, Micah and Elisha]; IV 14 (41T; vol. 1: 70V) [= Zechariah 1]; IV 14 (43-5T; vol. 1: 75-7V) [= Amos, Nahum and Jonah]; IV 15 (46T; vol. 1: 78V) [= Hosea]; IV 18 (53-4T; vol. 1: 87-8V) [= Isaiah and Zephaniah]; IV 19 (54-5T; vol. 1: 89-90V) [= Jeremiah]; IV 20 (58-61T; vol. 1: 94-8V) [= Ezekiel, Daniel and Habakkuk]; IV 21 (63-4T; vol. 1: 101-2V) [= Haggai, Zechariah 2 and Malachi].

<sup>8</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 172 (Elijah, Obadiah and Micah), 176 (Hosea, Amos and Jonah), 181-2 (Isaiah), 206 (Jeremiah), 212, (Daniel and Habakkuk).

<sup>9</sup> Vit. Proph. Syr. §§86-107.

<sup>10</sup> Brock 2006, 22.

<sup>11</sup> Hall 1887.

<sup>12</sup> Chabot 1937, 69, n. 1.

<sup>13</sup> Chabot 1937, 71, n. 1.

<sup>14</sup> Brock 2006.

Chronicler's reliance on the *Lives* for information regarding the lives and deaths of Hosea, Elijah, Elisha, Amos, Zechariah, Nahum, Jonah, Micah, Isaiah, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, Ezekiel and Malachi.<sup>15</sup> This is not entirely correct: the Anonymous Chronicler copied material on the death of Isaiah from the *Cave of Treasures* 40:3-6 whose author seems to have consulted the *Lives of the Prophets* himself.

The Anonymous Chronicler never cites Epiphanius of Salamis as his source for information from the *Lives*. There is no reason to assume that the Anonymous Chronicler did not have direct access to a manuscript that contained the *Lives*. Usually, the applied vocabulary is identical to that used by the *Lives*, albeit in a slightly rearranged order and sometimes combined with information from other sources. Realistically, he could have disposed of a codex that contained the *Cave of Treasures* as well as the *Lives*. Several examples of such compendia of sources on Old Testament history are recorded; all of them, however, East-Syrian.<sup>16</sup>

Chron. 1234's descriptions of the lives, deeds and deaths of Hosea,<sup>17</sup> Elisha,<sup>18</sup> Zechariah,<sup>19</sup> Nahum,<sup>20</sup> Zephaniah,<sup>21</sup> Jeremiah,<sup>22</sup> Ezekiel<sup>23</sup> and Malachi<sup>24</sup> mainly consist of

---

<sup>15</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 87.11-4T (Hosea), 88:4-10T (Elijah), 88.19-21T (Elisha), 88.26-89.6T (Amos; with materials from other sources), 89.12-23T (Zechariah), 90.6-10 (Nahum), 90:18-9 and 21T and 91.21-4T (Jonah; with materials from other sources), 92.12-5T (Micah), 94.3-4T (Isaiah), 94.21-4T (Zephaniah), 95.6-30T (Jeremiah), 97.2-6 (Habakkuk), 97.11-12, 20-3T 99.13-100.2T (Ezekiel) and 101.13-7T (Malachai).

<sup>16</sup> Mingana Syr. MS 567 (eighteenth century, Ri 2000, XIV-XV); Berlin, Staatsbibliothek preussischer Kulturbesitz, Or. Hs. Sachau 131 (nineteenth century, Ri 2000, XV); New York, Union Theological Seminary, Ms. Syr. 16 (twentieth-century copy of an eighteenth-century original, Ri 2000, XVI); Leningrad Ms. Syr. 25 (nineteenth-century, Ri 2000, XVI-XVII).

<sup>17</sup> Comp. Vit. Proph. Syr. §§201-205 and Mich. Syr. Chron. IV (46T; vol. 1: 78V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 87:11-14T.

<sup>18</sup> Comp. Vit. Proph. Syr. §§371-4 and Mich. Syr. Chron. IV (41T; vol. 1: 69V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 88:18-23T.

<sup>19</sup> Comp. Vit. Proph. Syr. §§307-17 and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 89.17-23T

<sup>20</sup> Comp. Vit. Proph. Syr. §§261-268 and Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 14 (43-4T; vol. 1: 75-6V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 90:6-10T.

<sup>20</sup> Comp. Vit. Proph. Syr. §§217-22 and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 92.12-5T.

<sup>21</sup> Comp. Vit. Proph. Syr. §§297-300 and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 94.21-4T.

<sup>22</sup> Comp. Vit. Proph. Syr. §§41-2, 63-70, 71-90, 93 and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 95.6-30T

<sup>23</sup> Comp. Vit. Proph. Syr. §§96-143 and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 99.12-100.2T.

vocabulary from the *Lives* and do not contain material from supplemental sources. In some of these cases, minor changes were applied, such as the addition or change of geographical specifications in order to contextualise the story. For the descriptions of the lives of Elijah, Amos, Jonah, Daniel and Habakkuk, the Anonymous Chronicler not only used the *Lives*, but also biblical and historical sources, as well. The example of the life of Elijah shows the influence of the *Gospel of Luke 4:25*.

Vit. Proph. Syr. §§359-68 <sup>25</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 88.4-13T	<i>Luke 4:25</i>
<p>Elijah was from Tishbi, from the land of the north, from the tribe of Aaron. He lived in the land of Galaad, because Tishbi had been given to the priests. When he was going to be born, his father Shabok saw white men in a vision, hailing him. They surrounded him with linen of fire and gave him of the flames to eat. He went and made known (these things) in Jerusalem. And it was said to him through a revelation: 'Do not fear, for he will be the house of the light and his word (will be) judgement. He will judge Israel with fire and sword.'</p>	<p>Elijah the prophet,</p> <p>before he was born, his father Shabok saw men dressed in white, hailing him;</p> <p>and they gave him fire to eat. He came and made known (these things) in Jerusalem and it was said to him through a revelation: 'A son will be born to you. He will judge Israel with fire and sword. He will be the dwelling-place of the light and his word (will be) judgement and decree.'</p> <p>When the zealot of the cult of God had grown, because of the inequity and the idolatry of the house of Ahab, he beseeched God not to let the rain come down on earth for three years and six months.</p>	<p><i>Luke 4:25</i></p> <p>I assure you that there were many widows in Israel in Elijah's time, when the sky was shut for three and a half years and there was a</p>

<sup>24</sup> Comp. Vit. Proph. Syr. §§319-29 and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 101.13-18T.

<sup>25</sup> See also Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 12 (39-40T; vol. 1: 68V).

		severe famine throughout the land.
--	--	------------------------------------

The life of Amos presents a similar case. The majority of the material was clearly copied from the *Lives*.

Vit. Proph. Syr. §§207-12	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 88.26-89.6T
Amos was from Thecua. Amaziah tortured him many times and eventually, he also killed his son by a blow to his temple with a staff (ܘܡܠܚܐ). And while he was still alive, he came to his land and after a day, he died and he was buried.	This Amos was not a prophet, but a shepherd from Thecua. And the Lord called him from behind the sheep and he said to him: 'Go and be a prophet for my people Israel.' He left the sheep and came and prophesied. Amaziah, the son of Joram, however, removed him from the prophethood, (but) he was not silenced by the reprimand. Eventually, Amaziah killed him by a blow to his temple with his staff (ܘܡܠܚܐ). And while he was still alive, he came to his land and after (a few) days, he died and he was buried.

Yet, Amos 7:12-5 provided the Anonymous Chronicler with more information.

Amos 7	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 88.26-89.6T
Amos answered Amaziah, "I was neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I was a shepherd, and I also took care of sycamore-fig trees. But the Lord took me from tending the flock and said to me, 'Go, prophesy to my people Israel.' (Amos 7:14-5) Then Amaziah said to Amos: "Get out, you seer! Go back to the land of Judah. Earn your bread there and do your prophesying there. Don't prophesy anymore at Bethel, because this is the king's sanctuary and the temple of the kingdom." (Amos 7:12-3)	This Amos was not a prophet, but a shepherd from Thecua. And the Lord called him by way of the sheep and he said to him: 'Go and be a prophet for my people Israel.' Amaziah, the son of Joram, however, removed him from the prophethood, (but) he was not silenced by the reprimand.

The same conclusions can be drawn concerning the materials on Jonah, Daniel and Habakkuk, which are much more extensive and shall be discussed in more detail.

## Jonah

The description of the life of Jonah begins with a historical contextualisation of the story, in the time of the successor of an unnamed Assyrian king who committed suicide after his defeat by the king of Media:

At that time the king of Assyria waged war with the king of Media. When the king of Assyria was conquered, he threw himself in the fire and burned. And after him rose another king who did repentance in the time of Jonah.<sup>26</sup>

These remarks are extra-biblical, but can be traced back to the *Chronicle* of Eusebius who related how the Assyrian king Sardanapal committed suicide, throwing himself in the fire after his defeat by Arbaces the Mede.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, the (implicit) dating of Jonah's prophetic deeds during the reign of the Judean king Uzziah in Chron. 1234 is also due to the influence of Eusebius, who dated them to the time of Arbaces and Uzziah's seventh year.<sup>28</sup>

Originally, Jonah's prophetic activities were not connected to the biblical Jewish and Assyrian chronology in the *Lives*. In order to resolve this issue, at a certain point in time, Eusebius' opinion was used to fill in this lacuna and the king of Nineveh was identified as Sardanapal.<sup>29</sup> None of the Greek nor the earliest Syriac manuscripts of the *Lives* (the three used for Nestlé's edition,<sup>30</sup> dating from the eighth century, AD 874, and the ninth/tenth century nor Ambros. C.313 Inf. (the Milan Syrohexapla manuscript; eighth/ninth century<sup>31</sup>) contains this information. The earliest witnesses are a short notice on the prophets, preserved in the Melkite ms. Sinai syr. 10,<sup>32</sup> dating from the eighth /ninth century, which already dates Jonah to the time of Uzziah and Theodore

---

<sup>26</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 90.12-16T.

<sup>27</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.82b; Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 32.1-3T, 25.19-22V.

<sup>28</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.84<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> This "tendency to add chronological information" in the later Syriac tradition was noted by Brock 2006, 33.

<sup>30</sup> Vit. Proph. Syr., 237-59.

<sup>31</sup> Brock 2006, 28.

<sup>32</sup> Lewis 1894, 5.20 (ed.). The same manuscript also preserves Chron. Melk.

bar Koni (c. 791-2) who dates Jonah's arrival in Nineveh to "the time of king Sardanapal of Assyria and to year 2 of Uzziah who is this Sardanapal (who) was conquered by Arbaces the Mede and who burnt himself in the fire."<sup>33</sup> Isho'dad of Merv may have known this tradition through Theodore.<sup>34</sup> Later witnesses are Solomon of Bosrah's *Book of the Bee*<sup>35</sup> (thirteenth century) and three, possibly even four manuscripts<sup>36</sup> of the *Lives*.

In contrast, however, barely any Syriac Orthodox sources contain this information. In a letter to John of Litharb, written around the turn of the eighth century, Jacob of Edessa complains that in the version of the *Lives* that he disposed of it was "written nor said who was king of Nineveh when Jonah went there."<sup>37</sup> Vat. Borg. Syr. 133 (AD 1224) the only direct Syriac Orthodox version of the *Lives* on which I am informed,<sup>38</sup> does not. Neither do any of the previously mentioned Syriac Orthodox or Melkite chronographic witnesses to the *Lives* (Chron. 846,<sup>39</sup> Agapius,<sup>40</sup> Michael<sup>41</sup>). In fact, these chronicles contradict Eusebius by dating Jonah's prophecy to the time of Amaziah, Uzziah's father. This misdating goes back to a Syriac version of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, because Chron. 724<sup>42</sup> and Chron. Zuqn.<sup>43</sup> contain the same error. Interestingly however, Chron. Zuqn. also contains vestiges of the same tradition as Chron. 1234, which suggests that Chron. Zuqn. may stand at the crossroads of two different Eusebian traditions.<sup>44</sup> The only other West-Syrian witness that I have found that dates the voyage of Jonah to Nineveh to the

---

<sup>33</sup> Theod. bar Koni Lib. Schol. 4.16 (vol. 1, 283T; 245V).

<sup>34</sup> Ishodad of Merw, *Comm. Is. et Duodec.*, 94:3-6T, 120:3-6V.

<sup>35</sup> Sol. Bosr. Lib. Ap., 70 (trans.): "in the time of Sardana".

<sup>36</sup> NY Union Theological Seminar Ms Syr. 16 (Hall 1887, 33), Mingana Syr. 567, f°8a (see Brock 2006, 36) and probably also Berlin Sachau 131 (Brock 2006, 36, n. 15; Schermann 1907, 24-5).

<sup>37</sup> Nau 1905, 269.

<sup>38</sup> Brock 2006, 36.

<sup>39</sup> Chron. 846, 161.5-6T, 125.34-5V.

<sup>40</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 176.

<sup>41</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 14 (43-4T; vol. 1: 75-6V).

<sup>42</sup> Chron. 724, 88.28-9T, 72.3-4V: "In year 17 of Amaziah, king of Judah and year 16 of Joash prophesied Hosea, Amos, Jonah and Nahum."

<sup>43</sup> Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 31.28-32.1-3, 8-9T, 25.17-22, 28-9V.

<sup>44</sup> Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 32.1-3T, 25.19-22V.

second year of Uzziah is an equally late source: the *Storehouse of Mysteries* of Barhebraeus who must also be dependent on Eusebius for this information.<sup>45</sup>

Returning to the wider context of the Anonymous Chronicler’s narrative on Jonah, we see that he copied the *Lives’* identification of Jonah as “the son of the widow near whom lived the prophet Elijah who died when he was a young man and whom God resurrected by the prayer of Elijah,”<sup>46</sup> despite Jacob of Edessa’s suspicions<sup>47</sup> on these matters.

Vit. Proph. Syr. §§244-9	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 90.16-19T
There was Elijah who was rebuking the house of Ahab; and when he summoned a famine upon the earth, he fled, and when he came to Sarepta of Sidon and found there a woman, a widow, with her son. For he was not able to be with the uncircumcised. And he blessed her and her son Jonah. And thereafter he died, God resurrected him from the dead through Elijah.	This Jonah was the son of the widow near whom lived the prophet Elijah who died when he was a young man and whom God resurrected by the prayer of Elijah.

The excerpt continues with a fairly traditional version of the story of Jonah and the whale, which is mainly based on the biblical account. It even ends with a reference to the biblical “prophecy.”

When he had grown up, God told him to go to Nineveh and preach the destruction against it. But he did not want to go and he went down to the sea to flee away from God. By the will of God a great storm rose against the ship that Jonah had boarded and it was close to sinking. And when he saw that evil was determined against (the

---

<sup>45</sup> Barhebr.’s a commentary on the Scriptures, on which, see Takahashi 2005, 63, 147-74. For the reference in question, see Barhebr. Comm. Duodec. proph., 13.9-10. I was unable to consult Vat. Syr. 152 (AD 980), Barberini Or. 118 (AD 1000) and Paris Syr. 64 (eleventh century) nor the “potentially (...) important” early eighteenth-century Manchester, John Rylands Library Syr. 4, which was copied from a manuscript dated AD 752-3 (Brock 2006, 23).

<sup>46</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 90.16-19T.

<sup>47</sup> Nau 1905, 269.

ship), Noah approached the sailors, pointed out his guilt and said: 'Because of my sins, this severe storm is against you. Pick me up and throw me in the sea and this great storm will rest from you. The sailors, who were compelled by the severity of the storm, carried Jonah and threw him in the sea, and the storm rested from them. Within the hour, God prepared a great whale, (which) swallowed Jonah, and he remained in its belly for three days and three nights (cf. Jonah 1:1-12, 15, 17). *His hair and his beard fell off and he remained smooth (سلس).* He made the sign of the cross by spreading his hands inside of the whale, and he prayed (cf. Jonah 2:1).

*After the whale had swallowed him, it went north and south and west and east and there it spit him out on the sea-shores on the side of the land of Nineveh (Jonah 2:10). After Jonah had been spat out from the mouth of the whale, he went to Nineveh. Nineveh was a great city. Travelling around for three days, he entered it and began to preach the preaching that the Lord had said to him. The men heard (this), did penitence and turned away from their wicked ways. The word arrived to the king of the city. He dressed himself in a sackcloth, slept in ashes and decreed a forty-day fast over the city. All the people that were in the city fasted, men and women, adults and younglings (cf. Jonah 3:3-6). After they had finished the forty days and three days remained, the walls of the houses were suddenly shaking and the city was trembling. Then, the king ordered that they should double these three days that remained, men, cattle, land animals and younglings that were (still) at the breast. When the royal command went out, all the people accepted it. These people, their sons and their cattle fasted. And the merciful God saw their penitence, accepted their prayer, heard their plea, forgave them and turned away his angered rage from them (cf. Jonah 3:10). But when Jonah saw that his preaching was false, he did not stay there, but returned and settled in the land of Tyre. He said: 'I have overstepped my favour, because I have prophesied falsehood over the city of Nineveh and I have grown angry with the compassion of God. The remainder of this story is written in his prophecy.'*<sup>48</sup>

Because of the conciseness of the *Lives*<sup>49</sup> with regards to the story of Jonah and the whale and the preaching in Nineveh, the Anonymous Chronicler must have turned to other sources. The influence of the biblical text, *Jonah* 1-4, which he paraphrased, is evident, but four elements are extra-biblical.

---

<sup>48</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 90.19-91.26T.

<sup>49</sup> Vit. Proph. Syr. §§239-40; Brock 2006, 28.

a) The origin of the remark that “his hair and his beard fell of and he remained smooth” is unknown.

b) *Jonah* 2:1 states that Jonah prayed inside the fish, but the biblical account does not explicitly say that he made the sign of the cross.

c) The Anonymous Chronicler claims that the whale spat out Jonah on the coast near Nineveh, whereas *Jonah* 2:10 only states that he was spit out on “firm land”. This discrepancy is understandable, given that Jonah was sent to Nineveh, and appears in at least one commentary on *Jonah*.<sup>50</sup> Nevertheless, the Anonymous Chronicler could have applied this change himself.

d) One interesting aspect of this account is the interpretation of the duration of the Ninevite fast:

[a]fter they had finished the forty days and three days remained, the walls of the houses were suddenly shaking and the city was trembling. Then, the king ordered that they should double these three days that remained, men, cattle, land animals and younglings that were (still) at the breast.

The unusual interpretation of the duration of the fast in Nineveh ensued from the contradiction between the testimony of the Hebrew and Peshitta version of *Jonah* 3:4, which have “forty days”, and the Septuagint, which has “three days.” The Anonymous Chronicler’s approach to the exegesis of *Jonah* 3:4 differs considerably from the interpretations of Jacob of Edessa and Barhebraeus. Jacob preferred the Greek reading of three days, because he thought a period of forty days too long, because it would have given Nineveh’s inhabitants time to escape the destruction of the city.<sup>51</sup> Barhebraeus adhered to the Syriac reading and attempted to resolve the issue by counting the forty

---

<sup>50</sup> Ishodad of Merv, *Comm. Is. et duodec*, 96:4-6T, 122:23-123:1V.

<sup>51</sup> Nau 1905, 269.

days from the time when Jonah “was spit out by the whale and began to preach on the way.”<sup>52</sup> Instead, the Anonymous Chronicler in turn suggested that, after thirty-seven days, the king proclaimed that the remaining three days of the fast should be doubled.

The story of Jonah in Chron. 1234 is concluded by a remark that was also based on the *Lives*:<sup>53</sup>

“when Jonah saw that his preaching was false, he did not stay there, but returned and settled in the land of Tyre. He said: ‘I will remove my shame, because I have prophesied falsehood over the city of Nineveh and I have grown angry with the compassion of God.’”<sup>54</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler’s interest in the story of Jonah was on the purely chronological level. By using biblical and extra-biblical information, he pinpointed the length of time Jonah remained in the belly of the whale, how long it took him to reach Nineveh and how long the fast lasted.

#### *Daniel and Habakkuk*

The sufferings of Daniel seem to have been of particular interest to the Anonymous Chronicler. Information about this prophet was taken from the bible (*Daniel* 3, 13-4), Eusebius, the *Cave of Treasures* and the *Lives*. Furthermore, since Habakkuk directly impacted the life of Daniel, when the former brought Daniel food when he was in the lions’ den, material from the *Lives* regarding Habakkuk was also included among other materials pertaining to the life of Daniel.

After an identification of Daniel as the son<sup>55</sup> of king Jehoiachin and a description of the circumstances of Daniel’s birth, on the road from Judea to Assur in the beginning of the Captivity, both taken from the *Cave of Treasures* 41:12, the Anonymous Chronicler refers and alludes to several biblical and pseudepigraphical Daniel traditions (*Daniel* 3

---

<sup>52</sup> Barh. Comm. Duodec. proph., 13:20-4.

<sup>53</sup> Vit. Proph. Syr. §§240-3; Brock 2006, 28.

<sup>54</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 91.21-5T.

<sup>55</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 96.14-7T.

and 13-4: the pseudepigraphical texts *Susannah* and *Bel and the Dragon*). Upon mention of Daniel's stay in the lion's den (from *the Dragon*), the Anonymous Chronicler, like the biblical account, turns towards Habakkuk. This prophet was working with the harvesters in Judah, was taken up by an angel and transported to the lion's den, where he gave food to Daniel so that he could survive.

At that time was the prophet Habakkuk in Judah, who foresaw the destruction of Jerusalem in the holy spirit and mourned greatly. When Nebuchadnezzar came up to and captured Jerusalem, he fled to his region, Beth Paḥara<sup>56</sup>. And at the time of the harvest he served in the harvest. And one day, he boiled lentils and asked to bring them to the reapers. And by the spirit he saw that God was ready to bring him at that moment to Babel where Daniel was placed in the lion's den. And he filled the porridge in a dish and he broke pieces of bread. He ordered in his house: 'Now if I delay, they will bring the bread to the reapers.' He took up the porridge and went out. Immediately, an angel of God picked him up with a wind from Jerusalem and instantaneously placed him in Babylon above the den in which Daniel had been placed. Habakkuk raised his voice and said: 'Daniel, servant of God, stand up, accept the meal that God that you serve has sent you.' And immediately Daniel stood up, praised God because He looked after him, took the porridge and ate. And the angel took Habakkuk again and placed him in the region of Jerusalem near the reapers. He saw the harvesters, eating, and he didn't say to anyone what had occurred. *And then he prophesied* the end of the temple by an *oriental* people.

Although the essence of the story is biblical, certain details concerning the circumstances of Habakkuk are not.<sup>57</sup> The claims that Habakkuk fled from Nebuchadnezzar to Beth Pahara and that he "prophesied the end of the temple by an *oriental* people" for instance, are extra-biblical. They are based on material from the *Lives*, although the latter speaks of 'an occidental people' rather than 'an oriental people'.

---

<sup>56</sup> Beth Paḥara: a literal translation of the Greek *eis Ostrakinèn*, cf. also Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 10 (60T; vol. 1: 97V).

<sup>57</sup> On the afterlife of the legend of Habakkuk in Syriac, see Molenberg 1986.

After quite a long diversion about the reign of Zedekiah, the Anonymous Chronicler also describes the madness of king Nebuchadnezzar:

After king Nebuchadnezzar had captured the people of Israel, he went down to Babylon. He rose against God and against Daniel. God became angry with him and his mind left (him). He was a bull for 2 years and 4 months, and he ate grass. And he was a lion for 2 years and 4 months, and he ate meat. And he was an eagle for 2 years and 4 months, and he ate birds. And he completed a week of years according to what Daniel had prophesied on account of him. And he lifted up his eyes towards heaven and was a man, he opened his mouth and praised God. And he returned to his kingdom after the seven years that he had spent in the desert.<sup>58</sup>

This exegesis of *Daniel 4* is quite original, being a combination of material from the *Lives* with the Anonymous Chronicler's own opinion. The influence of the *Lives* emerges from the description of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation into a beast which is part-ox, part-eagle, part-lion. These three facets of the beast were probably instigated by *Daniel 4:30*'s reference to Nebuchadnezzar eating as an ox and an eagle, and the *Lives*' comparison<sup>59</sup> of parts of Nebuchadnezzar's body with those of a lion and an ox.

As in the case of Jonah, the Anonymous Chronicler added some exegetical comments of his own. In this way he disagrees with the *Lives* in several respects.

(1) The Anonymous Chronicler interprets the "seven times" that Nebuchadnezzar's madness lasted (*Daniel 4: 13, 20, 22, 29*) as a week of years, i.e. seven years, contradicting the testimony of the *Lives*, which emphasises that the king's seven-year sentence was reduced to seven months by Daniel's prayers;

(2) those seven years are said to have been divided into three equal periods of roaming the land as a lion, an eagle and an ox;

---

<sup>58</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 99.1-10T.

<sup>59</sup> Hall 1887, 35; Vit. Proph. Syr. §§155-160.

(3) similarly to the claim in *Daniel* 4:30 that Nebuchadnezzar ate grass as an ox, Chron. 1234 adds that he ate meat as a lion and birds as an eagle. The reference to the eating of a bird (ܪܥܘܒܐ) perhaps ensued from the statement, in the same biblical verse, that his nails were as long as those of a bird (ܪܥܘܒܐ).

### 3.3 Conclusion

The Anonymous Chronicler included material from the *Lives of the Prophets*, an ancient apocryphal work on the origins and deaths of the Old Testament prophets, in his presentation of pre-Christian history. He probably took this information from a Syriac version of the *Lives*. If it was the Anonymous Chronicler who was responsible for merging this information with material from other sources such as the Bible cannot be determined. This brief chapters has shown that an investigation of the witnesses to the Syriac versions of the *Lives*, which is a clear example of a 'living text', could provide new insights into the transmission and transformation of this text in Late antiquity and the Middle Ages.

## Chapter 4 The *Book of Jubilees* and 1 *Enoch* (second or first century BC)

### 4.1 Introduction

Originally, this chapter was intended to only cover *Jubilees*' influence on Chron. 1234, but due to the nature of the transmission of material from this text into Syriac, often fused with other apocryphal traditions, most notably from 1 *Enoch*, in some cases it is extremely difficult to distinguish between traditions from *Jubilees*, 1 *Enoch* (or more accurately the *Book of the Watchers*) and/or similar sources. Therefore, I will treat all of these traditions together in this chapter.

The *Book of Jubilees* accounts for about a third of the material that the Anonymous Chronicler used to describe the pre-Christian period. The extensive borrowings, often very literal copies, from this apocryphon were first noted by Eugène Tisserant.<sup>1</sup> This was a crucial discovery, because at that time only an Ethiopic version of *Jubilees* was available. This Ethiopic version is a translation of a lost Greek translation of the Hebrew original.<sup>2</sup> Recently, a number of Hebrew fragments from the Qumran collection have also been published, but these do not hold any bearing on our research.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Tisserant 1921.

<sup>2</sup> I use the most recent ed. and trans., prepared by VanderKam in 1989.

<sup>3</sup> VanderKam/Milik 1994.

From a study of *Jubilees*' traditions in Chron. 1234, Tisserant concluded that the Anonymous Chronicler had access to a now lost Syriac translation of *Jubilees*, made directly from the original.<sup>4</sup> His main argument was the lack of Greek loanwords in Chron. 1234's copies of passages from *Jubilees*. Tisserant focused in particular on the creation story and compared Chron. 1234's versions of *Jubilees* 2:2-8, 10-14, 15-16 with the same materials, preserved in the Syriac translation of Epiphanius' *De mensuris et ponderibus*, originally written in Greek.

Without even addressing the highly controversial nature of Tisserant's methodology, his conclusion must be nuanced. Firstly, the absence of Greek vocabulary does not necessarily point to the absence of a Greek source, but could equally be the result of changes applied to the source material by the Anonymous Chronicler or an intermediary. At least one case is known in Chron. 1234 in which Greek words or expressions were replaced with Syriac equivalents.<sup>5</sup> More importantly however, Chron. 1234's creation story is not simply a copy of *Jubilees*' account, but actually a combination of vocabulary from *Jubilees* and the *Cave of Treasures*. The Anonymous Chronicler fused material from two sources to construct a description of the creation of the world, in the process of which, he surely could have replaced Greek loanwords with Syriac counterparts.

One text that has often been adduced as evidence for a Greek *Vorlage* of Syriac *Jubilees* is a Syriac fragment preserved in BL Add. 12,154 and entitled "Names of the Wives of the Patriarchs according to the Hebrew *Book of Jubilees*."<sup>6</sup> The use of Greek loanwords such as ⲉⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ suggests that it is a Syriac translation of a Greek text. Yet, the fact that this list of names is based on a Greek *Vorlage* does not necessarily mean that *Jubilees* was available in Greek to any Syriac author.

---

<sup>4</sup> Tisserant 1921, 229.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. the case of the catalogue of Roman buildings (Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 110.23T.), borrowed from *Pseudo-Zachariah* [PZ X 16 (trans. Greatrex, 421)]; see also Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 16 (49T; vol. 1: 82V) and IX 20 (308-10T; vol. 2: 241-3V), in which the phrase ⲙⲉⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ "who gave *annonnae* (, i.e. to give food)" is replaced by the Syriac expression ⲙⲉⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ "who fed".

<sup>6</sup> Ceriani 1861.

In the end, the issue of the *Vorlage* of the Syriac fragments of *Jubilees* cannot be answered conclusively until such a time that this text, or another vital witness, is retrieved. It must be highlighted, however, that we have previously noted the Anonymous Chronicler's knowledge of a tradition from the Targum: that Nimrod threw Abraham in the fiery furnace.<sup>7</sup>

Almost a century after the publication of Tisserant's article, a re-evaluation of his conclusions concerning *Jubilees'* influence is clearly warranted. Before and after Tisserant's discoveries, other studies uncovered other paths of transmission via which *Jubilees'* traditions were passed on to Syriac authors in general and to the Anonymous Chronicler in particular. Studies published by Heinrich Gelzer,<sup>8</sup> Sebastian Brock<sup>9</sup> and William Adler<sup>10</sup> have shown that at least one *Jubilees'* and one Enochic tradition reached Michael the Great and the Anonymous Chronicler via a chronographic path. Together with other apocryphal materials such as the account of the fall of the Watchers, which is a fusion of material from various apocryphal sources such as 1 Enoch,<sup>11</sup> Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler likely retrieved Annianus' adaptation of *Jubilees* 4:1-2, 7, on the chronology from the birth of Adam until the birth of Seth, from a Syriac chronicle. Brock suggested that Michael may have known Annianus through John of Litharb, but did not explicitly identify the Anonymous Chronicler's source.<sup>12</sup> Even though Chron. 1234 does contain some variant readings, I see no reason why Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler couldn't have used the same source. If this source was John of Litharb cannot be determined.

The issue of the Syriac afterlife of *Jubilees* re-emerged in a later article<sup>13</sup> of Brock's, in which he discussed the Syriac witnesses to the *Jubilees'* traditions of Abraham and the

---

<sup>7</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 48.9-13T, cf. Genesis Rabbah, comm. on Gn 11.28 (Neusner 1985, vol. 2, 55-7) and the Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel (Etheridge 1865, 192). On which, see Bowker 1969, 187-189.

<sup>8</sup> Gelzer 1880-98.

<sup>9</sup> Brock 1968, 627.

<sup>10</sup> Adler 1987, Adler 1994 and Adler 2008.

<sup>11</sup> Brock 1968, esp. 627.

<sup>12</sup> Brock 1968, 629.

<sup>13</sup> Brock 1978.

ravens (*Jub.* 11:16-24) and Abraham and the burning of the temple of idols (*Jub.* 12:12-4). Brock identified Jacob of Edessa's letter 13 to John of Litharb and the *Catena Severi* as the earliest Syriac witnesses and noted the presence of the same tradition in several Syriac chronicles including Michael and Chron. 1234. On the basis of significant differences between the Ethiopic and Syriac accounts, he concluded that most Syriac witnesses reflect a much older variant tradition.<sup>14</sup> With regards to Chron. 1234, he determined that, although the Anonymous Chronicler preserved literal copies of *Jubilees*, he had clearly been influenced by that Syriac tradition as well.<sup>15</sup>

In response to Brock's conclusions, William Adler emphasised the significance of the chronographic background of most of the Syriac witnesses (Jacob of Edessa, Michael the Great, Chron. 1234, Barhebraeus) and the access to chronographic sources of others (Isho'dad of Merv). Because of these chronographic connections, Adler considered it more likely that the Syriac tradition of Abraham's burning of the temple did not represent an earlier version of the tradition, but rather a later adaptation that "originated in Greek chronography" and, because of Jacob's familiarity with *Jubilees* and related traditions, Adler suggested that Jacob himself introduced this tradition in Syriac historiography.<sup>16</sup> With regards to Chron. 1234, however, the idea of two-fold influence, by *Jubilees* and *Jubilees'* traditions in chronographic sources, remained.<sup>17</sup>

Given that *Jubilees'* traditions are well-attested in Christian Greek chronographic sources, Adler's theory about the chronographic transmission of *Jubilees'* traditions seems plausible. Hippolytus, Panodorus and Annianus of Alexandria, Malalas, George the Monk, George Syncellus and many others, as late as Michael Ducas, were all aware of (at least some of) these apocryphal traditions. How these *Jubilees'* traditions were introduced in Greek chronography remains unclear. Some chroniclers did have access to *Jubilees*, referring to it as the *Little Genesis* or *Apocalypse of Moses*, but also as *Life of Adam*

---

<sup>14</sup> Brock 1978, 142.

<sup>15</sup> As demonstrated by the interpolation of Abraham's invocation of God during the episode of the ravens and the reference to the 'house of idols' as the 'temple of Qainan', see Brock 1978, 136, 148-9.

<sup>16</sup> Adler 1987, 115.

<sup>17</sup> Adler 1987, 114.

or the *Testament of the Protoplasts*. Most often, however, *Jubilees'* traditions were attributed to either Josephus<sup>18</sup> or Eusebius,<sup>19</sup> so a chronographic intermediary for certain Greek chronographers, especially Syncellus, has been assumed.

In the case of these chronographic witnesses, however, it is often difficult to determine whether these so-called *Jubilees'* traditions “are traceable to differing sources or reflect instead continuous adaptation of a single work in the course of Christian transmission.”<sup>20</sup> Apart from the literal copies in Chron. 1234, most Jewish apocryphal traditions in Syriac chronicles, including in some cases Chron. 1234 as well, differ from their counterparts in *Jubilees* and 1 *Enoch* in several interesting ways. In each of these cases, it must be independently determined whether these are retraceable to *Jubilees*, 1 *Enoch* or another source.

Although our understanding of the *nachleben* of *Jubilees* in Syriac has greatly increased due to the work of Gelzer, Brock and Adler, their research has also demonstrated that the relationship between *Jubilees* and Chron. 1234 is not as straightforward as Tisserant may have thought. Nevertheless, the essence of most of his conclusions on this issue has never been questioned. James C. VanderKam, who edited and translated the Ethiopic translation of *Jubilees*, and assisted in the edition and translation of the Hebrew fragments<sup>21</sup>, incorporated Tisserant’s insights into his commentary, but did not criticise the latter’s conclusions, except for a few rare, mostly philological, cases. Furthermore, VanderKam also completely ignored the studies of Gelzer, Brock and Adler and therefore, the chronographic transmission of *Jubilees'* traditions to Chron. 1234.

It is therefore no surprise that several errors and lacunas in Tisserant’s conclusions have been overlooked until now. On the one hand, I have isolated Syriac equivalents of *Jubilees* 2:1, 3:23-5, 14:1, 4, 7, 19:8, and 33:1 in Chron. 1234 that have never been highlighted before. Even more interestingly however, several passages that Tisserant

---

<sup>18</sup> Gelzer 1898, 278-80; Adler 1994, 147.

<sup>19</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. III 1(ed. 41.10; trans. 28); Adler 1990, 484-8; Adler 1994, 147 and 167 n. 16.

<sup>20</sup> Adler 1994, 144.

<sup>21</sup> VanderKam/Milik 1994.

identified as adaptations of *Jubilees*' traditions, made by the Anonymous chronicler himself, originated in fact in (a) historiographical source(s) to which Michael clearly had access as well. In some of these cases, the testimony of Jacob of Edessa could bring the date of these Syriac traditions as far back as the turn of the eighth century and even earlier. Some of these traditions can be connected to Annianus, others perhaps to Andronicus.

## 4.2 Newly discovered Syriac fragments of *Jubilees* in Chron.

1234

### 4.2.1 The authorship of *Jubilees* (*Jubilees* 2:1)

In his second preface, after the Creation story and the tale of the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the garden of Eden, the Anonymous Chronicler claims that he is going to describe the

“[s]uccession of the generations and the times of the patriarchs and the years of several kings who existed among the nations, as we have promised above, according to the supposition of the holy book of the creation that was copied by the prophet Moses from the angel of the presence after the word of the Lord, and according to the supposition of Andronicus and the remainder of the chroniclers.”<sup>22</sup>

The “holy book of the creation that was copied from the angel of the presence after the word of the Lord by the prophet Moses” is unlikely to refer to the biblical book of *Genesis*,<sup>23</sup> but this definition is reminiscent of the claim in *Jubilees* 2:1 that

---

<sup>22</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 32.10-6T.

<sup>23</sup> On the angel of the presence and the authorship of *Jubilees*, see VanderKam 2001, 89.

“on the Lord’s orders the angel of the presence said to Moses :“Write all the words about the creation – how in six days the Lord God completed all his works, everything that he had created, and kept Sabbath on the seventh day. (...)”<sup>24</sup>

This discovery does not offer any new evidence with regards to the issue of the transmission of *Jubilees*’ materials to Chron. 1234. It could be argued that the separate references to *Jubilees* and Andronicus indicate that the Anonymous Chronicler accessed both separately, but since *Jubilees* is cited before Andronicus, it is equally possible that the Anonymous Chronicler accessed the former through the latter.

#### 4.2.2 God’s curse on Adam, Eve and the serpent (*Jubilees* 3:23-5)

A Syriac version of *Jubilees* 3:23 appears in the Anonymous Chronicler’s description of Adam and Eve’s expulsion from Paradise, carefully interwoven with materials from *Genesis* and the *Cave of Treasures*:

“Having been stripped from his glory, Satan lived in the serpent and abided a [certain] time. He saw Eva on her own, spoke to her and deceived her, because her nature was weak and she believed all his words. She plucked the fruit from the tree and ate it. Adam also ate the deadly fruit and He stripped off his glory. They made belts for themselves from fig leaves (cf. *Cave of Treasures* 4:12-4, 18-9). They heard the voice of the Lord God who was walking around in the Paradise in the evening and they hid from him. And God said to Adam: ‘Where are you?’ And he said to Him: ‘I heard Your voice and I was afraid.’ And He said to him: ‘Who informed you that you were naked, unless you have eaten from the fruit.’ And Adam said: ‘The wife that you gave to me has deceived me.’ God said to the wife: ‘Why have you done this?’ She said: ‘The serpent deceived me’ (cf. *Genesis* 3:8-13). God cursed the serpent, was angry at it (*Jubilees* 3:23) and gathered its paws in its belly (cf. *Cave of Treasures* 5:5). He said to Eva: ‘I will multiply your sorrows etc.’ (cf. *Jubilees* 3:24 or *Genesis* 3:16). He said to Adam: ‘May the ground be cursed on account of you etc.’ (cf. *Jubilees* 3:25 or *Genesis* 3:17).”<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> *Jubilees* 2:1 (trans. 7).

<sup>25</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 30.7-22T.

<i>Genesis</i> (Pesh.) 3:16-7	<i>Jubilees</i> 3:23-5 (trans. 19-20)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 30.19-22T
<p>He said to the woman: 'I will greatly multiply your pains in childbearing. You will give birth to children with painful labour. Your desire will be for your husband and he will rule over you.'</p>	<p>The Lord cursed the serpent and was angry at it forever.</p> <p>At the woman, too, he was angry because she had listened to the serpent and eaten. He said to her: 'I will indeed multiply your sadness and your pain. Bear children in sadness. Your place of refuge will be with your husband: he will rule over you.'</p> <p>Then he said to Adam: 'Because you listened to your wife and ate from the tree from which I commanded you not to eat, may the ground be cursed on account of you. (...)</p>	<p>God cursed the serpent and was angry with it. (...)</p> <p>He said to Eva: 'I will multiply your sorrows etc.'</p> <p>He said to Adam: 'May the ground be cursed on account of you etc.'</p>

Arguably, the majority of the contents of the passage from Chron. 1234 could be directly based on *Genesis* 3:16-7, but the sentence “God cursed the serpent and was angry with it” has no biblical counterpart. Since *Jubilees* 3:23 must have been copied by the Anonymous Chronicler, and no other excerpt from *Genesis* appears in the immediate surroundings of this passage, it is likely that the Anonymous Chronicler also copied *Jubilees* 3:24-5 rather than *Genesis* 3:16-7.

### 4.2.3 The origin of war, weaponry and slavery (*Jubilees* 11:2)

Immediately after Andronicus' adaptation of the *Jubilees*' tradition concerning the postdiluvian origin of war and weaponry (*Jubilees* 11:2; on which, see the chapter on Andronicus), Chron. 1234 preserves a reference to the postdiluvian origin of slavery, which goes back to the same *Jubilees*' passage. This time it is a much more literal translation.

<i>Jubilees</i> 11:2	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.2-5T
And the sons of Noah began to war on each other, to take captive and to slay each other, and to shed the blood of men on the earth, and to eat blood, and to build strong cities, and walls, and towers, and individuals (began) to exalt themselves above the nation, and to found the beginnings of kingdoms, and to go to war people against people, and nation against nation, and city against city, and all (began) to do evil, and to acquire arms, and to teach their sons war, and they began to capture cities, and to sell male and female slaves.	And then the peoples began to acquire instruments of war and to elevate <sup>26</sup> themselves, a people against a people and a race against a race, the one took the other captive and bought and sold male and female slaves.

This seems to be an excerpt from *Jubilees*, but it is worth noting that this tradition was already known to two eight-century Syriac Orthodox chroniclers, the authors of Chron. Zuqn. and Chron. 775, and again to one of Michael's sources.

Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 9.22-4V, 13.8-11T	Chron. 775, 338.24-6T, 268.9-11T	Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (11T; vol. 1: 23V)
At that time (of Serug) idolatry entered the world, From here onwards the sons of Noah began to worship idols, do evil, construct cities, take each other captive and wage war.	In the day (of Serug), [mankind] began to [worship i]dols, to m[ak]e sa[crifices], to build cities, to wage war and to take each other captive	Afterwards, at the time of year 56 (?) of Serug, all the peoples began to make instruments of war and to buy and sell male and female slaves.

The vocabulary of the three sources differs to such an extent that it is unlikely that all three chroniclers knew of this tradition through the same source. Considering the exact

<sup>26</sup> Ms.: ܐܘܝܪܘܢܐ, for ܐܘܝܪܘܢܐ.

date that Michael provides, it seems plausible that he copied this passage from an unidentified post-Eusebian chronicle. Chron. Zuqn.'s and Chron. 775's source, however, was probably a Syriac version of Eusebius' *Chronicle*.

#### 4.2.4 Jubilees 14:1, 4-5, 7

Similarly, the Anonymous Chronicler's description of God's conversation with Abraham in Harran bears similarity to *Genesis*' as well as *Jubilees*' account.

Genesis (Pesh.) 15:1, 5-6	Jubilees 14:1, 4-7 (trans. 83-4)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 53.23-54.1T
<p>(1) After these things, the word of the Lord was upon Abraham in a vision: 'Do not be afraid Abram, I am your helper (ܡܫܥܝܢܐ), your reward will be very large (ܟܝܘܢ ܪܝܒܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܡܫܥܝܢܐ).</p> <p>(5) He brought him outside and said to him: Look at the sky and count the stars, if you can count how many there are.' He said to him: your seed (ܡܫܝܒܝܢ) will be like this.</p> <p>(6) Abram believed God and it was credited to him as something righteous.</p>	<p>(1) After these things – in the fourth year of this week, on the first of the third month – the word of the Lord came to Abram in a dream: 'Do not be afraid, Abram. I am your protector, your reward will be very large'.</p> <p>(7) He said to him: 'I am the Lord who brought you from Ur of the Chaldeans to give you the land of the Canaanites to occupy forever and to become God for you and your descendants<sup>27</sup> after you'.</p> <p>(4) He brought him outside and said to him: 'Look at the sky and count the stars, if you can count them'.</p> <p>(5) When he had looked at the sky and seen the stars, he said to him: 'Your descendants will be like this.</p> <p>(6) He believed the Lord and it was credited to him as something righteous.</p>	<p>Afterwards, the word of the Lord was upon Abraham and He said to him: 'I, I am your helper (ܡܫܥܝܢܐ), because of these things that you have done, and your reward will be exceedingly great (ܟܝܘܢ ܪܝܒܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܡܫܥܝܢܐ).</p> <p>I have brought you forth from Ur of the Chaldeans to this land that will be yours and your seed's (ܡܫܝܒܝܢ).</p> <p>He brought him outside and said: 'Look up at the sky and see if you are capable to count the stars that are in the firmament. Your seed (ܡܫܝܒܝܢ) shall be innumerable as well.'</p> <p>And Abraham believed God and he credited it to him as righteousness.</p>

<sup>27</sup> The Ethiopic word for 'descendants' is based on the same Semitic root as the Syriac ܡܫܝܒܝܢ.

It is difficult to determine whether the Syriac text was entirely based on *Jubilees* or partly on *Jubilees* and partly on *Genesis*. Since he was certainly influenced by *Jubilees* 14:7, it seems highly likely that he also used *Jubilees* 14:1-6.

#### 4.2.5 The ten trials of Abraham (*Jubilees* 19:8)

A fourth passage mentions Abraham’s endurance of ten tests that God set aside for him.

<i>Jubilees</i> 19:8 (trans. 111)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 55.6-7T
This was the tenth test by which Abraham was tried, and he was found to be faithful (and) patient in spirit.	Abraham was tried ten times and he was found to be faithful (and) patient in spirit.

As far as I am aware, Chron. 1234 is the only Christian witness to the Jewish tradition of the ten trials of Abraham.<sup>28</sup> The fact that the Syriac text also has an equivalent for “he was found to be faithful (and) patient in spirit” suggests that this is indeed a copy of *Jubilees*. Exactly which ten trials Abraham endured according to the chronicler is unclear. Possible candidates are the Jewish tradition of Nimrod and the fiery furnace; the episode of the ravens and Abraham’s separation of his father; his failed attempt to turn his father away from idolatry; the burning of the temple and the death of Haran and the flight to Harran; the departure from Harran to Canaan, without Terah; the war against king Chederlaomer to save Lot; the sacrifice of Isaac; the deaths of Hagar and Sarah; and the separation of Isaac from Abraham. The struggles in Egypt are a possible candidate for one of the ten trials as well, but they go unmentioned in Chron. 1234.

---

<sup>28</sup> Noegel 2003, 75: “It appears variously in *Jubilees* 17:17, 19:8, Mishnah *Aboth* 5:3 (second century BCE) and in the two recensions of the *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* and in list form and parenthetically in other rabbinic writings.”

#### 4.2.6 Jubilees 33:1

Even though Tisserant discussed the episode of Ruben and Bilhah (*Jubilees* 33:2-16) in detail, he appears to have missed the fact that the sentence that precedes this episode in the Syriac account was based on *Jubilees* 33:1:

<i>Jubilees</i> 33:1 (trans. 218)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 55.22-3T
“Jacob (...) went to his father Isaac – he and his wife Leah – on the first of the tenth month.”	“In these days, Jacob went towards Isaac, his father, again to see him, he and Leah, his wife.”

### 4.3 Adaptations of traditions from *Jubilees* and 1 *Enoch* in Chron. 1234

Traditions from *Jubilees* and similar Jewish apocryphal sources reached the Anonymous Chronicler also via other paths. In these cases, he is clearly using one or more chronographic sources which were also available to Michael.

#### 4.3.1 Chronology from Adam to Seth (*Jub.* 4:1-2, 7)

The presence of an adaptation of *Jubilees* 4:1-2, 7, on the chronology between Adam and the birth of Seth, in Michael<sup>29</sup> and Chron. 1234, has already been revealed by Sebastian Brock.<sup>30</sup>

“Chronographers bring forth the testimony from the book of Enoch that Adam, after leaving Paradise, in seventy years, knew Eve, his wife, and she gave birth to

---

<sup>29</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. I 1 (1T; vol. 1: 1V).

<sup>30</sup> Brock 1968, 626-7.

Cain. After seven years she gave birth to Abel. After fifty-three years Cain killed Abel, his brother. And for one hundred years Adam and Eve mourned over him, then Adam knew Eve, his wife, and she gave birth to Seth.”<sup>31</sup>

Previously, Gelzer<sup>32</sup> already highlighted its presence in the *Chronicon Syriacum* of Bar Hebraeus.<sup>33</sup> By comparing Barhebraeus’ account, which is explicitly attributed to Annianus, with *Jubilees*’ and Syncellus’, Gelzer showed that it must have originated in the *Chronicle* of Annianus. Since Barhebraeus used Michael, Michael must have accessed the same source as the Anonymous Chronicler.

<i>Jubilees</i> 4:1-2, 7 (trans. 22-3)	Georg. Sync. Chron. 8.11-9.19 (trans. 11-3)	Mich. Syr. Chron. I 1 (1T; vol. 1: 3V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 32.17-24T
In the third week in the second jubilee [years 64-70], she gave birth to Cain; in the fourth [71-77] she gave birth to Abel; and in the fifth [78-84] she gave birth to his daughter Awan. During the first (week) of the third jubilee [99-105] Cain killed Abel because we had accepted his sacrifice from him but from Cain we had	In the 55 <sup>th</sup> year, it [the <i>Little Genesis</i> ; <i>Jubilees</i> ] says, Adam knew his wife. In the 70 <sup>th</sup> year, the first-born son Cain was born to them. In the 77 <sup>th</sup> year, it is said that the righteous Abel was born. (...)  In that same 99 <sup>th</sup> year, Cain killed Abel,	Annianus the monk adduces testimony from the book of Enoch, saying that ‘after leaving Paradise, when he was seventy years old, he [Adam] knew Eve and she bore Cain. After seven years [77] she bore Abel.  After fifty-three years [130] Cain killed Abel.	Chronographers bring forth the testimony from the book of Enoch that Adam, after leaving Paradise, in seventy years, knew Eve, his wife, and she gave birth to Cain. After seven years [77] she gave birth to Abel.  After fifty-three years [130] Cain killed Abel, his brother.

<sup>31</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 32.17-24T.

<sup>32</sup> Gelzer 1898, vol. 2, 254-5, 258, 440-1.

<sup>33</sup> Barhebr. Chron. Syr., ed. Bedjan, 3; trans. Budge, 3.

<p>not accepted (one).          (...) Adam and his wife spent four weeks of years mourning for Abel. Then in the fourth year of the fifth week [130] they became happy. Adam again knew his wife, and she gave birth to a son for him. He named him Seth because he said: 'The Lord has raised up for us another offspring on the earth in place of Abel' (for Cain had killed him).</p>	<p>And the protoplasts grieved for him for four year-weeks, that is twenty-eight years. In the 127<sup>th</sup> year, Adam and Eve ceased their grieving. (...) In Adam's 230<sup>th</sup> year, in which Seth was born, it was Cain's 160<sup>th</sup> year.</p>	<p>And Adam and Eve mourned for him for one hundred years [230], and then they gave birth to Seth, in his likeness, after his image'.</p>	<p>And for one hundred years Adam and Eve mourned over him, then [230] Adam knew Eve, his wife, and she gave birth to Seth.</p>
--	---	---	---

An interesting aspect of these passages is the difference in the chronologies. Syncellus' testimony shows that Annianus reworked the chronology to conform to the Septuagint, dating the birth of Seth to the 230<sup>th</sup> year of Adam instead of his 130<sup>th</sup>. However, whereas Syncellus agrees with *Jubilees* and dates the death of Abel to AM 99, Michael and Chron. 1234 date this event to AM 130. Annianus/Syncellus followed the opinion of *Jubilees*, counting 28 years (one year-week is seven days;  $4 \times 7 = 28$ ) between Abel's death and the birth of Seth. The common Syriac source used by Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler claimed that the mourning process lasted for exactly 100 years (one year-week is twenty-five days;  $4 \times 25 = 100$ ), so between AM 130 and 230.

Heinrich Gelzer<sup>34</sup> suggested that the Syriac chronographers faithfully preserve the opinion of Panodorus, copied by Annianus, and that Syncellus followed *Jubilees* more closely, but it seems much more likely that the elements that account for the differences between the Greek and the Syriac chronicles are due to the influence of a Syriac

---

<sup>34</sup> Gelzer 1898, 258-9.

intermediary between Annianus and the later Syriac chronicle tradition. We can only guess as to the identity of this Syriac chronicler. Brock suggested John of Litharb as a possible candidate, and this is certainly plausible.<sup>35</sup>

#### 4.3.2 The descent of the *Benai Elohim* from Mount Hermon (1 *Enoch* 6:1-6)

The following excerpt is not based on *Jubilees*, but mainly on 1 *Enoch* 6:1-6.

At that time these Watchers, the *Benai Elohim*, came down from the mountain Hermon, being in number two hundred. For they were discouraged and weakened in this angelic way of life, seeing that they were not returning to Paradise, and they were smitten with a desire for marriage. They appointed one of them as king, a man called Semiazos and concluded a pact with him, swearing an oath that they would descend from this mountain on which they were living and would marry women. When they came down towards their brethren, the sons of Seth and Enosh, they wished to marry their women, but they did not want to give women to them because they had transgressed their promise, and they came down towards the sons of Cain and married women of all that they chose and fathered sons by them, giants as towers.<sup>36</sup>

Similarly to the previous passage, Gelzer traced back this excerpt to Annianus, who was also used by Syncellus.<sup>37</sup> Years later, Brock<sup>38</sup> pointed out that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler used a common source.

---

<sup>35</sup> Brock 1968, 629.

<sup>36</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 36:18-37:5T.

<sup>37</sup> Gelzer 1898, 160-1.

<sup>38</sup> Brock 1968, 628-9.

1 <i>Enoch</i> 6:1-6	Georg. Sync. Chron. 11:7-11 (trans. 15)	Mich. Syr. Chron. I 3 (2T; vol. 1: 5V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 36.18-37.5T
<p>And it came to pass, when the children of men had multiplied, in those days there were born to them beautiful and comely daughters. And watchers, children of heaven, saw them and desired them, and lusted after them; and they said to another: ‘Come, let us choose for ourselves wives from the daughters of earth, and let us beget us children. (3) And Semhazah, who was their leader, said to them: ‘I fear you will not want to do this dead, and I alone shall pay the penalty for a great sin. (4) And they all answered him and said: ‘Let us all swear an oath, and bind one another with imprecations that we shall not depart, any</p>	<p>In AM 1000, in Jared’s 40<sup>th</sup> year, the 770<sup>th</sup> year of Seth himself, 200 Watchers of his line went astray and went down</p> <p>and took for themselves wives from the daughters of men, and begot giants,</p>	<p>In that year [the 40<sup>th</sup> of Jared] the Benai Elohim came down from the mountain Hermon, being in number two hundred. For, seeing that they had not returned to paradise, they were discouraged and so abandoned their angelic way of life, and they were smitten [with a desire for marriage].<sup>39</sup> And they set up a king for themselves, whose name was Semiazos.</p> <p><i>Concerning these Annianus relates that they came down from the mountain Hermon to their brethren, the children of Seth and Enosh, but these were unwilling to give them any wives, on the grounds that they had transgressed (their) promise. And so they went to the children of Cain and took wives; and</i></p>	<p>At that time these Watchers, the Benai Elohim, came down from the mountain Hermon, being in number two hundred. For they were discouraged and weakened in this angelic way of life, seeing that they were not returning to Paradise, and they were smitten with a desire for marriage. They appointed one of them as king, a man called Samazos (סמאזוס) and concluded a pact with him, swearing an oath that they would descend from this mountain on which they were living and would marry women. When they came down towards their brethren, the sons of Seth and Enosh, they wished to marry their women, but they did not want to give women to them because they had transgressed their promise, and they came down towards the sons of Cain and married women of all that they</p>

<sup>39</sup> There is an open space for these words in the original manuscript, see Ibrahim 2009, 3; the same thing was noted about Chabot’s copy by Brock 1968, 627, n. 3.

<p>of us, from this plan until we carry it out and do this deed.' (5) Then they all swore together and bound one another with imprecations. (6) And they were two hundred who descended in the days of Jared on the summit of Mount Hermon; and they called the mount Hermon, because they swore and bound one another with imprecations upon it. (...)</p> <p>(7:1) These (leaders) and all the rest (of the two hundred watchers) took for themselves wives from all whom they chose; and they began to cohabit with them and to defile themselves with them, and they taught them sorcery and spells and showed them the cutting of roots and herbs. (2) And they became pregnant by them and bore great giants of three thousand cubits; and</p>	<p>'men of renown', as scripture states.</p>	<p>they gave birth to great giants, <i>that is, plunderers, mighty and renowned assassins, and audacious bandits.</i></p>	<p>chose and fathered sons by them, giants as towers.</p>
--	--	---	---

there were [not] born upon earth off- spring [which grew to their strength].			
---	--	--	--

The subject of these excerpts are the *Benai Elohim*, the ‘Sons of God’, sometimes called ‘angels of the Lord’, who were depicted in *Genesis* 6:1-4, in *1 Enoch* 6:1:6 and 7:1-2 and in *Jubilees* 5:1, 6 as the fathers of the Giants. The identity of these ‘sons of God’ to whom was assigned the epithet ‘Watchers’ in *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, was a controversial subject. They had originally always been identified as angels, but this supernaturalistic interpretation was later rejected; first by the Jewish authors such as Philo of Alexandria who identified the *Benai Elohim* as corporeal beings, describing them as “good and excellent men”.<sup>40</sup> Among Christian authors, by the fourth century, the opinion of the chronographer Julius Africanus (c. 160 – c. 240), that the *Benai Elohim* were the descendants of Seth and men of impeccable moral conduct, had become canonical, and the supernaturalistic theory that women had intercourse with angels was rejected as heresy, mainly due to the reaction of authors such as Ephrem and Augustine against Manichaeism.<sup>41</sup>

Not surprisingly therefore, information on these Sethites was available to the Anonymous Chronicler in the *Cave of Treasures*, which he used to a great extent (probably because of the – erroneous – link with Ephrem), but also in a chronographic source that preserved material from Annianus’ *Chronicle*, possibly John of Litharb. These other materials are not based on *Jubilees*’ or Enochic traditions, so I will refrain from discussing them here, but leave them for the relevant chapters, on the *Cave of Treasures* and Annianus, as well as for my thematic discussion of the Sethites.

---

<sup>40</sup> Philo Alex., *Quaest. et Solut. Gen. et Ex.* I 92 (trans. 61).

<sup>41</sup> Adler 1989, 113-6.

### 4.3.3 An antediluvian massacre (*Jub.* 5:1-2, 9-10 and *1 Enoch* 7, 9-10)

A third excerpt depicts a massacre that occurred before the Flood among Mankind, whose blood soiled the earth and whose bones formed hills:

“At that time, after Mankind had multiplied and every flesh had corrupted its way, God allowed them to fall, one by one in war, until one by one, they were killed in battle, thousands and tens of thousands of men, until that area in which they had fought each other was putrefied by their blood. And their bones heaped up and became great tells due to their multitudes.”<sup>42</sup>

Tisserant correctly highlighted the similarities with *Jubilees* 5:1-2, 9, which describes a similar antediluvian event.<sup>43</sup> However, *Jubilees* 5:10 should be included in a textual comparison as well.

<i>Jub.</i> 5:1-10	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 40.19-25T
<p>(1) When mankind began to multiply on the surface of the entire earth and daughters were born to them, the angels of the Lord – in a certain (year) of this jubilee – saw that they were beautiful to look at. So they married of them whomever they chose. They gave birth to children for them and they were giants.</p> <p>(2) Wickedness increased on the earth. All animate beings corrupted their way – (every one of them) from people to cattle, animals, birds, and everything that moves about on the ground. All of them corrupted their way and their prescribed course. They began to devour one another, and wickedness increased on the earth. Every thought of all mankind’s knowledge was evil like this all the time.</p> <p>(...) (9) (God) sent his sword among them so that they</p>	<p>At that time, after Mankind had multiplied</p> <p>and all flesh</p> <p>had corrupted its way,</p> <p>God allowed them to fall, one by one in war, until one</p>

<sup>42</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 40.19-25T.

<sup>43</sup> Tisserant 1921, 79-80. VanderKam 1989, 33 catalogues the Syriac passage as an allusion rather than a translation or adaptation.

<p>would kill one another. They began to kill each other until all of them fell by the sword and were obliterated from the earth. (10) Now their fathers were watching, but afterwards they were tied up in the depths of the earth until the great day of judgement when there will be condemnation on all who have corrupted their ways and their actions before the Lord.</p>	<p>by one, they were killed in battle, thousands and tens of thousands of men, until that area in which they had fought each other was putrefied by their blood. And their bones heaped up and became great tells due to their multitudes.</p>
--	--

Similarly to *Genesis* 6:1-12, *Jubilees* 5:1-10 and Chron. 1234 describe how God grows angry with the offspring of the ‘sons of God’ and the ‘daughters of men’, because of their wickedness, and how He plans to send a Flood against mankind, but promises to save Noah and his sons. *Jubilees* and Chron. 1234, however, also describe a massacre on earth that preceded the Flood, which is not mentioned in *Genesis*. Jacques van Ruiten, who studied<sup>44</sup> the relationship between *Jubilees* 5:1-19 and *Genesis* 6:1-12, concluded that the author of the *Jubilees* rewrote the biblical account “as a story of the imprisonment of the Watchers and the destruction of their children, combined with elements of the Flood narrative to portray the consequences of lawlessness.”<sup>45</sup> The order of these biblical elements – the motivation of the Flood (*Genesis* 6:5-6, 7b, 11-12, 13a; cf. *Jubilees* 5:2-3), the decision to destroy all men (*Genesis* 6:7a, 13b; cf. *Jubilees* 5:4, 20) and the decision to rescue Noah (*Genesis* 6:8; cf. *Jubilees* 5:5, 19) – was rearranged and they were integrated into a description of two very different events that preceded the Flood: the judgement on the Giants (*Jubilees* 5:7-9: “the sending of the sword so that each one might kill his fellow”) and the judgement on the Watchers (*Jubilees* 5:6, 10-1: “they are bound in the depths of the earth until the day of the great judgement”).

These two judgements are also mentioned by the Anonymous Chronicler, but slightly differently. The Syriac account does not distinguish between the Giants and the Watchers: both judgements, the slaughter of one another as well as the subterranean

---

<sup>44</sup> van Ruiten 1997, van Ruiten 1998 and van Ruiten 2000, 181-97.

<sup>45</sup> van Ruiten 1997, 71. Cf. Davenport 1971, 47.

imprisonment, were cast on mankind.<sup>46</sup> The source for this account cannot be determined, but must have been written prior to the thirteenth century, because Michael knew the same information through the same source. Furthermore, the testimony of a scholion of Jacob of Edessa shows that a similar tradition was already known in Syriac at the turn of the eighth century, but both judgements were seen as having been cast on the “rebellious giants, the evil offspring of those who transgressed their covenant, those who were unlawfully born out of the daughters of Cain.”<sup>47</sup>

Jac. Ed. Schol. 10 <sup>48</sup>	Mich. Syr. Chron. I 6 (5T; vol. 1: 10V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 40.19-25T
<p>Concerning these (Giants), there is written and mention is made in stories (which are) ancient (ܡܘܨܬܩܘܢܐ) and (are) additional to those which are (found) among the Hebrews as follows.</p> <p>When God wanted to destroy them and their evil, still before that total wrath (exercised) by means of the Flood, while he allowed them to perish through the evil things of their (own) minds, they fell upon each other in a warlike manner, thoughtlessly as much as heartlessly. (This also occurred) in order that – still according to the</p>	<p>Mankind multiplied <i>on earth</i> and all flesh corrupted its way <i>in the presence of the Lord</i> and</p> <p>God</p> <p>allowed them</p> <p>to fall</p> <p>in cruel wars</p>	<p><i>At that time</i>, after mankind had multiplied and all flesh had corrupted its way,</p> <p>God</p> <p>allowed them</p> <p>to fall, <i>one by one</i> in war,</p>

<sup>46</sup> Tisserant 1921, 80: The author of the Syriac tradition “a omis l’essentiel du récit auquel il emprunte et l’on ne s’aperçoit aucunement dans la présente citation que les victimes des châtements divins, dans les *Jubilés*, sont les géants nés du commerce criminel des veilleurs.”

<sup>47</sup> Kruisheer 1997, 195.

<sup>48</sup> Preserved in BL Add. 17,193, f. 61b-62a, reconstructed and translated by Kruisheer 1997, 194-5.

<p>wording of the story – in all ages of the world thereafter there would not be such inordinate war and desolation and destruction of men like this.</p> <p>The destruction of those obstinate and rebellious giants – the evil offspring of those who transgressed their covenant, those who were unlawfully born out of the daughters of Cain – took place in such a way that (a distance of) many stadia of the earth was putrefied (ܩܘܘܠܘܬܐ) by their blood and by the festering (coming out) of their corpses and [that] enormous and might [worms] gathered out of the skeletons of their bones. As the story said, until the Flood the visible sign of their destruction clearly continued to exist.</p>	<p>thousands and tens of thousands were killed</p> <p>so that the area in which their wars had taken place, was putrefied (ܩܘܘܠܘܬܐ) by their blood.</p> <p>Their bones heaped up (in the form of) great tells due to their multitude.</p>	<p><i>until one by one, thousands and tens of thousands of men were killed in battle,</i></p> <p>until that area, in which they had fought each other, was putrefied (ܩܘܘܠܘܬܐ) by their blood.</p> <p>Their bones heaped up and became great tells due to their multitude.</p>
--	---	--

The similarities in wording suggest that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler share a common source, but did not use Jacob. Most likely, the Syriac chronicler on whom Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler used the same source as Jacob, but reworked the tradition independently. This adaptation is not surprising, considering the difference in literary context between a ‘mere’ exegetical remark on the origin of the Giants according to *Genesis* 6:1-4 and the relevance of such an important antediluvian event, for the reconstruction of the history of Mankind’s sinfulness. Therefore, Michael’s and the Anonymous Chronicler’s lack of reference to the Giants could be deliberate.

Michael only mentions the Giants once and the Anonymous Chronicler mentions them only twice: both preserve the aforementioned passage<sup>49</sup> from Annianus' *Chronicle* in which the Giants are identified as the children of the Sethites and the Cainites, and the Anonymous Chronicler<sup>50</sup> also copied *Cave of Treasures* 6.3, which describes them as descendants of Seth. In another passage, Michael describes the slaughter yet again in terms of "evil wars" among "Mankind":

"It is necessary to understand clearly that, when sin multiplied and Mankind worshipped impurity in several ways, they killed each other in evil wars, because this wickedness is the cultivation (ܠܫܝܒܐ) of demons and the fruit of their seed. When the earth became a putrefaction (ܠܫܝܒܐ) of human blood, it became infertile. To the pleasure of the demons, bones gathered in great tells, like strong mountains. Because of this, God commanded that the Flood (would) occur."<sup>51</sup>

This exegetical remark, which uses agricultural vocabulary ("cultivation of demons", "fruit of their seed") to interpret the infertility of the earth as the cause of the Flood, likely originated in the same historiographical source that was responsible for the adaptation of *Jubilees* 5:1-10, because it also speaks of the putrefied earth and the tells that were constructed from human bones.

Although there are some similarities between *Jubilees* 5:1-10 and the Syriac tradition preserved by Michael and Chron. 1234, such as the expression that "every flesh had corrupted its way" (*Jubilees* 5:2; also *Genesis* 6:12), the Syriac terminology, applied to the twofold judgement on mankind, which also appears in Jacob's scholion, suggests the additional influence of *Jubilees* 7:23-30 or even 1 *Enoch* 9-10, which is rooted in the same tradition as *Jubilees* 5:4-12.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 37.1T and Mich. Syr. Chron. I 3 (2T; vol. 1: 5V).

<sup>50</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 32.9T.

<sup>51</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 1 (7-8T; vol. 1: 15-6V).

<sup>52</sup> Van Ruiten, 1997, 72-3, who concluded on the basis of similarities in structure but differences in wording between *Jubilees* 5:4-12 and 1 *Enoch* 10:1-17 that, although both of these passages were elaborations on *Genesis* 6:1-4, their authors independently reconstructed material from the same tradition. Milik 1976, 31, however,

The reference to the shedding of blood on earth has counterparts in *Jubilees* 7:23-30 and 1 *Enoch* 9:1, 9. The author of *Jubilees*, however, only uses this image from the casting of the judgement on the Watchers onwards, and not before, whereas in 1 *Enoch* 9:1, 9, already before judgement was cast, “much blood was spilled upon the earth and the whole earth was filled with wickedness” and “Michael, Sariel, Raphael and Gabriel (...) saw much blood shed on earth; and the whole earth was full of godlessness and violence which men were committing against it.”

With regards to stacks of corpses forming hills, *Jubilees* 5:10 and *Jubilees* 7:29 remain rather vague:

“Now their fathers were watching, but afterwards they were tied up in the depths of the earth until the great day of judgement when there will be condemnation on all who have corrupted their ways and their actions before the Lord.” (*Jub.* 5:10)

“No one who consumes blood or who sheds blood on the earth will be left. He will be left with neither descendants nor posterity living beneath heaven because they will go into sheol and will descend into the place of judgement. All of them will depart into deep darkness through a violent death.” (*Jub.* 7:29)

More detailed descriptions, however, which use precisely this image of mountains and hills, are furnished by 1 *Enoch* 10:4-5 (albeit without mention of their bones)

“and to Raphael he said, ‘Go, Raphael, and bind Asael; fetter him hand and foot and cast him into darkness; make an opening in the desert which is in the desert of Dudael, and there go and cast him in. And place upon him jagged and rough rocks, and cover him with darkness and let him abide there for all time (...)’”

and another Jewish apocryphal text, the so-called *Damascus document* (CD-A, col. II 19-21):

---

suggested that 1 *Enoch* 6 may have been the basis for *Genesis*. Black 1985, 14 sees the merits of Milik’s hypothesis.

“And their sons, whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains, fell. All flesh which there was in the dry earth decayed and became as if it had never been, for having realized their desires and failing to keep their creator’s precepts, until his wrath flared up against them.”<sup>53</sup>

Also worth noting is 1 *Enoch* 22:3-4’s description of hollow mountains as storage spaces for “all the souls of men [...], fashioned in this way for their incarceration” until judgement day,<sup>54</sup> because it focuses on mankind rather than the Giants or the Watchers.

Further evidence for the involvement of the Enoch tradition is the agricultural theme in Michael’s exegetical remark<sup>55</sup> on the judgement on Mankind. The discourse of the infertility of the earth, caused by the wickedness of mankind, the “cultivation of demons” and the “fruit of their seeds” is reminiscent of 1 *Enoch* 10:7-8, which focusses on “the healing of the earth” which had been “devastated by the works of the teaching of Asael” and which shall

“be tilled in righteousness, and it shall all be planted with trees, and filled with blessing. And all luxuriant trees will be planted in it; and they will plant vines in it, and the vine which they plant will produce a thousand measures of wine, and of all seed which is sown upon it, each seah will produce a thousand seah; and every seah of olives will produce up to ten baths of oil” (1 *Enoch* 10:18-9).<sup>56</sup>

The Syriac traditions also differ from the Jewish traditions in several interesting ways. Most importantly, God plays a more active role in Mankind’s destruction in *Jubilees* 5:9<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> CD-A, col. II 19-21, García Martínez 1994, 34. On which, see van Ruiten 1997, 72 and van Ruiten 1998, 80.

<sup>54</sup> Black 1985, 37.

<sup>55</sup> A less certain argument is 1 *Enoch* 1:9’s statement that “He comes with ten thousand holy ones to execute judgement upon all” which can perhaps be linked to Michael’s and the Anonymous Chronicler’s emphasis on the deaths of thousands and ten thousands of people.

<sup>56</sup> Black 1985, 31.

<sup>57</sup> “He sent his sword among them so that they would kill one another.”

and 1 *Enoch* 10:9<sup>58</sup> than in the Syriac sources according to which Mankind brought about its own destruction. The image of God sending of the sword is perhaps partially reflected in Jacob's admission that "God wanted to destroy them and their evil," but Jacob goes on to say that God let "them perish through the evil things of their (own) minds," a statement which is similar to Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler's use of the phrase "God allowed them to fall."

This discrepancy might be connected to the fact that in the Syriac witnesses the judgement on Watchers, i.e. their subterranean imprisonment, was no longer interpreted as a continuous judgement that lasted until the day of judgement. Instead, the Syriac accounts present the judgement on the Giants (Jacob) or on Mankind (Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler) as a one-time historical event, an irreversible decision. After this final judgement, the last evidence of the existence of these Giants was washed away by the Flood and the earth was cleansed, made fertile again.

The nature and genesis of this material, being a fusion of traditions from *Jubilees* and 1 *Enoch*, could suggest the involvement of Annianus, similarly to the case of the previously discussed passage. Even though Jacob's reference to his sources as "old"<sup>59</sup> stories "additional to those which are (found) among the Hebrews"<sup>60</sup> is surprisingly similar to Syncellus' reference to some of his sources as "historians who have composed Jewish antiquities (Ἰουδαικὰς ἀρχαιολογίας) or Christian histories (Χριστιανικὰς ἱστορίας),"<sup>61</sup> Syncellus does not preserve a similar passage. Instead, he copied 1 *Enoch* in its entirety and only refers to *Jubilees* 5:6, 10-1, in dating a "judgement against the

---

<sup>58</sup> "And to Gabriel the Lord said: 'Go, Gabriel, to the giants, (their) bastard off-spring, the children of fornication, and destroy (those) sons of the watchers from among the sons of men. Muster them (for battle), and send them, one against the other, in a battle of destruction'" (trans. Black 1985, 30).

<sup>59</sup> To emphasise that they were old, was to emphasize their importance, their accuracy and the truth in their claims.

<sup>60</sup> Kruisheer 1997, 194-5.

<sup>61</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 4.20 (trans. 6).

Watchers”<sup>62</sup> to AM 2121 (27 years before the Flood).<sup>63</sup> Thus, the involvement of Annianus cannot be confirmed or denied.

Another, more likely, possibility is that Andronicus transmitted this information into Syriac. On occasion Andronicus, or more correctly Michael, cites a certain Asaph for traditions from *Jubilees*. This Asaph, who in some sources is called a “historian of the Hebrews” – suggesting perhaps a relation to Jacob’s ‘Hebrew’ source(s) – is cited in several sources that are attributed to Andronicus.<sup>64</sup>

#### 4.3.4 The inheritance of Shem and his sons (*Jubilees* 8:12-6, 21)

A fourth passage focuses on the division of the earth among Shem and his sons:

“To Shem emerged the inheritance of the entire centre of the region that is in the centre of the inhabited earth, from the frontier of Egypt and the Red Sea to this sea of Phoenicia and Syria. And Shem and his children also possessed these known locations: Palestine, all of Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria, all of Mesopotamia, Hyrcania, Assyria, the land of Sennaar and Babel, all the land of Persia and the lands that surround it, with Northern India and the remainder of the eastern regions.”<sup>65</sup>

Initially, the region of Shem is described fairly generally as the centre of the earth, as the land between Egypt and Phoenicia/Syria. Thereafter, this geographical zone is broken down into several countries and regions, including Persia and India which lie further east.

Perhaps because this geographical description was followed by fairly literal copies of *Jubilees*’ descriptions of the shares of Ham and Japheth (*Jubilees* 8:22-30), Tisserant<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> In Georg. Sync. Chron. 21.17 (trans. 29). Cf. also Joh. Mal. Brev. I 2 (ed. 5.36-8; trans. 3) who dates the union of the “sons of Seth” with the “daughters of men” to AM 2122.

<sup>63</sup> Rather than God’s restriction of the lifespan of mortals to 120 years, as Adler and Tuffin suggested.

<sup>64</sup> See 15.3.

<sup>65</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 43.19-26T.

<sup>66</sup> Tisserant 1921, 82-6. His opinion was adopted without criticism by Vanderkam 1989, 53-4 (trans.) and Witakowski 1993, 652.

identified this excerpt as an adaptation of *Jubilees* 8:12 and 21, created by the Anonymous Chronicler himself. Although the link with *Jubilees* is (partially) correct, a comparison of the accounts in *Jubilees* and Chron. 1234 with a passage from Michael reveals that the Syriac witnesses again depend upon a common source.

<p><i>Jub.</i> 8:12-6, 21 (trans. 52-4)</p>	<p>Mich. Syr. Chron. II 2 (8-9T; vol. 1: 17-8V)<sup>67</sup></p>	<p>Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 43.19-26T</p>
<p>In the book there <u>emerged</u> as Shem's lot the centre of the earth which he would occupy as an inheritance for him and for his children throughout the history of eternity: from the middle of the mountain range of Rafa, from the source of the water from the Tina River. His share goes toward the west through the middle of this river. One then goes until one reaches the water of the deeps from which this river emerges. This river emerges and pours its waters into the Me'at Sea. This river goes as far as the Great Sea. Everything to the north belongs to Japheth, while everything to the south belongs to Shem. It goes until it reaches Karas. this is in the bosom of the branch which faces southward. His share goes toward the Great Sea and goes straight until it reaches to the west of the branch that faces southward, for this is the sea whose name is the Branch of the Egyptian Sea. It turns</p>	<p>To the sons of Shem arrived (ܡܫܝܡܐ) the inheritance (of) the entire region that is in the centre of the inhabited earth,  from the frontier of Egypt and Rhinocorura  and the Red Sea, and from the sea of Phoenicia and Syria</p>	<p>To Shem <u>emerged</u> (ܡܫܝܡܐ) the inheritance of the entire centre of the region that is in the centre of the inhabited earth,  from the frontier of Egypt and the Red Sea to this sea of Phoenicia and Syria.</p>

<sup>67</sup> Copied in Barhebr. Chron. Syr. 7:27-8:4 (ed. Bedjan 1890); 7 (trans. Budge, 1932).

<p>from there southward toward the mouth of the Great Sea on the shore of the waters. It goes toward the west of Afra and goes until it reaches the water of the Gihon River to the south of the Gihon's waters along the banks of this river. It goes eastward until it reaches the Garden of Eden, toward the south side of it – on the south and from the east of the entire land of Eden and of all the east. It turns to the east and comes until it reaches to the east of the mountain range named Rafa. Then it goes down toward the bank of the Tina River's mouth.</p> <p>(...)</p> <p>He knew that a blessed and excellent share had come about for <u>Shem and his children</u> throughout the history of eternity: all the land of Eden, all the land of the Erythrean Sea, all the land of the East, India, (that which is) in Erythrea and its mountains, all the land of Bashan, all the land of Lebanon, the islands of Caphtor, the entire mountain range of Sanir and Amana, the mountain range of Asshur which is in the north – a blessed and spacious land. Everything in it is beautiful.</p>	<p>to the eastern limit of the inhabited earth.</p> <p>And these are their known regions: Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria, all of Mesopotamia and Hyrcania, Assyria, the land of Sennaar of Babel and of the Qarduyē, all of Persia and the regions in its vicinity, with Northern India, Bactria and the remainder of the eastern regions.</p>	<p>And <u>Shem and his children</u> also possessed these known regions: Palestine, all of Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria, all of Mesopotamia, Hyrcania, Assyria, the land of Sennaar and Babel, all the land of Persia and the lands that surround it, with Northern India and the remainder of the eastern regions.</p>
--	---	--

Although there are some minor similarities between the Syriac witnesses on the one hand and *Jubilees* on the other – Chron. 1234 even preserves *Jubilees*' use of the verb “to emerge” – the Syriac account is very different from the Ethiopic. This is due to the fact that the Syriac account is not a direct adaptation of *Jubilees* 8:12-6, 21 either, but an

adaptation of materials from the *Chronicle* of Hippolytus of Rome (d. 235), more specifically from the *Diamerismos* (Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς), the part that discussed the division of the earth among the descendants of Noah.<sup>68</sup> This is demonstrated by the shared vocabulary between the three source, especially Michael’s reference to the Qarduye, the Kurds (?), a corruption of Κορδυλία neither of which were unfortunately mentioned by the Anonymous Chronicler.

Hipp. Chron., §188, 193-4 (ed. 10, 30)	Mich. Syr. Chron. II 2 (8-9T; vol. 1: 17-8V) <sup>69</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 43.19-26T
<p>The dwelling-place of all the sons of Shem is from Bactria to Rhinocorura, which separates Syria and Egypt and the Erythraean sea from the mouth of [the river] at Arsinoe of India.</p> <p>These are the names of the lands of the sons of Shem: <u>Persia with the nations that surround it</u> (σὺν τοῖς ἐπικειμένοις αὐτῇ ἔθνεσιν), Bactria (Βακτριανή), Hyrcania, Babylonia, Kordulia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Arabia Archaia,<sup>70</sup> Elam, India, Arabia Felix, Koile Syria, Commagene and Phoenicia, which is of the sons of Shem.</p>	<p>To the sons of Shem arrived the inheritance (of) the entire region that is in the centre of the inhabited earth, from the frontier of Egypt and Rhinocorura and the Red Sea, and from the sea of Phoenicia and Syria to the eastern limit of the inhabited earth.</p> <p>And these are their known regions: Palestine (ܩܕܘܝܬܐ), Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria, all of Mesopotamia and Hyrcania, Assyria, the land of Sennaar of Babel and of the Kurds (Qarduyē, ܩܪܕܘܝܐ), all of <u>Persia and the lands that surround it</u> (ܩܪܕܘܝܐ ܩܪܕܘܝܬܐ), with Northern India, Bactria (ܩܪܕܘܝܬܐ) and the remainder of the eastern regions.</p>	<p>To Shem emerged the inheritance of the entire centre of the region that is in the centre of the inhabited earth, from the frontier of Egypt and the Red Sea to this sea of Phoenicia and Syria.</p> <p>And Shem and his children also possessed these known regions: Palestine, all<sup>71</sup> of Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria, all of Mesopotamia, Hyrcania, Assyria, the land of Sennaar and Babel, all the land of <u>Persia and the lands that surround it</u> (ܩܪܘܝܬܐ ܩܪܘܝܬܐ ܩܪܘܝܬܐ), with Northern India and the remainder of the eastern regions.</p>

<sup>68</sup> Interestingly, Scott 1997, 309-10 has argued that Hippolytus himself might have adapted this *Jubilees*’ tradition.

<sup>69</sup> See also Barhebr. Chron. Syr. 7:27-8:4 (ed. Bedjan 1890); 7 (trans. Budge, 1932).

<sup>70</sup> As opposed to Arabia Nova?

<sup>71</sup> “All of Arabia” seems to combine the reference to Arabia Archaia and Arabia Felix.

Although Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler clearly share a common source, they applied the information to a different event. Whereas the Anonymous Chronicler used this passage to describe the first division of the earth, Noah's division of the land among his sons, Michael applied it the second division, which occurred after the death of Noah, according to Andronicus, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler in year 120 of Peleg.

Hippolytus' involvement in the transmission of this tradition confirms Witakowski's conclusion that certain materials from the *Diamerismos* in Hippolytus' *Chronicle* were available in Syriac.<sup>72</sup> It must, however, be pointed out that Witakowski did not note the presence of this passage in Michael and only connected its equivalent in Barhebraeus' *Chronicum Syriacum* to Hippolytus, describing this excerpt as a list of countries, which, together with the descriptions of the Hamites and Japhethites and of their shares, belonged to a whole that was "of a composite character"<sup>73</sup> and based on particular passages from Hippolytus' *Chronicle* ("§§138-154; 84; 193f and other §§ and/or intermediate stages"<sup>74</sup>).

Although he did discuss Chron. 1234 and its description of the land of the Shemites as well, Witakowski merely dismissed the passage as based on *Jubilees*.<sup>75</sup> It is clear, however, that the Anonymous Chronicler shares a common source with Michael, and that Barhebraeus relied on Michael for this information. This common source remains unidentified. Since only Syriac fragments of Hippolytus' *Diamerismos* have survived in Syriac historical, apocryphal and exegetical texts, it is most unlikely that a complete Syriac translation of Hippolytus' *Chronicle* ever existed. This is also suggested by the rarity of references to Hippolytus as a chronicler.<sup>76</sup>

Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's common source was most likely a Syriac Christian who was living in the Near East, judging from the altered order of the lands,

---

<sup>72</sup> Witakowski 1993, 649-51. Others are extant in chronicles, apocrypha, ethno-geographical treatises and biblical commentaries.

<sup>73</sup> Witakowski 1993, 646: "unit R".

<sup>74</sup> Witakowski 1993, 650.

<sup>75</sup> Witakowski 1993, 647 and 652.

<sup>76</sup> See chapter 6.

with priority being given to the Near Eastern lands of Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria and Mesopotamia. There may be a connection to a source that was used by Syncellus whose chronicle preserves a passage in which the same materials from Hippolytus' *Chronicle*, are arranged in the exact same order as in the two Syriac accounts.

Hipp. Chron., §188, 193-4 (ed. 10, 30)	Georg. Sync. Chron. 49.20-50.5 (trans. 64)	Mich. Syr. Chron. II 2 (8-9T; vol. 1: 17-8V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 43.19-26T
<p>The dwelling-place of all the sons of Shem is from Bactria to Rhinocorura, which separates Syria and Egypt and the Erythraean sea from the mouth of [the river] at Arsinoe of India.</p> <p>These are the names of the lands of the sons of Shem: <u>Persia with the nations that surround it</u> (σὺν τοῖς ἐπικειμένοις αὐτῇ ἔθνεσιν), Bactria (Βακτριανή), Hyrcania, Babylonia, Kordulia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Arabia Archaia, Elam, India, Arabia Felix, Koile Syria, Commagene and Phoenicia, which is of the sons of Shem.</p>	<p>All these descendants of Shem inhabit the region [stretching westwards] in length from Bactria and India up to Rhinocorura, which marks a boundary for Syria, Egypt and the Erythraean Sea extending from its mouth at Arsinoë in India, and [stretching southwards] in breadth from Persia and Bactria down to India. These are the names of the countries: Persia and the nations in it, Bactria, Hyrcania, Babylonia, Kodrualia (sic), Assyria, Mesopotamia, Arabia Felix, Koile Syria, Commagene, and Persia proper.<sup>77</sup></p>	<p>To the sons of Shem arrived the inheritance (of) the entire region that is in the centre of the inhabited earth, from the frontier of Egypt and Rhinocorura and the Red Sea, and from the sea of Phoenicia and Syria to the eastern limit of the inhabited earth.</p> <p>And these are their known regions: Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria, all of Mesopotamia and Hyrcania, Assyria, the land of Sennaar of Babel and of the Kurds, all of Persia and the lands that surround it, with Northern India, Bactria and the remainder of the eastern regions.</p>	<p>To Shem emerged the inheritance of the entire centre of the region that is in the centre of the inhabited earth, from the frontier of Egypt and the Red Sea to this sea of Phoenicia and Syria.</p> <p>And Shem and his children also possessed these known regions: Palestine, all of Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria, all of Mesopotamia, Hyrcania, Assyria, the land of Sennaar and Babel, all the land of Persia and the lands that surround it, with Northern India and the remainder of the eastern regions.</p>

<sup>77</sup> Helm 1955, 30 indicates that Syncellus' καὶ ἡ φυσικὴ Περσίς is a corruption of Hippolytus' καὶ ἡ Φοινικὴ ἦπερ ἔστι.

These verbal agreements, albeit circumstantial, suggest that Annianus may have played a role in the transmission of Hippolytus' materials. In this respect it is worth noting that Annianus is mentioned by Jacob as a chronicler between Hippolytus and Metrodorus on the one hand and Andronicus on the other.<sup>78</sup> Which Syriac chronicler transmitted these excerpts to Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler remains unclear, but John of Litharb remains a candidate.

#### 4.3.5 The transgression of (the sons of) Canaan (*Jub.* 10:27, 29, 32)

The next passage under consideration concerns the aftermath of this division of the earth among the grandsons of Noah.

“And twenty years after the division of languages, all the peoples went out from Babel and Man went to the land of his heritage. The sons of Canaan saw that the land of Palestine until the border of Egypt was very good and beautiful. And the region of Palestine belonged to the children of Joktan, the grandchildren of Ham (sic!). It pleased them and they settled in it and did not want to go to the land of their heritage. They transgressed the command of Noah and they inherited this curse that they brought out against them in the prophecy.”<sup>79</sup>

After the division of the earth and the division of languages, the sons of Canaan, who are the grandchildren of Ham, are left with the inhospitable regions of the south. Upon seeing the land of Palestine, however, which belongs to the grandchildren of Shem and is richer in provisions and is much more comfortable than the region that they have been allotted, the sons of Canaan break the oath their forefathers had sworn to Noah and capture Palestine, the land of the children of Joktan, grandchildren of Shem (not Ham).

---

<sup>78</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 7 (trans. 590).

<sup>79</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 47.26-48.3T.

Tisserant identified this excerpt as an adaptation of *Jubilees* 10:29, made by the Anonymous Chronicler.<sup>80</sup> Although the author of this passage was definitely influenced by this *Jubilees'* tradition, the Anonymous Chronicler did not adapt it himself. Again, Jacob and Michael are additional witnesses to the same tradition, the latter via the same source as the Anonymous Chronicler, as the textual similarities below clearly demonstrate.

<p><i>Jub.</i> 10:27, 29, 32 (trans. 63)</p>	<p>Jac. Epist. 13<sup>81</sup></p>	<p>Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (9T; vol. 1: 20-1V)</p>	<p>Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 47.26-48.3T</p>
<p>In the fourth week, during the first year – at its beginning – of the thirty-fourth jubilee [AM 1739], they were dispersed from the land of Shinar. [...]</p> <p>When Canaan</p> <p>saw that the land of Lebanon as far as the stream of Egypt was</p>	<p>Because thus, after the division of languages in Babel and the destruction of the tower that they built foolishly, all the peoples were divided from each other, every one of them split up, promptly took all (that) they (owned) and everyone went out to go to the land of his heritage that had come to him.</p> <p>When the sons of Canaan learnt that they were sons of Ham and (that) their brethren were in Egypt and in the land Cush – that region was that had come to the sons of Ham – and saw the goodness of that country of Shem, which</p>	<p>After</p> <p>the peoples</p> <p>went out from Babel,</p> <p>the Canaanites appointed a leader for them(selves) and they called him Canaan after the name of their ancestor.</p> <p>Because the sons of Canaan</p> <p>saw that the land of Palestine (فلسطين) and Lebanon was very [good],</p>	<p>And twenty years after the division of languages,</p> <p>all the peoples</p> <p>went out from Babel and Man went to the land of his heritage.</p> <p>The sons of Canaan</p> <p>saw that the land of Palestine (فلسطين) until the border of Egypt was</p>

<sup>80</sup> Tisserant 1921, 207-8.

<sup>81</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 12-13 (ed. Wright 1867, 3 - 4; trans. Nau 1905, 201-2).

<p>very beautiful,</p> <p>he did not go to his hereditary land to the west of the sea. He settled in the land of Lebanon, on the east and west, from the border of Lebanon and on the seacoast.</p> <p>[His father Ham and his brothers Cush and Mizraim said to Canaan: ‘...] You are cursed and will be cursed more than all of Noah’s children through the curse by which we obligated ourselves with an oath before the holy judge and before our father Noah.’</p>	<p>(stretches) from the mount Amanus until Palestine (فلسطين), the land of Syria and Phoenicia (فنيقياء) and the entire sea-coast, Lebanon, Sennaar (سنة) and Hermon, and the regions of the torrents and the streams.</p> <p>They desired (اريدون) to settle (لايسكنوا) in it. They also saw the small amount of its lords who were not enough for it, and also their own multitude. They recognised that they could oppress them and settle (يسكنوا) in it.</p> <p>They acted boldly, settled in this land and occupied it.</p> <p>They tread upon the commands of their fathers</p> <p>and attracted (سلبوا) over them the curse of their common father Noah and that of his three sons Shem, Ham (حم) and Japheth.</p>	<p>they settled in it and did not want (لم يردوا) to go to the land of their heritage to the west of the sea of Egypt.</p> <p>They inherited the curse again. There, the curse of the just Noah fulfilled (itself) over them.</p>	<p>very good and beautiful.</p> <p>And the region of Palestine belonged to the children of Joktan, the grandchildren of Ham (sic).</p> <p>It pleased them and they settled in it and did not want (لم يردوا) to go to the land of their heritage.</p> <p>They transgressed the command of Noah</p> <p>and they inherited this curse that they brought out (سلبوا) over them(selves) in the prophecy.</p>
---	--	---	--

As before, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler cannot be dependent on Jacob, but may be dependent on his source, perhaps through an intermediary. A Greek intermediary between *Jubilees* and Jacob is suggested by the orthography of certain terms in the latter's letter; in 'Ham' and 'Palestine' alephs clearly function as substitutes for Greek alphas. With respect to the relationship between Michael's and Chron. 1234's account, it is worth noting that Michael's version ("the land of Palestine and Lebanon") more closely resembles *Jubilees* ("the land of Lebanon") than the Anonymous Chronicler ("the land of Palestine").

#### 4.3.6 Abraham, the ravens and the burning of the temple (*Jubilees* 11:11-12:15)

The last two cases that require closer inspection, the episodes of Abraham and the Ravens (*Jubilees* 11:11-24) and Abraham and the burning of the temple (*Jubilees* 12:1-15), will be treated in conjunction, because, as in Chron. 1234, they appear in close relation to each other in most of the later witnesses. These traditions and their appearance in Chron. 1234 have already been discussed in detail by Brock<sup>82</sup> and Adler,<sup>83</sup> but, with all of our previous conclusions of *Jubilees*' traditions in Syriac chronography in mind, a brief re-investigation of the transmission of *Jubilees* 11-12 in Syriac is bound to produce interesting new results.

These episode describe how the evil spirit Mastema sent ravens to steal all the seed from Terah and his family (*Jub.* 11:11-3) and how this resulted in a time of famine, during which Abraham was born (*Jub.* 11:15). At the age of 14 he separates himself from his father, because of his idolatry and begins to pray to God. In the same year, when Terah and his family go out to protect the seeds against the ravens, Abraham manages to send the ravens away by saying "Descend not, and return to the place you come from." The next year, Abraham invents the seed-plough, which drops the seeds before

---

<sup>82</sup> Brock 1978, 136, 148-9.

<sup>83</sup> Adler 1987, 114.

immediately covering them up, thus preventing the ravens from intervening (*Jub.* 11:16-24). Thirteen years later, in his sixtieth year, Abraham is said to have attempted to convert his father (*Jub.* 12:1-8). Later, he marries Sara (*Jub.* 12:9-11). One night, Abraham gets up and burns the house of idols, ‘trying to save the gods’, his brother Haran dies in the fire (*Jub.* 12:12-24). Afterwards Terah and his family leave Ur for Harran.

These events were designed to fill in the gap of knowledge concerning the early life of Abraham in Ur, which *Genesis* only discussed very briefly. The legend of the ravens appears to be inspired by *Genesis* 15:11, which describes how Abraham chased away birds of prey that wanted to steal the carcasses of the animals that he was going to sacrifice. This biblical episode, however, did not occur in Abraham’s youth, but after his stay in Egypt and before the birth of Ishmael. This story also allowed the author of *Jubilees* to identify Abraham as the inventor of the seed-plough. Similarly, the episode of the burning of the temple was invented by the author of *Jubilees* to resolve the issue of the puzzling statement in *Genesis* 11:28 that “while his father Terah was still alive, Haran died in Ur of the Chaldeans, in the land of his birth.”<sup>84</sup>

*Jubilees’* answer to these “ἀπορίαι in biblical chronology”<sup>85</sup> proved popular and Christian chronographers eagerly incorporated these traditions into their works. Whereas the majority of the Greek chronographic witnesses<sup>86</sup> appear to have used a (no longer extant) Greek translation of *Jubilees*<sup>87</sup> for these traditions, which they combined with material from other, often chronographic, sources (Epiphanius of Salamis, Africanus, Malalas), Syncellus<sup>88</sup> is reckoned to have only had access to *Jubilees’* traditions via the chronicles of Africanus, Panodorus and Annianus. In which chronicle Syncellus

---

<sup>84</sup> For a similar response, see the Targumic legend that Nimrod threw Abraham in the fiery furnace and Haran’s death from the fires that fell from the heavens.

<sup>85</sup> Adler 1994, 147.

<sup>86</sup> The Logothete chronographers, George Cedrenus and George the Monk. For translations and commentaries, see Adler 1987, 96-104

<sup>87</sup> Milik 1971, 546; Adler 1987, 103.

<sup>88</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 111.6-17, 112.1-12 (trans. 138-40).

found the episodes of the ravens and the burning of the temple, however, is uncertain, although Panodorus or Annianus are the most likely candidates.<sup>89</sup>

Only Syncellus uses these traditions to resolve another issue: that of the age of Terah at the time of his death, concerning which *Genesis* 11-12 offered conflicting evidence.<sup>90</sup> According to *Genesis* 11:26 Abraham was born in year 70 of Terah, and according to *Genesis* 11:32, Terah died when he was 205 years old, before Abraham's departure from Harran to Canaan. *Genesis* 12:4-5, however, dates this departure in Abraham's seventy-fifth year, which would equate to year 145 of Terah. Stephen's claim in *Acts* 7:4 that "after his father died, God removed him from there into this land in which you are now living" posed an additional problem for Christian exegetes: Syncellus explains this by interpreting Terah's death before Abraham's departure from Harran as a spiritual death: he was dead to God, because of his idolatry.<sup>91</sup> We need not expand further on Syncellus' treatment of this tradition, but it is worth noting that he cites Josephus as his source, no doubt thinking of the *Jewish Antiquities*, which must have "undergone a deliberate interpolation from *Jubilees*."<sup>92</sup> It is assumed that Syncellus knew of this tradition via the Alexandrian chronographers.

It is tempting to suggest a link between Syncellus' and Jacob of Edessa's source, his old and additional Hebrew histories, whom he cites for these Abrahamic (and other) traditions from *Jubilees*. Especially because a similar process as in Greek, appears to have occurred in Syriac. A Greek source for Jacob, the earliest Syriac witness to these Abrahamic legends, is suggested by his use of the Greek spelling for Haran (Ἰρῆν<sup>93</sup>) and 'Chaldeans' (Χαλδαῖοι<sup>94</sup>) and his quotation (Gen. 11:28<sup>95</sup>) from the Septuagint rather

---

<sup>89</sup> Adler 1987, 109-10.

<sup>90</sup> Adler 1987, 104.

<sup>91</sup> Adler 1987, 105-8.

<sup>92</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 111.13-7 (trans. 138-9); Adler 1987, 108-9.

<sup>93</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 12-13 (ed. Wright 1867, ⲙ, l. 26).

<sup>94</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 12-13 (ed. Wright, ⲙ, l. 19).

<sup>95</sup> His reading that Haran died "before Terah" reflects the Septuagint rather than the Peshitta ("in the life of Terah").

than the Peshitta.<sup>96</sup> Furthermore, all the Syriac witnesses are “either themselves chronographers or else familiar with the principles of chronographers”<sup>97</sup>: Jacob of Edessa (Letter 13 to John of Litharb<sup>98</sup> and a scholion on Gn 11:27-32<sup>99</sup>), the *Catena Severi*,<sup>100</sup> Isho‘dad of Merv’s commentary on Genesis,<sup>101</sup> Michael,<sup>102</sup> Chron. 1234<sup>103</sup> and Bar Hebraeus (*Chronicon Syriacum*<sup>104</sup> and *Storehouse of Mysteries*<sup>105</sup>). To this list can be added the names of Dionysius bar Ṣalibi (d. 1171),<sup>106</sup> and Cyriacus of Takrit (d. 817),<sup>107</sup> whose knowledge of these traditions was only highlighted fairly recently.

The earliest Syriac witnesses, Jacob of Edessa, in a letter to John of Litharb, and the monk Severus, the compiler of the *Catena Severi* (861), probably had access to a common source.<sup>108</sup> The tradition that they describe diverges from *Jubilees*’ account “in a considerable number of different ways.”<sup>109</sup> These differences probably represent “a correction of *Jubilees* or a chronology based on *Jubilees* that is earlier and less corrupt than the Ethiopic text,”<sup>110</sup> (Adler) rather than “a more primitive stage of development than (...) *Jubilees*” as Brock<sup>111</sup> initially suggested.

Brock, originally signalled nine discrepancies, two of which concern chronology and will be discussed separately, the other seven are listed below.

---

<sup>96</sup> Brock 1978, 146 was the first to point out both indications. See also Adler 1987, 114.

<sup>97</sup> Adler 1987, 114.

<sup>98</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 12-13 (ed. Wright 1867, α - α; trans. Nau 1905, 202-4; Engl. trans. in Brock 1978, 137-8).

<sup>99</sup> Phillips 1864, 4.

<sup>100</sup> Benedictus 1737, vol. 1, 156-7; Brock 1978, 137-8.

<sup>101</sup> Isho‘dad, Comm. Gen., 142-4T, 154-6V.

<sup>102</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (13-4T; vol. 1: 26-7V).

<sup>103</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 51.14-52.20T.

<sup>104</sup> Barhebr. Chron. Syr., 10:25-11:10 (ed. Bedjan 1890), 10 (trans. Budge, 1932).

<sup>105</sup> Barhebr. Comm. Gen – II Sam, 48-9 (trans.).

<sup>106</sup> Dion. Bar Salib. Comm. Gen., 149.

<sup>107</sup> Taylor 2010, 49-50.

<sup>108</sup> Brock 1978, 139-40: Jacob uses “wording that agrees with the *Catena Severi* against his own letter” in a scholion on Genesis 11:27-32 (Jac. Ed. Schol. 2, cf. Phillips 1864, 2\*-3\*, 4-5).

<sup>109</sup> Brock 1978, 140.

<sup>110</sup> Adler 1987, 115.

<sup>111</sup> Brock 1978, 151.

- (1) *Jubilees*: the ravens were sent by Mastema; Jacob and the *Catena Severi*: the ravens were sent by God himself, as punishment for idolatry.
- (2) The episode of the ravens is said to have occurred when Abraham was 14 (*Jubilees*) or 15 (Jacob, Michael and Barhebraeus)
- (3) *Jubilees*: Abraham and his entire family guard the seeds from the ravens; Jacob and the *Catena Severi*: Abraham is sent by his father to guard the seeds by himself.
- (4) *Jubilees*: Abraham merely tells the ravens to go away and they do so; Jacob and the *Catena Severi*: Abraham is not able to until he pleads God for help.
- (5) *Jubilees*: the purpose of the episode seems to be to identify Abraham as the inventor of the seed-plough; Jacob and the *Catena Severi*: this invention is not mentioned, the episode of Abraham and the Ravens is identified as ‘Abraham’s first calling’.
- (6) Jacob and the *Catena Severi*: Abraham’s attempt to divert his father from idolatry is presented by Jacob and the *Catena Severi* as a direct consequence of his encounter with God; in *Jubilees*, this merely occurs 14 years later.
- (7) *Jubilees*: the temple is described as the “house of idols”; Jacob and the *Catena Severi*: “the temple where the idol of the god Qainan stood.”<sup>112</sup>
- (8) Jacob and the *Catena Severi*, unlike *Jubilees*, explicitly identify Abraham’s and Terah’s departure from Ur as a direct consequence of Abraham having burnt the temple.
- (9) According to *Jubilees*, “Abraham and Terah left Ur at least three years *after* the temple episode.”<sup>113</sup>

Chron. 1234 takes up a special position among the Syriac witnesses to these two traditions from *Jubilees*, because it contains fairly literal renderings of these *Jubilees* traditions which are on several occasions interpolated from the Syriac tradition. This

---

<sup>112</sup> Brock 1978, 138.

<sup>113</sup> Brock 1978, 141-2.

suggests that “at least in this particular example the two traditions were not wholly independent of one another.”<sup>114</sup>

<p><i>Jub.</i> 11:11-12:15 (trans. 66-71)</p>	<p>Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 51.14-52.20T</p>
<p>(11) Then Prince Mastema sent ravens and birds to eat the seed which would be planted in the ground and to destroy the land in order to rob mankind of their labors. Before they plowed in the seed, the ravens would pick (it) from the surface of the ground.</p> <p>(12) For this reason he named him Terah; because the ravens and birds reduced them to poverty and ate their seed.</p> <p>(13) The years began to be unfruitful due to the birds. They would eat all the fruit of the trees from the orchards. During their time, if they were able to save a little of all the fruit of the earth, it was with great effort. (14) During the thirty-ninth jubilee, in the second week, in the first year, Terah married a woman whose name was Edna, the daughter of Abram, the daughter of his father’s sister. (15) In the seventh year of this week [1876], she gave birth to a son for him, and he named him Abram after his mother’s father because he had died before his daughter’s son was conceived.</p> <p>(16) The child began to realize the errors of the earth – that everyone was going astray after the statues and after impurity. His father taught him (the art of) writing. When he was two weeks of years [= 14 years], he separated from his father in order not to worship idols with him. (...)</p> <p>(18) When the time for planting seeds in the ground arrived, all of them went out together to guard the seed from the ravens. Abram – a child of 14 years – went out with those who were going out.</p> <p>(19) As a cloud of ravens came to eat the seed, Abram</p>	<p>Abraham, twelve years old, began to realise the error of the earth because everyone had been gripped by error of statues and molten images.</p> <p>And at seeding time, the entire people, everyone, went out to guard the seed from the ravens and Abraham also went out with them.</p>

---

<sup>114</sup> Adler 1987, 114.

<p>would run at them before they could settle on the ground. He would shout at them before they could settle on the ground to eat the seed and would say: 'Do not come down; return to the place from which you came'! And they returned.</p> <p>(20) That day he did (this) to the cloud of ravens 70 times. Not a single raven remained in any of the fields where Abram was.</p> <p>(21) All who were with him in any of the fields would see him shouting: then all of the ravens returned (to their place).</p> <p>His reputation grew large throughout the entire land of the Chaldeans. (...)</p> <p>(23) In the first year of the fifth week Abram taught the people who made equipment for bulls – the skilful woodworkers – and they made an implement above the ground, opposite the plow beam, so that one could place seed on it. The seed would then drop down from it onto the end of the plow and be hidden in the ground; and they would no longer be afraid of the ravens. (...)</p> <p>(12:1) During the sixth week, in its seventh year, Abram said to his father Terah; 'My father'. He said: 'Yes, my son'?</p> <p>(2) He said: 'What help and advantage do we get from these idols before which you worship and prostrate yourself?</p> <p>(3) For there is no spirit in them because they are dumb. They are an error of the mind. Do not worship them. (...)</p> <p>(5) Why do you worship those things which have no spirit in them? For they are made by hands and you carry them on your shoulders.</p> <p>You receive no help from them, but instead they are a great shame for those who make them and an error of</p>	<p>And he cried out, while saying to the ravens: 'Return, return to the place from whence you came.' And they returned.</p> <p>And on that day, he made the ravens return seven times.</p> <p>And he cried out to the God of heaven and He answered him and freed them from the ravens. And from then on, Abraham knew God and promised to serve him.</p> <p>And (Abraham) separated himself from his father. [= Jubilees 11:16b]</p> <p>And the name of Abraham grew large throughout the entire land of the Chaldeans.</p> <p>And he taught the woodworkers to make seed-ejectors above the end of the plough to throw seeds with. And the seed would then drop and be hidden in the ground and they would no longer be afraid of the ravens.</p> <p>And one day, Abraham said to Terah, his father: 'What advantage or help is in those idols that you worship?</p> <p>They are only dumb and an error of the mind.</p> <p>Hands have made them and you carry them on your shoulders. There is no spirit in them.</p> <p>Worship the God of heaven who makes the rain and dew fall and makes everything that he wishes, in heaven and on earth.'</p>
--	---

<p>the mind for those who worship them. Do not worship them’.</p> <p>(6) Then he said to him: ‘I, too, know (this), my son. What shall I do with the people who have ordered me to serve in their presence.</p> <p>(7) If I tell them what is right, they will kill me because they themselves are attached to them so that they worship and praise them. Be quiet, my son, so that they do not kill you’. (...)</p> <p>(12) In the sixtieth year of Abram’s life (which was the fourth week, in its fourth year), Abram got up at night and burned the temple of the idols. He burned everything in the temple but no one knew (about it). (...)</p> <p>(14) Haran dashed in to save them, but the fire raged over him. He was burned in the fire and died in Ur of the Chaldeans before his father Terah. They buried him in Ur of the Chaldeans.</p> <p>(15) Then Terah left Ur of the Chaldeans – he and his sons – to go to the land of Lebanon and the land of Canaan. He settled in Haran and Abram lived with this father in Haran for two weeks of years.</p> <p>(16) In the sixth week, during its fifth year, Abram sat at night – at the beginning of the seventh month – to observe the stars from evening to dawn in order to see what would be the character of the year with respect to the rains. He was sitting and observing by himself.</p> <p>(17) A voice came to his mind and he said: ‘All the signs of the stars and signs of the moon and the sun – all are under the Lord’s control. Why should I be investigating (them)?</p> <p>(18) If he wishes he will make it rain in the morning and evening; and if he wishes, he will not make it fall. Everything is under his control’.</p>	<p>And he said to him: I, too, know this, my son. But what shall I do with all the people who have appointed me to serve before them?</p> <p>If I tell them what is right, they will kill me because they themselves are attached to the worship of idols. But be quiet, my son, so that they do not kill you.’</p> <p>At the age of fifty-six years,</p> <p>he burned the temple of Qainan.</p> <p>And Haran, the brother of Abraham entered to save the temple and he was consumed by the fire and he died.</p> <p>And at the age of sixty, Abraham and Terah, his father, and Nahor, his brother and Lot, the son of Haran, left Ur of the Chaldeans and came to live in Ḥarran for fourteen years.</p> <p>And in the fifth year, on the first of the seventh month, when Abraham was in Ḥarran, he sat at night to observe the stars from evening until morning in order to see what would be the character of the year with regards to the rain. And when he was observing, a word came to his mouth and he said: ‘All the signs of the stars and the moon and the sun, they are under God’s control. Why should I be investigating them?</p> <p>If the Lord wishes, he will make the rain fall, whether early or late (rain); and if he does not wish [it], he will not make the rain fall.’</p>
---	--

Of the nine Syriac variants identified by Brock, three also appear in Chron. 1234: Abraham’s invocation of God for help against the ravens (4), Abraham’s first calling (5,

albeit inexplicit<sup>115</sup>) and the reference to the ‘house of idols’ as the ‘temple of Qainan’ (7). The Anonymous Chronicler does not identify who sent the ravens (1) nor does he explicitly place a causal link between the burning of the temple and the departure from Ur (8). Then again, Chron. 1234 contradicts *Jubilees* as well as the Syriac tradition by the statement that Abraham was 12 years old at the time of the episode of the ravens (2).

If we take a closer look at the Anonymous Chronicler’s narrative, it becomes clear that he agreed with *Jubilees* on several issues, not only the identification of those who guarded the seeds (3), but as regards chronological matters, also on the period of two years between Abraham’s encounter with God and his attempt to convert his father (6), and on the period of four years between the burning of the temple and the departure from Ur (9). For the Anonymous Chronicler there was no causal link between these two events (8).

Event	Abraham’s age (Jub.)	Abraham’s age (Chron. 1234)
Ravens	14	12
Invention of the seed-plough	First year of fifth week [= 15]	12?
Attempt to convert Terah	Seventh year of sixth week [= 28]	? (One day)
Burning of the temple	60	56
Voyage from Ur to Harran	At least 64 years old (lived with Terah in Harran for 14 years, at least until Abraham was 78 years old)	60 (lived with Terah in Harran for 14 years)
Encounter with God	76 (Fifth year of sixth week, at the beginning of the seventh month)	65 (in the fifth year, on the first of the seventh month, when Abraham was in Harran)
Failed attempt to convince Terah to move to Canaan	78 (Seventh year of sixth week)	67 (after two years)
Voyage from Harran to Canaan	?	75

---

<sup>115</sup> Abraham only separates from his father *after* the episode of the Ravens: “And from then on, Abraham knew God and promised to serve him.”

Although the number 56 in Chron. 1234 might be a corruption of 60<sup>116</sup>, it is unlikely to be a coincidence that on two occasions Chron. 1234 accounts for the same number of years between two events as *Jubilees*: four years between the burning of the temple and the voyage to Harran, and two years between Abraham’s encounter with God in Harran and his attempt to convince Terah to leave. 56 is probably the original age attributed to Abraham by the Anonymous Chronicler’s source. Michael seems to have been influenced by the same tradition:

Abraham burned the temple of idols (ܩܝܢܢܐ ܕܥܘܪ) that was in Ur of the Chaldeans. And Harran, (his) brother, entered to quench (the fire) and save the statues from burning, he was consumed there.

And when Abraham was sixty years old, his father Terah, Nahor his brother and Lot, the son of Haran left and came and settled in Harran for fourteen years.

That Michael does not see the causal link between the two events either is suggested by his use of the verb ‘to leave’, rather than ‘to flee,’ which is used by Jacob and Severus. This rejection of the causal link is also mirrored in the dating of the departure from Ur, but not the destruction of the temple to year 60 of Abraham. Therefore, this burning of the temple must have occurred in an earlier year. There is clearly some relation between Michael’s and the Anonymous Chronicler’s account, but the difference in vocabulary is substantial.

Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (14T; vol. 1: 26-7V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 52.7-12T
Abraham burned the temple of idols that was in Ur of the Chaldeans.	At the age of fifty-six years, he burned the temple of Qainan.
And Haran (ܩܝܢܢܐ), (his) brother, entered to quench (the fire) and save the statues from burning, he was consumed there.	And Haran (ܩܝܢܢܐ), the brother of Abraham, entered to save the temple and he was consumed by the fire and he died.
And when Abraham was sixty years old, his father Terah, Nahor his brother and Lot, the son of Haran left and came and settled in Harran for fourteen years.	And at the age of sixty, Abraham and Terah, his father, and Nahor, his brother and Lot, the son of Haran, left Ur of the Chaldeans and came to live in Harran for fourteen years.

<sup>116</sup> Brock 1978, 148.

The difference in the descriptions of the temple and the name of Haran suggests that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler either had access to this tradition via a different intermediary or independently reworked a tradition that they found in the same source. It seems unlikely that Michael would have removed the reference to Qainan, so perhaps the option of a different intermediary should be pursued.

In this case, we cannot provide a definitive answer to the question of the Anonymous Chronicler's source. Given the identification of Qainan as the god to whom the temple was devoted, this material ultimately goes back to him, but perhaps through a later chronographic intermediary.<sup>117</sup>

## 4.4 Conclusion

Throughout this chapter it has become evident that a *status questionis* of *Jubilees*' influence on Chron. 1234 was long overdue and that Tisserant's conclusions were in dire need of an update. With the results of our research in mind, we can now provide the reader with an updated version of VanderKam's catalogue<sup>118</sup> of traditions from *Jubilees* in Chron. 1234. The table displays the locations in Chabot's edition of Chron. 1234 and the locations in *Jubilees* (according to VanderKam's division of chapters and verses) as well as the subject.

---

<sup>117</sup> On Andronicus and the Syriac Qainan tradition, see chapter 15.

<sup>118</sup> VanderKam 1989, XVI.

Location in Chron. 1234	Location in Jub.	Subject
32.12-14	(cf. 2:1)	Authorship of Jubilees
27.14-20 27.24-27 27.27-28.2, 7-8 28.10-13, 28.16-17, 28.17-22, 29.29-30.1, 30.3-7	2:2-3, 4, 5-7, 8-10, 12, 13-4, 15-6, 23-25	Creation, day 1 Creation, day 2 Creation, day 3 Creation, day 4 Creation, day 5 Creation, day 6 Creation, day 7
30.19-22	3:23-25	God curses the serpent, man and woman
31.9-11	3:28	The day the animals stopped speaking
39.1-8 38.26-39.1	4:17-19, 21 4:25-26	Enoch, the inventor of astronomy His burning of the incense and the four places, belonging to the Lord
32.24 33.12-16	4:29 4:30	date of the death of Adam
36.29-37.1	5:1b	Birth of the giants from the sons of Seth and the daughters of Cain
42.22-28 42.29-31	6:1-3, 7, 10	Noah's sacrifice Noah's and his sons' oath not to eat animate beings
46.5-12 43.17 43.26-44.4 44.4-15	8:2-4 8:11 22-24 25-27, 29-30	Qainan division of the earth among Noah's sons the share of Ham and his sons the share of Japheth and his sons
50.2-5 51.14-27	11:2 16, 18-21, 23	war between the offspring of Noah Abraham and the ravens
51.27-52.30	12:1-7, -12-, -14-5-, 16-20, 22-23, 28-29	Abraham and the burning of the temple and flight to Harran; Abraham's encounter with God and conversation with Terah
52.30-53.1 53.4-8 53.9, 11-15	-13:1- (?) 17, 21-23, 25?, 28-29	voyage to Canaan several kings conquer Sodom and Gomorrah and capture Lot Abraham pursues them and frees Lot
53.23-54.1	14:1, 4-7	God speaks to Abraham
55.6-7	19:8	ten trials of Abraham
55:22-56:10	33:1-10, 16 (cf. 15)	Ruben and Bilhah
56:11-57.28, 58.3-12	37:1-19, 20-25	war between the sons of Jacob and Esau

58:12-25	38:1-5, 8-9	Jacob joins the war and kills his brother Esau
59:2-60.11	41:4-21, 24-5	Judah and Tamar

Through this investigation into *Jubilees'* influence, I have been unable to provide any new insights into the issue of the existence of a Syriac translation of *Jubilees*. It is possible that the Anonymous Chronicler found the literal copies of passages from *Jubilees* in a chronicle as well, but this source was not used by Michael. This source may also have been a collection of fragments from apocryphal sources such as the *Cave of Treasures* and the *Lives of the Prophets*.

In any event, it has been demonstrated that in several instances the Anonymous Chronicler did not access *Jubilees* directly, but recovered adaptations of traditions from *Jubilees* and other apocryphal sources such as 1 *Enoch* through one or more Syriac chronicles, to which Michael also had access. In the following table, I also include an adaptation of *Jubilees* 11:2, on the emergence of war among the descendants of Noah, that can be attributed to Andronicus but will be discussed in the chapter that is devoted to this enigmatic Syriac chronicler, along with an adaptation of *Jubilees* 11:4, which is not extant in Chron. 1234.

Location in Chron. 1234	Location in Mich. Syr. Chron.	Location in Jub.	1 Enoch	Subject	Intermediary/ies
32.17-24	I 1 (1T; vol. 1: 3V)	4:1-2, 7, 10	6	Chronology of the births of Cain, Abel and Seth	Annianus/?
40.19-25	I 6 (5T; vol. 1: 10V)	5:2, 4, 7-10	9-10	The destruction of the Giants before the Flood	?
43.19-26	II 2 (8-9T; vol. 1: 17-8V)	8:19, 21		the share of Shem and his sons	Hippolytus/?
47.28-48.3	II 3 (9T; vol. 1: 20-1V)	10:29, 33		transgression of the sons of Canaan	?

49.23-50.2	II 3 (11T; vol. 1: 22V)	11:2		war between the offspring of Noah	Andronicus
51.27-52.30	II 6 (14T; vol. 1: 26-7V)	12:12, 14-5		Abraham's burning of the temple and departure from Ur	?

It is still unclear in which chronicle(s) the Anonymous Chronicler (and Michael) found these passages. They may all go back to the same intermediary, but some no doubt passed through Greek intermediaries such as Annianus and Hippolytus, whereas others came into Syriac via Andronicus. In this respect it is perhaps telling that the Anonymous Chronicler refers to *Jubilees* as “*the priestly book of Genesis that was copied from the angel of the presence by the word of the Lord by the prophet Moses,*”<sup>119</sup> and mentions it in one breath with Andronicus. Unfortunately, this does not allow us to assume that the Anonymous Chronicler knew *Jubilees* through Andronicus, because it is equally possible that *Jubilees* and Andronicus were two separate sources.

---

<sup>119</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 32.12-4T.



## Chapter 5 Flavius Josephus (AD 37 – ca. 100)

### 5.1 Introduction

Flavius Josephus is cited more than any other historian, six times in total,<sup>1</sup> yet the Anonymous Chronicler does not seem to have used any of Josephus' works directly, even though part of the *Jewish Wars* (its sixth book<sup>2</sup>) was available in Syriac. Information from Josephus' *Wars* and the *Jewish Antiquities* was passed on to the Anonymous Chronicler via Syriac intermediaries. In some cases, these were Syriac translations of Eusebius' *Chronicle* and *Ecclesiastical History*, but at least one Syriac chronicler was involved in the transmission of Josephus' materials as well.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 63.23-4T (a reference to II 13.1); Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 125.4T; Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 125.9T (?); on the siege of Jerusalem: Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 129.6T and 130.6, 17T. On Syriac references to and uses of Josephus, see Castelli 2001, 208-9.

<sup>2</sup> Schreckenberg 1972, 61-2. For an edition of two chapters from BL Add. ....., see Kottek 1886, but see Gottheil 1887 for comments.

## 5.2 Josephus via Eusebius' *Chronicle*

The Anonymous Chronicler cites Josephus twice for events that occurred at the time of the Passion of Christ: (1) Pontius Pilate's erection of "a statue of Tiberius Caesar in the temple of God on the Friday night of the Passion," and (2) the "trembling voice" that was heard shouting 'Let us flee from here' in the temple. These materials, which are based on Josephus' *Antiquities* XVIII 3.1 and *Wars* VI 5.3 respectively, are actually copies of passages from Eusebius' *Chronicle*.<sup>3</sup>

## 5.3 The Life of Moses before the Exodus

The Anonymous Chronicler also cites Josephus in a description of the life of Moses before the Exodus. In what appears to be a copy of *Cave of Treasures* 34:6, pertaining to Moses' marriage to Zipporah, and the birth of their sons Gershon and Eleazar, the Anonymous Chronicler identifies Josephus (*Jewish Antiquities*, II 13.1) as the source for this information.

And Moses was in Egypt for 40 years, he then killed Chenephres. And he fled to Median, towards Raguel. And he was a shepherd there. And he took Zipporah, the daughter of Raguel, as his wife and two sons were born from him: Gershon and Eleazar, according to what Josephus wrote in his chronicle, and he was in Median for 40 years.

Two elements indicate that this passage was not a copy of *Cave of Treasures* 34:6. On the one hand, Josephus is not mentioned in any extant manuscript of the *Cave of Treasures*, probably because this information was taken from *Exodus* 2:21, 18:2-4. On the other hand, the use of **לָקַח** for "to take as a wife," i.e. to marry, conflicts with the *Cave of*

---

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 125.4-11T, Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.175.11-23 and Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.213.

*Treasures'* consistent use of ܠܘܩܘܣܐ ܕܡܘܨܝ. That the Anonymous Chronicler found this information in a copy of that text is therefore highly unlikely. Since he could not have had access to the *Antiquities* either, because they were not extant in Syriac, his source must have been a Syriac chronicle which functioned as an intermediary between Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* and Chron. 1234. It is therefore more likely that this passage was part of the account of the early adventures of Moses, which preceded it and which was also mainly based on the *Antiquities*.

#### On the Cushite wife that Moses married

His diviners and sorcerers informed Pharaoh, the king of Egypt, that a man from the people of Israel was rising and would reign over the kingdom of the Egyptians. And when Pharaoh, king of Egypt, had heard this, he took animosity in his heart. He ordered everyone to drown in the river the boys that were born to the Israelites.

At that time Moses was born. His mother devised a plan, made a basket and placed Moses in it. She threw the basket in the river. King Pharaoh had a daughter who was called Maris (ܡܪܝܫܐ). And he gave her as a wife to Chenephres (ܚܢܦܪܝܫܐ), king of Memphis (ܡܡܦܝܫܐ). And in these days she went down to divert herself on account of the river. She saw the basket and picked it up from the surface of the water. And she opened (it) and saw the young child in it. She took him (in), raised him and he was her son.

And one of the days, king Pharaoh took him up, placed him on his knees to please his daughter, and he took the crown of his kingship and placed it on the head of the young child. And through the working of God, he took the crown from his head and placed it on the ground before Pharaoh and the child trampled it, not knowing right from wrong. After the king had seen what had occurred due to Moses, he thought on account of him that he was the one to reign over the kingdom of the Egyptians like the sorcerers had said to him. And he sought to kill him and for the pleasure of his daughter he did not kill him. He awaited the time to kill him. After his daughter had noticed this, she took him and hid him until he had grown up. After he had grown up, she made the wise men Janis (ܝܢܝܫܐ) and Jambris (ܝܡܒܪܝܫܐ) teach him the wisdom of the Egyptians, those that thereafter rose up against him with their magic. He learned from them all the wisdom under the guardianship of the daughter of Pharaoh and he learned incantations, divination and every art of magic. And Pharaoh heard of his wisdom.

At that time then, the Cushites came to wage war with the Egyptians. And Pharaoh said to his daughter: 'I have heard on account of Moses that he is wise and skilful in all the sciences. I will send him against our enemies and I will let him reign by my life, if he conquers our enemies.'

She however suspected that there was guile in his heart and she made her father swear. And her father swore that he would not kill him, but would make him great. Then, she brought Moses before the throne of Pharaoh, her father. And he made him leader and general of the armies. And he sent him to war to go down to Cush by sea because no one was capable of going to Cush by land because of the multitude of snakes and vipers that were there.

And Moses brought some kind of bird that was a disperser of this evil reptile so to say where it would hear its sound, every evil reptile was fleeing and leaving. The name of this bird was ibis (إبيس). Moses brought this bird and made a brazen birdcage for it. And he took it with him and started to go down to the desert because the Cushites had taken possession of the sea. And immediately, the bird smelled the scent of a reptile and she gave a scream. And every reptile had fled and thus they were able to go down to Cush.

And after they had arrived at the city, they saw that a river surrounded it. And they did not know the entrance to this city. One Cushite woman perceived them from the wall, and she brought the daughter of the king. She saw Moses, desirable and beautiful and she desired him. And she sent (word) by way of a messenger and said to him: 'If you swear to me that you will marry me, I will show you the entrance to the city.' Moses swore (it) to her and she showed him the entrance to the city. Then, he sacked the city and destroyed it. And the woman, according to what he swore to her, he took her away as his wife and brought her to Egypt. She was with him until he killed Chenephres, king of Memphis, the husband of Maris, the daughter of Pharaoh. The reason for killing him was thus: This husband of Maris, the daughter of Pharaoh, hated Moses because the heroic deeds that he had done. And he sought to kill him. And he sent an Egyptian man to kill Moses. And after Moses had perceived his trap, he sent a deadly poison by a man that he trusted, that was familiar with Chenephres, and he served it to him and he died. Then he feared that Pharaoh would find out his deed and would make him perish. [And he killed another Egyptian who behaved haughtily against one of the Hebrews.]

And Moses was in Egypt for 40 years, he then killed Chenephres. And he fled to Median, towards Raguel. And he was a shepherd there. And he took Zipporah, the daughter of Raguel as his wife. And two sons were born from him: Gershon and Eleazar, according to what Josephus wrote in his chronicle and he was in Median for 40 years.

This account is an attempt to fill in the blanks about the first eighty years of Moses' life, it describes events that occurred after his birth, during his childhood, until his flight to Median. The title, "on the Cushite wife that Moses married" <sup>4</sup>, is probably a later interpolation. It is not my intention to produce a new analysis of the contents of this account. Its sources have already been identified and adequately studied by Sebastian Brock<sup>5</sup> who concluded that this excerpt was a mosaic of biblical and historiographical materials, including *Exodus* 2:3 (the basket on the Nile), passages from Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* (II 205-6, 224, 233-4, 236, 239, (241), 242, (244), 245-6, 249-50, 252-3) and fragments from a lost historiographical work of the Jewish Hellenistic author Artabanus,<sup>6</sup> that were passed on to the author of this account via Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*<sup>7</sup> (IX 27). Pertinent to the present study is the question how this material was transmitted to the Anonymous Chronicler.

Similar accounts in which material from Josephus and Artabanus has been fused together are extant in several writings of Jacob of Edessa (Letter 13; a commentary on *Numbers* attributed to him, and two scholia), Isho'dad of Merv's *Commentary on Exodus*, the *Chronicle* of Agapius and Michael. The chronographic nature of these witnesses or, in the case of Jacob and Isho'dad, their familiarity with chronographic sources, and the nature of the sources that were used (Artabanus, Josephus and Eusebius), indicates that the origin of this account must be sought in a chronicle.

Chron. 1234 takes up an important position among these witnesses. Even though this chronicle is the most recent witness – aside from Barhebraeus who entirely relied on Michael – its account is more extensive and displays several elements that are original to the *Antiquities*, but are not extant in any of the other Syriac witnesses. For instance, only Chron. 1234 preserves the episode of the trampling the crown and Josephus'

---

<sup>4</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 61.11-63.24T.

<sup>5</sup> Brock 1982. On this account in Chron. Zuqn., see also Witakowski 1987, 127-8.

<sup>6</sup> On whom, see Holladay 1983, 190-243.

<sup>7</sup> Brock 1982, 237 incorrectly refers to this text as the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, which is in fact an entirely different work.

identification of the snake-eating birds as ibises [against Jacob of Edessa<sup>8</sup> and Agapius<sup>9</sup> who speak of storks (هتة رة, from Greek πελαργός, and القعاقع<sup>10</sup>) and cranes (الكرامى)]. Also worth noting is the reference to the river that surrounded the Ethiopian city, which indicates the direct use of Josephus' *Antiquities* and not the Byzantine epitome.<sup>11</sup>

Brock suggested that this entire account reached the Anonymous Chronicler through “the intermediary of a lost Byzantine chronicler’s narrative that must have previously gotten into Syriac.”<sup>12</sup> However, the fact that “the majority of the Byzantine chronicles in fact provide only Josephus material”<sup>13</sup> makes it much more likely that its origin must be sought in a now lost Syriac chronicle.<sup>14</sup>

This Syriac chronicle was probably composed by an author who read Greek, because he had access to Josephus' *Antiquities* as well as Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica*. Identifying the Anonymous Chronicler's source is difficult. Given that only the Anonymous Chronicler, Isho'dad, Agapius and Michael – all known dependants of Andronicus<sup>15</sup> – identify Janis and Jambres as Moses' teachers, I assumed a connection in all four cases to this sixth-century author, but this seems unlikely. On the one hand, the Anonymous Chronicler's account is of a literary rather than a historiographical nature. Whereas Isho'dad, Agapius and Michael preserve the details in a chronological framework, the Anonymous Chronicler preserves a literary text. On the other hand, and more importantly, there is a crucial discrepancy between the testimony of Isho'dad and that of the other dependants of Andronicus: whereas Isho'dad agrees with Artabanus

---

<sup>8</sup> Jac. Ed. Comm. Num., preserved in Mingana Syr. 147, f. 31a (translation in Brock 1982, 243).

<sup>9</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 118's account is more extensive than Michael's, but the verbal agreements suggest that they used the same source, which Michael only partially excerpted.

<sup>10</sup> Only one manuscript has this variant and Vasiliev did not know how to translate it, but it is likely a corruption of الفالق, the Arabic equivalent of the Greek and the Syriac terms.

<sup>11</sup> Brock 1982, 252, §9.

<sup>12</sup> Brock 1982, 249.

<sup>13</sup> Brock 1982, 251.

<sup>14</sup> Castelli 2001, 222.

<sup>15</sup> On whom, see a later chapter in this volume.

(and Chron. Zuqn.<sup>16</sup>) in calling the father of Moses' adoptive mother, Palmanothes, the evidence from an excerpt,<sup>17</sup> preserved in BL Add. 17,193, f. 4a-b (AD 874), Michael<sup>18</sup> and Elias<sup>19</sup> indicates that Andronicus called the pharaoh Amenophotis, agreeing with Eusebius.<sup>20</sup> Andronicus clearly knew traditions concerning Moses via Artabanus and Eusebius as well as Josephus: the scholion and Michael explicitly refer to Artabanus [scholion: Artamamius (ܐܪܬܒܢܘܣ, clearly an error for ܐܪܬܒܢܘܣ); Michael: Artemonius (ܐܪܬܒܢܘܣ)] and both also identify Merris as Thermouthis, after Josephus. Though the evidence indicates Andronicus combined the narratives of these two Jewish historians, he was not Isho'dad's source, who had done the same. Given Isho'dad's reference to Palmanothes, it may be that his source and Andronicus shared a common source.

Like Andronicus and Isho'dad's source, the author of the account in the Anonymous Chronicler combined elements from the narratives of Artabanus/Eusebius and Josephus, but neither Andronicus and Isho'dad's source can be identified as the Anonymous Chronicler's source or excluded as a possibility. The Anonymous Chronicler does not mention Artabanus as a source, nor Thermouthis and Amenophotis, two key names in Andronicus' narrative, but neither does he mention Palmanothes.

Furthermore, the Anonymous Chronicler seems to have used a different source than Michael. Despite Michael's silence regarding the birds, the verbal similarities between his and Agapius' narrative indicate that they were using a common source.<sup>21</sup> This source, like Jacob of Edessa in his letter to John of Litharb, identified the ibises as storks. Jacob may have been influenced by a later Jewish tradition,<sup>22</sup> but Agapius and Michael cannot be dependent on him, because their information is much more extensive than

---

<sup>16</sup> Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 21-2T, 17V.

<sup>17</sup> On which, see Brock 1982, 245. This excerpt also identifies Phosinus as the king who oppressed the Hebrews, comp. Ish. Comm. Ex. (17.4-6T; 22.31-3V) and Mich. Syr. Chron. III 5 (22-3T; vol. 1: 39-40V). On this pharaoh, see 15.2.3.

<sup>18</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. III 5 (22-3T; vol. 1: 39-40V).

<sup>19</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 23.20T, 13.11V.

<sup>20</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.6.

<sup>21</sup> Brock 1982, 248.

<sup>22</sup> Brock 1982, 243.

the information preserved in the former's letter, scholia and commentary, and Jacob's *Chronicle* was a continuation of the Eusebian canons and did not discuss pre-Christian history. Agapius' and Michael's common source was a chronicle that was written before the middle of the tenth century, but whether it was influenced by Jacob or Jacob's source is unclear. If the identification of the ibises with storks was introduced by Jacob, Agapius and Michael are using a chronicle that was written between the turn of the eighth and the tenth century, possibly the chronicle of John of Litharb. After all, Jacob's letter to John tells us that the latter was interested in the issue of the chronology of Moses' life before the Exodus and that Jacob told him the birds were storks.

In the end, we are unable to identify Chron. 1234's source for this account. That he used a Syriac chronicle seems likely, but its date cannot be determined, though his knowledge of the ibises rather than storks suggests a date before the eighth century, or a tradition that was independent from the one that was known or created by Jacob of Edessa.

## 5.4 The Siege of Jerusalem

In Chron. 1234, Josephus is cited three times in connection with the siege and capture of Jerusalem by the Romans and portrayed as a "wise chronicler, worthy of praise, who was one of the famous Pharisees."<sup>23</sup> The praise for Josephus is reminiscent of Eusebius' depiction of Josephus as "the most noted of all the Jews of that day,"<sup>24</sup> and similar to Dionysius bar Salibi's emphasis on Josephus' wisdom.<sup>25</sup> The identification of Josephus as a Pharisee, however, has no counterpart in any source. Although Josephus is nowadays

---

<sup>23</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 129.6-8T. Comp. with Eus. HE III 9.1: "the son of Mattathias, a priest of Jerusalem, who himself fought against the Romans in the beginning and was compelled to be present at what happened afterward."

<sup>24</sup> Eus. HE III 9.2.

<sup>25</sup> Dion. Bar Sal. Comm. Gosp. II (1), 63.27-8T, 50.34-5V.

believed to have belonged to this sect, Josephus never identifies himself as such. This identification also rather explicitly contradicts a Syriac tradition that can be traced back at least as early as the eighth century (Chron. Zuqn.<sup>26</sup>) and that identified Flavius Josephus with Caiaphas (in reality Josephus, son of Caiaphas), the high priest who is said to have conspired to kill Jesus and to have been involved in Jesus' trial.<sup>27</sup> Whether the Anonymous Chronicler purged this Josephus-Caiaphas link from this account,<sup>28</sup> or whether the Anonymous Chronicler's source preceded this tradition cannot be determined.

The Syriac account of the siege and fall of Jerusalem can be divided into three sections: (1) the events leading up to the siege, (2) the siege itself, and (3) the signs that "foretold the approaching desolation."<sup>29</sup> This last section (3) is entirely composed of almost *verbatim* copies of passages from Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (III 8.1-5,7-9<sup>30</sup>), whose order was rearranged. Interestingly however, the Anonymous Chronicler does not refer to Eusebius as a source at all, but to Josephus himself. Since Eusebius does not mention Josephus in this chapter (though see III 5.4; 6.1, 13, 19), the Anonymous Chronicler (or his source?) must have had access to a complete version of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, because he knew that Eusebius' reference to "the sixth book of his History" (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* III 8.1) should be interpreted as a reference to Josephus.

For the most part, the remainder of the description of the siege and capture of Jerusalem is a paraphrase of the sixth book of the *Jewish Wars*. Together with many other elements not extant in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, the Anonymous Chronicler's use of the term ܨܘܠܘܢܝܘܬܐ for shoes, in the context of the famine that occurred in Jerusalem, indicates that he (or his source) made use of the Syriac translation of Josephus' *Wars* (VI

---

<sup>26</sup> Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 92.26-8T, 71.28-30V.

<sup>27</sup> Castelli 2001, 205 (Chron. Zuqn.), 208-9 (Chron. 1234), 214-5 (Ish.), 215-7 (Dion. Bar Sal., Geogr. Arb. and Abu 'l-Faraj 'Abdallah Ibn at-Tayib).

<sup>28</sup> Castelli 2001, 209.

<sup>29</sup> Eus. HE III 8.1.

<sup>30</sup> Eus HE III 8 is in itself an adaptation of material from Flav. Jos. *Bell. Jud.* VI 5.3.

3.3) and not the Syriac translation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* (III 6.22) for this information. Like Eusebius,<sup>31</sup> the author of this account perceives the capture of Jerusalem as a divine punishment. Similarly to the case of Troy and Sodom and Gomorrah, the Lord delivered Jerusalem into the hands of a foreign nation, in this case, the "emperor Titus, the son of the emperor Vespasian." Particularly noteworthy in this respect is the Anonymous Chronicler's use of the term "speedy end" (ܩܘܒܘܬܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ), which alludes to *Daniel* 9:25-7 (or perhaps *Isaiah* 10:23), biblical verses that speak of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple ("the city and the sanctuary") by "the people of the ruler" after the arrival and death of the "anointed one".<sup>32</sup>

Also worth noting are two literary expansions of Josephus' description of the fall of the city. The fire is described as burning as if "among the trees of a forest."<sup>33</sup> Similarly, "blood" is said to have "flowed" to have "went forth, like a river on the streets of the city" and to have "left through the eastern gate that was near the valley of Jehosaphat, and through sources of water that the city possessed."<sup>34</sup>

Peculiarly, Chron. 1234 also preserves information from Josephus' fourth and fifth books, information that is not extant in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* either. Some of this additional information such as the construction of siege-engines and other equipment for the siege is quite general and may have been added to enlarge the literary qualities of this account. The statement that Vespasian "left (Titus) against Jerusalem and moved up against Spain himself", because "some news had come to him from the western regions of Egypt"<sup>35</sup>, is reminiscent of material from the *Wars* IV 11.5 and the title of this chapter, but clearly some confusion regarding the exact circumstances has occurred because the text actually says that this news came from Rome, when Vespasian was in Alexandria. This information probably reached the Anonymous Chronicler via a chronographic source, perhaps Agapius' and Michael's

---

<sup>31</sup> Eus. HE III 8 emphasises that "for forty years after the crucifixion the Jews did not make penitence."

<sup>32</sup> Eus. HE III 5.4 refers to the "abomination of desolation, proclaimed by the prophets."

<sup>33</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 129.31-2T.

<sup>34</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 129.21-3T.

<sup>35</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 129.15-7T.

common source.<sup>36</sup> Michael describes how, after “Galba started to reign in Iberia [= Spain], for 7 months, and was killed in the centre of Rome,”<sup>37</sup> “when Vespasian doubled the strength in the siege of Jerusalem and when his army was ready to capture it, the news of the death of Nero and the events that followed it reached him” and that “after (Vespasian) had been proclaimed *autocrator* in Judah, (...) he went to Alexandria. After having captured the entire region of Egypt, he went to Rome by sea.”<sup>38</sup> Michael’s statement that Galba started to rule in Spain probably reflects Josephus’ statement that Galba “returned out of Spain to Rome” and is probably connected to the Anonymous Chronicler’s incorrect assertion that Vespasian “moved up against Spain”.

Similarly, the statement of the Anonymous Chronicler that Josephus “left, came (back), and interceded, brokering peace,” to no avail, is a paraphrase of the *Wars* V 9.2-4, but has counterparts in the work of Agapius<sup>39</sup> (though not Michael<sup>40</sup>).

In this context, it is also worth noting that the Anonymous Chronicler attributes to Josephus a brief list of the number of captives and casualties of the famine and the siege. According to the Anonymous Chronicler: “Josephus writes: ‘Before the sack, 1,000,000 men died from the famine in Jerusalem. And when it had passed, Titus and his armies killed 60,000 men in it, and 100,000 were taken captive and enslaved,’”<sup>41</sup> but these numbers do not match Josephus’ claim (*Wars* VI 9.3) that 97,000 Jews were taken captive and 1,100,000 people died in the siege.

This attention to the casualties of the siege is in fact a particularly popular *topos* among Syriac historiographers. The authors of Chron. 724 and Chron. 846, Agapius and Michael, also record some of these numbers, but they vary between the witnesses.

---

<sup>36</sup> Comp. Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 39-40 and Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 2 (98-101T; vol. 1: 160-2V).

<sup>37</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 2 (98-101T; vol. 1: 160-2V). Agap. does not record the reign of Galba.

<sup>38</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 2 (98-101T; vol. 1: 160-2V). Agap. has: “The first year of his reign, he invaded Egypt and captured it; thereafter he went to Rome by sea.

<sup>39</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 43.

<sup>40</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 2 (98T; vol. 1: 163V) contains similar materials, but no mention of Josephus’ embassy.

<sup>41</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 130.6-10T.

Source	Casualties of the entire siege	Captives	Casualties of the famine	Casualties of the Roman swords
Flav. Jos. <sup>42</sup>	1,100,000	97,000	///	///
Eus. <sup>43</sup>	1,100,000			
Chron. 724 <sup>44</sup>	///	100,000	1,100,000	<u>60,000</u>
Chron. 846 <sup>45</sup>	///	70,000	1,100,000	<u>60,000</u>
Isho <sup>c</sup> dad <sup>46</sup>	1,200,000	3,000,000	///	///
Agap. (1) <sup>47</sup>	///	100,000	“a great number”	<u>60,000</u>
Agap. (2) <sup>48</sup>	1,200,000	110,000	///	///
Mich. (1) <sup>49</sup>	1,260,000	///	///	///
Mich. (2) <sup>50</sup>	///	100,000	<u>60,000</u>	1,100,000
Chron. 1234 <sup>51</sup>	///	100,000	1,000,000	<u>60,000</u>

The number 1,100,000 that Josephus provided as the total number of casualties of the siege reappears as the number of casualties of the famine in Chron. 724 and Chron. 846, and as the casualties of the Roman swords in Michael [Mich. (2)]. It is also the total of the captives and the casualties of the famine in Chron. 1234, whose author may have relied on the same source as Michael [Mich. (2)].

The consistent appearance of the number 60,000 in the Syriac sources but not in Josephus nor Eusebius indicates the involvement of a Syriac intermediary between Josephus and the Syriac chronicle tradition. Given the limited scope of sources of Chron. 724 and Chron. 846, it is probable that this information was introduced into a Syriac translation of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, before 724, the year of the compilation of Chron.

---

<sup>42</sup> Flav. Jos. *Bell. Jud.* 9.3.

<sup>43</sup> Eus. HE III 7, copied by Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 113T, 85V.

<sup>44</sup> Chron. 724, 117.22-118.1T, 92.9-15V.

<sup>45</sup> Chron. 846, 180.20-3T, 139.14-8V.

<sup>46</sup> Ish. Comm. Gosp. 154T, 91V (*Mt* 24:15).

<sup>47</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 39.

<sup>48</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 40.

<sup>49</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 2 (101T; vol. 1: 161V).

<sup>50</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 2 (101T; vol. 1: 162V).

<sup>51</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 130.6-10T.

724, but probably even before 636, the year of composition of the Syriac Eusebian chronicle that was the main source of Chron. 724. Agapius' and Michael's common source was influenced by the same source [Agap. (1) and Mich. (2)], but at the same time also knew another tradition [Agap. (2) and Mich. (1)] of which Isho'dad was aware as well. Considering the identity of these three witnesses, the source for this second tradition may be Andronicus.

Given that the materials from the fourth and fifth books of the *Wars* must have also been passed on to Anonymous Chronicler via a Syriac chronicle, we can logically assume that the paraphrase of the sixth book of the *Wars* came from the same source. Since Chron. 1234 gives numbers more closely resembling those in Chron. 724, Chron. 846, Agapius [Agap. (1)] and Michael [Mich. (2)] but offers information not extant in any of these works including that of Isho'dad, it is more likely that the Anonymous Chronicler excerpted all of this information from another Syriac chronographic intermediary than Isho'dad, Agapius and Michael.

## 5.5 Conclusion

Josephus' influence on the Anonymous Chronicler was considerable. Even though the latter did not have direct access to the former's works, Josephus is cited six times. Material from his *Antiquities* survives in a passage on events occurring Pilate's erection of an imperial statue in the Temple (XVIII 3.1), which the Anonymous Chronicler excerpted from the Syriac translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, and in an account on the life of Moses before the Exodus (II 205-6, 224, 233-4, 236, 239, (241), 242, (244), 245-6, 249-50, 252-3), which was passed on to the author of Chron. 1234 via an unknown Syriac historian.

Information from the *Wars* reached the Anonymous Chronicler via two paths. In the Syriac translation of Eusebius, the Anonymous Chronicler found a passage on the voice that was heard in the temple (*Wars* VI 5.3). Extensive information regarding the Roman

capture of Jerusalem in AD 40 can be traced back to books IV, V and VI of the *Wars*, but was transmitted to the Anonymous Chronicler via an unidentified Syriac chronicler.

## Chapter 6 Hippolytus of Rome (d. 235)

The influence of Hippolytus of Rome's writings in Syriac was quite substantial. His commentaries on books from the Old Testament such as Daniel<sup>1</sup> and Susannah,<sup>2</sup> and books from the New Testament (e.g. the Apocalypse of John<sup>3</sup>) survive in Syriac translation and citations from his works survive in various collections. Also extant are Syriac works that were wrongly attributed to Hippolytus.<sup>4</sup> In addition, Hippolytus also wrote a chronicle. A Syriac translation of this work has not survived and is unlikely to have ever existed, Yet, fragments from that text and references to Hippolytus' work as a historian survive, not only in Syriac chronicles, including Chron. 1234, but also in exegetical and ethno-geographical texts and in one letter.

So far, I have been able to track down only three Syriac references to the historiographical contributions of Hippolytus: in a letter from Jacob of Edessa to John of Litharb and in the *Chronographies* of Michael and Barhebraeus. In all three cases Hippolytus is cited as a source for the date of the birth of Christ. In the section of his letter to John that deals with the issues of the number of years between Adam and the Seleucid era – between 5180 and 5181 years, according to Jacob – and the date of the birth of Christ, which he fixes in year 309 of the Greeks, Jacob mentions Hippolytus among other chronographers: “Eusebius; Clemens, the author of the *Stromateis*; Andrew

---

<sup>1</sup> De Halleux 1989.

<sup>2</sup> De Halleux 1987; de Halleux 1988a.

<sup>3</sup> Prigent 1972; Prigent/Stehly 1973. See also Prigent/Stehly 1974, on Ms. bodl. Syr. 410 (in Arabic).

<sup>4</sup> Riva 1974; Brock 1981.

and his brother Magnus; Hippolytus, holy bishop and martyr; Metrodorus; Annianus, the Alexandrian monk; and also Andronicus, who is much more recent and more modern than Eusebius.”<sup>5</sup>

Michael (and Barhebraeus who is aware of the same information via Michael) cites Hippolytus before an author called John (ܝܫܘܢܢܐ,<sup>6</sup> Joannes/Iwannis) and Jacob (of Edessa) for the date AM 5500 for the birth of Christ.<sup>7</sup> This information ultimately goes back to Hippolytus’ *Commentary on Daniel*,<sup>8</sup> but the citation of this Joannes, written with the Greek instead of the Syriac spelling (ܝܫܘܢܢܐ, Yuhannon), between Hippolytus and Jacob suggests the involvement of a Greek chronographer called John, which suggests the involvement of either John of Antioch or John Malalas.<sup>9</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler also places 5,500 years between Adam and the birth of Christ, but it is unclear who was his source for this information.<sup>10</sup>

Apart from this date, Hippolytus, in this case his chronicle, was also the source for information pertaining to the division of the earth among the sons of Noah, the peoples that are descended from them and the languages that they used, which survives in several Syriac exegetical, ethno-geographical and historiographical texts.<sup>11</sup> Two entries in Chron. 1234 are based on entries from Hippolytus’ *Diemerismos* (Διαμερισμὸς τῆς γῆς), the part of his chronicle that discussed the division of the earth: the description of the climate of the Shemites and a list of peoples who knew writing.

---

<sup>5</sup> Nau 1900, 590-1.

<sup>6</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. V 10 (90T; vol. 1: 142V).

<sup>7</sup> Mich. Syr. and Barhebr. give the number 5550, but Barhebr. has this date for the Passion instead of the birth.

<sup>8</sup> Hipp. Comm. Dan. IV 23 (ed. and trans. 242-3).

<sup>9</sup> Chabot 1899, 142 n. 2 suggested to emend ܝܫܘܢܢܐ to ܝܫܘܢܢܐ, referring to Annianus. This is possible, because in his letter to John, Jacob mentions Annianus, but no John, among his sources, and Annianus “dated the divine Incarnation to the end of the year 5500 and the beginning of 5501” (Mosshammer 2008, 361), but since Barhebraeus preserves the same spelling, an identification with Annianus seems unlikely, unless Michael already made this error.

<sup>10</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 116.4-5T.

<sup>11</sup> Witakowski 1993, 649-51.

The first, a description of the climate of the Shemites, is based on *Jubilees* 8:12-21, but not directly, as Witakowski<sup>12</sup> purported. It is in fact an adaptation of three entries from Hippolytus' *Chronicle*, which in itself may be adaptations of *Jubilees* 8;12-6, 21.<sup>13</sup>

Hipp. Chron., §188, §§193-4 (ed., 10 and 30)	Mich. Syr. Chron. II 2 (8-9T; vol. 1: 17-8V) <sup>14</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 43.19-26T
<p>The dwelling-place of all the sons of Shem is from Bactria to Rhinocorura, which separates Syria and Egypt and the Erythraean sea from the mouth of [the river] at Arsinoe of India.</p> <p>These are the names of the lands of the sons of Shem: Persia with the nations that surround it (σὺν τοῖς ἐπικειμένοις αὐτῇ ἔθνεσιν), Bactria (Βακτριανή), Hyrcania, Babylonia, Kordulia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Arabia Archaia, Elam, India, Arabia Felix, Koile Syria, Commagene and Phoenicia, which is of the sons of Shem.</p>	<p>To the sons of Shem came the inheritance (of) the entire region that is in the centre of the inhabited earth, from the frontier of Egypt and Rhinocorura and the Red Sea, and from the sea of Phoenicia and Syria to the eastern limit of the inhabited earth.</p> <p>And these are their known regions: Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria, all of Mesopotamia and Hyrcania, Assyria, the land of Sennaar of Babel and of the Kurds (Qarduyē), all of Persia and the lands that surround it, with Northern India, Bactria and the remainder of the eastern regions.</p>	<p>To Shem emerged the inheritance of the entire centre of the region that is in the centre of the inhabited earth, from the frontier of Egypt and the Red Sea to this sea of Phoenicia and Syria.</p> <p>And Shem and his children also possessed these known regions: Palestine, all<sup>15</sup> of Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria, all of Mesopotamia, Hyrcania, Assyria, the land of Sennaar and Babel, all the land of Persia and the lands that surround it, with Northern India and the remainder of the eastern regions.</p>

As I have shown in the chapter on the influence of the *Book of Jubilees* on Chron. 1234, this entry came from a Syriac chronicle to which Michael had access as well. This unknown chronographer rearranged the order of the countries in the Shemite climate,

<sup>12</sup> Witakowski 1993, 647 and 652.

<sup>13</sup> Scott 1997, 309-10.

<sup>14</sup> See also Barhebr. Chron. Syr. 7:27-8:4 (ed. Bedjan 1890); 7 (trans. Budge, 1932).

<sup>15</sup> "All of Arabia" seems to combine the reference to Arabia Archaia and Arabia Felix.

focusing on Palestine, Arabia, Phoenicia, Syria and Mesopotamia rather than countries further east such as Persia and Bactria.

Immediately after the description of the shares of Shem, Ham and Japheth, the Anonymous Chronicler included a list of sixteen peoples, descended from Noah’s three sons, that know writing:

“There are fifteen (sic!) languages in the world that know literature and writing: five (sic!) from Shem: Hebrews, Syrians, Babylonians, Persians, Elamites, Arabs; six from Japheth: Greeks, Iberians, Franks, Armenians, Medes, Alans; four from Ham: Egyptians, Kushites, Phoenicians, Indians (Ethiopians).”<sup>16</sup>

This list is also based on an entry from Hippolytus’ *Diamerismos*, but differs from Hippolytus’ opinion in several interesting ways.<sup>17</sup> From a comparison of Hippolytus’ list with Chron. 1234’s and Michael’s emerges that the Syriac chroniclers used different sources, because Michael’s resembles Hippolytus’ much more closely. In the table below I have rearranged the order in which the names of the peoples descended from the sons of Noah appear in the Syriac witnesses, in order to facilitate a comparison with Hippolytus’ list.

Sons of Noah	Hipp. Chron.	Mich. Syr. Chron.	Chron. 1234
Shem	Chaldeans	Chaldeans	Babylonians
	Assyrians	Assyrians who are Syrians	Syrians
	Hebrews	Hebrews	Hebrews
	Persians	Persians	Persians
	Medes	Medes	Elamites
	Indians	Arabs	Arabs

<sup>16</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 44.15-20T.

<sup>17</sup> Witakowski 1993, 647; Ri 2000, 295-7.

Ham	Phoenicians Egyptians Pamphylians Phrygians	Egyptians Pamphylians Phrygians	Phoenicians Egyptians  Kushites Indians
Japheth	Iberians Latins Spaniards (Iberians) Greeks Medes Armenians	Romans  Greeks Medes Armenians	Iberians Franks  Greeks Medes Armenians Alans

As far as the Shemite peoples who know writing are concerned, only Michael preserves Hippolytus' references to the Chaldeans, the Assyrians and the Medes, which have been replaced in Chron. 1234's list by the Babylonians, Syrians (who are mentioned as the equivalent of the Assyrians by Michael) and the Elamites. In both Michael's and Chron. 1234's list, the Arabs have replaced the Indians, i.e. the Ethiopians, suggesting that their sources date from after the Arab invasions in the mid-seventh century. In this respect it must also be noted that the Anonymous Chronicler lists six descendants of Shem, but gives 'five' as the number, suggesting that the reference to the Arabs was a later interpolation.

All three witnesses mention the Egyptians among the Hamites, but only Michael preserves Hippolytus' references to the Pamphylians and the Phrygians, which have been replaced in Chron. 1234 by the Kushites and Indians, the latter originally appearing among the Shemites. Chron. 1234's list, but not Michael's, contains Hippolytus' mention of the Phoenicians. This omission in Michael may be due to the oversight of a copyist rather than a conscious act.

The list of Japhethites consists of the Greeks, Medes and Armenians in all three witnesses. All three mention an equivalent of the Romans: Hippolytus has Latins, Michael has Romans and Chron. 1234 has Franks, suggesting a post-eleventh-century interpolation. Furthermore, Chron. 1234 has preserved Hippolytus' reference to the

Iberians and its list includes the Alans, who are not mentioned by either of the other witnesses.

Though Michael's list is very close to Hippolytus', it shares some similarities with Chron. 1234's: both Syriac witnesses equate the Syrians with the Assyrians, have updated the reference to the Latins (to Romans or Franks) and include the Arabs among the Shemites, showing the influence of a post-seventh-century tradition. Whereas Michael's list is much more conservative, Chron. 1234's is a highly updated version of Hippolytus', even mentioning the Alans, a Christian Caucasian people.

The identity of the Anonymous Chronicler's source is uncertain, but was definitely different from Michael's, who used a chronicle that preserved a tradition that was very close to the original list of Hippolytus. Chron. 1234's list on the other hand resembles much more closely other Syriac traditions that are preserved in three other Syriac texts:

1) the *Treatise on the Families of Languages*, wrongly attributed to Eusebius of Caesarea;<sup>18</sup>

2) the anonymous *Treatise on the peoples after the confusion of languages in Babylon*;<sup>19</sup>

3) a fragment entitled *On the Writing of Languages* and wrongly attributed to Epiphanius of Salamis.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> De Fam. Ling. is extant in the ninth-century West-Syrian BL Add. 14,541, f. 52a-b [Wright 1870-1872, vol. 3, 1040 (DCCCCXII)].

<sup>19</sup> De Pop. survives in two slightly different recensions: (1) in the East-Syrian BL Add. 25,875, f. 77b-78a, copied in 1709, [Wright 1870-1872, vol. 3, (DCCCCXXII)] immediately before the *Treatise on the Four Quarters of the Earth*, attributed to "Andronicus, the philosopher, rich in wisdom," (Descr. Pop. et Plag.; ed. and trans. Nau 1917, 462-71; ed. and trans. Furlani 1927; for some comments on Furlani's edition, see Brockelmann 1928) [on this text and author, see chapter 15]; and (2) in Harvard Coll. Libr., Syr 39, f. 37a-b, copied in the monastery of Zafran in Tur 'Abdin in AD 1846, incorporated into a version of the *Cave of Treasures* 24:17-20, [ed. Ri 1989, 193 (ms. d)].

<sup>20</sup> So far I have found three different recensions of this text in three manuscripts: the East-Syrian mss. Ming. Syr. 480 f°14a and Ming. Syr. 108 f°129, and the thirteenth-century West-Syrian ms. Paris syr. 9 (ed. and trans. Nau 1915-17, 102-3).

The case of the *Treatise on the peoples after the confusion of languages in Babylon* shows that these traditions were sometimes incorporated into a version of the Cave of Treasures, so this is possibly where the Anonymous Chronicler found his list, which he may have adapted himself by replacing the reference to the Romans with a reference to the Franks.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> These texts and their relation to Hippolytus will be discussed in a separate article.



## Chapter 7 Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 340)

Eusebius was undoubtedly one of the Anonymous Chronicler's most important sources. Material from three of his works survives in Chron. 1234: his *Praeparatio Evangelica*, *Ecclesiastical History* and *Chronicle*.

### 7.1 *Praeparatio Evangelica*

Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* – minimal and indirect – influence on Chron. 1234 has already been noted in the chapter on Flavius Josephus. This Eusebian work was a source of fragments of the now lost historiographical work of the Jewish Greek historiographer Artabanus on the early life of Moses, but was not directly used by the Anonymous Chronicler. These fragments were extracted by an unknown Syriac author, combined with information from Josephus' *Antiquities* and included in his own *Chronicle*.

## 7.2 *Ecclesiastical History*

The literary genre of church history, created by Eusebius, became hugely popular, as is shown by its early translation into Syriac,<sup>1</sup> from there into Armenian. Greek, Latin, Armenian and Syriac church histories were written, often conceived as continuations of Eusebius' work or of the works of his continuators.

In spite of its name, Eusebius' work was not only an important source for the history of the Christian church, but also for political events from the reign of Constantine the Great and the events that led up to it. Thus, it is not surprising that material from Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* survives in the Secular Part of Chron. 1234. Eusebius could also have been a source for the Ecclesiastical Part (either directly or via an intermediary), but this section has not survived. Judging from the scarcity of Eusebian material in the post-Constantinian section of the Secular Part, however, it is more likely that the Anonymous Chronicler used a synopsis of Eusebius and/or other ecclesiastical histories (Socrates!), especially that of Theodore Lector (though through an intermediary).

As I have previously noted, Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* was used in the Pre-Constantinian part as a source for pre-Christian history, more specifically his description of the signs that preceded the Roman capture of Jerusalem in AD 70 (Eus. HE III 8.1-5,7-9), based on material from Josephus' *Jewish Wars*. It is worth noting again that the Anonymous Chronicler only refers to Josephus, the original source, not Eusebius, the intermediary.

The other evidence for the Anonymous Chronicler's use of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* is minimal. At most nine small fragments can be traced back to this source.

---

<sup>1</sup> Eus. HE Syr. is preserved in two manuscripts, one, kept in St. Petersburg dates from AG 773/AD 462.

Location in Eus. HE	Location in Chron. 1234, I (ed.)	Subject
(VIII 13.12)	138.5-14	Life and death of Constantius Chlorus
(VIII 13.15)	138.14-5	Maximinus remains in the empire
(VIII 14.5, 8, 12)	138.18-23	The wickedness of Maximinus
VIII 14.16-7	141.9-22	Story of Maxentius [in Chron. 1234: Licinius] and the wife of the Roman prefect
IX 9.3-5, 7-9	139.23-140.2, 4-15	The battle of the Mulvian bridge
IX 9.10-11	140.16-23	The erection of the statue and the cross in Rome
IX 9.12	140.27-9	Licinius has not yet grown bitter
IX 11.6	141.1-2	Licinius comes to Antioch
(X 8.5, 10)	141.2-4	Licinius rebels and persecutes Christians

Only a few of these fragments are fairly literal copies of Eusebian passages, the majority are paraphrases or allusions, imbedded into passages with material from other sources. While there is a possibility that the Anonymous Chronicler was responsible for the paraphrastic and allusive nature of these references, it is more likely that this material reached him via a synopsis that was made by another author. In this respect it is worth noting that there are points of contact with Theophanes.<sup>2</sup> It is unclear if the Anonymous Chronicler or his Syriac source was responsible for the misattribution of the story of the wife of the Roman prefect (Eus. HE VIII 14.16-7) to Licinius instead of Maxentius.

---

<sup>2</sup> On these, see chapters 18 and 19.

### 7.3 *Chronicle*

Like most of its predecessors, Chron. 1234 preserves a vast amount of material from Eusebius' *Chronicle*. The Greek original of this work is now lost,<sup>3</sup> and the circumstances of the transmission of this work into Syriac are still unclear.<sup>4</sup>

In his *Catalogue*,<sup>5</sup> essentially the first history of Syriac literature, the fourteenth-century East-Syrian metropolitan of Nisibis, ʿAbdishoʿ bar Brikha attributes a translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle* to Simeon of Beth Garmay,<sup>6</sup> an East Syrian author (perhaps turn of the seventh century).<sup>7</sup> A little over a century earlier, however, Michael the Great, quoting Theodosius of Edessa (turn of the ninth century),<sup>8</sup> presumably through Theodosius' brother Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, claims that Jacob of Edessa translated the *Chronicle*.<sup>9</sup> The omission of any reference to this translation in the introduction to Jacob's *Chronological Canons* makes this highly unlikely.<sup>10</sup>

The earliest evidence for a Syriac translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, however, dates from the eighth, or the seventh century. Chron. 636, written by Thomas the priest and preserved in Chron. 724, is based on a Syriac translation of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius and an anonymous Antiochene continuation.<sup>11</sup> In his masterful investigation of this

---

<sup>3</sup> Recently however, two Greek fragments of the *chronographia*, the first – narrative – part of the *Chronicle*, were uncovered in Vind. Iur. gr. 18 ff. 32, 39 (on which, see Grusková 2012, 77-9)

<sup>4</sup> On Eusebius' *Chronicle* in Syriac, see Keseling 1927a; Keseling 1927b; Burgess 1999, 26, 132; Witakowski 1999-2000; Debié 2006; Burgess 2006; Debié 2009b. Eusebius' list of biblical patriarchs from Adam until Shelah is preserved in BL Add. 17,216, f. 1 (Eus. Chron. Syr.), but the title of the fragment "The Chronicle of Eusebius of Caesarea from the beginning un[til the year [8.]2 of Alexander the Macedonian" suggests that this Syriac text was written in the sixth century (or at least between AG 802/AD490-1 and AG 892/AD 580-1).

<sup>5</sup> For the edition and translation of this work (which was not accessible to me), see Ecchelensis 1653.

<sup>6</sup> Baumstark 1922, 135-6.

<sup>7</sup> Assemani 1719-1728, III, part 2, 18, 168, 633.

<sup>8</sup> Van Rompay 2011.

<sup>9</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 2 (128T; vol. 1: 255V).

<sup>10</sup> Keseling 1927a, 27; Witakowski 1999-2000, 427-8.

<sup>11</sup> Burgess 1999. On the so-called *Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii*, see chapter 8 in this volume.

continuation and its afterlife in Greek and Syriac, Burgess revealed the existence of two distinct Syriac traditions: the Syriac translation made from the Greek chronicle and its Antiochene continuation, and used by Thomas the priest, and a secondary Syriac tradition, which he retraced to an epitome of that translation. Burgess suggested that it was this epitome that influenced all later Syriac chroniclers, except perhaps John of Ephesus, who could have used a Greek version.<sup>12</sup> The main indicators for the involvement of the author of the epitome were the use of the Seleucid era instead of regnal years, the identification of Constantia as Tella, and the misidentification of Antoninopolis as Antipolis.

In spite of his importance, Eusebius is only mentioned on three occasions in Chron. 1234: twice in the first preface as a historiographical inspirator and only once in the main text as a source for the dates of the births of Amram and Moses. Nevertheless, Eusebius can be identified as one of the three authorities (presumably along with Annianus and Andronicus) that were cited for certain aspects of Jewish patriarchal chronology,<sup>13</sup> even though the Anonymous Chronicler generally preferred the chronological computations of Annianus and Andronicus.

The influence of the *Chronographia*, the first – narrative – section of the *Chronicle*, is minimal and probably indirect. The Anonymous Chronicler refers to Eusebius' pre-Abrahamic patriarchal chronology, but this information was more likely transmitted to him via either an intermediary chronicle or possibly via separate *series regum* rather than a full translation of the *Chronographia*, which has not survived and of which it is not certain if it ever existed.<sup>14</sup>

The bulk of the Eusebian information in Chron. 1234 derives from the *Canones* and almost exclusively appears in the Pre-Constantinian Part of Chron. 1234. Only two

---

<sup>12</sup> Burgess 1999, 130 and 132: the originator of this secondary tradition used the Seleucid chronological system, identified Constantia as Tella and located it in Mesopotamia, and misidentified Antoninopolis as Antipolis

<sup>13</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 33.17-8T (birth of Enosh), t 60.15-5T (birth of Qahath).

<sup>14</sup> The *series regum* were often quoted and copied by Syriac chronographers as late as Elias of Nisibis (d. 1046). The only evidence for the afterlife of narratives from the *chronographia* is a fusion of material from Abydenos and Alexander Polyhistor on the Flood, taken from Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.10-2, which survives in Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 38 and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 1 (7T; vol. 1: 14-5V).

Eusebian entries survive in the Post-Constantinian Part, in the section that deals with Constantine's reign: (1) an entry,<sup>15</sup> commemorating Hermon, bishop of Jerusalem (Chron. 1234: Rome), and (2) the results of a Roman census,<sup>16</sup> which were actually inserted into events from the reign of Augustus in the Eusebian canons.<sup>17</sup>

Although the contents of the canons are very much present in Chron. 1234, its model has completely vanished. Unlike Jacob of Edessa and Michael, the Anonymous Chronicler chose to implement the separate *lemmata* in a continuous text, rather than adopting Eusebius' column system.<sup>18</sup> Nevertheless, the brevity of the entries has been preserved. The pre-Constantinian section of Chron. 1234 is for the most part a collection of short entries, demarcated by punctuation signs, indicating the end of a paragraph (❖).

The Anonymous Chronicler made a conscious selection from the contents of the canons, clearly focussing on the history of the Near East, in particular Syria, Palestine and Asia Minor, on occasion also Egypt, but only when relevant for the Levant. The political history of the Greek city states, for instance, barely received any attention. Rather than presenting history as an evolution from multiple pagan kingdoms and societies to one Christian empire, as Eusebius had done, the Anonymous Chronicler mainly focuses on those *fila regnorum* that were directly relevant for the history of Syria, Palestine and Asia Minor: Jewish patriarchs, judges and kings; Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian kings; Alexander the Great; Seleucid kings (and governors of Judah); Roman emperors until Constantine (+ governors of Judah). After Constantine there is no emphasis on the succession of Roman emperors, but the Anonymous Chronicler mentions Constantine's successors until as late as Alexius I Comnenus, John II Comnenus and Manuel I Comnenus. After Heraclius the focus shifts to the succession of caliph until al-Mutawakkil (847-61). Thereafter the Anonymous Chronicler mainly focuses on Turkish sultans and local emirs.

---

<sup>15</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 138.15-6T = Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.227<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>16</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 138.23-5T.

<sup>17</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.210; Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.163<sup>h</sup>.

<sup>18</sup> Witakowski 1999-2000, 433.

On some occasions, the Anonymous Chronicler did stretch his attention as far as foreign rulers, but only when his narrative warranted such an *excursus*. Thus, he mentions the Macedonian kings Philip I and Philip II, but the latter only because he was Alexander's father and the former to distinguish him from the latter. Similarly, the first three Ptolemies are mentioned as well, presumably because their reigns directly impacted the Jewish people: Ptolemy I deported the Jews to Egypt, Ptolemy II commissioned the translation of the Septuagint and Ptolemy III appointed Josephus as governor of Judah. This lack of reference to other *fila regnorum* was taken so far that, even though the Anonymous Chronicler included the foundation myth of Rome, he completely ignored the succession of Latin kings to the point where the name of the Latin king Numa Pompilius was purged from a passage on the creation of the months of January and February.<sup>19</sup> The Romans only become of interest from the time when their dominion also covered the Holy Land.

Apart from the tendency to focus on Near Eastern chronology, no consistent methodology emerges from the borrowings from the Eusebian canons, except perhaps the copying of Eusebius' episcopal lists, because of obvious reasons. Worth noting, however, is the Anonymous Chronicler's evident interest in Greek mythology. After Eusebius, Chron. 1234 mentions Prometheus,<sup>20</sup> Atlas,<sup>21</sup> Pegasus<sup>22</sup> (although not by name), the Theban king Amphion<sup>23</sup> (who remains anonymous), the oracle Phemonoe,<sup>24</sup> Daedalus,<sup>25</sup> and Antaeus.<sup>26</sup> For some of these passages – those on Antaeus, Amphion and

---

<sup>19</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 94.7.10T. This reluctance to mention foreign kings is also reflected in the Anonymous Chronicler's use of Andronicus' postdiluvian and pre-Abrahamic *series regum* of the Chaldeans and the Egyptians: only Nimrod and Pharaoh are mentioned, the latter probably only because of the interest in the purported etymological origin of this term for the kings of Egypt.

<sup>20</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 61.1-4T.

<sup>21</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 61.8-9T.

<sup>22</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 65.15-6T.

<sup>23</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 65.16-8T.

<sup>24</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 65.18-9T.

<sup>25</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 66.6-7T.

<sup>26</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 85.10-4T.

Daedalus – Chron. 1234 is the only Syriac witness, along with Michael, which yet again highlights the import of these fairly late Syriac chronographies for the study of the afterlife of Eusebius in Syriac.

Unlike the case of the passage<sup>27</sup> on Zeus, and the euhemeristic interpretation of him being a mortal king (based on Malalas<sup>28</sup>), the function of these entries remains unclear, as they do not deal with gods. Instead, it appears that some of them fit into the Anonymous Chronicler's interest in and reverence for Greek wisdom, philosophy and science. Atlas is described as a wise astrologer, Prometheus as a wise teacher, Antaeus as a wise athlete and Daedalus was credited with the invention of walking statues. The clearest example of the philosophical connection rather than the interest in the divine world is the case of Antaeus. According to the tale, this son of Gaia was defeated by Hercules in a wrestling match. In Chron. 1234, however, there is no mention whatsoever of Hercules, only of Antaeus' wisdom and the fact that the earth was his mother.

This tendency to focus on the wisdom of some of these Greek mythological figures fits in with the Anonymous Chronicler's interest in Greek philosophy, which he already highlights in his preface<sup>29</sup> and which is also reflected by his copying Eusebius' references to the philosophers Diagoras, Socrates and Plato, the seven Greek sages (an entry that passed on via a common source with Michael<sup>30</sup>), and even his identification of the tyrant brothers Pantagnostus and Solon as philosopher brothers<sup>31</sup> and his inclusion of a reference to an otherwise unknown philosopher called Isagoras in the time of the Judean queen Athaliah. Last but not least, the Anonymous Chronicler's reverence<sup>32</sup> for Aristotle emerges from a brief text devoted to this philosopher, in which he claims that

---

<sup>27</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 78.25-8T.

<sup>28</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. I 13 (ed. 13-4; trans. 8-9).

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 26.1-2, 8-9T: "With the help of God the lord of time we begin to write down a chronicle (...) and also the times of famous men and philosophers that were known at that time."

<sup>30</sup> Unlike Eusebius, both Syriac chroniclers mention at least three of the sages by name; the Anonymous Chronicler lists Solon, Thales of Milete and Bias of Priene.

<sup>31</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 102.14-5T.

<sup>32</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 104.28-105.9T.

an understanding of the basic principles of Aristotle's *Organon* is indispensable to comprehend the Bible's message.

Despite of his disinterest in Greek history, the Anonymous Chronicler's fascination with Greek culture and science does not only emerge from his references to Greek philosophers, but also by his mention of the poets Archilochus and Simonides<sup>33</sup> (whose profession is not specified), Hippocrates<sup>34</sup> and the invention of the 24 letters of the Greek alphabet.<sup>35</sup>

Although so much material from the Eusebian canons survives in Chron. 1234, it is difficult to ascertain if the Anonymous Chronicler, like Michael the Syrian, actually disposed of a physical copy of Eusebius' *Chronicle*. An analysis of the contents of Chron. 1234 reveals the influence of at least five continuators and/or translators and/or adaptors of the *Chronicle*:

- 1) the anonymous Antiochene author who continued the *Chronicle* in Greek until c. AD 350;
- 2) Annianus (turn of the fifth century), a critic of Eusebius and the author of a *Paschoualion*,<sup>36</sup> a perpetual Paschal table of 532 years;
- 3) a Syriac translator of Eusebius and the Antiochene continuation
- 4) the Syriac author who made the epitome of the Syriac translation;<sup>37</sup>
- 5) the Syriac chronicler Andronicus (sixth century);<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 94.12T.

<sup>34</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 103.8-9T.

<sup>35</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 103.25-7T.

<sup>36</sup> Mosshammer 2008, 198-203.

<sup>37</sup> Burgess 1999, 129-32.

<sup>38</sup> On whom, see chapter 15 in this volume.

Because of all these layers between Eusebius and the Anonymous Chronicler, it is extremely difficult to determine the identity, contents and format of the text to which the latter had access. The testimony of Michael, for instance, shows that John of Ephesus (d. 589) introduced some entries from the Antiochene continuation into the First Part of the *Ecclesiastical History*, a text which may have also influenced the Anonymous Chronicler.<sup>39</sup>

Regardless of the difficulties concerning the reconstruction of Chron. 1234's *Vorlage*, a comparison of all the Syriac Eusebian witnesses (I include Agapius as a witness to the Syriac Eusebian tradition) with the early seventh-century Armenian<sup>40</sup> translation, Jerome's Latin<sup>41</sup> translation, adaptation and continuation (of the canons) and on occasion also Greek dependants (George Syncellus and the *Chronicon Paschale*) results in some new insights into the relationship between these witnesses, adding to the findings of Keseling<sup>42</sup> who did not take the testimony of Chron. 1234 into consideration in his otherwise magistral article on the Syriac afterlife of Eusebius' *Chronicle*.<sup>43</sup>

Chron. 1234 and Michael can be the only Syriac witnesses for certain Eusebian entries (e.g. Daedalus;<sup>44</sup> Antaeus;<sup>45</sup> Amphion;<sup>46</sup> Justin Martyr and the philosopher Crescens<sup>47</sup>). Similarly, Chron. 1234 may be an important witness for determining the relation

---

<sup>39</sup> The testimony of Michael indicates that John copied a lemma on two earthquakes from the Antiochene continuation, see chapter 13.

<sup>40</sup> Eus.Chron. Arm.

<sup>41</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat.

<sup>42</sup> Keseling 1927a, 33-40.

<sup>43</sup> Keseling 1927a; Keseling 1927b.

<sup>44</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.168.735; Eus. Chron. Lat. 55<sup>h</sup>; Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 66.8T. Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 3 (29-30T; vol. 1: 50V) has a lacuna, but cf. Mich. Chron. Arm. 1.55.6-9 (trans. Langlois, 52).

<sup>45</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.169.771; Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.57<sup>c</sup>; Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 85.10-4T. Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 3 (29-30T; vol. 1: 50V) has a lacuna, but cf. Mich. Chron. Arm. 1.56.1-2 (trans. Langlois, 53), with mention of Hercules.

<sup>46</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.53<sup>c</sup>; Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.167.693; Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 3 (29T; vol. 1: 51V); Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 65.6-8T.

<sup>47</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.221.2168; Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.203<sup>d</sup>; Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 4 (107T; vol. 1: 177V); Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 134.17-9T.

between the Armenian and the Syriac tradition: whereas Jerome<sup>48</sup> and Chron. 724<sup>49</sup> agree that the length of the reign of Nero was 13 years, 7 months and 28 days – which must therefore be Eusebius’ opinion – Chron. 1234<sup>50</sup> is the only Syriac witness that agrees with the Armenian<sup>51</sup> on 13 years and 7 months. The other Syriac witnesses either round this number up to 13 years and 8 months (Chron. Zuqn.<sup>52</sup> and Michael<sup>53</sup>) or 14 years (Agapius<sup>54</sup> and Elias;<sup>55</sup> possibly after Andronicus?).

More often than not, Chron. 1234 follows a tradition that is clearly different from the earliest witnesses (Jerome, the Armenian and Chron. 724), suggesting that Chron. 1234 reflects a secondary Syriac tradition. Thus, Chron. 1234,<sup>56</sup> together with Chron. 775,<sup>57</sup> Chron. Zuqn.,<sup>58</sup> Chron. 846,<sup>59</sup> Elias<sup>60</sup> (as a witness to Andronicus’ opinion), and Michael,<sup>61</sup> attribute 27 regnal years to the Persian king Artaxerxes Ochus, whereas Chron. 724,<sup>62</sup> the Armenian<sup>63</sup> and Jerome<sup>64</sup> (and also George Syncellus<sup>65</sup>) have 26 years. Like Elias’, and possibly also Chron. 846’s and Michael’s, Chron. 1234’s information may go back to Andronicus here, but the testimony of Chron. 775 and Chron. Zuqn. indicates the involvement of another tradition, possibly another Syriac intermediary between

---

<sup>48</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.181.24-5.

<sup>49</sup> Chron. 724, 115.14-5T, 90.23-4V.

<sup>50</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 127.20T.

<sup>51</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.215.2071.

<sup>52</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 2070 (vol. 1, 98.2-4T, 75.9-10V).

<sup>53</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 2 (96T; vol. 1: 154V).

<sup>54</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 35.

<sup>55</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 39.16T, 23.34V.

<sup>56</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 103.29T.

<sup>57</sup> Chron. 775, 346.3T, 273.5V.

<sup>58</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 1650 (vol. 1, 40.27-9T, 33.5-6V).

<sup>59</sup> Chron. 846, 166.14T, 129.29V.

<sup>60</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 20.16T, 11.1V.

<sup>61</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. V 3 (70T; vol. 1: 112, 231V).

<sup>62</sup> Chron. 724, 86.24T, 70.7-8V: “Artaxerxes Ukkama.”

<sup>63</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.196.

<sup>64</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.120.19-21.

<sup>65</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 87.2-3, 14 (trans. 110): 20 + 6 = 26.

Eusebius and Andronicus. Nevertheless, it is also worth noting that the *Chronicon Paschale*<sup>66</sup> preserves the same number, which could suggest the influence of a later Greek intermediary.

This later or parallel Syriac tradition was sometimes also followed by the compiler of Chron. 724 or rather by the author of Chron. 636: Chron. 724<sup>67</sup> and Chron. 1234,<sup>68</sup> and also Chron. Zuqn.,<sup>69</sup> disagree with the Armenian<sup>70</sup> and Jerome,<sup>71</sup> regarding the length of the reign of the Roman emperor Nerva, which according to the latter two witnesses lasted for 1 year and 3 months, but according to the Syriac texts, for 1 year and 4 months.<sup>72</sup> Similarly, for the length of the reign of Artaxerxes Longhand (41 years), Chron. 724 agrees with the majority of the Syriac witnesses (Chron. 775,<sup>73</sup> Chron. Zuqn.,<sup>74</sup> Chron. 846,<sup>75</sup> Michael<sup>76</sup> and Chron. 1234<sup>77</sup>) as well as George Syncellus<sup>78</sup> on the number 41, but disagrees with the Armenian,<sup>79</sup> Jerome,<sup>80</sup> and interestingly also the canons<sup>81</sup> in Michael (40 years). To make matters even more difficult, Jerome,<sup>82</sup> Chron.

---

<sup>66</sup> Chron. Pasch. 316.10.

<sup>67</sup> Chron. 724, 120.4-5T, 93.30V.

<sup>68</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 132.20T.

<sup>69</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 2112 (vol. 1, 121.26-7T, 91.17-8V).

<sup>70</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.218.

<sup>71</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.194.25-6.

<sup>72</sup> The other witnesses – Chron. 775, Chron. 846, Agap., El. Nis. (= Jac. Ed.?) and Michael – round it up to 1 year: Chron. 775, 347.13T, 274.1V; Chron. 846, 181.22T, 140.3-4V; Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 46; El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 39.20T, 24.3V; Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 4 (104T; vol. 1: 172V).

<sup>73</sup> Chron. 775, 345.27-8T, 273.2V: 51 for 41.

<sup>74</sup> Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 15.18T, 11.25V.

<sup>75</sup> Chron. 846, 166.7T, 129.22V.

<sup>76</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. V 1 (67T; vol. 1: 107V).

<sup>77</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 103.6T.

<sup>78</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 302.3-4 (trans. 366).

<sup>79</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.192.

<sup>80</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.110.18-21.

<sup>81</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. Can. a. 1551 (67T; vol. 1: 230V).

<sup>82</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.108.23-4.

724,<sup>83</sup> Chron. Zuqn.,<sup>84</sup> Chron. 846<sup>85</sup> and Chron. 1234<sup>86</sup> assign a 20-year-reign to Xerxes, son of Darius, whereas the Armenian<sup>87</sup> and Michael<sup>88</sup> have 21 years. In one case, that of the length of the reign of Philip II of Macedon, Alexander's father, Michael's canons<sup>89</sup> even agree with both Jerome<sup>90</sup> and the Armenian<sup>91</sup> on 26 years, whereas Chron. 1234's has 17 for 27, the number preserved by Elias<sup>92</sup> and Michael<sup>93</sup> himself.

Independently from all other witnesses, Michael<sup>94</sup> and Chron. 1234<sup>95</sup> also attribute a reign of 12 years and 7 months to Alexander the Great, where Jerome<sup>96</sup> and Chron. Zuqn.<sup>97</sup> have 12 years and 6 months, and the Armenian,<sup>98</sup> Agapius<sup>99</sup> and the other Syriac witnesses (Chron. 846<sup>100</sup> and Michael's canons<sup>101</sup>) round the number up to 12 years.

There is evidence that indicates that Agapius, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler were influenced by the same adaptor or continuator of Eusebius, perhaps Andronicus or a dependant of Andronicus (John of Litharb?): only these three authors identify the eighth Alexandrian bishop Marcus as Marcianus<sup>102</sup> and they also,<sup>103</sup> together

---

<sup>83</sup> Chron. 724, 86.19T, 70.3V.

<sup>84</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 1529 (vol. 1, 39.12-3T, 32.1-2V).

<sup>85</sup> Chron. 846, 166.5T, 129.20V.

<sup>86</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 102.16T.

<sup>87</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.191.

<sup>88</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. V 1 (66T; vol. 1: 105, 230V).

<sup>89</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. Can. a. 1655 (70T; vol. 1: 231V).

<sup>90</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.121.1-3.

<sup>91</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.196.1655.

<sup>92</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 36.6T, 21.22V.

<sup>93</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. V 3 (71T; vol. 1: 112V).

<sup>94</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. V 3 (72T; vol. 1: 113V).

<sup>95</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 104.13-4T.

<sup>96</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.122.22-6.

<sup>97</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 1680 (vol. 1, 41.10-2T, 33.17-8V).

<sup>98</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.197.

<sup>99</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 220.

<sup>100</sup> Chron. 846, 166.19T, 129.34V.

<sup>101</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. Can. a. 1681 (71T; vol. 1: 232V).

<sup>102</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 134.15-6T calls him Marcianus, "(one) of the philosophers."

with Elias of Nisibis,<sup>104</sup> mention the start of Ardashir's reign and the beginning of the Persian empire, during the reign of the Roman emperor Alexander, son of Mamma. Unfortunately, none of the authors identifies his source, except Elias, who says that he took the regnal years of Ardashir of the *series regum* of the Persians. Similarly, Agapius, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler also say that Alexander was poisoned, a tradition which is not provided by any other Syriac chronicler.<sup>105</sup> In this context, it is also worth pointing out that only Agapius, Michael and Chron. 1234 include a certain Sennacherib the Younger in their Babylonian king list. This figure is not attested elsewhere, so he must have been added by a Syriac intermediary, who was writing between the sixth century and the 940s.<sup>106</sup>

Lastly, Chron. 1234 also preserves two entries that may have come from an unknown continuation of Eusebius' Chronicle. In both cases Jerome is an additional witness. In the case of an entry on Constantius II's proclaiming of Gallus Caesar, Jerome preserves an entry that is almost literally identical to an entry in Chron. 1234 and Michael.

---

<sup>103</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 69 (year 9); Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 7 (113T; vol. 1: 188V): year 3; Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 136.8-10T.

<sup>104</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 91.18-21T, 45.3-4V.

<sup>105</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 236; Mich. Syr. Chron. V 3 (72T; vol. 1: 113V); Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 104.22-3T.

<sup>106</sup> On this figure and the Babylonian king list in Agap. Chron., Mich. Syr. Chron. and Chron. 1234, see Chapter 1.4.

Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.238 <sup>e</sup>	Chron. Pasch. a. 351 (ed., vol. 1, 540.8-12; <sup>107</sup> trans. 30-1)	Theophan. Chron. AM 5842 (ed. de Boor, 40.15-8; <sup>108</sup> trans. 67)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (136-7T; vol 1: 267V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 154.21-5T
<u>Gallus, Constantii patruelis, Caesar factus</u>	<u>Constantius</u> Augustus, being sole emperor, proclaimed <u>as Caesar</u> and colleague in his rule <u>his cousin Gallus</u> , renaming him Constantius, on Ides of March [15 March]; he dispatched him to Antioch in the east, since the Persians were pressing.	In this year <u>Constantius</u> ruling as sole Augustus, proclaimed <u>that his own cousin Gallus</u> was to have a share in the empire <u>as Caesar</u> . After bestowing on him the surname Constantius, he dispatched him to Antioch in the East while the Persians were still attacking.	<u>Constantius</u> <u>made his cousin Gallus, Caesar.</u>	When the emperor <u>Constantius</u> ruled in Rome, he <u>made his cousin Gallus Caesar.</u>

Jerome preserves a basic account of Constantius' proclamation of Gallus Caesar, using the verb "to make" and emphasising that Gallus was his nephew. The *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes preserve a much more extensive account, which uses the verb ἀναγορεύω, to proclaim and which also mentions that Gallus received the name Constantius and was sent to Antioch while the Persians were attacking. These Greek chroniclers probably copied this longer narrative from the same Greek author, perhaps a continuator and adaptor of Eusebius. Yet, the later Syriac chronicle tradition has preserved a much briefer account than the later Greek sources, in the case of Michael,

<sup>107</sup> Κωνστάντιος Αὔγουστος μόνος βασιλεύων Γάλλον ἀνεψιὸν αὐτοῦ κοινωνὸν τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας Καίσαρα ἀνηγόρευσεν, μετονομάσας αὐτὸν Κωνστάντιον, ἰδοῖς μαρτίαις, καὶ ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀνατολὴν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἀπέστειλε, τῶν Περσῶν ἐπικειμένων.

<sup>108</sup> Τοῦτῳ τῷ ἔτει Κωνστάντιος ὁ Αὔγουστος μόνος βασιλεύων Γάλλον, ἀνεψιὸν ἴδιον, κοινωνὸν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείας καίσαρα ἀναγορεύσας, μετονομάσας αὐτὸν Κωνστάντιον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ ἀπέστειλε κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, τῶν Περσῶν ἔτι ἐπικειμένων.

even identical to Jerome's. This suggests that the Syriac source that furnished Michael and Chron. 1234 with this entry may have had access to the same Greek source as Jerome.

The same continuation may also have been the source for an entry on an earthquake that destroyed Nicomedia on 24 August AD 358.<sup>109</sup> This must have been a major event, because it is commemorated in numerous Late Antique and Medieval historiographical sources, including by Jerome, Ammianus Marcellinus,<sup>110</sup> the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes, but interestingly also Agapius and two Syriac sources: the *Chronicle of Edessa* and Chron. 1234.

Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.241 <sup>a</sup>	Chron. Ed. §22	Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 116	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 153.15-6T	Chron. Pasch. a. 359 (ed. vol. 1, 543.5-8; <sup>111</sup> trans. 33)	Theophan. Chron. AM 5850 (ed. trans. 75)
<u>Nicomedia terrae motu funditus euersa uicinis urbibus ex parte uexatis</u>	In the year 670 (of the Greeks), <u>Nicomedia was thrown down.</u>	In year 20 of Constantius there was a great <u>earthquake</u> in <u>Nicomedia</u> and the city <u>was thrown down.</u>	At that time there was a great <u>earthquake</u> and <u>the city of Nicomedia was destroyed</u> by it and it <u>was completely thrown down.</u>	In the time of these consuls in the month Hyperberetaeus [October] there was a great and violent <u>earthquake</u> in <u>Nicomedia</u> about hour 3 of the night. And <u>the city</u> collapsed and <u>was destroyed</u> , and among others	In this year <u>the city of Nicomedia was thrown down</u> by a severe <u>earthquake</u> at about the third hour at night, and a great many people lost their lives. Among those who perished

<sup>109</sup> Grumel 1958, 477.

<sup>110</sup> Amm. Marc. XVII 7.1-18.

<sup>111</sup> Ἐπὶ τοῖτων τῶν ὑπάτων μηνὶ ὑπερβερεταίῳ μέγας γέγονε καὶ σφοδρὸς σεισμὸς ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ περὶ ὥραν γ' νυκτερινήν. καὶ ἡ πόλις κατέπεσε καὶ διεφθάρη, ἐν οἷς καὶ συναπώλετο ὁ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως ἐπίσκοπος Κεκρόπιος τούνομα.

				the bishop of the same city, named Cecropius, also perished.	was the city's bishop Cecropius.
--	--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

In his study of the Antiochene continuation, Richard W. Burgess discussed this entry, but determined that it was not part of a common source, and definitely not of the Antiochene continuation, which he deemed to have continued Eusebius' *Chronicle* until c. 350. However, he also overlooked the presence of this entry in Chron. 1234, probably because, unlike the other witnesses, the Anonymous Chronicler inserted it in his description of the reign of Constantine the Great, rather in that of Constantine's sons. Jerome, Theophanes, Agapius and the *Chronicon Paschale* date this earthquake to the reign of Constantius II, but they disagree about the exact regnal year, dating it to his 21<sup>st</sup>, 22<sup>nd</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> regnal year respectively.

Jerome, the earliest witness, writing in Constantinople in 379-80, preserves the most succinct account. Because the earthquake occurred in 358, Jerome's source cannot have been the *Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii*, but must have been a later continuation of this continuation, written between 350 and 379.

The additional details in the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes' *Chronographia* and their agreement on the dating of the earthquake in Nicomedia to AD 359 against Jerome's account and dating to AD 358 indicate that the two former share a common Greek source, most likely a later continuator and adapter of Eusebius, who was writing after 358 and before 630, when the Constantinopolitan<sup>112</sup> author of the *Chronicon Paschale* finished his work.<sup>113</sup> I suspect this Greek post-Eusebian chronicle – and not a “lost fourth-century Arian history of the Church (...) which was also used by the Arian church

---

<sup>112</sup> Treadgold 2010, 341.

<sup>113</sup> Burgess 1999, 123 noted that for post-350 events Theophan. was “using a single main narrative source and making additions to it from other sources, chiefly the same source as that used by the *Chron. Pasch.*” This source may be related to Philost. HE IV 10, who also mentions the earthquake and the death of Cecropius.

historian Philostorgius,”<sup>114</sup> may have been responsible for certain Arian materials that are shared by the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes.

The Syriac accounts of the *Chronicle of Edessa*, Agapius and Chron. 1234 preserve none of the additional details of the later Greek accounts. This indicates that the Anonymous Chronicler’s unidentified Syriac source was probably not influenced by the common source of the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes, but either (ultimately) by another chronicle, in either case most likely a continuation of Eusebius. I suspect this chronicle may have been an Edessan source, given the testimony of the *Chronicle of Edessa* and Chron. 1234, but one cannot be certain.

## 7.4 Conclusion

Three writings of Eusebius influenced the Anonymous Chronicler: the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and two historical texts, the *Ecclesiastical History* and the *Chronicle*. The former was not directly used by the Anonymous Chronicler, but through various intermediaries and only for material that ultimately goes back to the Jewish historian Artabanus.

The case of the *Ecclesiastical History* is less clear. Material from this text barely survives in Chron. 1234, perhaps because of the lacunary state of the Ecclesiastical Part. Bits of information survive imbedded into synopses of other Greek church historians, which suggests the involvement of intermediaries rather than the Anonymous Chronicler’s direct access to Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*. However, he may have had used it for information on the signs that preceded the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70, information that ultimately goes back to Flavius Josephus, that the Anonymous Chronicler incorporated into the Pre-Constantinian Part.

---

<sup>114</sup> Treadgold 2010, 344. See also Scott 2012, 60-9. On the unlikelihood that Theophanes shares a fourth-century Arian source with Philostorgius, see chapter 18 in this volume in which I argue that Theophanes used a seventh-, eighth- or ninth-century Greek chronicler who used Philostorgius.

Similar conclusions can be drawn regarding Eusebius' *Chronicle*. Because of the importance and popularity of this work, and its influence on several other Greek and Syriac historians, it is difficult to determine if the Anonymous Chronicler used Eusebius in Syriac translation, or merely found information from Eusebius in the work of a Syriac post-Eusebian chronicler. In this context, the name of Andronicus must surely be mentioned. Regardless of the issue of the nature of Anonymous Chronicler's reliance on the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, however, it is clear that a large number of entries in the Pre-Constantinian Part of Chron. 1234 go back to this source, and that it is one of the most important Syriac Eusebian witnesses, because, like Michael, it can be the only Syriac witness for certain entries from the chronological canons of Eusebius.



# Chapter 8 The Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii (c. 350)

## 8.1 Introduction

After a careful study and comparative analysis of numerous Greek, Latin, Syriac and Armenian sources, Richard W. Burgess revealed the existence of a continuation of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, probably written in Antioch in the middle of the fourth century AD.<sup>1</sup> The anonymous continuator wrote in Greek and discussed events from AD 325 until c. 350. Burgess included Chron. 1234 among the witnesses of the *Continuatio*, but oversaw two fragments. Thus, this chapter partially repeats Burgess' conclusions, but also corrects his oversights. Furthermore, Burgess' conclusions regarding the transmission of these excerpts to the Anonymous Chronicler will also be re-investigated.

Five of the events included in Burgess' reconstruction of this continuation (1-5) also appear in Chron. 1234. Two additional entries (6-7) may have come from the same source.

1) Refounding and renaming of Drepana,<sup>2</sup>

2) Dedication of Constantinople,<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Burgess 1999, 101-305.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 150.17-9T; Burgess 1999, 119, §7.

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 142.7-18T; Burgess 1999, 119, §13.

- 3) Persian invasion of Mesopotamia and first siege of Nisibis,<sup>4</sup>
- 4) Shapur invades Mesopotamia; second siege of Nisibis by Shapur,<sup>5</sup>
- 5) Constantius fortifies and renames Amida, and founds Constantia (Tella de-Mauzelat), the old Antoninopolis,<sup>6</sup>
- 6) Length of the reign of Constantine the Great,
- 7) Constantine's destruction of pagan temples.

## 8.2 Refounding and renaming of Drepana

The Anonymous Chronicler mentions the refounding and renaming of Drepana on two occasions. Both entries are based on the testimony of Socrates of Constantinople (HE I 17), who may have used the Continuation. One is a more literal copy,<sup>7</sup> the other is a paraphrase,<sup>8</sup> fused with information from a Greek chronicle.<sup>9</sup>

## 8.3 Dedication of Constantinople

The second excerpt that Burgess retraced to the *Continuatio* is a description of the refounding and dedication of Constantinople by Constantine the Great:

---

<sup>4</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 153.23-8T; Burgess 1999, 120, §27.

<sup>5</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.3-7T; Burgess 1999, 121, §43.

<sup>6</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.8-11T; Burgess 1999, 121-2, §47-8.

<sup>7</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 150.17-20T.

<sup>8</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 144.24-7T.

<sup>9</sup> On which, see chapter 18-9.

“When emperor Constantine saw that Rome, which was the seat of the imperium, was far from the middle of prefecture (ܡܨܚܘܬܐ) of the Romans, he had the intention to build a place that was suitable for the seat of his imperium. When he saw the tongue of the sea, on which sat the great Byzantium, placed on the coast of the sea in the middle of the two seas of Pontus and Asia, very becoming and beautiful, and on the cusp of West and East, holding all the frontiers, he had the idea to build the seat of his imperium there in that great city. And he built and founded it, and filled it with beautiful and magnificent buildings.”<sup>10</sup>

This passage is far more extensive than the other preserved fragments, some of which are fairly literal copies or translations. Chron. 1234’s account contains information such as the geographical elaborations that is not known elsewhere. It may be worth noting that this passage is followed in Chron. 1234 by Dionysius of Tell-Mahre’s account of the foundation of Constantinople, which could indicate that Dionysius was the source for this information, but the fact that this entry is not extant in Michael suggests otherwise.

## 8.4 The Persian invasion of Mesopotamia and the first siege of Nisibis

This event is mentioned in numerous chronicles, written in Greek,<sup>11</sup> Syriac,<sup>12</sup> Latin,<sup>13</sup> as well as in Arabic.<sup>14</sup> Chron. 1234’s testimony is as follows:

At that time king Shapur reigned in Persia, he ascended and besieged Nisibis. He sat on it for sixty-five days and when he could not take it, he pillaged and

---

<sup>10</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 142.7-18T.

<sup>11</sup> Theophan. Chron. AM 5829 (ed. 34.32-35.1, 4-7; trans. 56); Chron. Pasch. 533.18-20.

<sup>12</sup> Chron. 724, 130.14-8T, 101.32-6V; Chron. 724, 96.18-23T, 77.20-4V; Chron. 724, 132.9-11T, 103.13-5V; Jac. Ed. Chron. 289T, 216V; Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (137T; vol. 1: 267V).

<sup>13</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.234<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> Chron. Seert, 288; Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 109.

destroyed all of Mesopotamia, AG 649, and he also intended to go to the land of the West.<sup>15</sup>

Like Agapius, the Anonymous Chronicler does not specify that the prayers of Jacob of Nisibis were the reason why Shapur was unable to take Nisibis, even though Jacob, along with Ephrem, is mentioned a few lines earlier and Socrates, whom the Anonymous Chronicler used as a source, also described this event in detail.<sup>16</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler agrees with Chron. 724,<sup>17</sup> Jacob of Edessa<sup>18</sup> and probably Agapius<sup>19</sup> as well on the date of this siege, in AG 649/AD 337-8. This date is also used by several other Syriac chroniclers for the death of Jacob of Nisibis who was present at the time of the siege and died either during or soon after it.<sup>20</sup> Unlike some of his predecessors<sup>21</sup> who identified the siege of Nisibis as a response to the death of Constantine, however, the Anonymous Chronicler dates the siege during the last days of Constantine, between his baptism on the one hand and his death and funeral on the other.<sup>22</sup> This indicates that the compiler believed that the siege occurred in the summer of 337.<sup>23</sup> As far as its duration is concerned, only the Anonymous Chronicler assigns sixty-five days. The original number seems to have been sixty-three, which is supported

---

<sup>15</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 153.23-8T.

<sup>16</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 153.17-9T.

<sup>17</sup> Chron. 724, 132.9-11T, 103.13-5V.

<sup>18</sup> Jac. Ed. Chron. 289T, 216V: the year is missing from the manuscript, but was reconstructed by Chabot on the basis that Jacob equated AG 658 with the twenty-second year of Constantine's reign.

<sup>19</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 108-9 has AG 642, for the deaths of Constantine and Jacob of Nisibis and the siege of Nisibis, perhaps due to a misreading of ܩ (9) as ܨ (2).

<sup>20</sup> E.g. Chron. Ed. §17. For the issue of the exact date of this siege, see Burgess 1999, 234-8.

<sup>21</sup> Theod. Cyr. HE II 26, Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 109 and Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (134T; vol. 1: 266V).

<sup>22</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 153.22-3, 28-30T. Unlike what Burgess 1999, 234 believed, the narrative concerning Constantine's baptism was taken from Theod. Cyr. HE I 30 (with the inclusion of Constantine's age at the time of death from Socr. HE I 39.1). The description of his death and burial is a paraphrase of Socr. HE I 39.5 and 40.1-5.

<sup>23</sup> Burgess 1999, 234.

by the Greek and Latin sources.<sup>24</sup> The number sixty-five (𐌆𐌗) could in itself be a corruption of the number sixty-six (𐌆𐌘), which is given by Chron. 724.<sup>25</sup>

Identifying Chron. 1234's source for this passage is difficult. However, one verbal agreement between Chron. 724 (second entry<sup>26</sup>), Jacob,<sup>27</sup> Michael<sup>28</sup> and Chron. 1234<sup>29</sup> could be significant; in these four excerpts the verb ܥܠܡ (with preposition ܕ) is used to indicate that Shapur attacked (litt.: came up against) Nisibis. Judging from the evidence of the Greek witnesses, the Antiochene continuator used the Greek ἐπέρχομαι and in an equivalent entry Chron. 724<sup>30</sup> uses the equally neutral Syriac counterpart ܥܠܡ, 'to come' (with preposition ܕ). This small discrepancy may be an indication of a difference between the Syriac translation of the *Continuatio* that was used by the author of Chron. 636 on the one hand, and the secondary Syriac tradition that influenced Jacob of Edessa and several other sources (including apparently the author of Chron. 636 or the compiler of Chron. 724 as well) on the other. How this excerpt reached the Anonymous Chronicler is uncertain. Since it contains different information from Theodoret and Jacob of Edessa, we can eliminate them as possible intermediaries. The most likely intermediary is probably Ignatius of Melitene, who seems to have transmitted to Chron. 1234 at least one entry from the continuation, as I will now show.

---

<sup>24</sup> Burgess 1999, 233.

<sup>25</sup> Chron. 724, 130.15T, 101.33V. Elsewhere (132.9-11T, 103.13-5V) Chron. 724 gives thirty days, like Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 109, whose account is very similar. Burgess 1999, 233 interpreted this as proof that Jacob died on the thirtieth day of the siege, but 30 (ܕ) may simply be a corruption of 70 (ܕ), the number given by Theod. Cyr. HE II 26, whose account Agap. summarises and is preserved in its entirety in Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (135T; vol. 1: 266V), which could indicate Agap. and Mich. Syr.'s common reliance on a dependant of Theod. Cyr.

<sup>26</sup> Chron. 724, 130.14T, 101.32V.

<sup>27</sup> Jac. Ed. Chron. 289T, 216V.

<sup>28</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 3 (133T; vol. 1: 260V).

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 153.24T.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Burgess 1999, 132: table of the "Hypothetical Relationships among the Witnesses to the *Continuatio*".

## 8.5 The second siege of Nisibis

Chron. 1234 also has an entry on the second Persian siege of Nisibis. It appears, along with references to the foundation of Antoninopolis (identified as Antipolis) and Amida (see below), between descriptions of Julian's victories against the barbarians and the preparations for his rebellion against Constantius. This entry is also preserved in the chronicles of Jerome and Theophanes, which suggested to Burgess that it originated from the *Continuatio*.

Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.236 <sup>h</sup>	Theophan. Chron. AM 5838 (ed. 38.9-11; trans. 63)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.3-7T
Shapur besieged Nisibis again, for three months.	Sabores, the Persian emperor, invaded Mesopotamia and besieged Nisibis for 78 days, but once again retreated in shame.	At that time, king Shapur besieged Nisibis and waged a heavy war against it. The king had hired help and when he had oppressed it for 78 days, a heavy rain was sent against them, and an illness befell them. And thus, they returned in shame.

In this case Chron. 1234's account more closely resembles Theophanes' than Jerome's. The latter is very brief and, unlike Theophanes and the Anonymous Chronicler who agree on seventy-eight days, incorrectly gives three months as the duration of the siege, which actually coincides with the hundred days of the third siege.

Chron. 1234's account also contains elements that have no counterpart in Theophanes' and Jerome's versions. The remark concerning the heavy rain and the illnesses that befell the Persians is attributed by Michael to Ignatius of Melitene.

“Ignatius of Melitene said that God also sent a heavy rain against the Persians and that the plague fell on them and they fled.”<sup>31</sup>

In Michael, however, this remark appears after Theodoret’s account of the third siege of Nisibis (Theod. Cyr. HE II 30), not the *Continuatio*’s account of the second siege.<sup>32</sup> Most likely Ignatius was the intermediary between the *Continuatio* and Chron. 1234 in this case, but in which source he found this information is uncertain. Given Ignatius’ use of Greek sources and the similarities between the entry in Theophanes and Chron. 1234 the former’s source may well have been a Greek rather than a Syriac post-Eusebian chronicle.

## 8.6 Foundation of Tella/Constantia and refounding of Amida

This passage on the second siege of Nisibis is immediately followed by a commemoration of Constantius’ foundation of Tella de-Mauzelat or Constantia, previously called Antoninopolis, and the refounding of Amida:

At that time, the emperor (re)built Tella-Mauzelat, which was called Antipolis, in Mesopotamia. It was (re)built in AG 668. He also built the city of Amida, AG 668.”<sup>33</sup>

These (re-)foundations seem to have been important historical events for Syriac chronographers as nearly every Syriac chronicle<sup>34</sup> reports on at least one of the two, but usually both foundations. They are also commemorated by Theophanes.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (136T; vol. 1: 266V).

<sup>32</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (134-6T; vol. 1: 266V).

<sup>33</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.8-11T. On the accuracy of these claims, the exact dating of these events and the location of these cities, see Burgess 1999, 274-82.

<sup>34</sup> Chron. 724, 131.4-8T, 102:17-20V; Chron. Ed., 4.17-21T, 4.14-7V; Chron. Maron., 68.1-2T, 53.22-3V; Jac. Ed. Chron., 293T, 218V; Chron. Zuqn., 169.24-6T, 126.25-7V and 174.22-4T, 129.30-1V; Chron. 819, 4.17-9T, 2.9-11V;

This entry was the way through which Burgess determined that the majority of the Syriac witnesses were influenced by the Syriac Epitome of Eusebius' *Chronicle* rather than the Syriac translation. The author of the Epitome, according to Burgess, replaced the dating by regnal years of these events by the Seleucid dating and misidentified Antoninopolis as Antipolis.

Burgess concluded that the Anonymous Chronicler of 1234 was dependent on the Syriac Epitome via one or more unknown intermediaries, but his table<sup>36</sup> of the hypothetical relationships among the witnesses to the *Continuatio* does not allow for a common source between Michael and Chron. 1234. The previously discussed entry on the second siege of Nisibis, however, suggests that they may both have accessed the *Continuatio* via Ignatius of Melitene, though Michael did not copy the latter's account of the second siege.<sup>37</sup>

## 8.7 Length of Constantine's reign

I have isolated two other entries from the Antiochene continuation in Chron. 1234. Firstly, the Anonymous Chronicler claims that Constantine the Great reigned for 31 years and 8 months. Though its opinion differs slightly from Chron. Zuqn., which has 31 years and 10 months, Chron. 1234 is the only other Syriac witness that offers a number of months as well as years – most other Syriac chroniclers round the number of years up to 32. Chron. Zuqn.'s opinion has counterparts in Jerome's *Chronicle* (30 years and 10 months), the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes (both 31 years and 10 months),

---

Chron. 846, 195.24-6T, 150.27-9; El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 101.5-8T, 49.11-2V; Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (137T; vol. 1: 267V).

<sup>35</sup> Theophan. Chron. AM 5832 (ed. 36.10-3; trans. 59).

<sup>36</sup> Burgess 1999, 132.

<sup>37</sup> Yet, this was noted by Burgess 1999, 272, §43.

indicating that they are all ultimately dependent on the same source, i.e. the *Continuatio*.<sup>38</sup>

Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.228.26-229.1	Chron. Pasch. a. 337 (ed., vol. 1, 532.7-13; <sup>39</sup> trans. 21)	Chron. Zuqn. a. 2322 (vol. 1, 113.1-3V, 150.21-5T)	Theophan. Chron. AM 5828 (ed. 33.22-3; trans. 54)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 153.28-154.4T
Romanorum XXXIII <u>regnavit</u> Constantinus <u>ann.</u> XXX <u>mens X</u>	(Constantine ...) gloriously and piously quitted life in a suburb of the same city, on 11th in the month Artemisius [May], having been vouchsafed the saving baptism by Eusebius bishop of Constantinople, after a reign of <u>31 years and 10 months</u> .	Anno (Mundi) 2322, Constantius left the world in great honour. His son Constantine reigned after him, for <u>31 years and 10 months</u> .	He lived in all 65 years and <u>was emperor 31 years and 10 months</u> .	When the emperor Constantine <u>had reigned for 31 years and 8 months</u> , he went off to His Lord.

It is extremely likely that Chron. 1234 is also somehow dependent on the *Continuatio*, but that the discrepancy was caused by confusion between ω (8) and ι (10).

<sup>38</sup> Burgess 1999, 120, 25<sup>2</sup> and 157, §25.

<sup>39</sup> ἐνδόξως καὶ εὐσεβῶς μεταλλάττει τὸν βίον ἐν προαστείῳ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως μηνὶ ἀρτεμισίῳ ια', καταξιωθεὶς τοῦ σωτηριώδους βαπτίσματος ὑπὸ Εὐσεβίου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, βασιλεύσας ἔτη λα' καὶ μῆνας ι'.

## 8.8 Constantine's destruction of pagan temples

Having copied Socrates' accounts of Constantine's conversion of the Ethiopians and the Iberians, his abolition of the wicked customs of the citizens of Baalbek and his destruction of their pagan temples, as well as the temple of Aphrodite in Lebanon, the Anonymous Chronicler says that

“in Cilicia (Constantine) uprooted many temples from their foundations, and in every place he uprooted pagan temples and built churches in their stead. He completely uprooted the pagan sanctuaries.”<sup>40</sup>

While the first sentence alludes to Socrates' mention of Constantine's destruction of the Cilician temple of the Pythonic demon whom he had cast out (HE I 18.11) and his demolition of the altars under the Oak of Mamre (a place in Judea where Abraham was said to have met angels) and construction of churches there (HE I 18.6). The second sentence, however, appears to be a repetition of the second half of the previous sentence. More likely than being a repetition, made by the Anonymous Chronicler himself, it is possible that this second sentence is based on an entry from the *Continuatio*, which is attested in Jerome, Chron. 724 and Theophanes, but was heavily reworked.

Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.233 <sup>b</sup>	Chron. 724, 129.23-4T, 101.12-4V <sup>41</sup>	Theophan. Chron. AM 5822 (ed. 28.32-4, <sup>42</sup> trans. 47)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 150.15T <sup>43</sup>
Edicto Constantini gentilium templa subuersa sunt.	Because of his love of God he effaced the memory of the idols and	In this year the pious Constantine intensified the destruction of idols	(Constantine) completely uprooted the pagan sanctuaries.

<sup>40</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 150.12-5T.

<sup>41</sup> ❖ ⲉⲓⲃⲱⲧⲏ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲛⲓⲁⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ

<sup>42</sup> Τούτω τῷ ἔτει ἐπέτεινε Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβῆς τὴν κατὰ τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ τῶν ναῶν αὐτῶν κατάλυσιν, καὶ κατὰ τόπους ἠπάνιζοντο· καὶ αἱ πρόσοδοι αὐτῶν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεδίδοντο.

<sup>43</sup> ❖ ⲉⲓⲃⲱⲧⲏ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲛⲓⲁⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ ⲛⲉⲕⲣⲱⲧⲏ

	demolished their temples.	and their temples and they were demolished in [various] places The revenues from these were bestowed upon the churches of God.	
--	---------------------------	--	--

Though there are no verbal agreements between the Syriac accounts, it is plausible that Chron. 1234's account ultimately goes back to the Antiochene continuation.

## 8.9 Conclusion

Given the low number of entries from the continuation that have made it into Chron. 1234, it is difficult to offer any conclusive evidence about the sources in which the Anonymous Chronicler found this information. He may have disposed of a Syriac version of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, with its Antiochene continuation, but it is much more likely that he used the work of yet another (Syriac) continuator. Especially Androncius seems to have significantly influenced Chron. 1234.<sup>44</sup> Similarly, Ignatius functioned as an intermediary between Eusebius and Chron. 1234, but may have used a Greek post-Eusebian chronicle, perhaps a common source with Theophanes.

---

<sup>44</sup> See chapter 15.



## Chapter 9 Annianus of Alexandria (turn of the fifth century)

Annianus of Alexandria was a critic of Eusebius and the author of a *Paschoualion*,<sup>1</sup> a perpetual Paschal table of 532 years. His work has not come down to us in its full form. All our information regarding Annianus derives from his dependants: George Syncellus,<sup>2</sup> Agapius of Mabbug, Elias of Nisibis, Michael the Great and Chron. 1234.<sup>3</sup> Written around the turn of the fifth century, his work, which probably covered the period between Creation and AD 412, was an adaptation of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, with whom he often disagreed. It has been suggested that Annianus also relied on the – also lost – *Chronicle* of his almost contemporary and fellow-townsmen Panodorus, but the exact nature of the relationship between these two texts is still debated.<sup>4</sup>

Annianus' *Chronicle* is generally believed to have never been fully translated into Syriac.<sup>5</sup> Fragments<sup>6</sup> in Syriac that have so far been identified are:

---

<sup>1</sup> Mosshammer 2008, 198-203.

<sup>2</sup> Mosshammer 2008, 198-203, 368-84.

<sup>3</sup> Gelzer 1898, 400-1 suspected Ann.'s influence on Chron. Zuqn.. Keseling 1927a, 225 seems to have doubted this.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Mosshammer 2008, 359-62 and Treadgold 2013, 54-5.

<sup>5</sup> For Ann.'s possible influence on a seventh-century anonymous Armenian chronicle, see Greenwood 2008, 217-9 and 222-5.

<sup>6</sup> Witakowski 1999-2000, 434-5 identified a fragment entitled "The Chronicle of Eusebius of Caesarea from the beginning un[til the year [8.]2 of Alexander the Macedonian" from BL Add. 17,216, f. 1 (Eus. Chron. Syr.) as

1) Annianus' chronological computation of the biblical patriarchal<sup>7</sup> and the antediluvian<sup>8</sup> and postdiluvian Chaldean,<sup>9</sup> Assyrian,<sup>10</sup> and Median<sup>11</sup> royal successions (possibly also those of the Persians,<sup>12</sup> Ptolemies<sup>13</sup> and the Roman emperors until the twentieth year of Constantine,<sup>14</sup>

2) an adaptation<sup>15</sup> of a tradition from *Jubilees* 4:1-2, 7, discussing the chronology between the birth of Adam and the birth of Seth,

3) a passage<sup>16</sup> on the descent of the *Bnay Elohim*, the sons of Seth, from mount Hermon in year 40 of the life of Yared (= AM 1000),

4) possibly also a fragment from 1 *Enoch* 6:1-6<sup>17</sup>

The testimony of Jacob of Edessa,<sup>18</sup> who mentions Annianus among other chroniclers such as Eusebius, Hippolytus and Andronicus, shows that Annianus was known to Syriac historians at least as early as the turn of the eighth century. Whether Jacob had access

---

based on Annianus. However, the fragment only offers a patriarchal chronology from Adam until Shelah, which does not mention Qainan and completely agrees with the Eusebian computation.

<sup>7</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 16-7T, 7-8V. From Adam until Abraham, also in Chron. 1234.

<sup>8</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. I 8 (7T; vol. 1: 12V), on which, see Gelzer 1894. Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 97-8 preserves them also, but attributes them to Africanus.

<sup>9</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 98-9 attributes them to Africanus.

<sup>10</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 99-100; El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 26-8T, 15-6V.

<sup>11</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 100; El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 28-9T, 16-7V.

<sup>12</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 100-1.

<sup>13</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 101.

<sup>14</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 101-2.

<sup>15</sup> On which, see Gelzer 1898, 254-61, Brock 1968, and the chapter on *Jubilees* and 1 *Enoch* in this volume.

<sup>16</sup> On which, see Gelzer 1898, 254-61, Brock 1968, and the chapter on *Jubilees* and 1 *Enoch* in this volume.

<sup>17</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. I 4 (3-4T; vol. 1: 7-8V), on which, see Brock 1968.

<sup>18</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 7 (Nau 1900, 590).

to Annianus, directly, via an intermediary or via excerpts in Greek or Syriac is impossible to determine, as his letters do not preserve any fragments of Annianus.

The earliest evidence for Syriac fragments of Annianus appears in the middle of the tenth century, ironically in Arabic translation in the chronicle of Agapius.<sup>19</sup> Given the evidence for Agapius' reliance on Syriac rather than Arabic chronicles, there is no doubt in my mind that this information too came from a Syriac chronicle, and that thus, fragments of Annianus must have been translated into Syriac between the early fifth century and the 940s. Dating this transmission of information more precisely is not possible.

Recently, some scholars have argued for a connection between the Greek and Syriac transmission of fragments of Annianus. Adler and Tuffin have suggested the possibility that George Syncellus knew Annianus (and Panodorus) through a Syriac collection of excerpts.<sup>20</sup> If this highly speculative theory is correct, Syriac fragments of Annianus must have existed before 808, but there is no evidence to support this theory apart from the fact that the *Chronographia* of Theophanes the Confessor is to some (unknown) extent based on material collected by Syncellus as well as on one or more Semitic (Syriac and/or Arabic) sources. Warren Treadgold identified Theophilus of Edessa's *Chronicle* (d. 785) as Syncellus' source for Annianus (not Panodorus), but this theory is even more unlikely.<sup>21</sup> First of all, nothing suggests that Theophilus wrote a chronicle. Dionysius of Tell-Mahre uses the term "narratives resembling ecclesiastical histories," clearly distinguishing Theophilus' work from chronological canons and (developed) chronicles.<sup>22</sup> In addition, the East-Syrian chronicler Elias of Nisibis (d. 1046) also knew fragments of Annianus, but there is no evidence for his use of any of Theophilus' writings. Also, if Syncellus had access to Panodorus in Greek, as Treadgold goes on to

---

<sup>19</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 97-102.

<sup>20</sup> Adler/Tuffin 2002 [= Georg. Sync. Chron.], lxxviii-lxxix.

<sup>21</sup> Treadgold 2013, 56ff.

<sup>22</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 358V). On the issue of Theoph. Ed., see chapter 20.

suggest, it is equally plausible that he disposed of a copy of Annianus, whom Treadgold believes to be later than Panodorus.<sup>23</sup>

Annianus is only cited once by the Anonymous Chronicler, in the preface, as “Annianus, the Alexandrian monk.”<sup>24</sup> His influence on Chron. 1234 emerges in three instances. Firstly, Annianus’ main influence on Chron. 1234 lies in the computation of the succession of biblical patriarchs from Adam until Abraham, they are identical. The Anonymous Chronicler never explicitly refers to Annianus but he was probably one of the “three chronographers” who were the sources for the dates of the birth of Enosh, Kenan, Mahalalel, Yared and Shem.<sup>25</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler also cites “three chronographers” as the sources for the date of the birth of Qahath in year 46 of Levi, but since Syncellus<sup>26</sup> has 48, it is unclear if Annianus can also be counted as one of these three authors.

	Eusebius	Annianus	Andronicus	Chron. 1234
Adam fathers Seth	230	230	230	230
Seth fathers Enosh	205	205	205	205
Enosh fathers Kenan	190	190	190	190
Kenan fathers Mahalalel	170	170	170	170
Mahalalel fathers Yared	165	165	165	165
Yared fathers Enoch	162	162	162	162
Enoch fathers Methuselah	165	165	165	165
Methuselah fathers Lamech	167	167	187	167
Lamech fathers Noah	188	188	182	188

<sup>23</sup> Treadgold 2013, 59.

<sup>24</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 27.8T. On Annianus, see Witakowski 1999-2000, 434-5.

<sup>25</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. I 3 (2T; vol. 1: 4V) cites Annianus and Africanus for the same date of the birth of Kenan.

<sup>26</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 126 (trans. 158).

Noah fathers Shem	500	500	500	400 (for 500)
The Flood	2242	2242	2256	2242
Shem fathers Arphaxad	[102]	102	102	102
Arphaxad fathers Qainan	Arphaxad fathers Shelah at the age of	135	135	135
Qainan fathers Shelah	135	130	139	130
Shelah fathers Heber	130	130	130	130
Heber fathers Peleg	134	134	134	130 (for 134)
Peleg fathers Reu	130	130	130	130
Reu fathers Serug	135	132	132	132
Serug fathers Nahor	130	130	130	130
Nahor fathers Terah	79	79	79	29 (for 79)
Terah fathers Abraham	70	70	70	70
Total:	3184	3314	3337	3326 <sup>27</sup>

The second instance is the previously discussed adaptation of *Jubilees* 4:1-2, 7 concerning the chronology from the birth of Adam until the birth of Seth. In the chapter on *Jubilees* I have already mentioned the presence of similar entries in the chronographies of George Syncellus and Michael the Great and discussed its contents, so I shall not go into much detail here. It is, however, worth pointing out that, while Michael refers to Annianus as a source, the Anonymous Chronicler simply refers to “the chronographers,” suggesting that he may have been thinking of the original source (Annianus) as well as the intermediary, which he unfortunately does not identify. This passage probably reached the Anonymous Chronicler via the same Syriac chronicler as Michael had access to.

The third fragment from Annianus’ *Chronicle* is a narrative on the descent of the *Benai Elohim*, the sons of God, or Watchers, from Mount Hermon in year 40 of Yared (= AM 1000). This is an adaptation of apocryphal traditions including 1 *Enoch* 6:1-6. Again, it is

---

<sup>27</sup> Chron. 1234, I, 51.11-3T. Presumably for 3314.

also extant in Michael, so probably came from the same intermediary source as the one that transmitted the adaptation of that *Jubilees'* tradition. Their dependence on Annianus has already been shown by Heinrich Gelzer and Sebastian Brock.<sup>28</sup> Even more interestingly however, from the attribution of this third passage to Annianus follows the attribution of other entries in Michael and Chron. 1234 at least to the unknown Syriac intermediary, but possibly as far back as Annianus.

In his commentary<sup>29</sup> on the *Cave of Treasures*, Su-Min Ri noted the presence of a virtually identical passage on the origin and identity of the *Benai Elohim* in Michael and in Chron. 1234.

Mich. Syr. Chron. I.3 (2T; vol. 1: 4V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 34.14-25T
<p>In the time of Seth, when his sons remembered the good life in Paradise, <i>they decided to please God in their actions.</i> They went up Mount Hermon and settled There, <i>in holy actions</i>, abstaining from marriage. Therefore, they were called Benai Elohim and Watchers.</p>	<p>Then, in the time of Seth, when <i>(certain) people from his sons and from the members of his generation remembered the good life of Paradise, from which their parents had fallen, they were urging each other to return to it again. They wanted to please God in pure and saintly actions and therefore they separated themselves from their brethren. They went up Mount Hermon, which is the mountain of God, and settled on it and lived monastically there, abstaining from marriage and from all manners of life in sensual pleasure. Therefore, they were called Watchers and Benai Elohim, which (means) 'Sons of God', as if by praise.</i></p>

Apart from this passage, one other fragment can be attributed to Michael's and Chron. 1234's unknown common source. The fragment describes how Enosh behaved among the Sethites.

<sup>28</sup> Gelzer 1898, 254-61 and Brock 1968.

<sup>29</sup> Ri 2000, 73.

Mich. Syr. Chron. I.3 (2T; vol. 1: 4V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 35.13-6T
Enosh (...) <i>decided</i> to invoke the name of the Lord and zealously performed holy actions.	Enosh (...) invoked the name of the <i>Lord better than anyone of this time</i> and zealously performed holy actions <i>with these Bnay Elohim who went up Mount Hermon.</i>

Despite the small variants between both accounts – the Anonymous Chronicler consistently preserves long accounts – Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler clearly had access to the same source. Considering the similarities in contents and language between the two discussions of the origin and identity of the *Bnay Elohim* and the account of their descent, they probably originated in the same text. Unfortunately, because Syncellus has no comparable entries, it cannot be determined whether these indeed go back to Annianus, or if they were created by Michael’s and the Anonymous Chronicler’s common source. The latter remains the most likely possibility, but the *argumentum e silentio* does not constitute sufficient evidence for this assumption.

A few words regarding the transmission history of material from Annianus’ *Chronicle* to the Anonymous Chronicler will conclude this chapter. All of this material in Chron. 1234 likely reached him via a Syriac chronicler who was used by Michael as well. It is difficult to determine whether this unknown intermediary was also Agapius’ source.

That Andronicus, who also influenced Agapius,<sup>30</sup> was responsible for this information is unlikely, because the same chronicler probably also passed on Annianus’ reconstruction of the Chaldean royal succession to Michael. Since Annianus’ king list only fits into a scheme which dates the Flood in AM 2242, not into Andronicus’ according to whom the flood occurred in AM 2256, it is highly unlikely that Andronicus played a role in the transmission of materials from Annianus’ *Chronicle* into Syriac. The combination of material from Annianus and Andronicus in Syriac is probably due to a Syriac chronicler who was writing after Andronicus in the sixth century and before

---

<sup>30</sup> See chapter 15.

Agapius in the tenth. John of Litharb is a possible candidate, but we do not know the extent of his chronicle, only that it contained chronological canons.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Suggested by Brock 1968, 629. Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (377T; vol. 2: 357V) includes Joh. Lith. between Jac. Ed. and Ign. Mel., indicating that the former wrote a chronicle, not a historiographical text composed of longer narratives. Dion. TM [= Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 358V)] groups together Jac. Ed. and Joh. Lith., saying that they wrote down “the successions of years,” which suggests that they both wrote chronological canons, staying very close to the Eusebian way of chronicle writing.

# Chapter 10 Socrates of Constantinople (c. 380 – c. 440)

## 10.1 Introduction

Socrates, a layman from Constantinople, conceived his *Ecclesiastical History* as a continuation of Eusebius' work with the same title. Socrates' work overlaps slightly with Eusebius', covering the period between the accession of Constantine the Great in AD 306 and the seventeenth consulate of Theodosius the Younger (AD 439), in seven books. Its value as a source for the political and ecclesiastical history of this period was recognised by Eastern Christian communities as demonstrated by the existence of Armenian and Syriac translations.

No complete Syriac translation is preserved. The most complete direct witness is the ms. Vat. Syr. 145, dating from the ninth or tenth century, but this codex only contains excerpts from the first five books. From the second book, for instance, only the twenty-first chapter survives.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, initial fragments (Socr. HE I 1-7.2) of a once probably complete Syriac translation, tentatively dated to the seventh or eighth century, are kept in the Wellcome Institute in London.<sup>2</sup> Brief Syriac excerpts from

---

<sup>1</sup> Hansen 1995, xxxi.

<sup>2</sup> Allan 1987, 43-5.

Socrates are also extant in five manuscripts in the British Library, dating from the sixth up until the eleventh century.<sup>3</sup>

To the list of relevant sources must be added three Syriac historiographical texts: Chron. Zuqn.,<sup>4</sup> Michael and Chron. 1234. The import of the former two sources was recognised by Günter Christian Hansen who edited<sup>5</sup> the Greek text of Socrates, but for an unknown reason, he ignored Chron. 1234, which in fact, as we shall see, is the most important witness for the Syriac translation of Socrates, after the Vatican and London manuscripts.

## 10.2 Chron. 1234 and Socrates

Although “the book of Socrates” (ܣܘܩܪܐܬܐ ܡܗܘܠܐܒܐܘܬܐ) is only cited once<sup>6</sup> in Chron. 1234, the fifth-century church historian was a crucial source of information for the fourth and fifth centuries. An exceptionally large number of borrowings from Socrates’ *Ecclesiastical History* are preserved in Chron. 1234, from every book but the second. The evidence shows that material from Socrates reached the Anonymous Chronicler via at least two paths. On the one hand, borrowings from Socrates in Chron. 1234 are often fairly literal excerpts, suggesting that the Anonymous Chronicler had a physical copy of the Syriac translation of Socrates at his disposal. On the other hand, materials from Socrates’ *Ecclesiastical History* were also transmitted to the Anonymous Chronicler via at least two intermediaries. One of these was Theodore Lector, whose work was used by an unknown Syriac author. Other(s) cannot be identified.

---

<sup>3</sup> Hansen 1995, xxxii.

<sup>4</sup> Material from all seven books is extant in Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 157-221T, 117-65V. On which, see Witakowski 1987, 131-2.

<sup>5</sup> Hansen 1995.

<sup>6</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 160.15-7T.

### 10.2.1 Chron. 1234 and the Syriac translation of Socrates

The Anonymous Chronicler quotes the first chapter of Socrates' third book. Like Chron. Zuqn., Chron. 1234 refers to Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History* as a ܟܬܝܒܬܐ ܕܩܝܡܬܐ. Sometimes this is short for ܟܬܝܒܬܐ ܕܩܝܡܬܐ, a “writing of times”, a chronicle, but in this case it probably has “the broad meaning of ‘text’.”<sup>7</sup>

Given the large amount of fairly literal excerpts, we can be reasonably certain that the Anonymous Chronicler disposed of a Syriac translation of Socrates. Because Chron. 1234 preserves the most excerpts from Socrates' sixth and seventh books of any Syriac witness, it is probably a more important witness than even Vat. Syr. 145 and the Wellcome Institute fragments, given the fragmentary nature of these manuscripts. An in-depth investigation of the translation technique that emerges from Chron. 1234's literal excerpts from Socrates would take us too far here. Such a project would benefit from a separate study. Nevertheless, I will note a few tendencies, displayed by these excerpts, that have caught my eye.

One passage reveals the import of Chron. 1234 for the study of the Syriac Socrates. Following Socrates (HE I 2.1) the Anonymous Chronicler states that Constantine “was proclaimed emperor in the land of Britannia instead of his old father (...).” However, ‘Britannia’ is misspelled in Chron. 1234 as *Bārṭannia* (ܒܳܪܬܳܢܳܢܳܝܳܐ), with the first 'ālah misplaced between the bēth and the rēš instead of between the tēth and the nūn. A comparison with the only two other Syriac witnesses to this passage, Vat. Syr. 145 and the Wellcome Institute fragments from Socrates, shows that Chron. 1234 more closely resembles the Greek original. Instead of “in the land of Britannia”, the Wellcome Institute fragments read “in Italy” (ܒܳܝܳܬܳܐܳܠܳܝܳܐ, *b'īṭalya*), an error which probably ensued from a misinterpretation of the bēth as a preposition “in” instead of the initial letter of “Britannia”. Vat. Syr. 145 seems to represent an earlier stage in the occurrence of this error. It reads ܒܳܝܳܬܳܐܳܠܳܝܳܐ, *bāryṭalya*, or perhaps even as ܒܳܪܳܬܳܢܳܢܳܝܳܐ, *bārṇṭalya*, because the

---

<sup>7</sup> Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 160.1T, 120.2V applies the same term to Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History*. On this term, see Witakowski 1987, 149.



Because Chron. 1234 is our only Syriac witness for these excerpts, it cannot be determined if this discrepancy reflects the Syriac Socrates or the Anonymous Chronicler's own hand. Interestingly however, the same tendency can be noted in Michael's description of the proclamation of Valentinian I, which is a synopsis of Socrates and Sozomen.<sup>12</sup>

A similarly unexplained discrepancy occurs between Socrates' and the Anonymous Chronicler's equivalents of the description of the destruction of the temple of Aphrodite in Apamea (Socr. HE I 18.10). In this case, we have another Syriac witness, Chron. Zuqn., which agrees with Chron. 1234 in its disagreements with the Greek text.

Socr. HE I 18.10 <sup>13</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 150.10-2T <sup>14</sup>	Chron. Zuqn. a. 617 (vol. 1, 162.12-5T, <sup>15</sup> 121.26-8V)
In an identical way, destroying the temple of Aphrodite in Aphaka of Lebanon, he put an end to the practices of unmentionable vices (ἀρρητοποιίας) that were freely being committed.	He pulled down the pagan temples that were there, and the temple of Aphrodite that stood in Lebanon; and he smashed the stinking plates of food (ܩܘܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ) that were there.	At that time, he pulled down the temple for Aphrodite that was in Aphaka of Lebanon. He smashed the stinking plates of food (ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ) that were there, these that were called hallelujahs.

Both Syriac texts refer to the smashing of “stinking plates” of food, whereas the Greek text simply mentions Constantine’s abolition of “unmentionable vices.” This discrepancy between the Greek and the Syriac may reflect an error in the Syriac Socrates [perhaps a misinterpretation of ἀρρητοποιίας as composed of ἄριστον (breakfast or lunch) and πίναξ (plate)?<sup>16</sup>], but unfortunately Vat syr. 145 does not

<sup>12</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 7 (148T; vol. 1: 292V; Ibrahim 2009, 151): After the death of Jovian, the Romans came to the city of Nicaea and made reign that Valentinian who had struck the priest who had sprinkled him with his impurity.”

<sup>13</sup> παραπλησίω δὲ τρόπῳ καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀφάκοις τοῦ Λιβάνου ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης καθελὼν τὰς ἐκεῖ γιγνομένας ἀνέδην ἀρρητοποιίας ἐξέκοψεν.

<sup>14</sup> \*ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ

<sup>15</sup> ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܡܳܠܳܝܳܢܳܘܳܬܳܐ ܩܘܳܝܳܥܳܐ ܩܘܳܛܳܘܳܣܳܘܳܬܳܐ

<sup>16</sup> I am thankful to prof. dr. Peter van Nuffelen for pointing this possibility out to me.

contain a translation of this particular chapter.<sup>17</sup> Alternatively, an agreement between Chron. Zuqn. and Chron. 1234 against the testimony of the Greek may suggest a common reliance of the Syriac chroniclers on John of Ephesus.

More generally, moving away from the issue of translation, one may note Chron. 1234's omission of Socrates' source references. Particularly striking are two references to Rufinus of Aquileia which are omitted in Chron. 1234, but not by Michael.<sup>18</sup> Clearly, the identity of the original source was not relevant for the Syriac chronicler (or he considered it not relevant for his readers), possibly because he did not know him or his work.

Similarly noteworthy is the Anonymous Chronicler's lack of interest in the consular dates that were often provided by Socrates. In one example, a passage on the death of Constantius II, Chron. 1234 offers a fairly literal translation of the Greek and the date as 3 November, but has omitted the reference to the consuls Taurus and Florentius.

Socr. HE III 1.1 <sup>19</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 160.11-3T <sup>20</sup>
Emperor Constantine ended life on the frontier of Cilicia on the third of the month November during the consulate of Taurus and Florentius.	Then emperor Constantine ended his life on the frontier of Cilicia on the third of Teshrin II.

Another example confirms that omissions of the consular dating can be attributed to the Anonymous Chronicler and not an intermediate source. Theodosius I's victory over the rebels Arbogast and Eugene is dated by Socrates (HE V 25.16) to 6 September under the third consulate of Arcadius and the second of Honorius. Chron. 1234 omits these

<sup>17</sup> Assemani – Assemani, 1756-1759, vol. 3, 255-8.

<sup>18</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 145.29-147.24T [= Socr. HE I 19]; Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 147.25-149.29T [= Socr. HE I 20]. Comp. Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 3 (129T; vol. 1: 260V) [= Socr. HE I 15], VII 6 (145T; vol. 1: 288V) [= Socr. HE III 19].

<sup>19</sup> Ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς Κωνστάντιος ἐν μεθορίοις τῆς Κιλικίας περὶ τρίτην τοῦ Νοεμβρίου μηνὸς ὑπατεύοντων Ταύρου καὶ Φλωρεντίου ἐτελέυτα τὸν βίον.

<sup>20</sup> .,יזק פיעהי קהלה : ,מאטו על רמממי רמממם פפמם רממם רממם

dates entirely (not even supplying it with a Seleucid dating), but they are preserved by Michael.<sup>21</sup>

This tendency to omit irrelevant dating methods also applies to that of the Olympiads. The Roman army’s proclamation of Constantine I as emperor in Britain was originally dated by Socrates to “the first year of the 271<sup>st</sup> Olympiad, on the twenty-fifth of the month of July” (Socr. HE I 2.1), but in the equivalent in Chron. 1234, this date has been supplanted with the Seleucid dating.

Socr. HE I 2.1 (2.2-5) <sup>22</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 138.28 – 139.5T <sup>23</sup>
In Britain, however, Constantine was proclaimed emperor, instead of his father Constantius, who died in the first year of 271 <sup>st</sup> Olympiad, on the twenty-fifth of the month of July.	In AG 619 [= AD 307-8], the believing emperor Constan[tine] reigned, when Constan[tine] was proclaimed emperor in the land of Britannia, instead of his old father Constan[tius] who had died in all his manners of life (and) who converted to the cult of God through bishop Sylvester of Rome.

This case is similar to that of an entry from the *Chronicle* of Andronicus pertaining to the amount of time between the reign of Uzziah and the Exodus,<sup>24</sup> but it must be acknowledged that this entry on Constantine could have reached the Anonymous Chronicler via an intermediary and that the reference to the Olympiad had already been lost before the material came to him.<sup>25</sup>

Even though the Anonymous Chronicler often abbreviated Socrates and deleted dates and source references, Socrates’ first person standpoint was often kept.<sup>26</sup> In the introduction to his discussion of Julian’s reign, which was copied from Socr. HE III 1.3-5,

<sup>21</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 9 (162T; vol. 1: 322V).

<sup>22</sup> κατὰ δὲ τὰς Βρεττανίας Κωνσταντῖνος ἀνηγορευθὴ βασιλεὺς εἰς τόπον Κωνσταντίου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, τεθνηκότος τῷ πρώτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς διακοσιοστῆς ἑβδομηκοστῆς πρώτης ὀλυμπιάδος, τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ Ἰουλίου μηνός.

<sup>23</sup> Ἰωάννου βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντῖνος ἀνηγορευθὴ βασιλεὺς εἰς τόπον Κωνσταντίου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, τεθνηκότος τῷ πρώτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς διακοσιοστῆς ἑβδομηκοστῆς πρώτης ὀλυμπιάδος, τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ Ἰουλίου μηνός.

<sup>24</sup> On which, see the chapter on Andronicus in this volume.

<sup>25</sup> Even Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 10 (121T; vol. 1: 205V) only preserves the date “25 July”.

<sup>26</sup> Chron. Zuqn. does the same, see Witakowski 1987, 132, n. 50.





first passage is entitled “on the brothers of Constantine” rather than “on the genealogy of Julian” and included among materials from Socrates’ first book pertaining to the reign of Constantine I himself. Evidence that the Anonymous Chronicler was not responsible for this first, less literal, passage is provided by Michael, who preserves a similar version of Socr. HE III 1.6-7, including an identical misspelling of Gallus’ name as “Gallius”. In Michael’s account Socrates’ apposition “who called Byzantium after his own name” is replaced by “who built Constantinople.”<sup>33</sup>

Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 5 (141T; vol. 1: 278V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 145.7-12T
Constantine the victorious, who built Constantinople, had two brothers from (the same) father: [D]almatius and Const(antius). And Dalmatius called his son after his name. Constantius had two sons: Gallius (جاليوس) and Julian.	<u>On the brothers of Constantine</u> So, the emperor had two brothers. So, one was called Dalmatius, and he had a son who was called Dalmatius in his name; the other brother was called Constanti(u)s, and he had two sons, the name of the first was Gallius (جاليوس) and the name of the other was Julian.

A similar situation occurs in the case of entries on Julian’s release from prison after his brother Gallus’ death (Socr. HE III 1.22-4).

---

<sup>33</sup> This suggests that Theod. Lect. may not have been the intermediary. In the fragment from the Epitome [Theod. Lect. Epit. 118 (56.2-4)], Constantine is simply identified as “the Great” and there is no mention of his refounding of Constantinople. It is possible, however, that this apposition was added by the author of the epitome, not Theod. Lect. himself.



This entry likely came from the same Syriac source as the (first) entry on the genealogy of Gallus and Julian, but its identity remains unknown. Given the subject matter and the fact that this source was used by Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler the most likely sources are either John of Ephesus or Ignatius of Melitene. Considering the scribal error of Gallius-Gallus, I would prefer the latter author because he was much later in time, but this remains conjecture.

Equally uncertain is the origin of an earlier entry on Constantine's appointment<sup>37</sup> of his sons as Caesars, which was based on Socrates (HE I 39.12-3), but which also appears in Chron. Zuqn.,<sup>38</sup> Agapius' *Chronicle*<sup>39</sup> and Michael.<sup>40</sup> In this case, however, given the testimony of Chron. Zuqn., the involvement of John of Ephesus seems plausible, but Agapius would have then had to have found this material in another source.

Another interesting case is that of a paraphrase of Socrates' (HE IV 1) description of the accession of Valentinian I and Valens.

Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 7 (148T; vol. 1: 292V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 167.10-27T
<p><u>After the death of Jovian, the Romans came to the city of Nicaea</u> and made reign that Valentinian who had struck the priest who had sprinkled him with his impurity. <u>Valentinian was from the land of Pannonia (ܩܢܘܢܝܐ), from the city of Cibalae (ܩܒܐܠܐܝܐ), very powerful</u> and wise, so that, when the armies wanted to make him associate in the empire, he said to them: 'It belongs to you. When you don't have an emperor, you must choose for yourselves. When, you have appointed me leader, however, it is up to me to direct the affairs of the empire. And all admired his wisdom and adhered to his wishes.'</p>	<p><u>After Jovian had died in the Bithynian city of Nicaea (sic!), the Romans</u> proposed an emperor for themselves, <u>Valentinian who was of Pannonian stock from the city of Cibalae (ܩܒܐܠܐܝܐ ܩܢܘܢܝܐ)</u> a <u>powerful</u> man, because Jovian had no sons.</p> <p>(...<sup>41</sup>)</p>

<sup>37</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 153.7-14T.

<sup>38</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 642 (vol. 1, 169.21-170.2T, 126.23-9V).

<sup>39</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 108.

<sup>40</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 3 (130T; vol. 1: 257V).

<sup>41</sup> Between this material, the Anonymous Chronicler includes a short note about the existence of an Augustus for the Eastern and Western Roman empire.

<p>Then, he let bring his brother Valens and associated him into the empire, appointing him emperor of the Eastern part. Having been baptised by Eudoxius of Constantinople, who made him swear to uphold the doctrine of Arius, he favoured the Arians in every way and persecuted <u>the orthodox</u>.</p>	<p>For this reason, Valentinian associated his brother Valens, who had been baptised by the Arian bishop Eudoxius, with him. This man inflicted much evil against <u>the orthodox</u>.</p>
--	--

Both Michael and Chron. 1234 describe Valentinian as “powerful,” an adjective that was used by neither Socrates, Theodoret nor Sozomen, indicating that the Syriac sources might rely on the same intermediary. In both cases Socrates’ reference to the soldiers (οἱ στρατιῶται) is replaced by the generic term “the Romans.” Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler also emphasise that Valens “persecuted” or “inflicted much evil against the orthodox.” There are, however, also some striking differences between the two accounts. The Anonymous Chronicler erroneously claims that Jovian died in Nicaea. More importantly, however, Michael’s narrative contains material from Sozomen and/or Theodoret not extant in Chron. 1234. Whereas the phrase that the Romans “came to the city of Nicaea” and the reference to Valentinian’s ethnic background clearly show the influence of Socrates, Michael refers to the episode of Valentinian’s encounter with the priest, a story told by both Sozomen (HE VI 6) and Theodoret (HE III 12); the latter’s account was also copied in full by Michael.<sup>42</sup> Michael also adds Valentinian’s speech to the army, only preserved by Sozomen (HE VI 6). Furthermore, Michael says that Valentinian “let bring” Valens to him to make him emperor, a word only used by Theodoret (HE IV 6.3), where Socrates and Sozomen (and Theodore Lector<sup>43</sup>) say that Valentinian went to Constantinople. Lastly, Michael’s statement that Eudoxius “made (Valens) swear to uphold the doctrine of Arius, he favoured the Arians in every way,” also resembles Sozomen’s account (HE VI 6) quite closely. Given that Sozomen was never translated into Syriac and Michael did not know Greek, this paraphrase must have come to Michael via an intermediary. The discrepancies between

<sup>42</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 5 (144T; vol. 1: 287V).

<sup>43</sup> Theod. Lect. 158 (63.1-2).

Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's accounts, i.e. the fact that none of this information from Sozomen and Theodoret is extant in Chron. 1234, suggests that the Anonymous Chronicler did not have access to this information and that Michael himself integrated this additional information into a paraphrase of Socrates. Where Michael found this information cannot be ascertained.

Much more straightforward is a paraphrase of Socrates' description of how Valens commanded to murder all men whose name started with a *theta*. Michael and Chron. 1234 preserve the same paraphrase of Socrates' account (HE IV 19), which is rather different from Sozomenus' (HE VI 35.2-6) version of these matters, and Theodore Lector's paraphrase<sup>44</sup> thereof, which was copied by Theophanes.<sup>45</sup>

Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 7 (151T; vol. 1: 293V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 168.11-4T
Valens received an oracle from demons that someone whose name began with the letter theta, i.e. tau, would reign after him and (therefore) he ordered that everyone called Theodotus, Theodore and the like should be killed.	Valens received an oracle that a man would reign, the first letter of whose name was a theta. For this reason, he killed many, the first letters of whose name started with a tau.

Both Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler state that Valens "received an oracle." Though they use a different verb, their reliance on a common source is highly likely. Michael's mention of "demons" and "Theodore" can only point to the influence of Socrates.

In the end, only one passage in Michael and Chron. 1234, which comments on the genealogical relation between Constantine and Julian can be attributed to a common source (different from the Syriac translation of Socrates) with near absolute certainty. Unfortunately, this source cannot be unidentified.

<sup>44</sup> Theod. Lect. 209 (73.20-2): Πολλοὺς Οὐάλης ἐφόνευσε διὰ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν μαντειῶν ὑπονοηθέντας βασιλεύειν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θ γράμματος, καὶ πρὸ πάντων τινὰ Θεόδωρον τὸν ἐν πατρικίοις πρῶτον.

<sup>45</sup> Theophan. Chron. AM 5867 (ed. 62.14-6; trans. 95-6): "Valens put to death many people whose name began with the letter 'theta', whom as a result of divination he suspected of being destined to reign. Among these was a certain Theodore, first among the patricians."

## 10.3 Socrates and the Ecclesiastical Part

To conclude this chapter, some words must be devoted to Socrates' possible influence on the Ecclesiastical Part of Chron. 1234. This section of Chron. 1234 is now lost, but the chronicler's own remarks reveal which chapters from Socrates might have been used. Unfortunately, in most of these cases, Socrates can only be identified as one possible ultimate source: in the end the involvement of one or more intermediaries (especially Theodore Lector and/or John of Ephesus) is perfectly plausible.

Indicated by his remark at the end of his discussion of the reign of Constantine I, the chronicler – not surprisingly – focussed on Arius, Athanasius and the council of Nicaea of 325:

*In his days, the impious heresy of Arius appeared. And in the days of this emperor, in diligence of his faith, 318 fathers were gathered in the city of Nicaea and they put right all ecclesiastical matters. And in his days, the holy fathers Callisthenes (or Caelestinus, ܟܠܝܨܬܝܢܘܨ; in fact Sylvester) of Rome and Athanasius of Alexandria were renowned. And on all these we have abundantly written among the ecclesiastical matters according to the disposition of our weak strength in the book of ecclesiastical matters that we have made. He who wants to learn (about it) should read (it) there.<sup>46</sup>*

For this information, he may have consulted Socrates (HE I 5-9). Similarly, at the end of his discussion of Constantius II's reign the Anonymous Chronicler adds:

*At that time were known in the Church: the excellent confessor Athanasius of Alexandria, Meletius of Antioch, Basil of Cappadocia, Gregory the Theologian (ܟܠܝܨܬܝܢܘܨ) and Mar Ephrem on the Edessene mountain. And also the helpers of evil and heresiarchs, Mani, who went to the East, Marcion, Diodorus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius and Bardaiṣan. Behold, we wrote everything about them in the book of ecclesiastical matters that we have made.<sup>47</sup>*

---

<sup>46</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 152.22-31T.

<sup>47</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.18-26T.

From the reference to Meletius could be inferred that the Anonymous Chronicler used Socrates (HE II 44). However, Michael also mentions Meletius, Basil and Gregory in one breath, in an equally brief entry, which suggests the involvement of another source:<sup>48</sup>

“At that time Meletius returned from exile. He ordained Basil the Great, of Caesarea of Cappadocia. Many are the elegies on his virtues. His miracles are known by the memrē that Gregory the Theologian (ܩܪܝܫܬܘܣܐ ܩܘܪܝܢܐܢܘܣܐ) and other saints devoted to him.”

Given the brief nature of these entries in both chronographies, this common source may have been a chronicle. Socrates could, however, have been the Anonymous Chronicler’s source on Mani, as he devoted an entire chapter to this heresiarch (Socr. HE I 22).

Among information on the reign of Julian in Chron. 1234 appears the following remark:

At that time Mar Joannes (ܝܘܗܢܢܐ) was ordained for the imperial city. At this time the monastic fathers flourished in the desert of Scetis (ܫܥܬܝܫ) and in Egypt: Paul the monk, Aba Macarius and as many as there are stars in the skies. Also in the days of this emperor, the heresy of Macedonius appeared and a council of 150 (bishops) was gathered and it condemned him in the imperial city. And behold, we have written about all these matters in the book of ecclesiastical matters.<sup>49</sup>

This suggests the influence of Socrates’ fourth, fifth and sixth books, which focus on the Egyptian monastic fathers Paul, Macarius and others (HE IV 23); the proceedings of the first council of Constantinople (V 7-13); the Macedonian heresy (II 45); and the ordination of John Chrysostom (VI 2-3).

Similarly, when referring to “those of the party of Dioscorus of the party of the Arians” in a passage “on the sedition that the monks performed in Alexandria” during the reign of Theodosius I the Anonymous Chronicler adds that he “wrote [about them]

---

<sup>48</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 5 (143T; vol. 1: 285V).

<sup>49</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 170.22-30T.

among the ecclesiastical matters.”<sup>50</sup> Information on the confrontation between Theophilus of Alexandria and the monk Dioscorus and his Arian party may go back to Socrates (HE VI 7-9) as well.

## 10.4 Conclusion

Information from Socrates of Constantinople reached the Anonymous Chronicler via several paths. First and foremost, the Anonymous Chronicler had access to a Syriac translation of the *Ecclesiastical History*, which makes Chron. 1234 an important witness for the reconstruction for this translation, which only survives fragmentarily.

Socrates was also used by other sources of the Anonymous Chronicler which are often difficult to identify. John of Ephesus, whose *Ecclesiastical History* was used by the Anonymous Chronicler may have paraphrased Socrates, but it is not certain if the Anonymous Chronicler used John of Ephesus directly, it may be that Ignatius of Melitene was involved in the transmission of this material.<sup>51</sup> Similarly, we shall also see that Socrates was also used by Theodore Lector (early sixth century), whose *Ecclesiastical History* mostly survives in the form of an Epitome. It was this Epitome from which a late ancient Greek historian extracted information. In turn, this history was used by Theophanes the Confessor (d. 818) and a Syriac historian, again possibly Ignatius.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 177.20-1T.

<sup>51</sup> See chapter 13.

<sup>52</sup> See chapters 18 and 19.



## Chapter 11 Theodoret of Cyrrhus (c. AD 393 – c. 457)

It is difficult to determine if a full Syriac translation of Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History* ever existed. Syriac translations of loose chapters of this text (II 16-17, 30; IV 7, 11, 29; V 13-21) do survive in Vat. Syr. 145, a manuscript of the ninth or tenth century that also contains the most complete translation of Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History* and extracts from PZ. In addition, Syriac fragments from Theodoret are preserved in the *Chronography*<sup>1</sup> of Michael the Syrian and the commentaries<sup>2</sup> on the homilies of Gregory of Nazianze.

Theodoret's influence on Chron. 1234 was very limited. The Anonymous Chronicler never cites Theodoret and is only dependent on him on two occasions for accounts of the encounter<sup>3</sup> between Marcellus of Apamea and the demon (HE V 21) and the destruction<sup>4</sup> of the pagan temples by bishop Theophilus of Alexandria (HE V 22). Curiously however, the Anonymous Chronicler dates these events to the time of Arcadius, whereas Theodoret actually placed them during the reign of Theodosius I. That this misdating goes back to the Anonymous Chronicler's source is proven by the

---

<sup>1</sup> See below.

<sup>2</sup> De Halleux 1985, 103-47; De Halleux 1988b, 222-3; Theod. Cyr. HE III 7.1-4, 20.7-8; IV 2.3-5, 12.3-13, 19.9-11, 14-15, 22.1-6, 26.6-8).

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 171.25-172.2T (§37).

<sup>4</sup> Chron. 1234, I 172.27-173.4T.

testimony of Michael,<sup>5</sup> who records both episodes as well and preserves an identical introduction to the story of Marcellus of Apamea as the Anonymous Chronicler (not from Theodoret) and includes them in the same timeframe, during the reign of Arcadius, after the death of Theodosius I. It is therefore highly likely that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler are dependent on the same (Syriac) intermediate source for this information from Theodoret, rather than a Syriac translation. The identity of this source remains unknown, but other materials, extant in Michael, can perhaps be attributed to this unidentified author. The patriarch also preserves a paraphrase of Theodoret's reference to the snow that God sent against the Huns who had crossed the Danube (from Theod. Cyr. HE V 37.4), in which Theodoret's praise of Theodosius is transferred to Arcadius: Michael expressly says that God sent the snow because of "the prayer of the emperor Arcadius."<sup>6</sup> A similar occurrence appears in Chron. 1234, where the chronicler transposes the piety of Theodosius to Honorius, but in a paraphrase of Socrates (HE VII 22), not Theodoret.<sup>7</sup> Michael, however, paraphrases Socrates differently, retaining his attribution of the positive characteristics to Theodosius,<sup>8</sup> while at the same time, preserving an adaptation of part of the same material elsewhere,<sup>9</sup> perhaps from another source, in which it is said that Theodosius chose to wear a vest, made of hair, (cf. Socr. HE VII 22.15), supposedly "because he loved monastic life" (not in Socrates).

These three paraphrases – especially the first two – almost certainly go back to a single source that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler both used. This source was the intermediary – or at least one of the intermediaries – between Theodoret (and perhaps also Socrates) and the later Syriac chronicle tradition. The identity of this author is difficult to ascertain, but the most likely candidates are John of Ephesus and Ignatius of Melitene. The former's use of Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History* is suggested by

---

<sup>5</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 8 (160-1T; vol. 1: 315-8V).

<sup>6</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 1 (165T; vol. 2: 2V).

<sup>7</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 171.10-19T (§36).

<sup>8</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 2 (170T; vol. 2: 10V).

<sup>9</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 1 (164T; vol. 2: 1V).

a paraphrase of Theodoret's introduction that Michael attributes to John.<sup>10</sup> The latter's use of Theodoret is only suggested by the reference to this author in Ignatius' preface, which is preserved in Michael.<sup>11</sup>

Chron. 1234 does not show any other influences of Theodoret, but Michael is overflowing with it. On the one hand, Michael has copied several paraphrases which are based on Theodoret, some of which may have come via Theodore Lector, but others almost certainly not. On the other hand, his *Chronography* also contains very long narratives from Theodoret, which are fairly literal translations (e.g. Theodoret's introduction,<sup>12</sup> account of the first siege of Nisibis<sup>13</sup> and the conversation<sup>14</sup> between Ambrosius and Theodosius II). I suspect these may have come to him via Ignatius of Melitene, but this cannot be proven until more research has been done on this subject. Theodoret's relation to Michael requires further investigation, which would benefit from a separate study, which is why no more will be said on this subject there.

---

<sup>10</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 1 (122T; vol. 1: 242V), cf. Theod. Cyr. HE I 2, which also appears in a more literal form in Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 1 (121-2T; vol. 1:241V).

<sup>11</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 1 (546T; vol. 3: 115V).

<sup>12</sup> See previous note.

<sup>13</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (134-6T; vol. 1: 266V) = Theod. Cyr. HE II 30. This account in fact relates to the second siege.

<sup>14</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 8 (158-60T; vol. 1: 307-9V) = Theod. Cyr. HE V 18.



## Chapter 12 The *Breviarium* of John Malalas (c. AD 565)

John, born in Antioch, wrote a *breviarium* that covered the period from Creation until roughly the year AD 547. Afterwards, this work was continued at Constantinople until the death of Justinian I in AD 565, possibly by John himself. Neither of these recensions have come down to us, what survives is a Greek abridged version from Creation to AD 563, in cod. Baroccianus 182 of the eleventh century, and a Slavonic version of this second recension. Fragments of Malalas also survive in the works of later Syriac and Greek historians, in the Arabic chronicle of Agapius of Mabbug, and in the Ethiopic translation of the Chronicle of John of Nikiu.<sup>1</sup>

Fragments of Malalas' work survive in the Pre-Constantinian and the Secular Part of Chron. 1234, but, like Michael, the Anonymous Chronicler never had direct access to Malalas: he did not read Greek and Malalas was never fully translated into Syriac. The information from Malalas reached the Anonymous Chronicler via several different paths. On the one hand, Malalas was used as a source for information on the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries by John of Ephesus (see the relevant chapter). Secondly, Malalas furnished the unidentified author of a Syriac chronicle (possibly Andronicus) with precious information on crucial episodes from Greco-Roman mythology, such as the

---

<sup>1</sup> On Malalas, see Jeffreys/Croke/Scott 1990 and Beaucamp/Agusta-Boularot 2004. On Malalas in Syriac, see Witakowski 1990b; Debié 2004. On Malalas' influence on Agap. and Michael (and Chron. 1234) in particular, see Hilken 2013, 296-301.

burial of Zeus on Crete,<sup>2</sup> the Trojan war,<sup>3</sup> the foundation of Rome by Romulus and Remus,<sup>4</sup> and the origin of the name of the month February<sup>5</sup> and of the term Caesarean section.<sup>6</sup> Since this text was used by Agapius, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler, I suspect Andronicus may have been the intermediary between Malalas and the later chroniclers, but more research into this issue is required. As regards the Anonymous Chronicler's reliance on this source, only the entry on Zeus and the beginning of the foundation account of Rome survives in the Pre-Constantinian Part.<sup>7</sup> The discussion of Caesar's birth and the origin of the term Caesarean section may have originally been included by the Anonymous Chronicler, but the relevant part of Chron. 1234 is missing. The account of the Trojan war is not attested in the Pre-Constantinian Part either, because the Anonymous Chronicler preferred a much more extensive and detailed description, which was based on the Epic Cycle.

Thirdly, Malalas may be the source for the traditions in Chron. 1234 that certain Syrian cities that were founded by Seleucus, received their name from his sons or daughters.<sup>8</sup> The description of Laodicea as "a city on the sea shore" is very similar to Malalas' παραλίαν πόλιν, "coastal city".<sup>9</sup> How this information reached the Anonymous Chronicler is difficult to determine, it may have been part of a geographical compendium.

---

<sup>2</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. I 13 (ed. 13-4; trans. 8-9); Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 153-4; Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 7 (34T; vol. 1: 57V).

<sup>3</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. V (ed. 67-116; trans. 45-79); Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 153; Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 7 (33T; vol. 1: 57V).

<sup>4</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. VII 1-7 (ed. 132-8; trans. 91-7); Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 187-93; Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 15 (48-51T; vol. 1: 80-5V).

<sup>5</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. VII 10-13 (ed. 140-3; trans. 97-9); Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 253-5; Mich. Syr. Chron. V 10 (89-90T; vol. 1: 141-3V).

<sup>6</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. IX 1 (ed. 161; trans. 112); Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 253; Mich. Syr. Chron. V 8 (84T; vol. 1: 133V).

<sup>7</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 78.25-8T; 110.3-15T.

<sup>8</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 107T.

<sup>9</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 107.8-9T; Joh. Mal. Brev. VIII 12 (ed. 76-8; trans. 106 [VIII 13]).

# Chapter 13 The *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus (c. AD 507-89)

## 13.1 Introduction

The Anonymous Chronicler mentions “John of Asia” and “John, bishop of Asia,” i.e. John of Ephesus, as a source on several occasions: once<sup>1</sup> in the Secular Part for information on the reigns of the emperors Leo I (457-74) and Leo II (474) and thrice in the Ecclesiastical Part, for the election of Peter IV of Alexandria (567-9),<sup>2</sup> John’s own imprisonment<sup>3</sup> and the letters that John received, imploring him to accept Peter of Callinicum as patriarch of Antioch (581-91).<sup>4</sup> John is also mentioned in other instances as a ‘historical figure,’ as regards his conversion of 23,000 pagans and his role in Justinian’s construction of churches and monasteries.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 185.17T.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 244T, 183V.

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 254T, 191V.

<sup>4</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 257T, 193V.

<sup>5</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 193.18-20T (appointed as leader of the mission by Justinian) and 198.29-31T (construction works and conversion of 23,000 pagans). In the latter passage, John’s first person view (Mich. Syr. Chron. : “by our intervention”) is replaced by a third person (Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 198.29-31T: “by the intervention of bishop John of Asia”).

John, born around 507 in the region of Ingila, north of Amida, was raised from his fifteenth year by the monks of the nearby monastery of Mar John Urtoyo.<sup>6</sup> He was ordained deacon by John of Tella in AG 840/AD 528-9. In his youth, John travelled through Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt and also Asia Minor, visiting Constantinople, to visit friends and famous ascetics. Around 542, John left this fellow monks and became abbot of the Syriac Orthodox monastery of Mar Mara in Sycae, near Constantinople. In 558, John was ordained bishop of Ephesus by Jacob Burd<sup>c</sup>oyo.

John's *Ecclesiastical History*, the only preserved Syriac Orthodox example of its kind, covered the period from the days of Julius Caesar (d. 44 BC) up to the early years of Maurice (588).<sup>7</sup> It was made up of three parts: the First and Second Part, which were published together, roughly discussed the period between Julius Caesar and the death of Theodosius II (450), and from that time until the sixth year of Justin II (571). These parts are only fragmentarily preserved. Excerpts from the Second Part are preserved in BL Add. 14,647 and BL Add. 12,154.<sup>8</sup> Information from the First and Second Part also survives in the works of later historiographers, in particular Chron. Zuqn. and Michael,<sup>9</sup> though in a thoroughly reworked format, because these later authors adapted this material and introduced it into their own framework, writing with different intentions from and at a later time than John. For this reason it is often difficult to determine which information came from John and which from other sources.

The Third Part, divided into six books, was published separately and covered the years 572 until 588. It survives virtually completely in BL Add. 14,640<sup>10</sup> and three chapters of the sixth book are also preserved in Vat. Syr. 145.<sup>11</sup> The Third Part was used by Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler, as well as Elias of Nisibis.

---

<sup>6</sup> For the full biography of Joh. Eph., see Van Ginkel 1995, 27-37.

<sup>7</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 46 and 70.

<sup>8</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 46, n. 4.

<sup>9</sup> Also by Elias of Nisibis, see van Ginkel 1995, 57, n. 76.

<sup>10</sup> Wright 1870-1872, vol. 3, 1061-2 (DCCCCXX); Van Ginkel 1995, 70, n. 4

<sup>11</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 70, n. 5.

The issue of the Anonymous Chronicler's use of John's *Ecclesiastical History* was touched upon by Jan van Ginkel in his study of John's life and works.<sup>12</sup> This chapter will investigate this issue more thoroughly. Because the Third Part was published separately from the First and Second Parts, and because for the Third Part John mostly relied on his own experience rather than written sources, the latter will be discussed separately.

The Anonymous Chronicler extracted material from John's work, perhaps on occasion via an intermediary, in order to create a historiographical work of his own. Like his predecessors, he combined this information with material from other sources. For instance, the Anonymous Chronicler – like Michael – are dependent on PZ for descriptions of two events from the reign of Anastasius – the Persian capture of Amida and the fortification of Dara, suggesting that these late Syriac chroniclers – or their common source – did not consider John's account to be detailed enough.<sup>13</sup>

## 13.2 The First and Second Part

Chron. 1234's reference to John as a source for the reign of Leo I proves that the Second Part of John's work had at least some influence on Chron. 1234. Whether this also applies for the First Part remains to be seen. Because of the lack of primary evidence and the Anonymous Chronicler's layering technique, our ability to determine the extent of the Anonymous Chronicler's use of the First and Second Part not only depends on our ability to attribute material to other sources than John, but more importantly on our chances of identifying John's sources.

There is no apparent trace of John's narrative on the period from Caesar until Theodosius II apart from three entries, pertaining to events relating to Constantine the Great, for which Michael explicitly cites John: on Constantine's and his father

---

<sup>12</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 46-83, esp. 79-83, 237-40.

<sup>13</sup> John's brief narratives on these events are preserved in Chron. Zuqn. a. 814 (vol. 2, 4-5T, 3V) and a. 817 (vol. 2, 6T, 4V) are mostly based on Joh. Mal. Brev. XVI 9-10 (ed. 326-7; trans. 223-4).

Constantius' abandonment of idolatry (suggesting the influence of the Acts of Sylvester), a quotation regarding Arius [an adaptation of Theodoret (HE I 2)] and a discussion of an earthquake that destroyed the cities of Salamis on Cyprus and Neocaesarea Pontus at the end of the reign of Constantine (from the Antiochene continuation of Eusebius' *Chronicle*<sup>14</sup>).<sup>15</sup> Michael also cites John as a source for the following chapters. None of these passages is extant in Chron. 1234, but the Anonymous Chronicler does briefly say that Constantius was converted by Sylvester of Rome, alluding to a certain influence of the Acts of Sylvester.<sup>16</sup>

Since John paraphrased Theodoret,<sup>17</sup> it is likely that he also paraphrased other ecclesiastical writers: Eusebius, Socrates, and perhaps even others.<sup>18</sup> Chron. Mar,<sup>19</sup> Chron. 846,<sup>20</sup> Michael and Chron. 1234 preserve traces of one or more synopses of these ecclesiastical histories. Chron. Mar. and Chron. 846 are dependent on unknown sources, but Michael and Chron. 1234 show a common reliance on the writings of Theodore Lector. Alexander D'yakonov<sup>21</sup> concluded that John of Ephesus was the intermediary between Theodore's synopsis and Michael, though partially on false assumptions, and Jan van Ginkel suggested that John "possibly" adapted Theodore's synopsis of Socrates, Theodoret and Sozomen.

John did not use Theodore Lector. As will be shown in a later chapter, the later Syriac chronicle tradition is not dependent on Theodore directly nor even via the early seventh-century Epitome of Church Histories (Epitome for short), which was written

---

<sup>14</sup> Comp. Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (135T; vol. 1: 271V), Theophan. Chron. AM 5834-5 (ed. 37.14-15, 18-20; trans. 61-2) and Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.236<sup>c</sup> (only Neocaesarea Pontus).

<sup>15</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 49.

<sup>16</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 138.7-8T.

<sup>17</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 1 (122T; vol. 1: 242V) quotes John for a paraphrase of Theod. Cyr. HE I 2 of which a literal translation is also extant in Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 1 (121-2T; vol. 1:241V).

<sup>18</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 52.

<sup>19</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 52, n. 36.

<sup>20</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 52, n. 37.

<sup>21</sup> D'yakonov 1908, 179-202 was written in Russian and thus not accessible to me. But see van Ginkel 1995, 50. Van Ginkel does not specify if D'yakonov discussed the relationship between Theod. Lect. and Chron. 1234.

after John’s death, but via a Greek dependent of the Epitome. Secondly, there is no trace of Theodore’s synopsis in Chron. Zuqn.. Thirdly and lastly, there are traces in Chron. 1234 of two distinct versions of Leo I’s coronation of Leo II, the first from a yet unidentified source who may have relied on Theodore and another from John, who relied on Malalas. Both were immediately copied after the other, with nothing but a title – with a source reference to John – to separate them.

Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 185.11-16T	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 185.17-22T
<p>A son was born to Zeno from the daughter of the emperor Leo and he called him Leo. Emperor Leo the Elder loved this young Leo and designated him autocrator, i.e. ‘king of kings’, when he was alive before he died. And when Leo the Elder had reigned for 18 years, he died.</p>	<p><u>The reign of Leo according to what John of Asia wrote</u>  The emperor Leo made the son of his daughter, a little boy, the son of Zeno, who was also called Leo, he made him Caesar. And (this boy) ruled with him during his life, and he was called Leo the Younger. After one year, Leo the Great died.  And after one year, his mother-in-law deceived him, according to what we have written.</p>

The second account received its own title with special reference to John of Ephesus. The first entry, however, is included under the heading “the reign of the orthodox emperor Leo who started to reign in year 769 (of the Greeks)” after entries on the accession of Leo I after the death of Marcian and the appointment of Zeno as commander in the east. The vocabulary of the two accounts of the coronation of Leo II also differs considerably. In John’s account Leo I is called “Leo the Great (ܠܝܘܐܝܘܒ)²²” and is said to have “made” (ܠܚܒܐ) Leo II “Caesar.” In the first account, however, Leo I is called “Leo the Elder (ܠܝܘܐܝܘܠ)” and is said to have “designated” (ܘܕܝܢܐ) Leo the Younger as “autocrator”. These discrepancies suggest that these two accounts came from two different sources. The second was based on Malalas,²³ which confirms John’s use of Malalas (see below).

The source of the first narrative, however, remains unidentified. He may have been SSEA, the Syriac author who was dependent on the Greek historian (GSEA) that used the

²² Mich. Syr. also calls Leo “the Great”, in the same context, however, Chron. Zuqn. has “the Elder”.

²³ On Joh. Eph.’s use of Joh. Mal., see Witakowski 1990b and van Ginkel 1995, 61-2.

Epitome, because this entry appears under the same heading as the entry on the accession of Leo I, which originated from Theodore/the Epitome/GSEA, as is suggested by the common vocabulary (“Thracian by race and a tribune in rank”).<sup>24</sup>

I would like to suggest here that John made his own synopsis of Socrates and Theodoret (and possibly other church historians).<sup>25</sup> Michael<sup>26</sup> (and perhaps also Chron. 1234<sup>27</sup>) preserve material from such a synopsis and the evidence from Michael cited above proves that John paraphrased Theodoret.

As I have shown in the chapter on Theodoret, the Anonymous Chronicler is also somehow dependent on him via a common intermediate source with Michael<sup>28</sup> for a paraphrase of Theodoret’s story of Marcellus of Apamea and the demon (HE V 21),<sup>29</sup> furnished with an introduction and dated to the reigns of Arcadius and Honorius rather than Theodosius I (Theodoret),<sup>30</sup> and a paraphrase of an account of the destruction of pagan temples by Theophilus of Alexandria (HE V 22).<sup>31</sup> Because Chron. Zuqn. does not

---

<sup>24</sup> Comp. Theod. Lect. 367 (103.19-20) with Theophan. Chron. AM 5950 (ed. 110.19-21; trans. 170); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 1 (241T; vol. 2: 126V); and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 185.7-11T.

<sup>25</sup> See Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 6 (180T; vol. 2: 28V): “Until here, i.e. until this time, wrote Socrates and Theodoret and here end the books of their descriptions. And from here begin the chronicles of John of Asia and of Zachariah Rhetor.”

<sup>26</sup> Death of Constantine: Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 3 (133-4T; vol. 1: 260V) = Socr. HE I 39 + Theod. Cyr. HE I 32.1; Constantius’ treatment of the young Gallus and Julian: Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (136-7T; vol. 1: 267V) = Socr. HE III 1 + Theod. Cyr. HE III 1 (with material from additional sources); death of Constantius: Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (139T; vol. 1: 269V) = Socr. HE II 47 + Theod. Cyr. HE III 1; death of Jovian: Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 6 (147-8T; vol. 1: 290V) = Theod. Cyr. HE IV 5.2 + Socr. HE III 26; council of Constantinople (381): Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 8 (156-161T; vol. 1: 310-320V) = Socr. HE V 7-13 + Theod. Cyr. HE V 7-9.

<sup>27</sup> The first paragraph of Chron. 1234’s account (Chron. 1234, vol. 1, (§32) of Julian’s Persian campaign is a combination of Socr. HE III 21 and Theod. Cyr. HE III 21. Both authors also use an element from Soz. HE VI 1 about Julian’s death.

<sup>28</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 8 (160-1T; vol. 1: 315-7V).

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 171.25-172.2T (§37).

<sup>30</sup> For a similar misdating, see Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 1 (165T; vol. 2: 2V) who preserves the story of the snow that God sent against the Huns who had crossed the Danube (Theod. Cyr. HE V 37.4), but attributes this event to the piety of Arcadius rather than Theodosius.

<sup>31</sup> Chron. 1234, I 172.27-173.4T and Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 8 (161T; vol. 1: 317-8V).

contain these excerpts, it is impossible to determine whether John was the intermediary between Theodoret on the one hand and Michael and Chron. 1234 on the other. He is the only Syriac author, apart from Michael and Chron. 1234, whose reliance on Theodoret has so far been proven. However, Michael seems to have found information from Theodoret in at least two different sources: Michael not only preserves paraphrases of Theodoret, and synopsis of Theodoret and Socrates, which may have come from John and on the other hand, but also fairly literal excerpts from Theodoret, including a translation of the introduction, an account of the first siege of Nisibis and the conversation between Ambrosius and Theodosius II.<sup>32</sup> Thus, it is difficult to determine if these two paraphrases of Theodoret in Chron. 1234 come from John or from another intermediary.

Similar conclusions can be drawn as regards Socrates of Constantinople. The Anonymous Chronicler's description of the period between Constantine and Theodosius II is a combination of material from annalistic sources and longer narratives "concentrating especially on the reign of Constantine, Julian and Theodosius."<sup>33</sup> These longer narratives are mostly fairly literal excerpts from Socrates, to whose church history the Anonymous Chronicler had direct access.<sup>34</sup> In addition, Socrates is also paraphrased. Some of these paraphrases of Socrates were probably made by the Anonymous Chronicler himself, others originated from Theodore, but still others were transmitted via one or more unidentified intermediaries to which Michael had access as well (e.g. the entry on the sons of the brothers of Constantine i.e. on the relationship of Gallus and Julian to Constantine; cf. Socr. HE III 1.6-7). Similarly, Chron. Zuqn. and Chron. 1234 share an account of Constantine's destruction of the temple of Aphrodite in Lebanon, taken from Socr. HE I 18.10, including a translation error that may have originated from a common historiographical source rather than the Syriac translation

---

<sup>32</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 8 (158-60T; vol. 1: 307-9V) = Theod. Cyr. HE V 18; Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (134-6T; vol. 1: 266V) = Theod. Cyr. HE II 30. Theod.'s account in fact relates to the second siege.

<sup>33</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 52.

<sup>34</sup> See my chapter on Socrates.

of Socrates. In that case John is the most likely intermediary (see the chapter on Socrates).

As far as the annalistic material is concerned, it is possible that John was the intermediary for some of the entries from (the Antiochene continuation of) Eusebius' *Chronicle*, but the involvement of Ignatius is certain, so John could only have been involved if Ignatius used John.<sup>35</sup>

John's main chronographic source was the *Breviarium* of Malalas.<sup>36</sup> For the period between Caesar and the death of Theodosius II, covered by the First Part, I have been able to isolate merely two parallels between Malalas and Chron. 1234: the first is an account of Constantine's decoration and political and administrative organisation of Constantinople.

Joh. Mal. Brev. XIII 7-8, 10 (ed. 245-8; trans. 173-6)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 144.29-155.6T
<p>(...) He also completed the hippodrome and adorned it with bronze statues and with ornamentation of every kind (πάση ἀρετῇ), and built in it a kathisma, just like the one in Rome, for the emperor to watch the races. (...) He also built a large and beautiful forum, and set up in the middle a marvelous column, all of porphyry. On this column he set up a statue of himself with seven rays on his head. He had this bronze statue brought from where it had stood in Ilion, a city in Phrygia. Constantine took secretly from Rome the wooden statue known as the Palladion and placed it in the forum he built, beneath the column which supported his statue. Some of the people of Byzantion say that it is still there. (...) When he had finished everything he celebrated a race-meeting (...). Constantine continued to reign in Constantinople, removing it from the province of Europa and from its</p>	<p>Statues and many sacred objects (بأشياء مقدسة) were also erected in the city, most of which have been preserved until today. After everything was finished,</p>

<sup>35</sup> On this issue, see the chapter on Ign. Mel.

<sup>36</sup> Witakowski 1990b.

<p>metropolis Heracleia and giving it, from God, imperial status.</p> <p>He appointed there a praetorian prefect and a city prefect and the other great magistrates, selecting only Christians. It remained from that time felicitously an imperial capital.</p>	<p>established his imperial throne and residence</p> <p>and stored all his imperial treasures in it. And he stationed generals and governors in it; and until today it is called the imperial city.</p>
--	---

If this passage is indeed an adaptation of Malalas' narrative, it was almost certainly transmitted via John, in which case we have here the first evidence of the influence of the First Part of John's church history on Chron. 1234.

The second passage is quite brief and simply commemorates Theodosius' foundation of Resh ʿAyna. Though, this is quite a normal entry for Syriac historiographical sources – the chronicle of Edessa, Jacob of Edessa and Michael also commemorate this event<sup>37</sup> –, Chron. 1234 is the only Syriac witness that provides Resh ʿAyna's Greek name: Theodosiupolis. This suggests the involvement of Malalas<sup>38</sup> who provided the Syriac and the Greek name, and thus the involvement of John, rather than Jacob, on whom Michael seems to have relied.

Chron. 1234 definitely has passages that go back to the Second Part, which covered the period from the death of Theodosius (AD 450) until the sixth year of Justin II (AD 571). As we have seen, John is cited for information on the reigns of Leo I and Leo II, information that partially goes back to Malalas, as we have said, and this information is also extant in Chron. Zuqn. and Michael.<sup>39</sup> A comparison with the other Syriac witnesses shows that John expanded on Malalas' narrative, probably adding Ariadne's speech to her son and the expression that Zeno "was seen as" governor or regent of the empire.<sup>40</sup>

The conclusion that John used Malalas allows us to assume the involvement of John in the transmission of other entries in Chron. 1234, but only one of these, which

<sup>37</sup> Chron. Ed. a. 692 (§35); Jac. Ed. Chron. a. 57 (AG 693); Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 8 (155T; vol. 1: 309V).

<sup>38</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. XIII 38 (ed. 267.83-5; trans. 187 [XIII 39]).

<sup>39</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. XIV 46-7 (ed. 299-300; trans. 208); Chron. Zuqn. a. 786-9 (vol. 1, 228.20-229; Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 4-5 (249-50T; vol. 2: 141, 3V); Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 185.17-29T.

<sup>40</sup> Witakowski 1993, 309 translates ܠܘܕܝܢܐ with "became."

concerns the fifth earthquake in Antioch, is also attested in Chron. Zuqn.,<sup>41</sup> Michael<sup>42</sup> and Elias of Nisibis,<sup>43</sup> and has verbal agreements with Malalas' account.

Joh. Mal Brev. XVII 16-7 (ed. 346.92-348.52; trans. 238-40)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 194.13-7T
<p><u>In the seventh year of his reign</u>, in the month of May, <u>Antioch</u> the Great <u>suffered its fifth calamity</u> from the wrath of God, during the consulship of Olybrius. (...) As a result Antioch became desolate, for nothing remained apart from some buildings beside the mountain. <u>No</u> holy chapel nor monastery nor any other holy place <u>remained which had not been torn apart</u>. (...) Many of those who had been buried by earth survived to be brought up alive but then died.</p>	<p><u>In year 7 of emperor Justinian</u>, <u>Antioch</u> was overthrown (by) <u>a fifth ruin</u> and so (this) ruin was grave and terrible, according to those who survived the earthquake, that they died of fear; and <u>no</u> church or building <u>remained which had not been disrupted</u>, and in this manner the city perished.</p>

Four other entries, which are not extant in Chron. Zuqn., are also based on Malalas' narrative and therefore likely originated from John as well. These are the Samaritan rebellion that occurred during the reign of Zeno;<sup>44</sup> a flood that occurred in Edessa in AG 832/AD 520-1 during the reign of Justin I;<sup>45</sup> the conviction of Chalcedonian bishops as sodomites during the reign of Justinian I;<sup>46</sup> and an entry on the Persian king Kavad's

<sup>41</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 837 (vol. 2, 47-52V; 34-38V): year 7 of Justinian.

<sup>42</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 16 (272-3T; vol. 2: 181-3V): year 9 of Justin, AG 840, year 7 of Euphrosius' "impiety."

<sup>43</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron. a. 841 (vol. 1, 119.4-6T, 57.17-21V).

<sup>44</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. XV 8 (ed. 305-6; trans. 212); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 6 (253-4T; vol. 2: 148-9V); Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 186T, 147V.

<sup>45</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 12 (265T; vol. 2: 169V); El. Nis. Op. Chron. a. 836 (vol. 1, 119.1-3T, 57.6-9V). The testimonies of Joh. Mal. Brev. XVII 15 (ed. 345.71-91; trans. 237) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 191.6-12T were overlooked by van Ginkel 1995, Appendix B.

<sup>46</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. XVIII 18 (ed. 364-5; trans. 253); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 26 (296T; vol. 2: 221V); Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 191.24-192.2T.

persecution of the Manicheans to which John added the information that Khusro was educated by Manicheans.<sup>47</sup>

The origin of the remainder of the material that the Anonymous Chronicler used to is less certain. Several events from the reign of Justinian, for which Elias cites “John the Jacobite,” are also mentioned in Chron. 1234: a famine and three plagues that occurred in Amida<sup>48</sup> and a comet that appeared at the time of the death of Justinian.<sup>49</sup> The latter two were originally part of the same entry, as is demonstrated by the testimony of Chron. Zuqn., Elias and Michael. The accounts of the famine and the plagues in Amida in Michael and Chron. 1234 are equally brief and very similar, contrasting with Chron. Zuqn.’s, which suggests that the former two authors may have accessed John’s testimony through an intermediary.

Some of the events covered by the dependants of John are also featured in Malalas’ *Breviarum*, but often there are no verbal agreements between the accounts, so we cannot be completely certain about the origin of these entries. In the case of Chron. 1234’s and Malalas’ accounts of the sixth earthquake that destroyed Antioch,<sup>50</sup> however, the fact that it is also described by Chron. Zuqn. and Michael suggests that it originated from the Second Part.

The remaining information in Chron. 1234 for the period covered by the First and Second Part can be placed in two groups. The first group consists of those entries that are only extant in Chron. Zuqn., Michael and Chron. 1234. If the additional testimony of Chron. Zuqn. is close to that of Michael and Chron. 1234, then the involvement of John is to be expected. Accounts of the flooding of Claudia and the Lent controversy are also attested in the *Chronography* of Elias of Nisibis, the former with the same date as in the

---

<sup>47</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 21 (278-9T; vol. 2: 190-1V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 193-4T. Comp. Joh. Mal. Brev. XVIII 30 (ed. 371-2; trans. 258-9).

<sup>48</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 858 (vol. 2, 112-5T, 84-6V); a. 871 (vol. 2, 115-9T, 86-9V); II, 119T, 89-90V; El. Nis. Op. Chron. a. 871 (vol. 1, 121.24-122.2T, 59.11-5V); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 32 (322-3T; vol. 2: 267-8V).

<sup>49</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 885 (vol. 2, 144-5T; 107-8V); El. Nis. Op. Chron. a. 877 (vol. 1, 122.3-7T, 59.16-9V); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 33 (325T; vol. 2: 271V): year 39 of Justinian; Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 199.13-17T, 200.28-201.2T.

<sup>50</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 194.17-195.3T; Joh. Mal. Brev. XVIII 27 (ed. 369-70; trans., 256-7); Chron. Zuqn. a. 851 (vol. 2, 72-5T, 54-6V); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 21 (279T; vol. 2: 193-4V): year 2 (= year 10?) of Justinian.

other Syriac witnesses, which is also an indicator of an origin in the Second Part. The location of the events in question is on occasion also a good indicator of John's involvement, for instance in the case of the discussion of the pagans at Constantinople.<sup>51</sup> Curiously, some accounts of these events in Michael and Chron. 1234 are similar, yet entirely different from Chron. Zuqn.'s, which again suggests that Michael and Chron. 1234 may have had access to materials from the Second Part via a common intermediate source or may have even relied on another source than John altogether.

A second group of materials consists of passages, which pertain to the period between the reign of Marcian and year 6 of Justin II and which are only extant in Michael and Chron. 1234. I have provided a catalogue of these entries below, based on the catalogue provided by van Ginkel, but with the addition of several entries that have previously been overlooked.<sup>52</sup>

#### Reign of Marcian (450-7)

- (1) negative description of Marcian and length of his reign,<sup>53</sup>
- (2) Pulcheria and Eudocia (Chron. 1234: Pulcheria and Marcian) in Rome and meet Pope Leo,<sup>54</sup>
- (3) description of patriarch Eutyches and the Eutychian heresy,<sup>55</sup>

#### Reign of Anastasius (491-518)

- (4) Persian siege of Edessa,<sup>56</sup>
- (5) rebellion of the Armenians,<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Chron. Zuqn., vol. 2, 76-7T, 57-8V (year 10 of Justinian) and Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 24 (287-8T; vol. 2: 207-8V), IX 33 (324-5T; vol. 2: 271V).

<sup>52</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, Appendix B.

<sup>53</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 183.5-7, 185.4T; Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 9 (184T; vol. 2: 36V)

<sup>54</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 183T; Mich. Syr.; Chron. VIII 8 (183-4T; vol. 2: 35V).

<sup>55</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 183-4T; Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 5 (176-7T; vol. 2: 22-3V).

<sup>56</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 190.8-10T; Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 8 (259-60T; vol. 2: 160V).

## Reign of Zeno (474-91)

(6) Basiliscus supports Monophysism,<sup>58</sup>

## Reign of Justinian I (527-65)

(7) end of persecution of the orthodox,<sup>59</sup>

(8) Hareth bar Gabala rejects Chalcedonian patriarch Ephrem's conversion attempt,<sup>60</sup>

(9) John's baptism of 23,000 pagans in Asia,<sup>61</sup>

(10) Justinian builds many churches, monasteries and *xenodokia*,<sup>62</sup>

(11) Elisha the cannibal,<sup>63</sup>

(12) the death of Theodora,<sup>64</sup>

(13) al-Mundhir ravages Roman territory and is killed by Harith Ibn Gabala,<sup>65</sup>

(14) Khusro pillages the region of Callinicum and Beit Balas; takes bones of Mar Bacchus and the golden inlay of the sarcophagus of Mar Sergius,<sup>66</sup>

(15) list of heresies during the reign of Justinian,<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 190T (§52); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 11 (264T; vol. 2: 167V); see also Chron. 724 a. 824 (150T; 115.31-2V).

<sup>58</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 186.6-9T (§49); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 5 (251T; vol. 2: 143-4V).

<sup>59</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 191.4-6T; Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 21 (277-80T; vol. 2: 192-5V).

<sup>60</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 255-6T, 192V (§32); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 29 (310-1T; vol. 2: 246-8V).

<sup>61</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 198.29-31T; Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 33 (323-4T; vol. 2 : 271V).

<sup>62</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 198.24-9T; Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 33 (323-4T; vol. 2: 269-70V).

<sup>63</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 195.4-197.2T (§60): AG 853; Mich. Syr. Chron. XI 11 (429-33T; vol. 2: 446-9V): around AG 966.

<sup>64</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 200.25-6T (§63) [year 20 of Justinian = AG 860]; Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 29 (310T; vol. 2: 243V) [AG 859] and the fragment from JE II (Chron. Zuqn., vol. 2, 410-1T; 328-9V), which dates the death of Theodore to AG 858.

<sup>65</sup> Twice in Chron. 1234 in slightly different recensions: Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 192.24-8T (AG 853) and 200.15-20T (year 27 of Justinian); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 33 (289T; vol. 2: 323-4V);

<sup>66</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 193.6-10T; Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 26 (296T; vol. 2: 220V): AG 854, year 15 of Justinian.

<sup>67</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 242T, 182V (§30); II, 128-9T, 194-5V ([b]); Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 30 (312-9T; vol. 2: 248-62V). Comp. Mich. Syr. Chron. X 21 (379-82T; vol. 2: 360-4V).

## Reign of Justin II (565-78)

(16) Justin II's accession,<sup>68</sup>

(17) *katadromos*,<sup>69</sup>

(18) comet, earthquake, ash-rain,<sup>70</sup>

(19) attempt at unification of the Church; debate with Tritheists in Constantinople,<sup>71</sup>

(20) controversy between patriarch Paul of Antioch and the Alexandrines.<sup>72</sup>

It is unlikely that all of this information came from only one source. Furthermore, in two cases, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler place narratives in entirely different contexts, suggesting that they may have had access to them via different intermediaries. The Anonymous Chronicler<sup>73</sup> situates the story of Elisha the cannibal (12) during the plague in the time of Justinian I, and specifically dates it to AG 853/AD 540-1). Michael, however, places the story of Elisha the cannibal (11) around the time of the naval battle of Phoenix (AD 655), without explicitly dating it, among two other examples<sup>74</sup> of cannibalism that occurred during a plague and a famine. It is possible that the Anonymous Chronicler copied this tale from John, placing it in the correct context, and Michael accessed it through Dionysius, who had moved it to a later time.

A list of heresies from the time of Justinian poses a similar problem. The Anonymous Chronicler mentions Stephen bar Sudayli, Sergius the Armenian (bishop of Edessa) and his brother John, Stephen the Alexandrian sophist under the heading "heretics in the time of Peter, patriarch of Antioch."<sup>75</sup> Immediately, thereafter another heretic from that

---

<sup>68</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 201.3-7T (§64); Mich. Syr. Chron. X 1 (331T; vol. 2: 282V).

<sup>69</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 201.7-15T (§64); Mich. Syr. Chron. X 1 (331-2T; vol. 2 : 283V).

<sup>70</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 201.16-9T (§64); Mich. Syr. Chron. X 1 (332T; vol. 2 : 284V).

<sup>71</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 246-52T, 185-9V (§32-5); Mich. Syr. Chron. X 1 (331-2T; vol. 2 : 282-4V); X 2 (333-6T; vol. 2: 285-90V).

<sup>72</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 242-6T, 182-5V (§31); Mich. Syr. Chron. X 1 (331-2T; vol. 2: 283-4V).

<sup>73</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 195-7T.

<sup>74</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XI 11 (429-33T; vol. 2: 446-9V).

<sup>75</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 128T, 194V.

same time, Zakkai of Edessa, is also mentioned, under his own heading “the story of Zakkai the Edessan.”<sup>76</sup> All of this information appears among material that was taken from Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, after what “Dionysius wrote about Peter,”<sup>77</sup> but the testimony of Michael, who preserves the entire chapter of Dionysius suggests that the latter only mentioned Stephen the sophist.<sup>78</sup> Michael does, however, mention the other heretics as well. In the twenty-third chapter of Michael’s tenth book,<sup>79</sup> he mentions Sergius of Edessa and his brother John, almost as an afterthought, immediately before the entry on Julian’s replacement of Peter as patriarch. Zakkai of Edessa<sup>80</sup> and Stephen bar Sudayli,<sup>81</sup> on the other hand, appear in the thirtieth chapter of the same book in a list of heresies which “arose in the time of Justinian (I).”<sup>82</sup> Michael may therefore be dependent on John of Ephesus here, rather than on Dionysius of Tell- Mahre like the Anonymous Chronicler.<sup>83</sup>

The origin of some of the lemmatic entries is equally uncertain. The involvement of another source is possible. The reference to John’s baptism of 23,000 pagans in Asia for instance, is very brief and only appears in Michael and Chron. 1234, in the former as an afterthought to a longer narrative John’s missionary activities in Asia Minor, which also appears in Chron. Zuqn. but not in Chron. 1234 (though it may have been present in the Ecclesiastical Part).

In the end, the extent of the influence of John’s Second Part on Chron. 1234 is difficult to ascertain. John influenced the Anonymous Chronicler via at least one intermediary, Dionysius of Tell- Mahre, perhaps another for the period before Marcian. None of the other materials (tentatively) attributed by van Ginkel<sup>84</sup> to the Second Part,

---

<sup>76</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 259.20T; 195V.

<sup>77</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 257T, 193V.

<sup>78</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 30 (379-82T; vol. 2: 361-4V).

<sup>79</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 23 (377T; vol. 2: 372-3V).

<sup>80</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 30 (319T; vol. 2: 261V).

<sup>81</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 30 (312-3T; vol. 2: 249-50V).

<sup>82</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 30 (312T; vol. 2: 248V).

<sup>83</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 235, n. 67.

<sup>84</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 57-65.

not even the lists<sup>85</sup> of kings and famous men during the reign of Justinian have counterparts in Chron. 1234. However, some of these such as the lists of patriarchs, may have been used for the now-lost sections of the Ecclesiastical Part. It is clear, however, that John's description of the reign of Anastasius was not sufficient for the Anonymous Chronicler nor for Michael. Both reverted to PZ, possibly via a common source, who described the Persian capture of Amida and the fortification of Dara in a much more extensive way than John.

### 13.3 Third Part

Chron. 1234's dependence on the Third Part of John's *Ecclesiastical History* is evident: the majority of this part of John's work is preserved, Michael is an additional witness and the Anonymous Chronicler cites John as his source (in the Ecclesiastical Part).<sup>86</sup> A comparison with the narratives in Chron. 1234 and the Third Part has shown that Chron. 1234 preserves material from all six books of the Third Part, but not from all their chapters.<sup>87</sup>

Though Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler may have had direct access to the Third Part and paraphrased John's narrative, they were also demonstrably influenced by a later intermediary who used John. Whether this was the same intermediary (or one of the intermediaries) as the one who used the First and Second Part cannot be determined.

Michael's and 1234's version of the speech of Justin II at the inauguration of Tiberius II Constantine in AD 574 is a combination of John's version of this speech (from the Third Part) and information from the Greek historiographical tradition. Parallels for this

---

<sup>85</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 855, §6 (vol. 2, 110-1T, 82-3V). On which, see van Ginkel 1995, 63.

<sup>86</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 244.2T, 183.26V.

<sup>87</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 237-40.

material can only be found in the *History*<sup>88</sup> of Theophylact Simocatta, who was writing during the reign of Heraclius in the 630s, and in the *Chronographia* of Theophanes (d. 818).<sup>89</sup> Michael's and Chron. 1234's common source, therefore, was a Syriac historian who knew Greek and used one of these sources.<sup>90</sup> Van Ginkel has suggested the involvement of Ignatius of Melitene.<sup>91</sup>

In one case, material from the Third Part was used to reconstruct an event that had occurred much earlier. In the twentieth chapter of his sixth book, while commemorating the death of the Persian king Khusro and praising his love of philosophy and religions, John described the circumstances of the creation of the maphrianate by Jacob Burd<sup>c</sup>oyo.<sup>92</sup> After a debate between Ahoudemma, the Syriac Orthodox bishop of Persia, and the Nestorian Catholicos, Khusro is said to have favoured the Orthodox and to have begun a persecution of the Nestorians, which allowed Jacob to create the maphrianate.

Michael<sup>93</sup> preserves a paraphrase of John's narrative, mentioning all these events, but the Anonymous Chronicler, who does mention Khusro's love of books and religions, refuses to admit Khusro's positive attitude towards the Orthodox.<sup>94</sup> He makes no mention of the creation of the maphrianate, not even referring to the Ecclesiastical Part of Chron. 1234 on this occasion, and says that Khusro in fact persecuted all Christians. Though it is possible that both chroniclers independently abbreviated John's narrative, they may have also found this information in an intermediary, a Syriac chronicle, since both paraphrases are extremely brief.

These conclusions regarding Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's dependence on the Third Part via an intermediary should also caution us in using them to

---

<sup>88</sup> Theoph. Sim. Hist. III 11 (ed. 136-7; trans. 89-90).

<sup>89</sup> Theophan. Chron. AM 6070 (ed. 248-9; trans. 368-9).

<sup>90</sup> Cameron 1976, 162.

<sup>91</sup> Van Ginkel 2010, 116-7.

<sup>92</sup> Joh. Eph. III, VI 20 (316-317T; 240-1V).

<sup>93</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 16 (366T; vol. 2: 339V).

<sup>94</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 192.19-24T.

reconstruct some of the last chapters of the Third Part.<sup>95</sup> Their versions may not only have been adapted by Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler, but by an intermediary as well, or may in fact even have come from other sources.

## 13.4 Conclusion

Material from all three parts of the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus survives in Chron. 1234, though more from the Second and the Third than from the First. It cannot be determined if the Anonymous Chronicler accessed any of the three parts directly, but this is probably the case for the Third. At the same time, however, there is also evidence that information from the Third Part was also transmitted to the Anonymous Chronicler via a Syriac historian who was writing between 589 and the latter half of the twelfth century and had access to Greek sources, possibly Ignatius of Melitene.

---

<sup>95</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 82-3.

## Chapter 14 The *Miscellaneous History* of Pseudo-Zachariah (c. AD 568-9)

### 14.1 Introduction

Circa AD 568-9, an anonymous Syriac Orthodox compiler, perhaps a monk from Amida, combined material from historiographical, ecclesiastical, apocalyptic and other sources into one work “at the urging of his superior, hoping thereby to instruct the faithful.”<sup>1</sup> The result of this compiler’s activities has traditionally been called the *Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah* (PZ), but is perhaps better categorised as a *Miscellaneous History*.<sup>2</sup> PZ is mostly based on material from the now lost Greek *Ecclesiastical History* of Zachariah of Mytilene, but the exact relation between these two sources is still unclear. Further sources of PZ include records of church councils, correspondence of bishops and patriarchs, a *Notitia Urbis Romae*, an apocalyptic source and additional historiographical sources, among which at least one chronicle.

The relationship between PZ and Chron. 1234 is difficult to assess, because Chron. 1234 preserves material that is similar, but not identical to that found in the seventh, eighth and tenth books of PZ:

---

<sup>1</sup> Greatrex et al. 2011, 32. On PZ, see also Greatrex 2009.

<sup>2</sup> On the issue of its genre and title, see Greatrex et al. 2011, 33-4.

(1) a description of events from the reign of the emperor Anastasius: the death of the Persian king Peroz in the war against the Huns, his son Kavad's capture of Amida (AD 502-3 AD), and Anastasius' fortification of Dara (cf. PZ VII 3-6);

(2) the accession to the throne of Justin I "from the camp of Myrina" (cf. PZ VIII 1);

(3) a *Notitia Urbis Romae*, a description of Rome and its buildings (cf. PZ X 16).

Two recent studies have attempted to explain these discrepancies by minimalising PZ's influence on Chron. 1234. In 2003, Muriel Debié suggested that the Anonymous Chronicler copied his description of Kavad's siege and capture of Amida not from PZ, but from John of Ephesus who could have been PZ's source.<sup>3</sup> In the introduction to the 2011 annotated English translation of PZ, Chron. 1234's *Notitia Urbis Romae* is said to have been "no doubt based on" a similar list in Michael.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand Chron. 1234 is said to have used PZ's seventh book, which reinforced their belief that a distinct author, perhaps PZ himself, was the author of this book.<sup>5</sup> In this chapter I will briefly reinvestigate these issues and show that both assertions were wrong, that the Anonymous Chronicler was in fact dependent on PZ for the information the events at Amida in 502-3, though perhaps through an intermediary, and that the *Notitia Urbis Romae* came from a source that was also used by Michael, perhaps a geographical compendium.

---

<sup>3</sup> Debié 2003, 616, 618-9.

<sup>4</sup> Greatrex et al. 2011, 419, n. 149.-Michael in fact preserves two lists, but the second was definitely copied from PZ, as it appears in the right context, after an account of the sack of Rome by the Goths in 546, Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 29 (308-10T; vol. 2: 241-3V).

<sup>5</sup> Greatrex et al. 2011, 55, also 57.

## 14.2 Chron. 1234 and PZ X 16

The claim<sup>6</sup> that Chron. 1234's *Notitia Urbis Romae* was based on a similar list, preserved in Michael, has no factual basis. The Anonymous Chronicler did not use this text. However, the assessment that Chron. 1234's catalogue of Roman buildings was not copied from PZ is probably accurate. More likely, the Anonymous Chronicler found this *Notitia* in a Syriac compendium.

When discussing Michael's relationship to the *Notitia* in PZ, the authors of the 2011 volume on PZ argued that Michael used a Syriac compendium that "drew together all sorts of miscellaneous information on the wonders of the cities of the empire"<sup>7</sup> along with other materials such as a *Notitia Urbis Alexandrinae*,<sup>8</sup> a discussion of the "relative sizes of the cities of the empire"<sup>9</sup> (in order from greatest to smallest: Rome, Alexandria, Carthage, Ephesus, Nicomedia and Antioch; supposedly based on epigraphic evidence on a "column of Apollo" "in the middle of the *demosion*" in Antioch) and material pertaining to the mythical foundation of Rome by Romulus and Remus, primarily, but not exclusively, drawn from Malalas.<sup>10</sup>

Since the Anonymous Chronicler preserves similar, but not identical, materials to Michael, the same conclusion, that he had access to a Syriac compendium, may be drawn for the former. Apart from a *Notitia Urbis Romae*,<sup>11</sup> which is rather dissimilar<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Greatrex et al. 2011, 419, n. 149.

<sup>7</sup> Greatrex et al. 2011, 420, n. 149.

<sup>8</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. V 3 (71-3T; vol. 1: 113-5V). On this *Notitia*, see Fraser 1951.

<sup>9</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. V 3 (71-2T; vol. 1: 113V). ܠܠܝܪܫܐ should probably be read as Carthage (ܠܠܝܪܫܐ) and not Bartella.

<sup>10</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. contains two different Roman foundation myths: one based on Joh. Mal. Brev. VII 1-7 (ed. 132-8; trans. 91-7), the other on a tradition similar to that preserved in Liv. *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.3-7, which Michael attributes to a certain Qūmūn (Cymon?). He also adds a tradition about the origin of the distribution of 'consular largess' (*hupateia*).

<sup>11</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 110.16- 111.16T.

<sup>12</sup> The order of buildings is rearranged, certain numbers do not match and phrases have been added or changed: the *katholikon churches* are identified as buildings that used to be 'temples', thus, solving the

from PZ's as well as Michael's, Chron. 1234 also contains an account<sup>13</sup> of Romulus' foundation of Rome and some of its traditions (based on Malalas<sup>14</sup>); a discussion<sup>15</sup> of the "relative sizes of the cities of the empire" (also written from the standpoint of Antioch, but this time based on a letter of the emperor Antoninus (Pius?) to the Antiochenes); and even a list of world wonders.<sup>16</sup> Though the materials on the foundation of Rome may not have come from this compendium,<sup>17</sup> the involvement of some such compendium in the transmission of the remainder of the information is likely. Whether Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler used the same compendium is unclear, the discrepancies between them (in the *Notitia Urbis Romae*, the "column of Apollo" vs. the letter of emperor Antoninus) suggest otherwise.

### 14.3 Chron. 1234 and PZ VII 3-6

The relation between Chron. 1234 and PZ's seventh book is controversial. A few years before the contributors to the study and English translation of PZ accepted the Anonymous Chronicler's use of it, Debié questioned PZ's position as a source for the

---

anachronism (Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 110.18-9T), and the replacement of the phrase ܘܢܘܢܘܟܘܢ ܕܐܢܢܘܢܐ, 'give annona', with an originally Greek term, with the Syriac verb ܘܢܘܢܘܟܘܢ, 'to feed' (Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 110.23T).

<sup>13</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 109.15-110.15T.

<sup>14</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. VII 2.

<sup>15</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 111.16-112.3T.

<sup>16</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 112.4-20T.

<sup>17</sup> The information on early Roman history from Malalas and other sources in Michael has virtually literal Arabic counterparts in Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 187-93. The same is true for several other materials such as a description of the Trojan war [Joh. Mal. Brev. V (ed. 67-116; trans. 45-79); Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 153; Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 7 (33T; vol. 1: 57V)] and an entry on the burial of Zeus on Crete [Joh. Mal. Brev. I 13 (ed. 13-4; trans. 8-9); Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 153-4; Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 7 (34T; vol. 1: 57V)], also taken from Malalas and available in Chron. 1234. This suggests that this information came from a Syriac chronicle written between the second half of the sixth and the middle of the tenth century. On this issue and for other examples, see also Hilken 2013, 296-301 and the chapter on Malalas in this volume.



(4) Chron. 1234 claims that “one of the generals of the king” convinced the king to spare the church of the 40 martyrs, whereas PZ<sup>24</sup> actually attributes this action to a Christian king “from the land of Arran”.

(5) Chron. 1234 ignores several episodes that are extant in PZ such as the wounding of Cyrus the governor of Amida; the heroic conduct of Peter during the siege; the story of bishop John of Amida and his prophecy of the fall of the city; Kavad’s vision of Christ and Kavad’s use of Isaac bar Bar<sup>c</sup>ai’s bath.

Even though Chron. 1234’s account of the capture of Amida differs from PZ’s in several respects, it seems more likely that these discrepancies ensued from changes that accompanied the transmission process. Positively portraying the archimandrite and claiming that the Persians did not follow Qutrigo into the city through the secret passageway would identify the archimandrite and Qutrigo as merely naive persons and relieve them from the label of traitors that other authors had assigned to them. The omission of the epithet “of the Urtoyē” and several episodes could have been applied for the sake of brevity. The Christian king from Arran could have been identified as a Persian general because the transmitter might not have been able to identify Arran or was not prepared to identify a Christian king as part of the Persian army.

Furthermore, while there is something to say for the argument that the account of the siege of Amida appears in Chron. 1234 in the general proximity<sup>25</sup> of material from John of Ephesus’ *Ecclesiastical History* (“John of Asia”<sup>26</sup> is cited for the reign of Leo I), the immediate context is that of material from PZ: Peroz’s death in the Persian-Hunnic wars precedes the siege and an account of the refounding of Dara nearly immediately follows it. This last episode can almost certainly be attributed to PZ: Chron. Zuqn., a known dependant of John of Ephesus, describes the refounding of Dara by emphasising the

---

<sup>24</sup> PZ VII 4 (*Hist. Eccl. Zach. Rhet.*, vol. 2, 28.4-7T, 19.4-6V; Greatrex et al. 2011, 240).

<sup>25</sup> Debié 2003, 615-6.

<sup>26</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 185.17T.

walling of the city (ܠܘܢܐ ܕܘܪܐ; “a wall was built”),<sup>27</sup> which reflects Malalas’ description of these events (ἐτείχισε<sup>28</sup>) and thus almost certainly also John’s, whose use of Malalas has already been established.<sup>29</sup> In contrast, Chron. 1234, like PZ and Michael, only focuses on the “construction” of the city and the involvement of bishop Thomas, who is mentioned<sup>30</sup> by Chron. Zuqn., but not implicated in the refounding of Dara.<sup>31</sup>

Regarding the transmission of PZ’s account of the foundation of Dara to Chron. 1234, it is worth noting that it only survived in Chron. 1234 in abbreviated form, very similar to Michael’s, which may suggest that they found this information in a common source that was not PZ. Looking further, we also find similarities in wording between Michael’s and Chron. 1234’s description of the Persian-Hunnic war that do not go back to PZ: their common use of the verb ܠܘܢܐ, “to conquer,”<sup>32</sup> after the reference to the war, and the phrase “(Peroz) was killed”<sup>33</sup> against the wording in PZ VII 3 [(“the Huns) killed (Peroz)

---

<sup>27</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 817 (vol. 2, 6T, 4V), which confirms the conclusion of van Ginkel 1995, 66, that “John (of Ephesus) often stayed close to the text of his sources”, containing “almost verbatim fragments”, is certainly valid for John’s use of Joh. Mal. Brev. Similarly, I suspect that Chron. Zuqn. a. 814 (vol. 2, 4-5T, 3V) preserves John’s complete account of the siege of Amida. It begins in the same fashion as Malalas’ account [Joh. Mal. Brev. XVI 9 (ed. 326-7; trans. 223-4)], but then continues with details that were not known to Malalas: the amount of casualties and the fate of the monks of the monastery of John, information which would have been available to Joh. Eph. There is also no need to assume that Chron. Zuqn. has abbreviated John here, this is probably a *verbatim* copy.

<sup>28</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. XVI 10 (ed. 326-7; trans. 223-4).

<sup>29</sup> See Witakowski 1990b and van Ginkel 1995, 61-3, esp. 66: “Pseudo-Dionysius and Michael the Syrian contain several almost verbatim fragments of John Malalas’ Chronography and John’s own Lives of the Eastern Saints.”

<sup>30</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 816 (vol. 2, 6T, 4V).

<sup>31</sup> For another account of the refounding of Dara, see Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 163 who informs us that Anastasius built the city of Dara in the third year of his reign. The vocabulary of Agap.’s entry suggests that it was not borrowed from Joh. Mal., PZ or Joh. Eph. but from an unidentified source, given its short and annalistic nature, most likely a (Syriac) chronicle, perhaps the same source that furnished Agap. and Mich. Syr. with the entry on the siege of Edessa by Khosrow in year 18 of Justinian [Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 172 and Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 24 (287T; vol. 1: 206V)].

<sup>32</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 186.28: ܠܘܢܐ (“(Peroz) was conquered”) and Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 7 (257T; vol. 2: 155V): ܠܘܢܐ ܕܘܪܐ ܕܘܪܐ ܕܘܪܐ (“the Huns conquered the Persians”).

<sup>33</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 187.1T: ܠܘܢܐ ܕܘܪܐ ܕܘܪܐ; Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 7 (257T; vol. 2: 155V): ܠܘܢܐ ܕܘܪܐ ܕܘܪܐ ܕܘܪܐ ܕܘܪܐ.

and a large portion of his army”<sup>34</sup>]. Furthermore, neither Michael nor the Anonymous Chronicler identifies the Roman leaders in Amida.

It is therefore possible that an intermediary transmitted PZ VII 3-6 in its entirety to Michael and Chron. 1234, which Michael then copied more literally and more fully than the Anonymous Chronicler, who abbreviated the material and omitted several episodes that are preserved in Michael.<sup>35</sup>

The involvement of a common intermediary source is also suggested by the appearance of an entry on an unsuccessful Persian assault on Edessa<sup>36</sup> in both chronographies at the heart of the PZ material between the fall of Amida and the foundation of Dara:

PZ VII 3-6	Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 7-8 (256-61T; vol. 2: 154-62V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1,
VII 3 Peroz dies in a war against the Huns Kavad succeeds Peroz and blames the Romans Kavad’s Armenian campaign  Siege of Amida VII 4 Capture of Amida Riches are stolen and city leaders are killed A Christian king intercedes for the preservation of the Church of the 40 martyrs	Peroz dies in a war against the Huns Kavad succeeds Peroz and blames the Romans Kavad’s Armenian campaign  Siege of Amida  Capture of Amida Riches are stolen and city leaders are killed A Christian king intercedes for the preservation of the Church of the 40 martyrs	Peroz dies in a war against the Huns Kavad succeeds Peroz and blames the Romans Kavad’s Armenian campaign  Siege of Amida  Capture of Amida Riches are stolen A Persian general intercedes for the preservation of the Church of the 40 martyrs

<sup>34</sup> PZ VII 3 (vol. 2, 22.12-3T; Greatrex et al. 2011, 234) : *ساردينوس ملك الروم قتل في الحرب مع الملك كواد*.

<sup>35</sup> Michael’s access to PZ via two different paths (directly as well as via a later intermediary) could also explain some other discrepancies between PZ and Michael, which Greatrex attributed to (Michael’s use of) a fuller – no longer extant – version of PZ.

<sup>36</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 190.8-10T with Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 8 (259-60T; vol. 2: 160V).

<p>Christ appears to Kavad</p> <p>Kavad stations Aglon, two marzbans and 3,000 troops at Amida</p> <p>Romans unsuccessfully besiege Amida</p> <p>VII 5</p> <p>Kavad stations Aglon, two marzbans and 3,000 troops and goes “to his country”</p> <p>Romans besiege Nisibis, but Kavad chases them away</p> <p>Romans besiege Amida ; Gadana kills Aglon; a famine occurs; the Persians leave Amida in peace</p> <p>Thomas becomes bishop of Amida</p> <p>VII 6</p> <p>Anastasius and bishop Thomas build Dara</p>	<p>Christ appears to Kavad</p> <p>Kavad stations Aglon, two marzbans and 3,000 troops at Amida</p> <p>Romans unsuccessfully besiege Nisibis</p> <p><u>Kavad advances towards Edessa, is unable to capture it, pillages the land and returns to Persia, his land</u></p> <p>Romans besiege Amida ; Gadana kills Aglon; a famine occurs; the Persians leave Amida in peace</p> <p>Thomas becomes bishop of Amida</p> <p>Anastasius and bishop Thomas build Dara</p>	<p>Kavad stations a general and 3,000 troops at Amida.</p> <p><u>Kavad advances towards Edessa, is unable to capture it, pillages the land and returns to Nisibis</u></p> <p>Anastasius and bishop Thomas build Dara</p>
--	---	--

Both the *Chronicle of Edessa*<sup>37</sup> and Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite<sup>38</sup> – and interestingly also the Greek chronicler Theophanes<sup>39</sup> – demonstrate knowledge of the siege of Edessa, but

---

<sup>37</sup> Chron. Ed. §81.

<sup>38</sup> PJS (trans. 53-63), preserved in Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 276-81T, 203-6V.

<sup>39</sup> Theophan. Chron. AM 5997 (ed. 147.5ff; trans. 226) inserted this entry into a paraphrase of Jo. Mal’s and Procop.’s accounts of the Persian-Roman struggles of the early sixth century. Although Theophan.’s account has more detail than the Syriac accounts, the fact that he, but not his usual Greek sources, knew this event, could suggest the influence of an ‘eastern source’ here.

their accounts are very different from Michael's and Chron. 1234's. Michael and Chron. 1234, however, are clearly dependent on a common source.

Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 8 (259-60T; vol. 2: 160V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 190.8-10T
And (Kavad) went up and besieged Edessa of Mesopotamia. (But) when he was not able to capture it, he pillaged and burned all the land of Mesopotamia. And he went to Persia, his land.	<u>On Edessa</u> Kavad came to Edessa after he had captured Amida and besieged it. (But) when he was not able to capture it, he pillaged the land, burnt the crops, turned back and came to Nisibis.

Neither Chron. Zuqn. nor Malalas preserves a similar entry, so John of Ephesus is unlikely to be the source of this information. Either Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler share a common source that combined material from PZ with this account of the siege of Edessa, which this unknown author found in another source or both later Syriac chroniclers are in fact dependent on a much more complete version of PZ than the one that has come down to us.<sup>40</sup> One possible intermediary between PZ and Michael/the Anonymous Chronicler is Ignatius of Melitene who mentions Zachariah of Mitylene (= PZ) in his proemium among his historiographical inspirators.<sup>41</sup> If there was a Syriac intermediary between PZ and the later Syriac chronicle tradition, this chronicler may have found the information on the siege of Edessa in a now lost Edessan source.

---

<sup>40</sup> On the transmission of PZ, especially the relation between the extant version and Michael, see Greatrex 2009, 40-2.

<sup>41</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 1 (545-6T; vol. 3: 114-6).

## 14.4 Chron. 1234 and PZ VIII 1

The only evidence for the influence of the eighth book of PZ is the Anonymous Chronicler's indication that Justin I was "an older man of beautiful looks from the camp of Myrina."<sup>42</sup> The testimony of Michael shows that this entry in Chron. 1234 cannot have come from John of Ephesus, because he called Myrina by its Greek name, Bedrinos.<sup>43</sup> It seems unlikely that the Anonymous Chronicler would have only taken this information from PZ's eighth book when PZ VIII 5 provided so much more information about the reigns of Justin and also Anastasius. Most likely an intermediary was responsible for this information as well. Again, Ignatius is a possibility, given his interest in the succession of (Eastern) Roman and Byzantine emperors from Constantine until Nicephorus III Votaniates (or Alexius I Comnenus) and his use of similar descriptions for later emperors.

## 14.5 PZ and the Ecclesiastical Part

Evidence for PZ's influence on Chron. 1234's Ecclesiastical Part is minimal, given that the majority of its pre-sixth-century section is missing. In the Secular Part, at the end of his narrative on the reign of Anastasius, the Anonymous Chronicler includes a brief editorial remark, a reference to the Ecclesiastical Part:

(On) all of these (deeds) that were performed in the churches and on the high-priests of his time, we have written in the book of ecclesiastical stories.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 191.3-4T with PZ VIII 1 (vol. 1, 60.22-61.2T, 41.23-25T).

<sup>43</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 12 (265T; vol. 2: 169V).

<sup>44</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 190.28-31T.

The use of the term “high priests” for the archbishops during the reign of Anastasius could indicate that Chron. 1234 used PZ (VII 15). However, Chron. Zuqn. and Michael refer to the archbishops as “high priests” as well, even though neither used PZ. Chron. Zuqn. probably used John of Ephesus (whose list is identical to PZ’s, suggesting that they used a common source), and Michael probably Jacob of Edessa (perhaps even through Ignatius of Melitene), whose list differs from John’s and PZ’s. Thus, there is no way to tell if Chron. 1234 copied this list of bishops from John, PZ or perhaps even from a common source with Michael, especially considering that John and PZ share at least one common source as well.

Other material that may have come from PZ to the Anonymous Chronicler, but if so probably via an intermediary, concerns the Macedonian heresy and Timothy’s succession of Macedonius as patriarch of Constantinople (PZ VII 7-9), the synod of Sidon in AG 823 (PZ VII 10-11) and the synod of Tyre (PZ VII 12). In any case the Anonymous Chronicler’s (i.e. his source’s) use of PZ must have depended on the extent with which John of Ephesus discussed these events. If John’s narrative was not detailed enough, Chron. 1234’s source may have turned to another source, PZ.

## 14.6 Conclusion

PZ most definitely contributed to Chron. 1234, but the evidence suggests that the Anonymous Chronicler might have only accessed PZ through intermediaries. This would explain why only material from, or similar to that in PZ’s seventh and tenth books appears in Chron. 1234. It is highly unlikely that the *Notitia Urbis Romae* in Chron. 1234 ever passed through PZ, more likely the Anonymous Chronicler found a *Notitia* similar to that in PZ (X 15) in another source, possibly a compendium. In contrast, PZ was probably the original source of information on the reign of Anastasius, in particular the Persian siege of Amida and the construction Dara, but this material probably reached the Anonymous Chronicler via a later intermediary, to which Michael had access as well. This unknown intermediary, possibly Ignatius of Melitene, combined material

from PZ, which he slightly reworked, with at least one piece of information from another source, an account of a Persian assault on Edessa.



# Chapter 15 Andronicus (sixth century)

## 15.1 Introduction

Andronicus is cited five times by the Anonymous Chronicler. Two of these references occur in the preface<sup>1</sup> to the entire work, one other in the preface<sup>2</sup> of the beginning of the chronographic section after the story of Creation. Andronicus is mentioned a further two times, once for the dates<sup>3</sup> of the birth of ʿAmram and his son Moses, and once for the date<sup>4</sup> of the birth of Christ.

The identity of this enigmatic Andronicus is uncertain because his work is not preserved. All our information comes from his dependants.<sup>5</sup> In one of his letters addressed to John of Litharb, Jacob of Edessa identifies Andronicus' *Chronicle* as "much more recent" than those of Hippolytus of Rome and Eusebius of Caesarea. Andronicus must therefore have been writing between the fourth and the turn of the eighth century.<sup>6</sup> Elias of Nisibis claims that Andronicus lived during the reign of Justinian (AD

---

<sup>1</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 26.25, 27.8T.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 32.14T.

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 60.18T.

<sup>4</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 125.13T.

<sup>5</sup> I use this word here indiscriminately for all the authors who cite Andronicus or know material that derives from his chronicle, whether they were directly or indirectly influenced by him (which is often difficult to determine).

<sup>6</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 7 (trans. 590). Numbering taken from van Ginkel 2008, 78.

527-65), but the last entry that Elias attributes to him relates to an earthquake on the island Cos dated to AD 334-5.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, Michael<sup>8</sup> cites Andronicus for the last time for the beginning of the reign of the Roman emperor Probus (r. 276-82), which he dates to AG 593/AD 282-3. Nevertheless, Elias' claim appears to be genuine: the earliest *terminus ante quem* is provided by Chron. Melk., which was composed soon between 641 and 680-1 and preserves Andronicus' patriarchal chronology (see below).<sup>9</sup>

That Andronicus is only mentioned by Syriac chroniclers (Jacob of Edessa,<sup>10</sup> Chron. 846,<sup>11</sup> Dionysius of Tell-Mahre,<sup>12</sup> Elias of Nisibis, Michael, Chron. 1234), not by their Byzantine colleagues suggests that he wrote in Syriac.<sup>13</sup> That he was a Syriac Christian is supported by his dating of the Passion to AG 342/AD 31-2<sup>14</sup> and thus of the birth of Christ to AG 309 (342 - 33 = 309).

Although Andronicus' *Chronicle* influenced Syriac historians and exegetes ranging from the seventh until the thirteenth century, he and his work have barely been studied. Witold Witakowski briefly discussed Andronicus in his article on the afterlife of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius in Syriac.<sup>15</sup> The most extensive discussion of Andronicus was published by Daniel Serruys, who analysed Andronicus' chronology from Adam until Alexander and his *series regum*, based on the evidence provided by Elias and Michael.<sup>16</sup> Andronicus' influence on Chron. 1234 has never been studied nor has anyone ever

---

<sup>7</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 99.19-22T, 48.19-21V. This entry is also extant in Chron. Zuqn. a. 2346 (vol. 1, 159T; 119V).

<sup>8</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 9 (117T; vol. 1: 197V).

<sup>9</sup> Chron. Melk., 8-9.

<sup>10</sup> Nau 1900, 590.

<sup>11</sup> Chron. 846, 124.35-7V, 159.22-5T.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. the preface of his chronicle, preserved in Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 358V).

<sup>13</sup> Suggested by Witakowski 1999-2000, 436.

<sup>14</sup> Chron. Melk, 17; Chron. 724, 95.2T, 76.17V; Barhebr. Chron. 40 (trans. Budge). Interestingly, Mich. Syr. Chron. V 10 (90T; vol. 1: 142V); and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 125.13T all have AG 340. This is also extant in Chron. 724, 88.9-10V.

<sup>15</sup> Witakowski 1999-2000, 435-6.

<sup>16</sup> Serruys 1913, 28-36.

compared the results of Serruys' research with materials from other sources.<sup>17</sup> By looking beyond the citations of Andronicus in Elias, Michael and Chron. 1234, and comparing materials from Chron. 1234 with those in other known dependants of Andronicus, I have been able to isolate additional information from his chronicle in these sources as well as in Chron. Melk. and in previously unknown dependants of Andronicus: Isho'dad of Merw's commentaries on the Old Testament,<sup>18</sup> the chronicle of Agapius of Mabbug,<sup>19</sup> certain manuscripts<sup>20</sup> of the *Cave of Treasures*, and Solomon of Bosra's *Book of the Bee*.<sup>21</sup>

The wide range of religious backgrounds of these witnesses (Syriac Orthodox, Church of the East as well as Melkite) accentuates the early date and importance of Andronicus for the Syriac historiographical tradition and might well reflect an early date: it is perfectly possible that his work was written in the sixth century and was the first Syriac chronicle in the Eusebian tradition.

Because the *Chronicle* of Andronicus has barely received any study, it must first be (partially) reconstructed in order to elucidate its influence on Chron. 1234. This reconstruction will be expand on Serruys' findings. It will not only take into account the biblical patriarchal succession and Chaldean and Egyptian kings lists that were highlighted by Serruys, but other materials as well.

---

<sup>17</sup> See Hilkens 2014 (forthcoming) for some provisory conclusions.

<sup>18</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen. and Ish. Comm. Ex.

<sup>19</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 73 dates the Flood to AM 2256 and the birth of Reu to AM 2926 conform the computation of Andronicus. Due to a calculation, scribal or translation error (of the birth of Abraham to year 75 of Terah instead of year 70) Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 106 dates year 75 of Abraham to AM 3417 instead of AM 3412.

<sup>20</sup> All the East-Syrian versions of CT 48.6 equate AM 3000 with year 74 of Reu and AM 4000 with year 25 of Ahod. This passage is missing from all West-Syrian mss. except Harvard College Library, Syr 59, which Ri designated as ms. e and which also equates AM 3000 with year 74 of Reu.

<sup>21</sup> According to Sol. Bosr. Lib. Ap., Chapter 23, ܐܕ (ed.), 28-29 and 39 (trans.), Methuselah fathers Lamech at the age of 187 years, Lamech fathers Noah at the age of 182 years and Qainan fathers Shelah when he was 139 years old. Furthermore, Sol. places 1081 years between the Flood and Abraham.

## 15.2 Reconstruction of Andronicus' *Chronicle*

### 15.2.1 Introduction

From the evidence supplied by Andronicus' dependants, especially Elias and Michael, we gather that Andronicus' *Chronicle* was conceived in a similar fashion as Eusebius', it was a universal chronicle that covered the history of the world from its Creation (or probably more accurately from the birth of Adam) until at least the year AD 334-5. Like Eusebius, Andronicus' work consisted of (Jewish, Greek, Assyrian, Persian, Egyptian and Latin) *series regum*<sup>22</sup> as well as chronological canons. There is a distinct possibility that these *series regum* were also part of a so-called *chronographia*, the pre-Abrahamic section of his *Chronicle* that preceded the canons, in which the history of various peoples, especially the Hebrews, was discussed.

Not much is known about the canons of Andronicus. Michael<sup>23</sup> and Elias cite Andronicus for material that was equally available in the canons of Eusebius, so the *lemmata* of both canons were probably often similar or identical. Therefore, Andronicus was not only a continuator, but also an adaptor of Eusebius. The crucial differences between Eusebius' and Andronicus' chronicles, can be found on the chronological level, i.e. in the *series regum*: Andronicus disagreed with Eusebius regarding the correlation between Jewish, Greek and Assyrian chronology. From Michael we learn that Andronicus equated the first year of Cecrops, the first king of Athens, with the first year of Othoniel, rather than with "the thirty-fifth year of Moses" (Eusebius<sup>24</sup>) and placed the visit<sup>25</sup> of Dionysius, son of Deucalion, to Semachus in Attica in the time of the judge Ahod and not during the Exodus (Eusebius<sup>26</sup>). Furthermore, Andronicus also equated the

---

<sup>22</sup> Possibly even Babylonian, see chapter 1.4.

<sup>23</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VI 8 (115T; vol. 1: 192V) says that Andronicus placed year 1000 after the foundation of Rome during the reign of the emperor Philippus, which agrees with Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.217<sup>d</sup>.

<sup>24</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.160; Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.41<sup>c</sup>; Mich. Syr. Chron. III 6 (23T; vol. 1: 41V).

<sup>25</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. III 6 (24T; vol. 1: 43V).

<sup>26</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.44<sup>c</sup>.

first year of Mamylyus, the fifteenth Assyrian king, with Moses' seventy-third year<sup>27</sup> rather than the sixty-seventh or the sixty-eighth year of the servitude of the Hebrews in Egypt (Eusebius<sup>28</sup>). These chronological discrepancies were probably mainly due to the differences between the Jewish chronologies of Eusebius and Andronicus (see below).

The testimonies of Elias and Michael show that, like Eusebius', Andronicus' *Chronicle* contained *series regum* of the Hebrews, Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes, Egyptians, Persians, Macedonians, Latins and the Greek city states of Sicyon, Argus and Athens (but perhaps not Corinth and Sparta?). The names in Andronicus' *series regum* are generally identical to Eusebius', but the length of the reigns of certain rulers often differs.<sup>29</sup> If longer narratives also accompanied these royal successions, they have not been preserved. In addition, Andronicus included a list of Jewish high priests, which is preserved by Michael.<sup>30</sup>

## 15.2.2 Jewish chronology

The main differences between Eusebius and Andronicus lie in Jewish chronology and the pre-Abrahamic Chaldean and the pre-Mosaic Egyptian royal successions. As far as his patriarchal chronology according to the Septuagint is concerned, Andronicus dated the birth of Lamech to year 187 of Methuselah and Noah's birth to year 182 of Lamech. These numbers differ from the standard version of *Genesis* (LXX) 5:25,28 (year 167 of Methuselah and year 188 of Lamech) and also from the opinions of Eusebius<sup>31</sup> and Annianus.<sup>32</sup> They are known, however, in other witnesses, most notably the Peshitta, which also dates the birth of Lamech to year 187 of Methuselah. As regards the date of

---

<sup>27</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. III 2 (22T; vol. 1: 39V).

<sup>28</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.158; Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.39.23.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Elias' comparison of the opinions of Eusebius, Annianus and Andronicus on these matters: El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 35T, 15-20V.

<sup>30</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. App. I (741T; vol. 3: 427-9V).

<sup>31</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.38.

<sup>32</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 16.18-9T, 8.4-5V. See also Chron. Alex., I 1.1 (ed. and trans. 144-5).

the birth of Noah, there are parallels in two Alexandrian Christian Arabic chronicles: Eutychius<sup>33</sup> and the thirteenth-century Arabic *Chronicon Orientale*<sup>34</sup> also date Noah's birth to year 182 of Lamech.

An additional difference with Eusebius' patriarchal list is the inclusion of Qainan as son of Arphaxad, suggesting Andronicus' reliance on the Septuagint (*Genesis* LXX 11:12) or on a continuator of Eusebius, like Annianus. Unlike Annianus however, Andronicus dates Qainan's birth to year 139 of Arphaxad instead of year 130. This number is also cited by Pseudo-Zachariah of Mitylene, though for the date of the birth of Qainan's son Shelah, which is usually dated to year 130 of Qainan.<sup>35</sup> Chron. 1234 proposes 560 years as the length of the life of Qainan, and year 27 of Peleg as the date of his death. The number 560 is an error for 460 (cf. *Genesis* LXX 11:13: 130 + 330 = 460). Qainan's age matches Andronicus' chronological system,<sup>36</sup> if it is emended to 57 respectively (the discrepancy can be easily explained by a scribal error): Andronicus dated the birth of Qainan in AM 2393, placing his death in AM 2853, i.e. at the age of 460, and Peleg's birth to AM 2796, so Peleg's age would have been 57 (2853 - 2796) at the time of Qainan's death.

A particular lacuna in patriarchal chronology was the age of Qahath and 'Amram, Moses' grandfather and father respectively, at the time of the birth of their sons. Andronicus' opinion on this subject differed from those of his predecessors, dating the birth of 'Amram to year 60 of Qahath and Moses' birth to year 70 of 'Amram. The Anonymous Chronicler<sup>37</sup> expressly cites him for this information and the same details are given by Agapius, Elias and Michael.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Eut. Alex. Chron. 28-9.

<sup>34</sup> Chron. Or., 3.

<sup>35</sup> E.g. PZ I 3 (vol. 1, 15T, 11V).

<sup>36</sup> In Annianus' system, Qainan died in AM 2839 (= 2379 + 460), which coincides with year 66 of Peleg.

<sup>37</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 60.18T.

<sup>38</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 115-6; Chron. 846, 157.16-7T, 123.15-6V; Elias. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 18.15-6T, 9.18-9V and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (16T; vol. 1: 30V).

Because of all these discrepancies, Andronicus dated the Flood to AM 2256<sup>39</sup> instead of AM 2242 (Eusebius and Annianus). Other pivotal dates in Andronicus' system are that of the birth of Abraham in AM 3337, the Exodus in AM 3842 and the construction of the temple in AM 4452.<sup>40</sup> Crucial aspects of Andronicus' pre-Abrahamic system are presented in Book 2 Chapter 7 of Michael's *Chronicle*.

"From Adam until the Flood	2256 years
From the Flood until the division (of the earth): 660 <sup>41</sup> years	2916
Peleg fathered Reu, 10 years before the division	2926
Reu fathered Serug, 132 years old	3058 <sup>42</sup>
Serug [fathered] Nahor, 130 years old	3188 <sup>43</sup>
Nahor fathered Terah, 79 years old	3267
Terah fathered Abraham, 70 years old	3337 <sup>44</sup>

Table: Michael, *Chronography*, Book 2, Chapter 7<sup>45</sup>

This allows us to attribute one more passage in Chron. 1234 to Andronicus: both the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael date the division of the earth to year 120 of Peleg, which in Andronicus' system agrees with AM 2916, because he dates the birth of Peleg to AM 2796.

---

<sup>39</sup> Andronicus may have dated the Flood to AM 2256 in order to solve the issue in biblical chronology that Methuselah is said to have died at the age of 969, before the Flood, even though, his birth date in AM 1257 implied a death fourteen years after the Flood (1257 + 969 = 2256 = 2242 + 14). On this issue, see Adler 1989, 47.

<sup>40</sup> For these dates see Andron.'s List in El. Nis. Op. Chron.

<sup>41</sup> Ms.: 600.

<sup>42</sup> Ms.: 3018.

<sup>43</sup> Ms.: 3102.

<sup>44</sup> Ms.: 3357

<sup>45</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (14T; vol. 1: 28V).

Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 46.28-29T	Mich. Syr. Chron. II 2 (8T; vol. 1: 17V)
In year 120 of Peleg, the earth was divided under the generations of the grandchildren of Noah, of Shem, Ham and Japheth, and they ascended from the east and found a plane in the region of Sennaar and settled in it.	In year 120 of Peleg, the earth was divided for the second time among the children of Shem and the other children of Noah.

Even though the Anonymous Chronicler followed Annianus' opinion on antediluvian patriarchal chronology (see the chapter on Annianus), Chron. 1234's chronology between Abraham and the Exodus is based on Andronicus'.

From Abraham to the Exodus	Eusebius	Annianus	Andronicus	Chron. 1234
Abraham fathers Isaac	100	100	100	100
Isaac fathers Jacob	60	60	60	61
Jacob fathers Levi	86	?	89	89
Levi fathers Qahath	46	48 <sup>46</sup>	46	46
Qahath fathers Amram	63	60	60	60
Amram fathers Moses	70	75 <sup>47</sup>	70	70
Age of Moses at the time of the Exodus	80 [= AM 3689]	80 [= AM 3819]	80 [= AM 3842]	80 [= AM 3819]
Total:	505	505	505	505

This is revealed not only by the dates of the births of 'Amram and Moses himself, but also by the date of the death of Isaac to year 31 of Levi.

<sup>46</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 126 (trans. 158).

<sup>47</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 136 (transl. 170).

	Eusebius	Annianus	Andronicus	Chron. 1234 <sup>48</sup>	Michael <sup>49</sup>
Abraham dies, 175 years old	AM 3184 (birth of Abraham) + 175 = AM 3359 = year 15 of Jacob [AM 3344 (birth year of Jacob) + 15]	AM 3314 + 175 = AM 3489 = year 15 of Jacob [AM 3474 + 15]	AM 3337 + 175 = AM 3512 = year 15 of Jacob [AM 3497 + 15]	Year 15 of Jacob	Year 15 of Jacob (and year 76 of Isaac)
Isaac dies, 180 years old	AM 3284 (birth of Isaac) + 180 = AM 3464 = year 34 of Levi [AM 3430 (birth year of Levi) + 34]	AM 3414 + 180 = AM 3594 = year 38 of Levi [AM 3556 + 38]	AM 3437 + 180 = AM 3617 = year 31 of Levi [AM 3586 + 31]	Year 31 of Levi	Year 31 of Levi

Other chronological computations concerning the period between Jacob's departure from his father and the birth of Levi in Chron. 1234 also match Andronicus'. The Anonymous Chronicler gives a calculation of the age of Jacob during several pivotal events in his lifetime:

Jacob, 77 years old, went down to Harran towards Laban, his uncle. 84 years old, he married Lea and Rachel, the daughters of Laban. 85 years old, he fathered Ruben. In year 89 he fathered Levi, and one after the other, [he had] 12 sons.<sup>50</sup>

From the testimony of no less than five dependants of Andronicus can be deduced that, unlike Eusebius and Annianus, Andronicus claimed that Jacob fathered Levi at the age of

<sup>48</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 55.13-4T and 56.10-1T.

<sup>49</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. III 2 (19T; vol. 1: 35V).

<sup>50</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 55.15-8T.

89.<sup>51</sup> The other dates in his entry in Chron. 1234 also have counterparts in Andronicus' dependants. Agapius<sup>52</sup> and Michael<sup>53</sup> date the approach of Jacob to Laban in year 77 of Jacob as well, although this date is also extant in the canons<sup>54</sup> of Jerome. Agapius also gives 84 as Jacob's age when he married Lea and Rachel.<sup>55</sup> Ruben's birth in year 85 of Jacob is not attested in Agapius and the Syriac manuscript of Michael, but the long Armenian adaptation of Michael's work has "year 85"<sup>56</sup> and Agapius<sup>57</sup> places Ruben's birth between year 84 and 89 of Jacob, the latter being the year of Levi's birth.

In Chron. 1234, this passage is followed by more material that probably originated from the same source:

In year 3 of Levi, (Jacob) fathered Joseph. In year 10 of Levi, Jacob went up to Isaac, his father, because he had fled from before Esau, his brother. In year 20 of Levi, Joseph was sold by his brothers.<sup>58</sup>

The source for this material is unlikely to be a Jewish apocryphal text,<sup>59</sup> but almost certainly chronographic. A nearly identical passage is preserved by Barhebraeus,<sup>60</sup> but neither by Agapius nor Michael, the latter due to a lacuna in the manuscript. Although Agapius does not preserve this entry or this number, he does state that "at the age of 17 years, (Joseph) was taken to Egypt where he passed ten years as a slave and three years

---

<sup>51</sup> El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 9.16V; Chron. 846, 157.T, 123.V; Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 113 and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (16T; vol. 1: 30V) See also Chron. Melk. 14-15, which equates year 130 of Jacob with year 41 of Levi, thus also dating his birth to year 89 of Jacob.

<sup>52</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 112.

<sup>53</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. III 2 (20T (lacuna); vol. 1: 36V), reconstructed on the basis of Barhebr. Chron. Syr. 11V, (ed. Bedjan 1890, 12).

<sup>54</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.30°.

<sup>55</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 113.

<sup>56</sup> Mich. Chron. Arm. 1.39; Langlois 1868, 42.

<sup>57</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 113.

<sup>58</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 55.19-22T.

<sup>59</sup> Tisserant 1921, 215.

<sup>60</sup> Barhebr. Chron. Syr. 11 (ed. Bedjan 1890, 12) [= Mich. Syr. Chron. III 2 (20T; vol. 1: 36V)].

in prison”<sup>61</sup> which fits in with the chronological computation in Chron. 1234 that Joseph was born in Levi’s third year and sold into slavery by his brothers in year 20 (20 – 3 = 17). That Barhebraeus preserves Michael’s and thus Andronicus’ opinion on these matters is confirmed by the Armenian versions of Michael. The shorter Armenian version, which resembles the original more closely also says that Joseph was born in year 3 of Levi, which is year 91 of Jacob.<sup>62</sup>

One other chronological remark can also be attributed to Andronicus, because Michael preserves a similar entry, in which Andronicus is explicitly identified as the source. This entry gives the number of years between the Exodus and the reign of Uzziah.

Mich. Syr. Chron. IV 15 (47T; vol. 1: 79V) <sup>63</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 92.5-6T
Andronicus says that from the beginning of the reign of Cecrops, the first king of the Athenians, until the first Olympiad (= year 46 of Uzziah), there are 802 years; from Moses and the exodus: 863 years.	From Moses and the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt until here (the reign of Uzziah), there are 863 years.

Worth noting in this respect is that, unlike Michael, the Anonymous Chronicler had no interest in adopting the dating system of Olympiads that Eusebius and Andronicus used. From all of these observations regarding Andronicus’ patriarchal chronology can be drawn conclusions regarding other aspects of his presentation of history, most notably his Egyptian and Chaldean chronologies. Michael’s previously cited copy of Andronicus’ pre-Abrahamic chronology is immediately followed by a list of pre-Abrahamic Chaldean and Egyptian kings.

---

<sup>61</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 114.

<sup>62</sup> Mich. Chron. Arm. 2.27. Cf. also Mich. Chron. Arm. 1.39 (trans. 42) which only gives the dates relative to Jacob’s age.

<sup>63</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 2.161.506-180.1240, counted 734 years between the Exodus and the first Olympiad/the reign of Uzziah.

“From Adam until the Flood From the Flood until the division (of the earth): 660 <sup>64</sup> years Peleg fathered Reu, 10 years before the division Reu fathered Serug, 132 years old Serug [fathered] Nahor, 130 years old Nahor fathered Terah, 79 years old Terah fathered Abraham, 70 years old		2256 years 2916 2926 3058 <sup>65</sup> 3188 <sup>66</sup> 3267 3337 <sup>67</sup>	
Kings of Babylon <sup>68</sup>		Kings of Egypt	
In year 40 <sup>69</sup> of Reu, Nimrod starts to reign: 69 years		In year 100 of Reu, Panouphis: 68 years	
Then there was no king for 43 years	112	Eupipaphius <sup>70</sup> : 46 years	114
Qambirus: 85 years	197	Sanus: 60 years (= Ethiopus)	174
Samirus: 72 years	269	Pharaoh, son of Sanus: 35 years	209
Kisaronus: <sup>71</sup> 43 years	312	Karimun: 4 years	213
Arphakid: 18 years	330 <sup>72</sup>	Aphintus: 32 years	245 <sup>73</sup>
Interregnum of 7 years	337 <sup>74</sup>	Arsacus: 33 years	278
Belus, leader of the Assyrian kingdom		Sam[on]us: 20 years	298
		Hirmius <sup>75</sup> : 25 years	323 <sup>76</sup>
In his thirty-sixth year, Abraham is born		In his fourteenth <sup>77</sup> year, Abraham is born”	

Table: Michael, *Chronography*, Book 2, Chapter 7<sup>78</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Ms.: 600.

<sup>65</sup> Ms.: 3018.

<sup>66</sup> Ms.: 3102.

<sup>67</sup> Ms.: 3357

<sup>68</sup> An echo of this list may be found in Theod. bar Koni Lib. Schol. (vol. 2, 120), which mentions Halbator (ܗܠܒܬܘܪ) or Qalbator (ܩܠܒܬܘܪ) as Nimrod’s direct successor [= Qambiros (?)] and another king Shamiron (ܫܡܝܪܘܢ) [= Samirus (?)].

<sup>69</sup> Ms.: 10.

<sup>70</sup> Ms.: Eupropis.

<sup>71</sup> Barhebr. Schol. Gen – II Sam, 43 identifies this king as “Diocrates”.

<sup>72</sup> Ms.: 340.

<sup>73</sup> Ms.: 246

<sup>74</sup> Ms.: 347.

<sup>75</sup> Ms.: Hirqius.

<sup>76</sup> Ms.: 325.

<sup>77</sup> Ms.: 17.

<sup>78</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (14T; vol. 1: 28V).

The Anonymous Chronicler does not mention any of these Chaldean kings, except Nimrod, an often-mentioned figure in Syriac literature, and only one of these Egyptian kings, called Pharaoh,” presumably because only the names of these kings appeared in the Bible, but this material requires more explanation regardless.

### 15.2.3 Egyptian chronology

Andronicus’ opinion on the Egyptian royal succession differs considerably from Eusebius’. Serruys<sup>79</sup> was able to reconstruct it for the period from the Flood until Moses, on the basis of Michael’s testimony.<sup>80</sup> Further witnesses, however, include Chron. 1234, who only mentions the fourth king, Pharaoh, and interestingly also Isho’dad of Merv and Agapius were also clearly influenced by Andronicus. Their testimonies allow us to confirm, correct and expand on Serruys’ conclusions.

Dynasties		Kings	Regnal years	Synchronisms
I				
II	1	Panouphis <sup>81</sup> [= Mesraim <sup>82</sup> ]	68	= 101 of Reu
III	2	Eupipaphius	46	
IV	3	Sanus [= Ethiopus]	60	
V	4	Pharaoh, son of Sanus	35	= 12 of Nahor
VI	5	Karimon	4	= 48 of Nahor
VII	6	Aphintus <sup>83</sup> [= Puntos]	32	= 52 of Nahor
VIII	7	Arsacus	33	= 5 of Terah

<sup>79</sup> Serruys 1913, 32-3.

<sup>80</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. III 5 (22-3T; vol. 1: 39-40V), cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.6-7.

<sup>81</sup> The three manuscripts of Agap. Chron. on which Vasiliev based his edition and translation preserve the spelling “Manouphis”, Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 75. This could be an error due to a misreading of ܡܢ as ܦܢ, but could also reflect the original. Manouphis could be a contraction of Menes and Epaphos, two names that are often connected with the first Egyptian pharaoh. Ri 2000, 306 suggested that Panophis was etymologically related to Panopolis, one of the oldest Egyptian cities.

<sup>82</sup> Mestraim was identified with Menes, the first Egyptian king, in Annianus’ *series regum*: Georg. Sync. Chron. 102.17 (trans. 127).

<sup>83</sup> Mss. B and C of Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 80 have انطوطيس, A has افطوطيس.

IX	8	Samonus	20	
X	9	Armius/Hermius	27	
XI	10	Pharnadus	43	
XII	11	Phanus	(40)	
XIII	12	Hyksos	21	= 98 of Abraham
XIV	13	Sisinus	44	
XV	14	Tarakus	44	
	15	Satis <sup>84</sup> [= first Shepherd king]	19	
	16	Second Shepherd king [= Bnon? <sup>85</sup> ]	[40?]	
	17	Third shepherd king [= Archles? <sup>86</sup> ]	[30?]	
	18	Apophis <sup>87</sup> [= fourth and last Shepherd king]	14	
	(19)	Maphrus <sup>88</sup> [Memphres <sup>89</sup> ]	12	= 12 of <sup>c</sup> Amram
	(20)	Mipharmounis [= Mispharmouthosis <sup>90</sup> ]	24	
	(21)	Tymochamou [= Tutmoses <sup>91</sup> ]	18	= 50 of <sup>c</sup> Amram
	(22)	Amenophotis <sup>92</sup>	43	= 68 of <sup>c</sup> Amram
	(23)	Phosinus <sup>93</sup> [= Psusennes? <sup>94</sup> ]	(43)	= 41 of Moses
	24	Orus <sup>95</sup>	38	= 84 of Moses

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.67.29: first king of the seventeenth dynasty, 19 years.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.67.33: second king of the seventeenth dynasty, 40 years. Instead of Apophis, Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 115 refers to Amosis, who reigned for 25 years, first king of the eighteenth dynasty according to Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.4 (see also Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.33-4). Agap. also relied on Eus. for the following two Egyptian kings.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.67.33: third king of the seventeenth dynasty, 30 years. Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 115-6 has Kebron (= Bnon?) as Amosis' successor, claiming that he started to reign in year 38 of Qahath and that his reign lasted for 13 years, in following of Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.4 who identifies him as the second king of the eighteenth dynasty (see also Eus. Chron. Lat. 34-5).

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.1: fourth king of the seventeenth dynasty, 14 years. Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 115-6 refers to Amophis, third king of the eighteenth dynasty according to Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.4.

<sup>88</sup> See Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 116. Vasiliev preferred the reading Mensis, after ms. A, but ms. C probably has a better reading with مقرس which must be an error for مغرس.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.4-5: fourth king of the eighteenth dynasty, 12 years.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.5: fifth king of the eighteenth dynasty, 26 years.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.5: sixth king of the eighteenth dynasty, 9 years.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.6: Amenophthis, seventh king of the eighteenth dynasty, 31 years.

<sup>93</sup> Ish. Comm. Ex. (17.4-6T; 22.31-3V) has  $\varphi\lambda\mu\sigma$ , which was corrected by C. Van den Eynde to  $\varphi\lambda\mu\sigma$ , after Mich. Syr.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 23.13.14V.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.68.7: eighth king of the eighteenth dynasty, 28 years.

The discrepancies between this list and those of Eusebius<sup>96</sup> and Annianus<sup>97</sup> are evident. Andronicus' Egyptian kings list is a combination of names from Eusebian and perhaps Greek mythological material.<sup>98</sup> Andronicus also applied some innovations, the most important of which are the inclusion of a fourth Egyptian king called Pharaoh, whose name provides the official royal label from that era onwards; and a Pharaoh called Phosinus, between Amenophotis and Orus, who is thus identified as the pharaoh “who oppressed the Hebrews in the work of the mud and bricks (and) who resisted Moses and Aaron and who suffocated in the sea.”<sup>99</sup> The identification of Phosinus as the pharaoh at the time of the Exodus (and Panouphis<sup>100</sup> as the first Egyptian king) allows us to identify Andronicus, or one of his dependants, as the chronographic source<sup>101</sup> that Isho<sup>c</sup>dad of Merv quarried for historical information for his commentaries on the Old Testament. Similarly, although he does not mention Phosinus, several names that are unique to Andronicus' Egyptian king list are also mentioned by Agapius, demonstrating his dependence on Andronicus' *Chronicle*.

The Anonymous Chronicler was not very interested in the Egyptian royal house, unlike Michael who mainly relied on Andronicus' opinion on these matters (though probably via an intermediary). Andronicus' influence on Chron. 1234 does, however, emerge from the Anonymous Chronicler's reference to “Pharaoh” as the fourth king and the claim that “the kings of Egypt were called Pharaoh”<sup>102</sup> after him. Furthermore, his

---

<sup>96</sup> Eus. Chron. Arm. 1.65-69.

<sup>97</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 102.16-103.4 (trans. 127). On which, see Gelzer 1898, vol. 2, 206-14.

<sup>98</sup> Serruys 1913, 33 denoted these as “noms imaginaires et de personnages déguisés,” but Ri 2000, 305-6, without knowledge of Serruys' study, remarked that some of these names appeared to have been based on names of Egyptian kings from Greek mythology (e.g. Aphintos ≈ Puntos; Karimon ≈ Kadmos).

<sup>99</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. III 5 (22-3T; vol. 1: 39-40V) maintains that “all the chroniclers say that this Phosinus, nicknamed Aegyptus, drowned.” See also El. Nis. Op. Chron., vol. 1, 23.23T, 13.14V who keeps Eus.'s order of Egyptian kings, but identifies Eus.'s Psusennes with Andron.'s Phosinus (فسانوس; حصنه).

<sup>100</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 133.9-12T, 144.15-8V: ܦܢܘܦܝܫ.

<sup>101</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 144V, n. 7; 146V, n. 1; 152V, n. 4; 180-1V, n. 9).

<sup>102</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.18-21T. Cf. Mich. Syr. Chron. II 5 (11T; vol. 1: 25V).

dating of the beginning of Pharaoh's reign to year 12 of Nahor fits in nicely with Andronicus' list of early Egyptian kings as preserved by Michael.<sup>103</sup>

Phosinus, the second Pharaoh particular to Andronicus' opinion on pre-Abrahamic Egyptian chronology, is not mentioned in Chron. 1234. The Anonymous Chronicler simply states that in the time of Moses "many kings reigned in Egypt"<sup>104</sup> and merely refers to the Egyptian king and father of Moses' adoptive mother as "Pharaoh". The reference to these "many kings" must be seen in light of the extra-biblical story of Moses' childhood which prominently appears in the Syriac chronographic and exegetical tradition and is also included in Chron. 1234. According to this tale (and Artabanus), Moses' adoptive mother was the daughter of Palmanothes, king of Heliopolis, and the wife of Chenephres, king of Memphis.<sup>105</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler mentions Chenephres, but does not identify the pharaoh who was oppressing the Hebrews at that time.

#### 15.2.4 Pre-Abrahamic Chaldean chronology

Other crucial differences between Andronicus and his predecessors lie in his presentation of the third branch of postdiluvian and pre-Abrahamic Near Eastern history (after the patriarchal chronology and the Egyptian royal succession): the succession of the kings of Chaldea, the sinful land where the pious Abraham was born.

As seen above, Andronicus' Chaldean kings list is preserved in Book 2 Chapter 7 of Michael<sup>106</sup> alongside his list of pre-Abrahamic Egyptian kings.<sup>107</sup> Nimrod's successors Qambiros, Samiros, Kisonus, Arphakid and Belus the Assyrian are also mentioned by

---

<sup>103</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (11T; vol. 1: 25V).

<sup>104</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 61T.

<sup>105</sup> Brock 1982, 238. On this issue, see chapter 5.3.

<sup>106</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (14T; vol. 1: 28V). Barhebraeus not only copied this list in his Chron. Syr., see also Barhebr. Schol. Gen – II Sam, 42-3.

<sup>107</sup> For the views of Panodorus and Annianus on the succession of the Chaldean, 'Arab' and Assyrian rulers after the Flood and before the birth of Abraham, see Georg. Sync. Chron. 101.22-102.13, 103.19-104.12, 109.15-22. On which, see Gelzer 1898, 200-6 and Serruys 1913, 21-3.

Isho<sup>c</sup>dad and Agapius, confirming that this information also originated from Andronicus' *Chronicle*.

Unlike Annianus,<sup>108</sup> who dated the beginning of the Egyptian and Chaldean royal houses simultaneously to AM 2776, Andronicus claimed that the Egyptian institution of kingship was secondary to that of the Chaldeans in Babylon.<sup>109</sup> According to three dependants of Andronicus – Isho<sup>c</sup>dad,<sup>110</sup> Agapius<sup>111</sup> and Michael – Panouphis, the first Egyptian king, started to reign in year 100 or 101 of Reu. Interestingly however, these three witnesses disagree about the relationship between Egyptian and Chaldean chronology. Michael equates year 1 of Nimrod with year 40 of Reu (which is also done explicitly by Chron. 1234) and thus the first year of Panouphis' reign with year 61 of Nimrod. Thus, Michael allows for an interregnum between the reigns of Nimrod and Qambirus. Both Isho<sup>c</sup>dad<sup>112</sup> and Agapius,<sup>113</sup> however, claim that Nimrod's reign began in year 84 of Reu and do not allow for an interregnum. The reason for this discrepancy is unclear. Most likely it is due to a misreading of 100 (ⲁ) as 40 (Ⲅ) that Michael, his source or a later copyist may have made.

As is the case with the Egyptian kings, the Anonymous Chronicler fails to include any of these kings in his presentation of pre-Christian history. Only Nimrod is mentioned in Chron. 1234, but his appearance need not necessarily be solely due to Andronicus' influence, as Nimrod is a very important figure in Syriac literature in general and historiography in particular.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup> Georg. Sync. Chron. 101.22-3 (trans. 126) and 102.14-5 (trans. 127), on which, see Adler 1989, 126-31.

<sup>109</sup> A parallel tradition is attested in another sixth-century source, the *Cave of Treasures* (XXV 1), according to which “it was after the Babylonians that the Egyptians appointed a king” (translated from the East-Syrian version, ed. Ri 1989, 194). Even more interestingly, the *Cave of Treasures* claims that the first Egyptian king, whom its author calls Puntos, started to reign “in the days of Reu” and reigned for 68 years. This number agrees with Andronicus' opinion and suggests that one knew of the other tradition or that they had access to a common source.

<sup>110</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 133.9-10T, 144.15-6V.

<sup>111</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 75.

<sup>112</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 133.4-6T, 144.10-11V.

<sup>113</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 75.

<sup>114</sup> Desreumaux 2003, 195-6.

In this respect the tradition that Nimrod wore a woven crown, which appeared to him in the sky is also worth noting.<sup>115</sup> The earliest attestation of this – probably Syriac – tradition can be found in the *Cave of Treasures*, but was probably known to Andronicus as well. The same tradition is attested in the works of Ishoʿdad,<sup>116</sup> Agapius<sup>117</sup> and Michael,<sup>118</sup> neither of whom used the *Cave of Treasures* (24.25-6). The Anonymous Chronicler knew this tradition via a chronographic source as well: both Chron. 1234<sup>119</sup> and Michael place this event ten years after a division. The *Cave of Treasures*, which does not explicitly date this event, was not their common source, because its author claims that it was not Nimrod, but the weaver Sisan who wove his crown. Also worth noting in this respect is that Michael cites “the second book of Asaph” for this information, which suggests a connection between Asaph and Andronicus.<sup>120</sup>

### 15.2.5 Additional aspects of postdiluvian and pre-Abrahamic history

A comparative analysis of the material in Andronicus’ dependants, i.e. Ishoʿdad, Agapius, Michael and 1234, shows that Andronicus filled a particular *vacuum* in Eusebius’ presentation of history: the time between the Flood and the birth of Abraham. Ishoʿdad’s, Agapius’ and Michael’s connection of several events to some of the pre-Abrahamic Chaldean and Egyptian kings from Andronicus’ kings lists allows us to further attribute other materials in these sources to Andronicus. William Adler, who did not make the connection with Andronicus, believed that these “fabulous tales about ancient Chaldea” were “interwoven into [the] narrative” in order “to promote Syrian national identity.”<sup>121</sup> This may be so for the foundations of certain Syrian and Northern

---

<sup>115</sup> On this tradition, see Ri 2000,

<sup>116</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 133.6-7T, 144.12-3V.

<sup>117</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 75.

<sup>118</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (9, 11T; vol. 1: 19, 22V).

<sup>119</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 47.23-6T.

<sup>120</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (11T; vol. 1: 22V).

<sup>121</sup> Adler 1994, 165.

Mesopotamian Christian centres (on which, see below), but the consistently negative connotations of this material suggest that they were mainly meant to emphasise the sinful ways of Mankind, and particularly the Chaldeans, that developed on earth after the Flood and before the arrival of Abraham.<sup>122</sup> Similarly to *Jubilees* – and to a lesser extent also in the *Cave of Treasures* – the emphasis lies on historical continuity: the sinful ways of Mankind re-emerge after the Flood, primarily due to the Chaldeans and the biblical patriarch Qainan and his offspring who worship him. Abraham is presented in a similar way as Noah. Both grow up in a sinful world, full of war, idolatry and magic, but find God. Four main themes dominate Andronicus' and the Anonymous Chronicler's description of pre-Abrahamic history: the foundation of cities, the waging of wars, the worship of idols and the Chaldean art of magic and divination.

#### 15.2.5.1 Foundations of cities

The root of all evil was the construction of the first postdiluvian cities in which sinful behaviour emerged. Antediluvian examples of this are known from Annianus' *Chronicle*<sup>123</sup> and particularly noteworthy here also is the implied difference between these Chaldean cities and villages founded by the biblical patriarchs until Qainan.<sup>124</sup>

The prototype of the Chaldean builder of cities was Nimrod, the first Chaldean king, who was already accredited with the foundation of Uruk, Akkad and Kalneh by *Genesis* 10:8-11. In the Syriac tradition, from Ephrem<sup>125</sup> onwards,<sup>126</sup> these three cities were

---

<sup>122</sup> Cf. also the explicit dating of Abraham's birth to year 36 of Belus and year 17 of Hirkos, Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (14T; vol. 1: 28V).

<sup>123</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. I 4 (3T; vol. 1: 6-8V).

<sup>124</sup> The *Cave of Treasures* distinguishes between a Chaldean city (ܟܠܢܗ) and the biblical patriarchs' foundations of villages (ܩܝܢܢ), e.g. *Cave of Treasures* 20:8 (the village of Tmanun/t.), 24:3 (Arphaxarkat) and 24:5 (Shelhiun).

<sup>125</sup> Ephr. Syr. Comm. Gen. VIII 1. Witakowski 1993, 648 suggests that Ephrem may have been influenced by a Jewish tradition.

<sup>126</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 133.7-9T, 144.13-5V; 133.21-4T, 145.8-10V; 140.15-21T, 152.16-21V; Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 75; Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (9T; vol. 1: 20V) and II.6 (14T; vol. 1: 26V); Barh. Chron. Syr. I (8 and 10V).

identified as Edessa, Nisibis and Ctesiphon, but the Anonymous Chronicler only mentions Edessa.<sup>127</sup>

From the reign of Nimrod onwards, the foundation of Near and Middle Eastern cities becomes a recurring theme. Foundations of cities are attributed to Chaldean and Egyptian kings from Andronicus' kings lists, but also to certain biblical patriarchs. Susa<sup>128</sup> is said to have been built by Qambirus; Babylon-on-the-Nile<sup>129</sup> (= Babalyun near Cairo?<sup>130</sup>) by the pharaoh Aphintus and named after him; and the construction of a city "in his [own] name" by his successor Arsacus.<sup>131</sup> That the foundation of cities was a Chaldean 'tradition' is indicated by the fact that the first Egyptian city, not surprisingly nicknamed Babylon, is only founded by Aphintus after the arrival of Chaldeism in Egypt.<sup>132</sup> Apart from these three foundations, Michael also adds that Samirus, "built cities for the Parthians and the Chaldeans,"<sup>133</sup> and Isho'dad<sup>134</sup> and Agapius<sup>135</sup> that Belus the Assyrian "built several cities", though none of these is identified. Two Assyrian successors of Belus, king Belochus and queen Semiramis, who also appear in the Eusebian canons (though not their foundations) are also connected to the foundations of Aleppo<sup>136</sup> and Hierapolis<sup>137</sup> respectively.

Not only Chaldean and Assyrian kings, but figures and peoples from the Old Testament were identified as founders of certain cities as well: Jerusalem<sup>138</sup> by king

---

<sup>127</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 48.17-9T.

<sup>128</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 134.12-3T, 146.2-3V; Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 78 and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (11T; vol. 1: 23V).

<sup>129</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 80 and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (12T; vol.1: 26V). See also Barh. Chron. Syr. I (9V).

<sup>130</sup> Becker 2013.

<sup>131</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (13T; vol. 1: 27V).

<sup>132</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 80 and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (12T; vol. 1: 26V). See also Barh. Chron. Syr. I (9V).

<sup>133</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (12T; vol. 1: 24V).

<sup>134</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 134.21-2T; 146.10-1V.

<sup>135</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 104.

<sup>136</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. III 9 (27T; vol. 1: 47V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 46.29T.

<sup>137</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 167.28-30T, 181.8-10V; and Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 108.

<sup>138</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 105 and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (14T; vol. 1: 26V). Chron. Melk., 15 preserves the same entry, which increases the likelihood that this passage was taken from Andron. Chron. Two other sixth-century sources mention the foundation of Jerusalem: Joh. Mal. Brev. III 2 (ed. 41; trans. 28) and PZ I 3 (vol. 1,

Melchizedek the Canaanite; Hebron<sup>139</sup> by the Canaanites, and Shechem<sup>140</sup> by Hamor (the Hivite)<sup>141</sup>. The foundation of Damascus is attributed to the unknown Myropus the Hittite.<sup>142</sup> Michael also includes Uz, son of Aram, in year 70 of Nahor as its possible founder, after Josephus.<sup>143</sup>

Only one of these foundations is attributed to a biblical patriarch, Qainan, son of Arphaxad, who is said to have founded Harran.<sup>144</sup> This claim follows from a tradition from *Jubilees* 8:2 that Qainan, the biblical patriarch and postdiluvian inventor of astrology, was looking for a location to build a city. The foundation of Sodom, Gomorrah and Zoar<sup>145</sup> on the other hand, is attributed to the otherwise unknown Armonius the Canaanite, who is identified as the widower of Zoar and the father of Sodom and Gomorrah.<sup>146</sup>

Cities	Founder(s)	Isho'dad		Agapius		Michael		Chron. 1234	
Uruk, Ur and Kala	Nimrod	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Raḥbut, Rasan and Kalnai	Nimrod	x	x	x	x	[x]	[x]		
Sodom and Gomorrah (and Zoar)	Armonius the Canaanite (and/or his sons)	x		x	x	x	x	x	
Damascus	Myropus the Hittite or ʿUts, son of Aram			x	x	x	x	x	

---

13.21-7T; 9.11-6V). The latter dates it circa eighty years before the birth of Abraham and mentions Flav. Jos. as a source, but Flav. Jos. Ant. Jud. I 10.2 only says that Melchizedek was king of Salem and does not mention the city's foundation.

<sup>139</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 105-6 and Mich. Syr. Chron. III 1 (18T; vol. 1: 34V).

<sup>140</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 112.

<sup>141</sup> Genesis 34:2.

<sup>142</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 80, Mich. Syr. Chron. II 5 (13T; vol. 1: 25V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.29T. See also Barh. Chron. Syr. I (10V).

<sup>143</sup> Flav. Jos. Jud. Antiq. I.6.4.

<sup>144</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 2 (8T; vol. 1: 17V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 46.20-1T. See also Barh. Chron. Syr. I, 7V.

<sup>145</sup> Genesis 14:2, 8; 22-3, 30.

<sup>146</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 167.19-22T, 180.33-181.2V; Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 80; Mich. Syr. Chron. II 5 (25-6V; 11T); and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.23-6T.

Susa	Qambirus	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Jerusalem	Melchizedek	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Harran	Qainan					x	x	x	x
Aleppo	Belochus					x	x	x	
Aphintus/Babylon	Aphintus			x	x	x	x		
Hebron	Canaanites			x	x	x	x		
Hierapolis	Semiramis	x	x	x	x				
Arsacus (?)	Arsacus					x	x		
Sachem	Hamor			x	x				

Only the foundations of Susa, Aphintus/Babylon and Arsacus are attributed to pre-Abrahamic kings from Andronicus' *series regum*, so it cannot be ascertained if Andronicus was the source for all these materials. Nevertheless, those entries which appear in three or four dependants of Andronicus are likely to have originated from Andronicus' *Chronicle* as well. When Isho<sup>c</sup>dad is one of those dependants the degree of likelihood increases, because he probably relied on only one chronographic source.

Two others – the foundation of Harran by Qainan and the foundation of Hierapolis by Semiramis – probably came from the same work, because of the references to Qainan and the deity Qainos (which I will discuss in detail below).

The only foundations whose origins are uncertain are those of Aleppo, Hebron and Shechem. The fact that only the two later Syriac Orthodox chroniclers mention the foundation of Aleppo may be an indication that it was a later addition by a Syriac Orthodox intermediary. However, it seems unlikely that Andronicus would not have included a foundation myth of such an important Syrian Christian centre. Furthermore, that Agapius and Michael agree on the foundation of Hebron by the Canaanites suggests their reliance on a common source. However, whether this was Andronicus or another chronicler cannot be established.

Apart from the foundation of Edessa [= Uruk] by Nimrod, the Anonymous Chronicler only mentions four others: that of Sodom and Gomorrah, Damascus, Harran and Aleppo. In only one of these cases, he identifies the founder, the biblical patriarch Qainan, the three other founders remain unknown. The foundation of Harran by Qainan is interesting, because it is based on a tradition from *Jubilees* in which Qainan is identified as the inventor of Chaldeism after the Flood, as the one who found inscriptions

containing astronomical information, when he was looking for a place to found a city. In *Jubilees* 8:2 the city remains unidentified, but Andronicus has identified it with Harran, an important pagan city in antiquity and a crucial location in the life of Abraham, because it was there where he sojourned between Ur and Canaan.

### 15.2.5.2 War

A second postdiluvian pre-Abrahamic theme was the concept of war, brought on by the invention of weaponry, which Andronicus attributed not to Chaldean kings, but to Sheba, Ophir and Havilah, the sons of Yoqtan who became kings over their own domain. Sheba, Ophir and Havilah are listed in the Table of Nations (*Genesis* 10:26-30), but no additional information is provided about them, save that “the region where [all the sons of Yoqtan] lived stretched from Mesha toward Sephar, in the eastern hill country.” According to the *Cave of Treasures* (XXV 5), these three sons of Yoqtan began to reign over their respective kingdoms in the time of Reu. Each kingdom has its own characteristics: the kingdom of Sheba is described as a land where after the death of Sheba women ruled until the time of Solomon, and the kingdom of Ophir as the land of gold.

These traditions are of course based on the biblical material at hand: the former took into account the story of the queen of Sheba who came to visit Solomon (1 *Kings* 10) and the latter on various biblical references to the richness in gold of the land of Ophir (1 *Kings* 9:28, 10:11, 22:49; 1 *Chronicles* 29:4; 2 *Chronicles* 8:18; *Job* 22:24, 28:16; *Psalms* 45:10 and *Isaiah* 13:12). After the *Cave of Treasures* however, this tradition seems to have evolved. On the one hand, the lands of Sheba, Ophir and Havilah are now respectively connected to perfume, gold and precious stones (cf. Agapius<sup>147</sup> and Michael<sup>148</sup>), perhaps based on 1 *Kings* 10:2 which identifies these three as the gifts that the queen of Sheba presented to king Solomon.<sup>149</sup> On the other hand, however, not the three kingdoms

---

<sup>147</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 76-7.

<sup>148</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (11T; vol. 1: 22V).

<sup>149</sup> The identification of the land of Havilah as the land of precious stones perhaps reflects *Genesis* 2:10-1, which identifies it as the land of gold, resin (pearls?) and onyx.

themselves, but the wars that they waged against each other and other peoples become the crucial element of the story in this evolved Syriac tradition.

Ish. Comm. Gen., 133.12-6T, 144.18-145.3V	Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 76-7	Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (11T; vol. 1: 22V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 49.23- 50.2T
At that time reigned three leaders (ܩܘܬܢܝܢ), the sons of Yoqtan, Sheba, Ophir and Havilah. These (men) started to fight with weapons against other peoples. The land that each of them occupied was named after them.	It is written that at that time the sons of Yoqtan, who is the same as Qaḥtan, appeared, three giant leaders (ܩܘܬܢܝܢ), one called Sheba, another called Ophir, a third called Havilah. The sons of Qaḥtan began to wage war against the peoples and the tribes with all sorts of weapons and instruments, because they were the first who acquired instruments of war and who knew them. [an elaboration on how these weapons mimicked body parts of certain animals such as the horn of a rhinoceros (sword) and the shell of a turtle (shield) and the richness of perfumes, gold and precious stones in these lands.] The wise Moses writes in his book on the nations that the peoples, tired of the continuing battle against the children	After the death of Peleg, the sons of Yoqtan, brother of Peleg, saw that they were not given (their) share and they held council and appointed three leaders (ܩܘܬܢܝܢ): Sheba, Ophir and Havilah. These (men) began to make weaponry and taught men (to acquire) instruments of war, and they started to consume blood and became strong because they used instruments of war. And because mankind was not yet experienced in weaponry, they fled away from them and built fortresses to defend (themselves). The people, defeated by the war with the children of Ophir, gave them the power so that they were given every place that pleased their wishes, and to take their share, if only they would abstain from war.	At that time, when the grandchildren of Shem saw that the share of their inheritance did not arrive to them, they appointed three kings (ܩܘܬܢܝܢ <sup>150</sup> ) from their brethren: Sheba, Ophir and Havilah. These three giant kings of the house of Yoqtan began to forge weapons and they left to fight peoples that inherited their land and overcame them, because they fought with weapons and up to that point no man from the peoples had learnt to acquire instruments of war. Therefore, they fled from before them and built fortresses for them[selves]. After the peoples had seen that they were defeated by them, they gave them the land of their share.

<sup>150</sup> Perhaps influenced by the use of the verb ܩܘܬܢ in CT 25.4-5?

	<p>of Qahtan and the troubles that resulted from the war and battles that were fought against them with many kinds of weapons that the peoples did not know, they permitted them to choose the climates that they preferred, in order that they would cease the war. The children of Qahtan chose this land, everyone needs this land, that which can be found there and that which those that govern it possess, even though they themselves do not need anything that can be found in other lands.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Sometime between the composition of the Cave of Treasures (sixth century), and the time of Isho'dad (c. 850), the legend of the three kingdoms of the sons of Yoqtan must have been merged with a tradition from *Jubilees* 11:2, which claims that “Noah’s children began to fight one another, to take captives, and to kill one another; to shed human blood on the earth, to consume blood; to build fortified cities, walls and towers; men to elevate themselves over peoples, to set up the first kingdoms; to go to war – people against people, nations against nations, city against city; and everyone to do evil, to acquire weapons, and to each warfare to their sons. City began to capture city and to sell male and female slaves.”<sup>151</sup> The fact that only these four known dependants of Andronicus preserve this evolved tradition suggests that it was Andronicus who merged

---

<sup>151</sup> Trans. VanderKam 1989, 64. This tradition was known to other Syriac chroniclers as well: Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 9.22-4V, 13.8-11T; Chron. 775, 328.T; 268.9-11V. Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (11T; vol. 1: 23V) knows it as well, given the dating of this event to year 56 of Serug, his source was probably a chronicle, possibly (ultimately) Andronicus. In Greek, it is extant in Georg. Cedr. Brev. 47.2-5.

these traditions. This is also supported by the fact that, as with the foundation of Harran by Qainan (*Jubilees* 8:2-4), there is evidence for a familiarity with traditions from the *Book of Jubilees*.

Although the descendants of Noah (*Jubilees*: “sons of Noah”; Andronicus: sons of Yoqtan) invented weapons and initiated wars on earth after the Flood, the Chaldean kings quickly adopted this wicked custom and continued this warlike way of life. Because the Anonymous Chronicler does not name any of the Chaldean successors of Nimrod, he ignored the wars that they waged as well. For the sake of completeness, however, and because they have not been discussed in detail before, I will briefly describe them here.

Agapius<sup>152</sup> and Michael<sup>153</sup> report on a war that took place when Serug was 70 years old, between Nimrod’s successor Qambirus and an enigmatic people or nation, which Michael calls Qlṭu (ܩܠܬܘ), but for whom Agapius used الكلدانيين, using the root ‘kld’, which Vasiliev wrongly translated as “Chaldeans.” Again, there seems to be a connection with a tradition, attested in the *Cave of Treasures* (30.18), which attributes the foundation of Claudia to the “oriental king” Komrus (ܟܘܡܪܘܫ) or Pomberus (ܦܘܡܒܪܘܫ).<sup>154</sup>

Only Michael<sup>155</sup> mentions the war between, Qambirus’ successor, and the sons of Javan<sup>156</sup> and the Canaanites. The war of this Chaldean king against the Amazons (the house of Sheba), however, is noted by both Agapius and Michael, and its results, the deaths of their male children, by the Anonymous Chronicler as well. Again, the similarities in the vocabulary of this episode in the chronicles of Agapius and Michael and in Chron. 1234 reveal their common origin.

---

<sup>152</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 78.

<sup>153</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (11-2T; vol. 1: 23V).

<sup>154</sup> Ri 2000, 308.

<sup>155</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (12T; vol. 1: 24V).

<sup>156</sup> The son of Japheth (Gen 10:2).

Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 78	Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (10T; vol. 1: 21-2V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.5-11T
<p>Other tribes of women also life in a region in this [sixth] climate and men do not live with them. They are called Amazons in Greek, they cut off their right breast and cauterise it with fire to prevent them from developing in order to be ready for war and fighting.</p> <p>They are also called al-Kharouniat (?), because Samirus fought them and killed all their male children. Therefore they were forced not to raise males, but only females. Once per year they went out and went to the borders of their lands, to the land of the Bourdjans (البرجان), where the men of the Bourdjans knew them, and they conceived, then they returned to their homes.</p>	<p>Sanus (....) went to war with Sheba and killed him. His daughter, who was called Sheba as well, after her father, reigned after him, for forty years. Aristoboulos<sup>157</sup> writes about her that she fought many wars and excelled greatly. And because of this women were also reigning there and going out to war at the head (of an army). On account of these Amazon women, they were found to be daughters of Ashkenaz and Togarmah, with whom Samirus, king of Babylon, waged war in the beginning and whose sons he killed. From then on, they adopted a law not to raise males, but (only) females. And once per year they crossed the border and had intercourse with men, returned and conceived. <i>They killed the males that they gave birth to and</i></p>	<p>At that time</p> <p>women also excelled in war and were even ruling.</p> <p>And from then on, they adopted a law that they would not raise males, but (only) females. And once per year they had intercourse with their men and <i>passed their male children towards their men.</i></p>

<sup>157</sup> Possibly a reference to Aristoboulos of Cassandrea (fourth – third century BC), author of a now lost biography of Alexander the Great, see Pownall 2013. However, Aristoboulos either did not mention any women dressed as Amazons [cf. Arr. Anab. VII 13.2-3 (ed. and trans. 244-7)] or expressly dismissed a meeting between Alexander and an Amazon queen as fiction [Plut. Alex. XLVI 1-2 (ed. and trans. 356-7)].

They are always ready for war and battle. No scholar doubts this fact or renounces <u>the truth of their story</u> as we tell it, and no one contradicts it.	raised the females, according to <u>the true story</u> about them that is placed in ancient books.	
--	--	--

Similarly to the convergence of the tradition of Sheba, Ophir, Havilah with *Jubilees* 11:2, the tradition of the female rulers of the house of Sheba has now been interwoven with the Greek myth of the Amazons and implemented in Andronicus' views on postdiluvian pre-Abrahamic history due to the connections to the Chaldean (Samirus) and Egyptian (Sanus) royal houses.

Furthermore, Isho<sup>c</sup>dad,<sup>158</sup> Agapius,<sup>159</sup> and Michael<sup>160</sup> also report on the war between Samirus and Kisonus the Parthian, who defeats Samirus, takes his crown (in the shape of two horns) and becomes king of Chaldea himself. These three authors also record that Kisonus is eventually killed himself by Heşron,<sup>161</sup> the brother of Terah, according to one source, because he had stolen a golden idol from the house of Nahor, one of the priests of the cult of Qainan.<sup>162</sup> After Arphazad, Kisonus' successor, the throne remains vacant for seven years until Belus the Assyrian takes over the empire and wages war against the Chaldeans and the Medes.<sup>163</sup>

It is possible that the war between king Chedorlaomer and the five kings of the lands of Sodom and Gomorrah (*Genesis* 14:1-16;<sup>164</sup> *Jubilees* 13) should also be included in this

---

<sup>158</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 134.15-7T, 146.5-7V.

<sup>159</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 79.

<sup>160</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 5 (12T; vol. 1: 24V).

<sup>161</sup> Only two Hesrons is attested in the Bible. *Genesis* 46:9 identifies him as the son of Ruben, *Genesis* 46:12 as the son of Perez. Why Terah's brother received the name Hesron is unclear, but the creation of this apocryphal figure was probably instigated by *Genesis* 11:25 which states that Nahor had other (unnamed) sons and daughters after the birth of Terah.

<sup>162</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 134.18-20T, 146.5-7V; Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 104; and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (13T; vol. 1: 25V).

<sup>163</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (13T; vol. 1: 25V).

<sup>164</sup> On which, see Ephr. Syr. Comm. Gen. XI 1.

list. Isho<sup>c</sup>dad<sup>165</sup> merely comments on *Genesis* and Chron. 1234<sup>166</sup> almost literally quotes *Jubilees* 13:21-3, 28-9, but both Agapius and Michael clearly owe their account to a common source, a Syriac chronicle that dated this war to year 71 of Abraham.

Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 105	Mich. Syr. Chron. III 1 (18T; vol. 1: 34V)
In year 71 after the birth of Abraham, the wars and conflicts between king Chedorlaomer and the five kings of the land of Sodom and Gomorrah commenced. They lasted for 14 years until the tenth year after the departure of Abraham from the land of Ur of the Chaldeans, which was the land of Canaan, son of Ham, son of Noah.	In year 71 of Abraham occurred the war of Chedorlaomer with the Assyrian kings of Sodom. He subdued them for 14 years until the time that Abraham settled in the land of Canaan, the tenth year (...).

### 15.2.5.3 The origin of idolatry

Of vital importance to the presentation of postdiluvian and pre-Abrahamic history in Andronicus' *Chronicle* was the issue of the origin and transmission of idolatry. In following of a Jewish tradition that went back as least as far as *Jubilees* and had an etymological background,<sup>167</sup> most Syriac exegetes and chronographers claimed that mankind started to worship idols in the time of Serug. One of the earliest Syriac examples of this can be found in the *Cave of Treasures*.

Jub. 11:4-5 (trans. VanderKam, 1989, 65)	CT 25:8-14 <sup>168</sup>
[in the time of Serug] they made molten images for themselves. Each one would worship the idol which he had made as his own molten image. They began to make statues, images, and unclean things; the spirits of the savage ones were helping and misleading	And in the days of Serug the worship of idols entered the earth and mankind started to make statues. This was the entry of idolatry on earth because at that time there were no teachers, wise men or legislators to show the peoples the path of truth on which they

<sup>165</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 145.21-2T, 157.27-8V.

<sup>166</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 53.5-15T.

<sup>167</sup> Jubilees 11:6: "For this reason Serug was named Serug: because everyone turned to commit every (kind of) sin" (trans. VanderKam 1989, 65).

<sup>168</sup> Translation based on the West-Syrian version of the *Cave of Treasures* (ed. Ri 1989, 199, 201).

<p>(them) so that they would commit sins, impurities, and transgression.</p> <p>Prince Mastema was exerting his power in effecting all these actions and, by means of the spirits, he was sending to those who were placed under his control (the ability) to commit every (kind of) error and sin and every (kind of) transgression; to corrupt, to destroy, and to shed blood on the earth.</p>	<p>should walk and travel. Due to this they erred completely. [Some] of them worshipped the sun in their error, [others] the moon, the stars, the earth, the animals, birds, reptiles and also trees, shadows, waters, and winds.</p> <p>When Satan blinded their eyes, they walked in the shadow of error, because there was no hope of resurrection. Immediately when one of them had died, they made a statue of him in his likeness and placed it on his tomb so that his memory would not pass. This wicked thing was sown in every place and the earth was filled with idols in the likeness of men and women.</p>
---	--

According to *Jubilees* 11:4-5, in the time of Serug, Men started to make statues of themselves and worship them, and this evil quickly spread due to the influence of prince Mastema and his evil spirits. The author of the *Cave of Treasures* was probably inspired by this Jewish tradition, perhaps even this text.<sup>169</sup> He describes how, in the time of Serug, idolatry evolved out of the erection of statues of dead relatives (XXV 8-14). Furthermore, the *Cave of Treasures* makes no mention of prince Mastema; this evil figure is replaced by Satan.<sup>170</sup> The same sentiments appear in Chron. 1234, whose author clearly relied on the *Cave of Treasures*.

CT 25:8-14 <sup>171</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 49.6-13T
<p>And in the days of Serug the worship of idols entered the earth and mankind started to make statues. This was the entry of idolatry on earth because at that time there were no teachers, wise men or legislators to show the peoples the path of truth on which they should walk and travel. Due to this they erred</p>	<p>In the days of Serug the worship of idols entered the earth and the name of the one God vanished from their hearts because they had no wise men or legislators. And from the beginning of their error, they worshipped the sun, the moon, idols and all the figures that are in the sky and on earth. And because</p>

<sup>169</sup> Ri 2000, 311-3.

<sup>170</sup> The Syriac accounts of the episode of Abraham and the Ravens do not mention Mastema either, see Brock 1987, 137 and 140.

<sup>171</sup> Translation based on the West-Syrian version of the *Cave of Treasures* (ed. Ri 1989, 199 and 201).

<p>completely. [Some] of them worshipped the sun in their error, [others] the moon, the stars, the earth, the animals, birds, reptiles and also trees, shadows, waters, and winds.</p> <p>When Satan blinded their eyes, they walked in the shadow of error, because there was no hope of resurrection. Immediately when one of them had died, they made a statue of him in his likeness and placed it on his tomb so that his memory would not pass. This wicked thing was sown in every place and the earth was filled with idols in the likeness of men and women.</p>	<p>they did not have hope [in] the resurrection, they fabricated statues for their dead and they worshipped them so that they would not forget them.</p>
---	--

In a brief passage, however, Michael reverts to the original Jewish version of the legend, referring to “evil spirits and impure demons” rather than Satan.<sup>172</sup> In which chronicle Michael found this entry is unknown.

<p><i>Jubilees</i> 11:4 (trans. VanderKam 1989, 65)</p>	<p>Mich. Syr. Chron II 3 (9T; vol. 1: 21V)</p>
<p>[in the time of Serug] they made molten images for themselves. Each one would worship the idol which he had made as his own molten image. They began to make statues, images, and unclean things; the spirits of the savage ones were helping and misleading (them) so that they would commit sins, impurities, and transgression.</p>	<p>“In the time of Serug, men made images that they worshipped,  excited by evil spirits and impure demons.”</p>

Andronicus also independently reworked this tradition on the emergence of idolatry. His reinterpretation is preserved in the works of Isho<sup>c</sup>dad, Agapius and Michael, but not in Chron. 1234.

---

<sup>172</sup> Ri 2000, 311 retraces a similar comment to Flav. Jos. Ant. Jud. I 4, but I have been unable to find any reference to the emergence of idolatry in the time of Serug in the works of Josephus.

Ish. Comm. Gen., 139.24-30T, 151.24-30V	Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 71-2	Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (10T; vol. 1: 21V)
<p>Mar Ephrem and the Book of Jubilees (ܩܘܿܒܘܿܠܐ ܕܝܘܒܝܠܐ) say: “When [mankind] was divided into seventy-two languages and dispersed over the face of the earth, they started to fight each other and erect statues for those who had gone out in front of them and triumphed, as a commemoration. Eventually, they also worshipped them and in that manner and at that time the idolatry first entered the world.”</p>	<p>It is written that when the languages of the tribes of the children of Shem, Ham and Japheth, son of Noah, were divided in all the climates over the face of the earth, when they had occupied their regions and after every language, every people and tribe had distanced itself in a location of a climate of the earth, as we have described, the peoples began to fight each other. Every nation and every people chose a military leader, who conducted their troops and guided them to war, walking in front of them. It is said that finally, when some of these leaders, warlords and commanders of troops returned victoriously and triumphantly to their companions, their people and their nations, the people took them as masters because of their victory. For their leaders, known and celebrated because of their exploits, wars and success, they erected idols that bore their names and resembled them, so that these idols allowed them to remember he who had conquered for them and had returned to them victoriously.</p> <p>Much later, they had started to venerate them and to offer them sacrifices, first as a sign of veneration for them, and as a remembrances of the victories</p>	<p>In year 70 of Reu, the Tower was built and was completed after 40 years. Mankind was dispersed over the face of the entire earth, and they started to multiply wars and battles. Those who were victorious raised statues of victory and eventually worshipped the statue(s). Thus idolatry multiplied itself.</p>

	<p>that they had brought on; later, when evil things occurred, when their enemies, who wanted to have revenge, inflicted all sorts of evil and hurt upon them, they went to those idols, begging for their help. It is for this reason that, thereafter, the cult and the veneration of idols was even applied to living heroes. As is written, demons spoke to men from the inside of the idols.</p>	
--	---	--

Andronicus directly connects the theme of wars (*Jubilees* 11:2) to the sin of idolatry (*Jubilees* 11:3-4) by claiming that Mankind’s reverence for the heroes who fought (and won) their wars quickly evolves into mere idolatrous behaviour.

Worth noting in this respect is that Ishoʿdad may preserve Andronicus’ source references here: he refers to Ephrem and a *Book of Jubilees* as his sources. Ephrem’s *Commentary on Genesis* does not show any familiarity with any traditions from the *Book of Jubilees*, but it may be a reference to the *Cave of Treasures*, whose authorship was incorrectly attributed to Ephrem. If so, this incorrect attribution may date back as early as the sixth century.

Ishoʿdad’s reference to the *Book of Jubilees*, however, is very interesting. Generally speaking, it may refer to a mere chronological list of the biblical patriarchs, but here it probably does refer to the actual *Book of Jubilees*, given that this excerpt deals with the origin of idolatry, not chronology. If this is the case, Ishoʿdad preserves Andronicus’ original source references to the *Cave of Treasures* and the *Book of Jubilees*. This ties in with Andronicus’ opinion on the emergence of war among the sons of Yoqtan, which is a combination of a tradition extant in the *Cave of Treasures* (the three kingdoms of Sheba, Ophir and Havilah) and the emergence of war (*Jubilees* 11:2).

#### 15.2.5.4 Qainan and the origin of Chaldeism and idolatry

Closely connected to the theme of idolatry, is the issue of the origin of Chaldeism, the Chaldean art of magic. *Jubilees* 11:4-5 identified Serug as a worshipper of idols and *Jubilees* 11:8 stated that he taught his son Nahor “the studies of Chaldeans: to practice divination and to augur by the signs of the sky” (trans. VanderKam 1989, 66). *Jubilees* 8:2-4 retraced the origin of these “studies of Chaldeans” to Qainan, the son of Arphaxad, who had found steles that had been left by the antediluvian Watchers, inscribed with “the Watchers’ teaching by which they used to observe the omens of the sun, moon, and stars and every heavenly sign” (trans. VanderKam 1989, 50-51).

This aspect of the figure of Qainan is only attested in two Syriac sources: Michael and Chron. 1234, the latter of which preserves a fairly literal copy of *Jubilees* 8:2-4.

<i>Jub.</i> 8:2-4 <sup>173</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 46.5-12T <sup>174</sup>
When the boy grew up, his father taught him (the art of) writing. He went to look for a place of his own where he could possess his own city. He found an inscription which the ancients had incised in a rock. He read what was in it, copied it, and sinned on the basis of what was in it, since in it was the Watchers’ teaching by which they used to observe the omens of the suns, moon, stars and every heavenly sign. He wrote (it) down but told no one about it because he was afraid to tell Noah about it lest he become angry at him about it.	After Qainan had grown up, his father taught him letters. He went to build a place and a city for him(self) and he found an inscription that the first ones had incised in a rock. He read it, copied it and erred in it because the doctrine of the first ones had been written on it to see the signs in the sun, the moon, the stars and all the signs of the sky. He did not reveal it to anyone because he was afraid of Noah, in order that he would not be angry with him.

Michael states on two occasions that “Qainan invented Chaldeism, magic and astrology.”<sup>175</sup> One of these citations occurs in Book 2 Chapter 7 in the heart of

<sup>173</sup> On the afterlife of this episode in Greek and Syriac historiography, see Adler 1989, 91-3, 196-8 and 215-6.

<sup>174</sup> On which see Tisserant 1921, 206-7.

<sup>175</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 2 (8T; vol. 1: 16-7V), on which, see Ri 2000, 312 and Adler 1994, 165. Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 42-5 speaks at length of Qainan and the fact that he is not mentioned in the Torah and Peshitta (“Syriac

Andronicus' computation of Old Testament chronology, suggesting that they may have come from the same source. Given our previous findings regarding Andronicus' familiarity with *Jubilees*' traditions, it is highly likely that Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's knowledge of Qainan's invention of Chaldeism also reverts to a common source, probably an intermediary between them and Andronicus.

Although his *Chronicle* does not preserve a literal copy of *Jubilees* 8:2-4, Michael did include a counterpart to *Jubilees* 11:8 in his work. He claims that "Serug taught Nahor the Chaldean religion and divination, and to reflect on the signs of the sky" and attributes this information to "Asaph, in his book, (in which) he exposes the genealogies."<sup>176</sup> In a quote from an equally unknown author, called Zamardos the mage, preserved in Michael, Serug receives the epithet "the Chaldean".<sup>177</sup>

The Jewish Qainan tradition became very popular in Syriac sources, but was adapted. Only Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler know that Qainan invented astrology. Similarly, only they claim that Qainan founded Harran, a tradition that was obviously based on *Jubilees* 8:2 in which it is said that Qainan was looking to found a city. What better city to attribute to Qainan than Harran, which remained a pagan centre for the moon god Sin as late even as the fourteenth century. In addition, however, Syriac historians and exegetes, as early as Jacob of Edessa, report that the temple in Ur of the Chaldeans that was burnt by Abraham according to *Jubilees* 12:12 was in fact dedicated to Qainan.

Only the most recent witnesses, however, explicitly record the deification of Qainan: Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler claim that Qainan thought of himself as a god,

---

Torah"), but does not say anything else about him. Ish. Comm. Gen. follows the Peshitta and does not mention Qainan at all.

<sup>176</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (12T; vol. 1: 23V).

<sup>177</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (11T; vol. 1: 23V).

that he was worshipped as a god by his sons<sup>178</sup> and that idols were made in his likeness.<sup>179</sup>

“After the death of Noah, however, the members of his people worshipped him as a God and honoured him, erred after him, made statues and idols of him in every place.”<sup>180</sup>

Michael also alludes to the divine status of Qainan in several instances. Nahor is identified as a “priest of the idol Qainan” who kept a golden statue of this deity in his house.<sup>181</sup> “Qainan, god of Babylon” is mentioned in an account of how the Egyptians came into contact with Chaldeism, which was also recorded by Agapius<sup>182</sup> and the Anonymous Chronicler,<sup>183</sup> albeit without any reference to Qainan:

“the sixth king of Egypt, Pharaoh Aphintus (...) sent (messengers) to Kisaronus, king of the Chaldeans, and learnt their doctrine and also the name of Qainan, god of Babylon, whose image was worshipped in Egypt until Serapis, son of Niobe.”<sup>184</sup>

Michael reinforces this last statement with a citation from the work of Asaph, that

---

<sup>178</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 5 (13T; vol. 1: 25V) is very explicit in identifying these sons as the pre-Abrahamic patriarchs, by calling Nahor a “priest of the idol Qainan” who kept a golden statue of this deity in his house.

<sup>179</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 2 (8T; vol. 1: 16-7V) and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (16T; vol. 1: 30V), on which, see Ri 2000, 312 and Adler 1994, 165. Ish. Comm. Gen. follows the Peshitta and therefore does not mention Qainan at all. Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 42-5 speaks at length of Kainan and the fact that he is not mentioned in the Torah and Peshitta (“Syriac Torah”), but does not identify him as the inventor of Chaldeism at any point.

<sup>180</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 46.12-6T.

<sup>181</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 5 (13T; vol. 1: 25V).

<sup>182</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 80: “a king, called Aphintos (or: Antuthis) reigned in Egypt for thirty-two years. He was the first to invent books, sciences, astronomy, arithmetic, after the books of the Chaldeans and Eastern scholars, and introduced them in Egypt. He learnt the science of sorcery and magic.”

<sup>183</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.23-4T: “at that time, the books of the Chaldean art were brought to Egypt.”

<sup>184</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 5 (12T; vol. 1: 26V).

“in the time of Terah, the Egyptians learnt Chaldeism and made a molten image, a golden statue for the idol Qainos.”<sup>185</sup>

Qainos is Qainan’s divine name, a Hellenised version of it. Apart from Michael, only Isho<sup>c</sup>dad and Agapius demonstrate knowledge of this name, suggesting that Andronicus was the original source for this information. Both authors record the construction of a temple for Qainos (Isho<sup>c</sup>dad: ܩܝܢܘܨ<sup>186</sup>; Agapius: ܩܝܘܨ<sup>187</sup>) by the Assyrian queen Semiramis on the bank of the Euphrates, in a location which is later appropriately called Hierapolis (“holy city”, Mabbug/Manbij). The fact that this passage is not present in Michael’s *Chronicle* also reinforces the theory that Isho<sup>c</sup>dad and Agapius accessed Andronicus directly and that Michael (and Chron. 1234) only accessed him via an intermediary that contained only excerpts from Andronicus’ *Chronicle*.

The Anonymous Chronicler does not record the name ‘Qainos’, but he identifies the temple that was burnt by Abraham (*Jubilees* 12:12) as the “temple of Qainan”.<sup>188</sup> That this temple was devoted to the idol Qainan was known to Syriac authors as early as Jacob of Edessa.<sup>189</sup> Other witnesses include the *Catena Severi*,<sup>190</sup> a ninth-century commentary on the Old Testament, based on material from Ephrem and Jacob of Edessa, and Cyriacus of Tagrit<sup>191</sup> (Syriac Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, 793-817). Without mentioning the cult of “Qainan, god of Babylon” as Michael<sup>192</sup> had done, the Anonymous Chronicler also reports the transmission of the books of the Chaldean art to the Egyptians, during the time of the pharaoh Aphintus.<sup>193</sup>

---

<sup>185</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (12-3T; vol. 1: 26V) has Ninos (ܢܝܢܘܨ), but Barh. Chron. Syr. I, 9V (ed. Bedjan 1890, 10.14) has Qainos (ܩܝܢܘܨ).

<sup>186</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 167.28T, 181.9V.

<sup>187</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 108.

<sup>188</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 52.8T.

<sup>189</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 12-3 (ed. ܐ; trans. 203-4; Engl. trans. in Brock 1978, 138).

<sup>190</sup> Benedictus 1737, 156-7; Brock 1978, 138.

<sup>191</sup> Taylor 2010, 49.

<sup>192</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 5-6 (12-3T; vol. 1: 26V).

<sup>193</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.23-4T. Cf. also Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 80.

Several studies have touched upon the issue of the origin of this Syriac Qainan tradition. Jacob of Edessa's use of the Greek spelling for Chaldeans' (ܟܠܕܝܐܝܡ<sup>194</sup>) and Haran (ܗܪܐܢ<sup>195</sup>) and his quotation from *Genesis* (LXX) 11:28<sup>196</sup> rather than the Peshitta suggests a Greek origin for the tradition of the burning of the temple."<sup>197</sup> However, no Greek chronicle shows any knowledge of the deification of Qainan nor of the dedication of the temple in his honour. John Malalas<sup>198</sup> attributes the discovery of steles containing astronomical information to Arphaxad-Qainan, but says nothing of Qainan's deification, and neither does George Cedrenus,<sup>199</sup> who attributes this discovery to Shelah. Similarly, those Greek chroniclers that report Abraham's burning of the temple do not identify the god to whom it was dedicated.<sup>200</sup> This suggests that the Syriac Qainan tradition evolved independently from the Greek, probably after a Syriac chronicler extracted the tradition about Qainan's discovery of the stelae of the watchers (*Jubilees* 8:2-4) and Abraham's burning of the temple (*Jubilees* 12:12) from a Greek chronographic source, and fused the two together.

Jacob of Edessa offers us a tiny glimpse of his source. He identifies his sources as "Jewish (hi)stories," a reference similar to the one he uses for his source for the adaptation of *Jubilees* 5:1-10: "stories (which are) ancient and (are) additional to those which are (found) among the Hebrews" (on which, see my chapter on *Jubilees*).<sup>201</sup> Though Jacob may have accessed Jewish sources, he is probably dependent on a Syriac source, possibly Andronicus who identifies as one of his sources a Jewish author called Asaph who may or may not have existed (see below).

---

<sup>194</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 12-3 (ed. ܡ, l. 19).

<sup>195</sup> Jac. Ed. Epist. 12-3 (ed. ܡ, l. 26).

<sup>196</sup> His reading that Haran died "before Terah" reflects the Septuagint rather than the Peshitta ("in the life of Terah").

<sup>197</sup> Brock 1978, 146 was the first to point out both indications. See also Adler 1987, 114.

<sup>198</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. I 5 (ed. 7.3-7; trans. 4).

<sup>199</sup> Georg. Cedr. Brev. 27.

<sup>200</sup> E.g. Georg. Sync. Chron. 112.7-10 (trans. 139-40).

<sup>201</sup> Jac. Ed. Schol. 10, preserved in BL Add. 17,193, f. 61b-62a (trans. Kruisheer 1997, 194-5).

### 15.2.5.5 Postdiluvian inventions

A last set of materials that can definitely be attributed to Andronicus are references to the inventions or first occurrences of certain techniques or practices, most of which seem to have been adduced as examples of facilitators of the emergence of wars and idolatry.<sup>202</sup>

Invention	Isho <sup>c</sup> dad	Agapius	Michael	Chron. 1234
Weapons	x	x	X	x
Melting of iron		x		
Weights, measures and balances	x	x	x	x
Melting of gold			x	
Money and jewellery	x	x	x	
Fabrics (silk) and dyes			x (x)	x
Ship			x	

Apart from the previously mentioned invention of weapons by Sheba, Ophir and Havilah, Ophir himself is supposed to have invented the technique for gold-working,<sup>203</sup> which allowed mankind to produce money and jewellery,<sup>204</sup> and, even though none of the authors emphasises it, it also allowed them to make golden idols. The invention of weights, measurements and balances is mentioned by all four sources<sup>205</sup> and attributed to Samirus by all but Chron. 1234. This invention was probably able to occur due to the

---

<sup>202</sup> With regards to these materials and Andronicus' sources, it is worth noting that some of these inventions, weapons in iron and bronze, gold-working, the production of bracelets for women and even dyes, are specifically mentioned in 1 *Enoch* 8:1. Its author attributes them to the twenty leaders of the Watchers.

<sup>203</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (11T; vol. 1: 23V).

<sup>204</sup> Ish. Comm. Gen., 133.15-6T, 145.2-3V; Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 78; and Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (11T; vol. 1: 23V).

<sup>205</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 79, Ish. Comm. Gen., 134.14-5T; 146.4-5V; Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (12T; vol. 1: 24V); and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.11-2T. A similarly negative ancient Jewish tradition, which attributes the antediluvian invention of weights and measures to Cain, is extant in Flav. Jos. Ant. Jud. I 2.2.

innovations of Amorius, son of Ophir, an artisan in iron and copper who is only mentioned by Agapius.<sup>206</sup> Michael<sup>207</sup> and Chron. 1234<sup>208</sup> also date the invention of dyes and fabrics (especially silk) in the time of Samirus (Michael) and Serug (Chron. 1234).<sup>209</sup> Only Michael emphasises that these fabrics were meant to be applied to idols. Also worth noting is that Michael attributes this information to “the mage Zamardos.”

One last item, the invention of the ship, is only mentioned by Michael, but given the fact that it is attributed to Eupaphintus, one of the Egyptian kings that is uniquely mentioned by Andronicus, this element must have stemmed from Andronicus' *Chronicle* as well. The reason for this invention remains unclear, but could have been adduced in order to explain how the Egyptians came into contact with the Chaldeans and how Chaldeism was transmitted to Egypt.<sup>210</sup>

### 15.3 Andronicus' sources

Andronicus' main source was Eusebius, in particular his canons. Andronicus often merely copied these, which is why chroniclers such as Elias of Nisibis often cite Andronicus for information that was equally available in the Eusebian canons. Andronicus' *series regum* were also largely based on Eusebius', although the former often disagreed with the latter regarding the length of certain kings' reigns and added certain kings to the lists. It is unclear if Andronicus accessed Eusebius in Greek or in Syriac, but he continued the Eusebian canons, with or without the Antiochene continuation, at least until AD 334-5.

---

<sup>206</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 78.

<sup>207</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (12T; vol. 1: 24V).

<sup>208</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.12-3T.

<sup>209</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 23-4 does not preserve this invention, but does attribute the antediluvian use of dyes and coloured clothes to Naama, the sister of Jubal and Tubal-Cain.

<sup>210</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (10T; vol. 1: 21V).

Andronicus knew several traditions from *Jubilees*, which he fused together in a new way. He combined the traditions concerning the origins of war and weapons (*Jubilees* 11:2) and of idolatry (*Jubilees* 11:4) together, so that the latter was a consequence of the former. Similarly, he seems to have combined Qainan's invention of astrology (*Jubilees* 8:2-4) with tradition of Abraham's burning of the temple (*Jubilees* 12:12), by identifying Qainan as the god to whom this temple was dedicated.

These traditions from *Jubilees* were also fused with traditions from other sources, sometimes Greek myths (e.g. that of the Amazons). In one case Andronicus knew a tradition that is now only extant in the *Cave of Treasures* but whether he had access to this work or simply knew traditions that were circulating orally or written down in sixth-century Syria and Northern Mesopotamia cannot be determined. Isho'dad's reference to "Ephrem and the *Book of Jubilees*," however, suggests the former theory.

One name that often appears in connection with material that can be attributed to Andronicus is a certain Asaph, who is frequently cited by Michael in his description of the period between the Flood and Abraham, as well as other earlier Syriac authors. From the information provided by Michael we gather that Asaph wrote "a book"<sup>211</sup> that consisted of at least two "books."<sup>212</sup>

The evidence suggests that the first book of Asaph was concerned with Hebrew chronology whereas the second focused on the history of Chaldea. All we know for certain about the second book is that the tradition of Nimrod's woven crown was mentioned in it,<sup>213</sup> but the first book is said to have contained a computation of the chronology of the Old Testament, giving the dates of the births and deaths of the biblical patriarchs supposedly according to the Septuagint, but completely matching Andronicus' computation.<sup>214</sup> Michael, and probably Andronicus as well, juxtaposes Asaph's calculation with that of the Hebrew bible and the Peshitta. This Hebrew

---

<sup>211</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (12T; vol. 1: 23V).

<sup>212</sup> First book: Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (14T; vol. 1: 28V); second book: Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (11T; vol. 1: 22V).

<sup>213</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 3 (11T; vol. 1: 22V).

<sup>214</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (14-6T; vol. 1: 28-30V).

computation is attributed to the ‘*Chronicle*’ of Ezra.”<sup>215</sup> This book of Asaph in which “he exposes the genealogies”<sup>216</sup> is also cited by Michael for a version of *Jubilees* 11:8, a tradition about Serug’s teaching of the Chaldean studies to his son Nahor, indicating that Asaph was one of Andronicus’ sources for traditions from *Jubilees*.

Asaph is mentioned thrice more in Michael’s *Chronicle*. According to Michael, Asaph claimed that Methuselah died during the Flood.<sup>217</sup> Once, Asaph is identified as the source for an entry on the transmission of Chaldeism to the Egyptians. Crucially, this entry specifically mentions the idol Qainos.<sup>218</sup> The last reference to Asaph occurs in an entry on the date of the struggle of Job and the issue of the latter’s genealogical origin.

“We have found that, according to the chronicle of Arud the Canaanite, the struggle of the just Job took place at the time of the twenty-fifth (year) of Nahor. The words of Arud are these: “there was a rich man of the tribe of Joqtan, who was called Job. Seven times he fought with Satan on his own and won. Asaph says that this struggle occurred sixty years later.”<sup>219</sup>

Chron. 1234 preserves the same material, but does not preserve the date year 25 of Nahor nor the source references. Furthermore, the Anonymous Chronicler has split up the material and given both opinions as regards the dates of the struggle of Job.

And at that time [between year 12 and year 79 of Nahor] there was the struggle of Job with Satan, for seven years. And he was victorious and triumphed. And there are (those) who say that his struggle occurred sixty years later. (...)

At that time [between year 121 and year 147 of Jacob] occurred the struggle of the just Job with Satan for seven years. And he was victorious and triumphed. And there are (those) who say that this occurred 60 years earlier than this.<sup>220</sup>

---

<sup>215</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (14T; vol. 1: 28V).

<sup>216</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 4 (12T; vol. 1: 23V).

<sup>217</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 7 (14T; vol. 1: 28V).

<sup>218</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 6 (12-3T; vol. 1: 26V) has Ninios (ܢܝܢܘܫ), but Barh. Chron. Syr. I, 9V (ed. Bedjan 1890, 10.14) has Qainos (ܩܝܢܘܫ).

<sup>219</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. II 5 (12T; vol. 1: 24V).

<sup>220</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 50.21-3 and 60.20-3T.

Crucially, a similar entry is also extant in the *Commentary on Job* of Dionysius bar Salibi (d. 1171):

“Asaph the priest, the colleague of Ezra, and Aroz the chronicler, and Jacob of Edessa say that the belongs to the sons of Joqtan, the one who is the son of Eber and he is prior to Abraham and by a space of more than sixty years.”<sup>221</sup>

This Aroz is clearly the same figure as Arud the Canaanite chronicler, mentioned by Michael, and Dionysius’ identification of Asaph as a colleague of Ezra perfectly matches the juxtaposition of their respective patriarchal chronologies in Michael’s *Chronicle*. Dionysius’ mention of Jacob of Edessa suggests that the latter transmitted this entry to the former.<sup>222</sup> In which work of Jacob Dionysius found this material cannot be determined, but Jacob probably found this information in the *Chronicle* of Andronicus.

Dionysius’ “Asaph the priest” may be an allusion to the biblical figure of Asaph, a Levite descendant of Qahath (1 *Chron* 26:1; 2 *Chron* 20:14) who was adduced in order to give credit to all of this information. This is probably also how the otherwise unknown figures of Arud the Canaanite chronicler, Damaris, the mages Zamardus and Menander, and the Assyrian Qumabarus should be viewed, as ancient trustworthy sources.<sup>223</sup> Given that Asaph is cited for information on chronological issues, there may also be a connection to “Asaph the recorder” (2 *Kings* 18:18, 37).

---

<sup>221</sup> Dion. Bar Salib. *Comm. Job*, 44. For a French translation, see Jac. Ed. *Epist.* 12-3 (trans. Nau 1900, 261, n. 1 and Adler 1994, 165 and 171, n. 74). Dion. was also used by Barhebr. *Comm. Job*, who also mentions Jac. Ed. The complete text was edited and translated into Latin by Bernstein in 1858, but I have not been able to access this work. However, see Payne Smith 1864, 4-5 for the Syriac text and Latin translation of the relevant entry from ms. Bodl. Syr. 1.

<sup>222</sup> Dion. Bar Salib. *Comm. Job*, 44, n. 2.

<sup>223</sup> The ‘chronicle’ of Menander is identified as the source for the number of regnal years of Nimrod, or possibly also for Nimrod’s death during the fall of the Tower of Babylon, *Mich. Syr. Chron.* II 3 (10-1T; vol. 1: 21-2V). Zamardus and Damaris are identified as the source for the war between the “Qlt” and the Chaldeans in year 70 of Serug; Zamardus as the source for the invention of fabrics by Samirus; and Zamardus and Qumabarus for the deaths of Peleg and Nimrod in year 69 of Reu, *Mich. Syr. Chron.* II 4, 7 (11-2, 16T, vol. 1: 23-24, 30V).

In the larger context of the connection between Andronicus and Asaph, other non-historical texts are worth mentioning as well. In the Syriac *Treatise on the twelve stoicheia of the sun*,<sup>224</sup> Asaph, who is cited as a source for the Aramaic names of the signs of the Zodiac, is identified as a “historian of the Hebrews.”<sup>225</sup> The attribution of this treatise to Andronicus, “the wise, the philosopher, and the learned”<sup>226</sup> shows that the Asaph-Andronicus connection is genuine and encompasses not only the Syriac chronographic tradition. An “Andronicus the philosopher and rich in sciences”<sup>227</sup> or “Andronicus the wise”<sup>228</sup> is also credited with the authorship of the *Treatise on the four quarters of the earth*,<sup>229</sup> which does not refer to Asaph, but was probably written by the same person. More to the point also is the Syriac *Book of Medicines*,<sup>230</sup> which does not mention Asaph either, but in a chapter dealing with astrological and astronomical issues, cites the “Book of Andronicus” and “the Book of Andronicus the wise” as the source for the prediction that “when the star shoots from the east to the west, the king of Persia will wage war on Beth Huzaye.”<sup>231</sup>

These Andronicuses are probably one and the same. The treatise on the *stoicheia* of the sun provides a link between Asaph, Andronicus and astronomical or astrological

---

<sup>224</sup> Mingana 1917, 29-33 (introd. and trans.) and 60-2 (ed.).

<sup>225</sup> Mingana 1917, 61 (ed.), 33 (trans.).

<sup>226</sup> Mingana 1917, 60 (ed.), 32 (trans.).

<sup>227</sup> Nau 1917, 464 (ed.) and 468 (trans.).

<sup>228</sup> Nau 1917, 467 (ed.) and 471 (trans.).

<sup>229</sup> Extant in three manuscripts. The first witness, BL Add. 25,875, f. 77a – 79a, has been edited and translated two times, by E.-W. Brooks (Descr. Pop. et Plag.) and by Nau 1917, 462-71. The second, preserved in the early eighteenth-century manuscript Berlin, Königlichen Bibliothek, Syr. 59 (olim ms. Or. Quart. 802), f. 72b-75a [Sachau 1899, vol. 1, 200-4, 203, n. 9], was edited and translated into German by Furlani 1927, 238-49. Brock 1969, 216-7 signals the existence of a nineteenth-century witness (in an eighteenth-century manuscript), “very close to that of Berlin syr. 59” in Ming. Syr. 183, f. 180b-181b. The testimony of the Berlin ms. shows that Descr. Pop. et Plag. in BL Add. 25,875 is in fact a combination of Andronicus’ *Treatise on the Four Quarters of the earth* with the anonymous *Treatise on the peoples after the confusion of languages in Babylon* (De Pop.) Witakowski 1993, 650-1).

<sup>230</sup> Geiger 1860, 277-8 and Mingana 1917, 31 connect Asaph to Asaph ha-Yarhoni, who is identified as the author of a twelfth- or thirteenth-century Jewish book on medicine.

<sup>231</sup> Lib. Med., vol. 1, 442.19 and 552.11 (ed.), vol. 2, 521 and 654 (trans.).

literature, and historical writing and the practice of astronomy/astrology often go hand in hand as the later example of Theophilus of Edessa (d. 785), the court astrologer of the ʿAbbasid caliph al-Mahdi and the author of a now lost *History* shows. In historiographical sources, astronomical events such as meteor showers or eclipses were often mentioned, usually to emphasise the import of a particular historical and usually tragic event which followed or sometimes preceded this astronomical event. Significantly, the attribution of the writing of historical texts and the practice of astrology/astronomy to one and the same person was not a unique occurrence.

## 15.4 Conclusion

Andronicus' *Chronicle* was a post-Eusebian chronicle, written in the middle of the sixth century, almost certainly in Syriac. This work covered the history of the world from Creation at least until the reign of Constantius, son of Constantine the Great. Andronicus conceived his *Chronicle* as Eusebius': chronological canons were preceded by a *chronographia* that contained *series regum* which may or may not have been accompanied by longer narratives. One of these longer narratives may have been a description of the world after the Flood leading up to the birth of Abraham, which focussed on the emergence of sinful behaviour on earth, in particular in Chaldea, the place where the pious Abraham started his life. On another level, however, the foundations of important Syrian and Northern Mesopotamian cities such as Aleppo, Damascus and Harran may also have mentioned from a nationalistic or perhaps even religious point of view (these towns were important Syriac Orthodox and later also East-Syrian sees).<sup>232</sup>

Saying that Andronicus may have been as important for the Syriac historiographical tradition as Eusebius is not an exaggeration. Andronicus is mentioned by

---

<sup>232</sup> Adler 1994, 165.

historiographers from the ninth until the thirteenth and his influence emerges from chronicles dating from as early as the first half of the seventh century. Not solely Syriac Orthodox chroniclers, but also East-Syrian exegetes (Isho<sup>c</sup>dad) and Melkite chroniclers (Agapius) used his work, which suggests his importance as a source.

How exactly his work was transmitted to all of his dependants is not clear. Isho<sup>c</sup>dad and Agapius probably had access to the same source, which was probably the original *Chronicle*, but there is a minor chance that they too disposed of an intermediary. The discrepancies between Isho<sup>c</sup>dad and Agapius on the one hand and Michael and Chron. 1234 on the other suggest that the latter two authors accessed Andronicus through a, yet unknown, intermediary. Furthermore, it is possible that Michael also accessed Andronicus directly, because he shares some materials with Agapius, but not Chron. 1234, though this remains speculation. Agapius and Michael possibly share another common source as well.

We have also been able to identify some of Andronicus' sources. He was clearly familiar with traditions extant in the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Cave of Treasures* and he may have had access to both texts, as is suggested by Isho<sup>c</sup>dad's references to Ephrem, to whom the *Cave of Treasures* was wrongly attributed, and to the *Book of Jubilees* for one tradition that stemmed from Andronicus' *Chronicle*. The cases of the Qainan tradition (cf. *Jubilees* 8:2-4), the origin of war among the sons of Yoqtan (cf. *Jubilees* 11:2) and the emergence of idolatry soon after that (cf. *Jubilees* 11:4-5) also shows that Andronicus was not afraid of adapting these *Jubilees'* traditions to fit his narrative.

His inclusion of the myth of the Amazons and the fact that he wove it into his narrative, identifying the kingdom of the Amazons with the biblical kingdom of Sheba also shows that he was aware of Greek mythology and not afraid of using it for his own purposes. This raises the question if he did not transmit more Greco-Roman mythological materials into Syriac.<sup>233</sup> Of particular interest was Andronicus' tendency to

---

<sup>233</sup> Agap. and Michael share materials on the burial of Zeus on Crete, the Trojan War, the foundation of Rome by Romulus and the city's earliest history, which are mostly, but not exclusively paraphrases of passages from Malalas' *Chronicle*. The entry on Zeus' burial and passages from the foundation of Rome are also extant in Chron. 1234. On this issue, see the chapter on Malalas in this volume.

attribute materials to this equally enigmatic Asaph, and to other unknown figures such as Zamardos, Damaris, Arud the Canaanite chronicler and Menander. These attempts to give credit to certain traditions by identifying them with much earlier writers, has counterparts in the Greek chronicle tradition, which sometimes incorrectly identifies Flavius Josephus as a source for traditions from *Jubilees*.

In the end most of our conclusions remain hypothetical. Nevertheless, it is clear that the last word has not been said about this Andronicus and his relation to the later Syriac chronicle tradition.



## Chapter 16 The Book of the Cave of Treasures (sixth century?)

The *Book of the Cave of Treasures*<sup>1</sup> is a Syriac apocryphon, conceived as a chronicle that outlined the genealogy of Christ, through Mary, to Adam. It survives in several manuscripts, in a West-Syrian and an East-Syrian version, but probably goes back to a single sixth-century original compilation of much older traditions – Syro-Mesopotamian Jewish and Christian as well as Iranian – from the fourth and fifth century.<sup>2</sup> Ephrem is wrongly identified as its author, which explains its immense popularity, demonstrated by its survival in dozens of manuscripts<sup>3</sup> and the existence of Georgian<sup>4</sup> and Arabic<sup>5</sup> translations and adaptations.

The *Cave of Treasures* was one of the main sources for the Pre-Constantinian Part of Chron. 1234. A large amount of excerpts from this text are preserved in Chron. 1234 and the Anonymous Chronicler explicitly mentions “the holy Mor Ephrem”<sup>6</sup> as his source.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the most recent edition and translation, see *Cave of Treasures*. C. Bézold published a German translation (Bézold 1883), based on three manuscripts and later his (inferior) edition, based on four manuscripts (Bézold 1888).

<sup>2</sup> For the most recent commentary on this work, see Ri 2000.

<sup>3</sup> For the description of the manuscripts used by Ri for his edition, see his introduction, vi-xxv.

<sup>4</sup> *Cave of Treasures (G)*.

<sup>5</sup> The Arabic recension is often referred to as the *Kitāb al-Magāll*. See also *Caverna dei Tesori*.

<sup>6</sup> The first person singular in CT 43:14 is replaced by the third person singular with “the holy Mar Ephrem” as subject of the verb.

Even though Jean-Baptiste Chabot<sup>7</sup> already revealed the *Cave of Treasures*' influence on Chron. 1234 in his translation, this subject was not studied in detail until Su-Min Ri published his commentary<sup>8</sup> on the *Cave of Treasures* in 2000. The reason why Götze did not discuss Chron. 1234 in his otherwise magisterial "Die Nachwirkung der Schatzhöhle" is unknown.<sup>9</sup>

A chronicler's reliance on the *Cave of Treasures* is peculiar, but not unprecedented nor surprising, given the exegetical and chronographic nature of this work and its wealth of information on Old Testament times. Chron. Zuqn.<sup>10</sup> also preserves excerpts from this text, albeit to a much lesser extent, and Sa'cid ibn Bitriq<sup>11</sup> (more commonly known as Euty chius), the Melkite patriarch of Alexandria, and the Muslim chronicler al-Ya'qubi (d. c. 897-8) disposed of Arabic versions.<sup>12</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler probably had direct access to a manuscript of the *Cave of Treasures*. Su-Min Ri concluded that the Anonymous Chronicler, like Chron. Zuqn., used a version of the text that was more closely related to those preserved by ms. Vat. Syr. 489 (= Ri's ms. a), mss. Mingana Syr. 355 (= Ri's ms. b) and 588 (= Ri's ms. c).<sup>13</sup> Often, however, Chron. 1234 preserves variants that are only attested in Harvard College Library, Syr 39 (Ri's ms. d) and/or ms. Harvard College library, Syr 59 (= Ri's ms. e). On some occasions, Chron. 1234 even has variants that are only attested in East-Syrian manuscripts, especially the East-Syrian ms. BL Add. 25875 (= Ri's ms. A) that is closely related to mss. d and e.<sup>14</sup> For this reason Chron. 1234 may in fact be a crucial witness for understanding the evolution of the *Cave of Treasures*. A great example is the case of *Cave of Treasures* 47:27. Chron. 1234 reads: "and when this occurred, no house remained in

---

<sup>7</sup> Chabot was already aware of this: Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 22, n. 1, 33, n. 2 (trans.).

<sup>8</sup> Ri 2000, 72-5.

<sup>9</sup> Götze 1923; Götze 1924.

<sup>10</sup> Ri 2000, 70-2.

<sup>11</sup> Graf 1947, 32-8

<sup>12</sup> Smit 1907, 111-4, 128-34; Götze 1924, 60-71; Griffith 2013, 184-97.

<sup>13</sup> *Cave of Treasures* (ed.), xvii.

<sup>14</sup> Comp. CT 8:6 and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 35.19-20T where only the East-Syrian mss. and West-Syrian mss. d and e use the verb *ⲛⲓⲁ*.

Judah (ܝܘܕܐ) in which there was no mourning,” as do the East-Syrian manuscripts. All the West-Syrian manuscripts, however, replace “in Judah” with “on this day” (ܠܗܝܘܼܢ ܝܘܡܐ). The testimony of Chron. 1234 therefore suggests that “in Judah” was the original reading and that Chron. 1234’s *Vorlage*, which is no longer extant, preceded the occurrence of this error in the West-Syrian tradition.

A similar example is that of *Cave of Treasures* 9:7. Chron. 1234’s equivalent reads “and he blessed his son Mahalalel, admonished him and ordered him (ܡܝܚܝܠܐ ܡܢܗܠܠܐ) on account of the body of Adam.”<sup>15</sup> Chron. 1234 uses two verbs, whereas all West-Syrian manuscripts of the *Cave of Treasures* in fact only use the second. The East-Syrian manuscripts, however, all use the former. Chron. 1234 therefore reflects an older version of the *Cave of Treasures*, which used both verbs.

On occasion, the Anonymous Chronicler copied complete narratives from the *Cave of Treasures*, but in fact he tended to abbreviate sentences and paraphrase it, combining material from several sentences into one. Longer expressions that often recur are often simply cut off and replaced by “etcetera” to save time (or more likely space in the manuscript). Material from the *Cave of Treasures* was also fused with material from other sources. The perfect example of this is the account of the story of Creation, which is a combination of vocabulary from the *Cave of Treasures* and *Jubilees*. Similarly, the Anonymous Chronicler seems to have supplemented narratives from the *Cave of Treasures*, constructed from biblical verses, with additional verses from the same texts [e.g. *Genesis* 3:8-13<sup>16</sup> (conversation between God and Adam) and *Gospel of Matthew* 2:11-6<sup>17</sup> (return of the Magi to their land and flight of Joseph to Egypt)].

An interesting case of an expansion of a tradition from the *Cave of Treasures* is the legend of Yoniton. The *Cave of Treasures* 27:7 identifies Yoniton, a ‘son of Noah,’ as the first astronomer after the Flood. It is said that he passed on his knowledge to the Chaldean king Nimrod, but that it was later corrupted into astrology by Ardashir, one of the priests of the Chaldean cult of the fire, who was under the influence of a fire demon.

---

<sup>15</sup> Chron. 1234, 36.7-8T.

<sup>16</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 30.13-19T.

<sup>17</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 117.29-118.10T.

This tradition, which I suspect may have been developed in response to the Syriac Qainan tradition,<sup>18</sup> probably in the sixth century, was also known to the Anonymous Chronicler, but in a more developed form. Under the influence of the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*<sup>19</sup> some sources identify Yoniton as the fourth son of Noah, who was said to have been born after the Flood, but Chron. 1234, like the *Book of the Acknowledgement of Truth*,<sup>20</sup> an encyclopedic work “in nine books, dealing with theology, philosophy, anthropology, and natural sciences,”<sup>21</sup> dating from the eleventh or twelfth century, identifies Yoniton as a distant relative of Noah (originally he was probably meant to be a son of Arphaxad), praises him for his excellent way of life, as a solitary, a man of God.<sup>22</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler did not rely on the *Cave of Treasures* without criticism, regardless of the fact that he believed it to be written by Ephrem. For instance, in saying that the prophet Jeremiah was buried in Egypt,<sup>23</sup> the Anonymous Chronicler follows the opinion of the *Lives of the Prophets*, but contradicts the *Cave of Treasures* 42:5, which says that his death occurred in Samaria and that he was buried in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, in spite of his critical attitude towards the *Cave of Treasures*, the Anonymous Chronicler made some errors in copying material from this work. Thus, having said that Lamech died in the life of Methuselah,<sup>24</sup> he later says that Lamech and Noah were at the burial of Methuselah, after the *Cave of Treasures* (14:17).

In conclusion, we can state that the *Cave of Treasures* had a significant influence on Chron. 1234. However, even though the Anonymous Chronicler believed he was using the work of the revered Ephrem, he often corrected his opinion by preferring to use other sources.

---

<sup>18</sup> CT does not mention Qainan because its author followed the opinion of the Peshitta as regards the succession of the biblical patriarchs.

<sup>19</sup> Apoc. Ps.-Meth. 3.2–8, 3–5 (ed.), 5–8 (trans.).

<sup>20</sup> Caus. Caus. 5.6, 198–99 (ed.), 259–60 (trans.).

<sup>21</sup> Mengozzi 2011, 90.

<sup>22</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 48–9T.

<sup>23</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 98.20T.

<sup>24</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 40.17T.

## Chapter 17 Jacob of Edessa (d. AD 710)

Jacob of Edessa famously continued the canons of Eusebius.<sup>1</sup> This continuation is fragmentarily preserved in BL Add. 14,685, a manuscript of the tenth or eleventh century.<sup>2</sup> Though Michael extensively copied material from Jacob's work, the Anonymous Chronicler does not appear to have used it. Only an excerpt from Jacob's introduction,<sup>3</sup> relating to king Abgar and his (Macedonian) ethno-genealogical background is preserved in Chron. 1234.<sup>4</sup>

It is far more probable that this excerpt was transmitted to the Anonymous Chronicler via an intermediary. There is a possibility that this information came from Basil of Edessa, but it seems more likely that the Anonymous Chronicler found this extract in a dossier on the history of Edessa, perhaps as part of a larger historical-geographical compendium.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Jac. Ed. Chron.

<sup>2</sup> Wright 1870-1872, vol. 3, 1062-4 (dccccxxi).

<sup>3</sup> Jac. Ed. Chron. (281-2T; 211V), also preserved in Mich. Syr. Chron. V 5 (77-8T; vol. 1: 119-20V).

<sup>4</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 119.28-120.8T, which contains a few variants, the most important of which is the replacement of "to the frontiers of Babylon" with "in Edessa and in Mesopotamia."

<sup>5</sup> See chapter 25.1.



## Chapter 18 An unidentified Greek history (seventh, eighth or early ninth century)

### 18.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will gradually set out the hypothesis that the Anonymous Chronicler used a late ancient or medieval Syriac historian who himself was dependent on a late ancient Greek historian who combined material from the Epitome of Church Histories (Epitome for short), Philostorgius and other sources to create his own narrative. Furthermore, I will show that this unidentified Greek history was also one of the sources of Theophanes the Confessor (d. 818). I will begin this investigation by discussing the issue of the Syriac afterlife of Theodore Lector's *Ecclesiastical History* and showing that the Syriac tradition is not directly dependent on Theodore, nor even on the Epitome, but on a Greek dependant of the Epitome. In addition, I will suggest that this Greek dependant also had access to Philostorgius.

## 18.2 Theodore Lector and the Epitome

### 18.2.1 Introduction

Theodore of Constantinople, also known as Theodore Anagnostes or Theodore Lector, was a reader in the Hagia Sophia in the early sixth century. He joined his bishop Macedonius in exile in the city of Gangra in Paphlagonia. Theodore wrote an *Ecclesiastical History* in Greek, which covered the period from the early years of Constantine until the beginning of the reign of Justin I in 518.<sup>1</sup> This work was made up of two parts: in the second part, which started with the death of Theodosius in 450, he continued his own synopsis of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret (in four books), which covered the period between 313 and 439 AD. Modern scholars have identified the first half of his work as a separate work, the *Tripartite History*, but it was probably simply part of his *Ecclesiastical History*.<sup>2</sup> In this chapter, however, I will refer to them as separate works in order to distinguish between the synopsis and Theodore's own narrative.

Theodore's writings are only fragmentarily preserved. Only the first two books of the *Tripartite History* survive completely in the thirteenth- or fourteenth-century Codex Marcianus gr. 344. Fortunately, Theodore's writings were used by the author of an early seventh-century Epitome of Church Histories (Epitome for short), along with material from Eusebius, Gelasius of Caesarea and John Diacrinomenus.<sup>3</sup> When studying Theodore, one must always keep in mind that the author of the Epitome had his own views, intentions, methodology and message.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Nautin 1994; Pouderon 1998; Greatrex 2014 (forthcoming).

<sup>2</sup> See the testimony of the Suda (Θεόδωρος, θ 153), which identifies his entire work as a ἱστορίαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἀπὸ τῶν χρόνων Κωνσταντίνου ἕως τῆς βασιλείας Ἰουστινιανοῦ (Hansen 1995, ix).

<sup>3</sup> Hansen 1995, xvi-xvii, xix-xxix, xxxvii-xxxix; Nautin 1994, 213-5; Treadgold 2010, 171.

<sup>4</sup> On the relationship between Theod. Lect. and Theod. Lect. Epit., see Greatrex 2014 (forthcoming).

The Epitome, which survives in four manuscripts,<sup>5</sup> also only fragmentarily, was edited by Günther Christian Hansen.<sup>6</sup> To make up for the fragmentary state of the Epitome, Hansen's edition also includes excerpts from Theodore's *Ecclesiastical History* in later Greek and Latin historiographical works, but unfortunately not the text of the first two books of the *Tripartite History*. Instead, Hansen chose to refer to the relevant entries in Socrates, Sozomenus and Theodoret and only indicate Theodore's divergences from his sources.

Theodore was used directly by several historiographers, writing in Greek and Latin.<sup>7</sup> Other authors only had access to it in abridged form, not even necessarily through the Epitome that was edited by Hansen.<sup>8</sup> To which group of historiographers Theophanes the Confessor (d. 818) belongs has long since been uncertain. Theophanes was previously believed to have used the Epitome directly,<sup>9</sup> but Theophanes also preserves elements that are not extant in the Epitome, even from the part covered by Theodore's synopsis of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret. For this reason it has been supposed that Theophanes either also disposed of the original text or simply of a much more complete epitome. As my analysis of the material in the Syriac sources will demonstrate, however, it is more likely that Theophanes did not have direct access to Theodore's writings nor to the Epitome, but that he accessed information Theodore through an unidentified Greek historian who was writing between the middle of the sixth and the turn of the ninth century and who used the Epitome (and other sources).

---

<sup>5</sup> Ms. Paris. Suppl. Gr. 1156 (tenth/eleventh cent.), ms. Ath. Vat. 286 (thirteenth cent.), ms. Paris. Gr. 1555 A (thirteenth/fourteenth cent) and the ms. Barocc. Gr. 142 (fourteenth cent.).

<sup>6</sup> Theod. Lect.

<sup>7</sup> Hansen 1995, xix-xxiv.

<sup>8</sup> Hansen 1995, xxix-xxxv.

<sup>9</sup> Krumbacher 1891, 121; Hansen 1995, xxix-xxx; Mango/Scott/Greatrex 1997, lxxv-lxxvi.

## 18.2.2 Theodore in Syriac

There is no trace of a Syriac translation of Theodore's writings, but it has long since been established that material from Theodore survives in Syriac in Michael's *Chronicle*. It was not until the publication of Hansen's edition of the Epitome that the presence of fragments of Theodore/the Epitome in Chron. 1234 was also highlighted. Several theories have been proposed as to the path of transmission of these fragments into Syriac: that Michael made direct use of the Epitome (Opitz), that Michael accessed Theodore through John of Ephesus (D'yakonov), that Michael accessed adaptations of Theodore's narrative through a Syriac historiographer, possibly but not necessarily John of Ephesus (van Ginkel) or that Michael and Chron. 1234 accessed Theodore, or more accurately the Epitome's version of Theodore, through Theophanes (Hansen). In this chapter I will suggest that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler are reliant on a common Syriac source, whose author did not use the Epitome, but Theophanes' Greek source.

In the lemma on Theodore in the second series of the *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, published in 1934, Hans-Georg Opitz purported, without citing textual evidence or study - that "[d]ie Epitome muß ebenfalls von Michael (...) benutzt worden sein."<sup>10</sup> It is highly improbable, however, that Michael used the Epitome, given that he did not know Greek.

The first to actually discuss the transmission of Theodore into Syriac in detail was Alexander D'yakonov, in his study of John of Ephesus, which was published in 1908 in Russian and was therefore not accessible to me.<sup>11</sup> D'yakonov<sup>12</sup> concluded that Michael did not directly use Theodore, though on the false assumption that Theodore was not cited as a source by Michael, and suggested that John of Ephesus (d. c. 589) used

---

<sup>10</sup> RECA II, vol. 10, 1878.

<sup>11</sup> D'yakonov 1908.

<sup>12</sup> D'yakonov 1908, 179-202. Because of the inaccessibility of this work, I rely on the notes of Jan van Ginkel in his study of the life and works of Joh. Eph. for these conclusions, see van Ginkel 1995, 50-4. Van Ginkel did not discuss Chron. 1234's reliance on Theod. Lect. either.

Theodore's *Tripartite History* for the First and Second Part of his *Ecclesiastical History* and that in turn this work was used by Michael (D'yakonov seems to have overseen Chron. 1234's reliance on Theodore entirely<sup>13</sup>).

Van Ginkel, however, nuanced D'yakonov's conclusion. Firstly, "Theodore Lector of Constantinople" is cited in the introduction of the Armenian translations of Michael's *Chronicle*, though only as a source for the period between Theodosius II and Justinian I, the period for which Theodore did not rely on earlier church historians.<sup>14</sup> More importantly, however, "a comparison of Michael the Syrian and the detailed survey by Hansen of the sources of the books I and II – as preserved in the fourteenth-century manuscript – (...) brought to light several discrepancies between Michael the Syrian and Theodore:" several entries from a synopsis used by Michael contain elements or entire phrases that were taken from other church historians than those that were used by Theodore.<sup>15</sup> For this reason, van Ginkel carefully suggested that John "possibly" used "Theodore Anagnostes' [synopsis] in an adapted version,"<sup>16</sup> but emphasised that this is by no means certain. Although John's *Ecclesiastical History* is the only known Syriac narrative work that covers this period, we are aware of the existence of a now lost work, covering at least the latter half of the sixth century, written by a Syriac historian who wrote longer narratives, fusing material from the Third Part of John's *Ecclesiastical*

---

<sup>13</sup> Van Ginkel does not mention the possibility that Chron. 1234 contains fragments of Theod. Lect.

<sup>14</sup> Mich. Arm. Chron. 1, 3 and Mich. Arm. Chron. 2, 2; translation of the latter in Mich. Syr. Chron., vol. 1: 2V and Langlois 1868, 19. In both cases, Theod. Lect. is mentioned between Joh. Mal. (referred to as John of Antioch) and Zach. Mityl. (= PZ).

<sup>15</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 51. For instance, Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 1 (121-2T; vol. 1: 241V) preserves part of Theod. Cyr.'s introduction (HE I 1), that was not used by Theod. Lect.; Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 1 (133-4T; vol. 1: 260V), an account of the death of Constantine is a synopsis of Socr. HE I 39 and Theod. Cyr. HE I 32.1 (Constantine wished to be baptised in the river Jordan), whereas Theod. Lect. 26.22 is entirely based on Socr. Similarly, Michael has Socr.'s description of the death of Constantine II (HE II 5) for which Theod. Lect. 28.19-20 [= Theod. Lect. Epit. 56 (29.19-21)] used Soz. HE III 2.10, and a description of Gallus against the Jews and his death, based on Socr. HE II 33-4, which is not extant in Theod. Lect.

<sup>16</sup> Van Ginkel 1995, 54.

*History* with information from the Greek chronicle tradition. The same author could also have used the First and Second Part.<sup>17</sup>

John of Ephesus was not involved in the transmission of fragments of Theodore into Syriac. The first indications are offered by Chron. Zuqn., another important dependant of the First and Second Part of John's *Ecclesiastical History*, which does not preserve any fragment of Theodore, and by Chron. 1234 which contains two different versions of the proclamation of Leo II Caesar, one based on Malalas and from John of Ephesus, the other attached to a fragment of Theodore (in fact of the Epitome, see below) on the background of Leo I.<sup>18</sup> More importantly, however, Michael and Chron. 1234 preserve (adaptations of) fragments of the Epitome, not of Theodore. Though it is theoretically possible that the later Syriac chronicle tradition is dependent on Theodore as well as on the Epitome, this seems unlikely and it is much more plausible that they are only reliant on the Epitome.<sup>19</sup>

Hansen posited yet another theory. Adducing three kinds of agreements between Theophanes and Michael, he concluded that the latter used the former. Hansen provided one example in which Theophanes and Michael preserve an identical combination of fragments from the Epitome; two fragments that discuss the reason why Constantius II deposed Macedonius as patriarch of Constantinople and appointed Eudoxius.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> The case of the speech of Justin II, on which, see the next chapter.

<sup>18</sup> See chapter 13.

<sup>19</sup> The discrepancies between Theod. Lect.'s synopsis of Socr., Soz. and Theod. (and/or the Epitome) and the synopsis of Socr. and Theod. preserved by Mich. Syr. may in fact be due to his reliance on two synopses, one going back to Theod. Lect./the Epitome and another possibly to Joh. Eph.

<sup>20</sup> Theod. Lect., introd., xxxiv.







residing in Antioch, heard about the Goths, he went to Constantinople.	
--	--

Hansen<sup>32</sup> noted similar tendencies in Chron. 1234: he found that Theophanes and Chron. 1234 shared entries on Julian's reign<sup>33</sup> that are extant in the Epitome, and a longer narrative on the Persian king Yazdgird's stewardship over the emperor Theodosius II,<sup>34</sup> not extant in the Epitome.

My research suggests that Hansen's assumption of a closer relationship between the transmission of these fragments of Theodore to Theophanes and to the later Syriac chronicle tradition is correct, but that rather than being the source of the Syriac tradition, Theophanes relies on the same Greek source that was used by the Syriac historian whose work was in turn used by Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler. Before I investigate this issue in more detail, I will first briefly catalogue and comment on the fragments of Theodore in Chron. 1234, because this exercise has never before been undertaken. A study of Theodore's influence on Chron. 1234 will show that its testimony is of equal import for the study of Theodore's afterlife in Syriac as Michael's, because it preserves fragments that are not or only partially extant in Michael's *Chronicle*. To be clear, I will not catalogue all the fragments attested in Syriac: Michael's *Chronicle* preserves many more, but including all the excerpts from Theodore in Syriac in this study would take us too far. The fragments in Chron. 1234 will be discussed in the order in which they appear in Chron. 1234, which does not necessarily agree with the chronological order, i.e. the order in which the events described in these fragments occurred.

---

<sup>32</sup> Theod. Lect., introd., xxxv, n. 1.

<sup>33</sup> See below.

<sup>34</sup> On which, see the next chapter.



<p>by his victory, he was not content with his good fortune, but, seeing a usurpation, he killed Domitian, the prefect of the East, and the quaestor Magnus, both of whom had revealed his plot to Constantius. Knowing this, Constantius recalled Gallus and ordered his execution on the island of Thalmon. This having occurred, Caesar sent Julian, the brother of the deceased Gallus, against the barbarians in Gaul.</p>	<p>And becoming similarly suspicious about Julian, Constantius put <u>him under arrest.</u> <u>But Eusebia, the wife of Constantius, made a plea on his behalf and sent (him) to Athens.</u></p>	<p>with his good fortune and he plotted a usurpation.</p> <p>He killed Domitian, the prefect of the East, and the quaestor Magnus, both of whom had revealed his plot to Constantius. Constantius recalled Gallus and ordered his execution on the island of Thalmon <u>and also had his brother Julian put under arrest. But Eusebia, the wife of Constantius, made a plea on his behalf and sent him to Athens.</u></p>	<p><u>rebelled against the emperor.</u></p> <p>The emperor <u>sent to kill Gallus</u> <u>and to put Julian under arrest.</u> Then, <u>the empress Eusebia beseeched the emperor to send him to Athens</u> to study sciences.</p>	<p><u>rebelled against the emperor</u></p> <p>and he was <u>killed.</u> The emperor also intended <u>to kill his brother Julian,</u> but he was forgiven by request of <u>the empress.</u></p>
---	--	---	--	--

Though there are very little verbal agreements between the entries in Chron. 1234 and the Epitome, Chron. 1234 does share a verbal agreement with Michael (Gallus “rebelled against the emperor”), which does not have a counterpart in Socrates (HE 1.22-4) nor Sozomenus (HE V 2.19), on whom Theodore and thus also the Epitome based their narrative. Michael’s account, however, is clearly based on Theodore’s/the Epitome’s, as a comparison with the two fragments of the Epitome (especially fr. 121) and with Theophanes’ narrative shows. Thus, the Anonymous Chronicler is probably dependent on Theodore/the Epitome through the same Syriac source as Michael, but has severely altered his source material. He left out the reference to Athens, presumably because this

had already been mentioned in an earlier – quite literal – copy of information provided by Socrates. A few lines later he does, however, clarify that Constantius “sent to fetch Julian from Athens and made him Caesar.”<sup>40</sup> Similarly, he has dropped the reference to Gallus, having been made Caesar, because this event was mentioned in the previous sentence.

### 18.2.3.2 The reign of Julian

A fragment that certainly derives from Theodore/the Epitome appears in a longer narrative on “the reign of Julian the Apostate (Ἰουλιανὸς ἁποστάτης), the pagan emperor.”<sup>41</sup> Again, Theophanes and Michael are additional witnesses.<sup>42</sup>

Theod. Lect. Epit.	Theophan. Chron. AM 5853 (ed. 46.32-47.1, <sup>43</sup> 47.6-15, <sup>44</sup> trans. 76-7)	Mich. Syr. Chron.	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.28-156.9T
--------------------	---	-------------------	------------------------------------

<sup>40</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 154.28-9T.

<sup>41</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.26-7T.

<sup>42</sup> The commonalities between Theophan. Chron. and Chron. 1234 have already been noted by Hansen (Theod. Lect., introd., xxxv, n. 1).

<sup>43</sup> Ἐπαρθεὶς γὰρ τῇ τῶν βαρβάρων νίκη, ἑαυτῷ τὸ κράτος ἐπιστρέψας καὶ διάδημα περιθέμενος πρὸ τῆς Κωνσταντίου τελευτῆς εἰς ἑλληνισμὸν ἀναιδῶς ἐξετράπη. (...)τέλων δεῖξαι τὸν Κωνσταντίον ἄδικον καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον, ὑποκρινόμενος δικαιοσύνην ὁ παράνομος τοὺς ἐν ἐξορίᾳ ἐπισκόπους ἀνεκαλέσατο, Εὐσέβιον δέ, τὸν πρῶτον τῶν βασιλικῶν εὐνούχων, ἀνεῖλεν ὡς δῆθεν ἄδικον. ἐδίωξε δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους εὐνούχους τοῦ παλατίου διὰ τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν τὴν γαμετήν, ἣν συνῆψεν αὐτῷ Κωνσταντίος ἀδελφὴν ἑαυτοῦ· ὁμοίως καὶ μαγείρους διὰ τὸ λιτὸν τῆς διαίτης καὶ κουρίσκους διὰ τὸ ἕνα πολλοῖς ἀρκεῖν, ὡς ἔλεγεν. τοῦ δὲ δημοσίου δρόμου τάς τε καμήλους καὶ ὄνους, βόας καὶ ἡμίονους ἐξέβαλεν, μόνους ἵππους συγχωρήσας ὑπουργεῖν διὰ πολλὴν φιλαργυρίαν, ἧς δοῦλος ἦν, ὡς πρὸς τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας.

<sup>44</sup> Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει ἐβασίλευσεν Ἰουλιανὸς ὁ παραβάτης μοναρχήσας διὰ πλῆθος ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. ἐπαρθεὶς γὰρ τῇ τῶν βαρβάρων νίκη, ἑαυτῷ τὸ κράτος ἐπιστρέψας καὶ διάδημα περιθέμενος πρὸ τῆς Κωνσταντίου τελευτῆς εἰς ἑλληνισμὸν ἀναιδῶς ἐξετράπη. (...)θέλων δεῖξαι τὸν Κωνσταντίον ἄδικον καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον, ὑποκρινόμενος δικαιοσύνην ὁ παράνομος τοὺς ἐν ἐξορίᾳ ἐπισκόπους ἀνεκαλέσατο, Εὐσέβιον δέ, τὸν πρῶτον τῶν βασιλικῶν εὐνούχων, ἀνεῖλεν ὡς δῆθεν ἄδικον. ἐδίωξε δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους εὐνούχους τοῦ παλατίου διὰ τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν τὴν γαμετήν, ἣν συνῆψεν αὐτῷ Κωνσταντίος ἀδελφὴν ἑαυτοῦ· ὁμοίως καὶ μαγείρους διὰ τὸ λιτὸν τῆς διαίτης καὶ κουρίσκους διὰ τὸ ἕνα πολλοῖς ἀρκεῖν, ὡς ἔλεγεν. τοῦ δὲ δημοσίου δρόμου τάς τε καμήλους καὶ ὄνους, βόας

<p><u>Puffed up by his victory over the barbarians</u> on the river Rhine, after taking power for himself and donning the diadem, he turned shamelessly to paganism [117 (55.20-1<sup>45</sup>)].</p> <p>He recalled from exile all the bishops who had been sent (away) in order to slander Constantius as unjust and inhumane [123 (57.1-2<sup>46</sup>)].</p> <p>He executed Eusebius, chief of the imperial eunuchs, for supposed injustice, seeking to get the glory of a righteous person. He drove the eunuchs from the palace since he had dissolved the marriage by which Constantius had linked him to his sister who was called Constantia, the cooks, because of his frugal ways (it is said), and the barbers, since one was sufficient for many, as he used to say.</p>	<p>For, <u>puffed up by his victory over the barbarians</u> (ἐπαρθείς γὰρ τῇ τῶν βαρβάρων νικῆ), after taking power for himself and donning the diadem before Constantius' death, he turned shamelessly to paganism. (...) Wishing to show that Constantius had been unjust and inhumane, this lawless man, feigning righteousness, recalled the exiled bishops and executed Eusebius, chief of the palace eunuchs, for supposed injustice. He also drove the other eunuchs from the palace since he had dissolved the marriage by which Constantius had linked him to his sister. Similarly, he expelled the cooks, because of his frugal</p>	<p>Julian was sent against the barbarians of Gaul and flourished in victory, <u>he became</u> very arrogant and <u>haughty</u> and exalted himself (παυδαίρεα ὑπερβυδαίρεα ) VII 4 (138T; vol. 1: 268V).</p> <p>He removed the eunuchs from the palace</p>	<p>In AG 670, Julian the Apostate reigned and <u>he became</u> <u>haughty</u> (καυδαίρεα παυδαίρεα) by <u>(his) victory over the barbarians</u>.</p> <p>This one demonstrated greatness of spirit towards the Romans, in order to show that Constantine (sic!) was evil and treacherous.</p> <p>He killed Eusebius, chief of the eunuchs, and removed all the eunuchs from the palace,</p>
---	--	--	--

καὶ ἡμίονους ἐξέβαλεν, μόνους ἵππους συγχωρήσας ὑπουργεῖν διὰ πολλὴν φιλαργυρίαν, ἧς δοῦλος ἦν, ὡς πρὸς τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας.

<sup>45</sup> Ἰουλιανὸς ὁ Καῖσαρ τῶν βαρβάρων κρατήσας τῶν πρὸς τῷ Ῥήνῳ ποταμῷ ἐπαρθείς τῇ νικῆ διαδήμα περιτίθεται μεταθέμενος εἰς Ἑλληνισμὸν

<sup>46</sup> οὐς ἐπισκόπους ἅπαντας ἐκ τῆς ὑπερορίας δῆθεν πέμφας ἀνεκαλέσατο, καὶ τοῦτο διὰ τὸ Κωνσταντῖον διαβαλεῖν ὡς ἄδικον καὶ ἀπάνθρωπον

<p>From the public post he removed <u>the camels</u> and asses, the oxen and mules. He only allowed horses to serve the public post [124 (57.3-9<sup>47</sup>)].</p>	<p>ways, and the barbers, since one was sufficient for many, as he used to say. From the public post he removed <u>the camels</u> and asses, the oxen and mules, and only allowed horses to serve, because of the great avarice to which he was a slave, even to the point of idolatry.</p>	<p>and he also removed <u>the camels</u>, donkeys and mules from his service and only left horses. VII 5 (144T; vol. 1: 280V).</p>	<p>in the same manner as the cooks and the makers of stew under the pretext of the simplicity of tables. He even expelled <u>the camels</u>, donkeys and mules from the imperial service, only keeping the horses.</p>
--	---	--	--

The Epitome describes, after Socrates (HE III 1.43-50, 52) and presumably also Theodore, how Julian became haughty because of his victories against the barbarians, and when he became emperor, turned to paganism. Furthermore, he recalled exiled bishops, depicted Constantius II in a negative way, killed Eusebius, chief of the eunuchs, and expelled the eunuchs, cooks and barbers from the palace and the camels, donkeys and mules from the imperial service. The reference to the camels is the only element that distinguishes Theodore's/the Epitome's narrative from Socrates'.

Theophanes' narrative in this case is a fusion of material that is extant in fragments 117 and 123 of the Epitome, among which was inserted information similar to that preserved in fragment 149<sup>48</sup> of the Epitome and information that is not extant anywhere else.

Michael's *Chronicle* preserves less information than Theophanes, mentioning Julian's haughtiness, his expulsion of the eunuchs and the animals from the palace. In contrast,

---

<sup>47</sup> Εὐσέβιον τὸν πρῶτον τῶν βασιλικῶν εὐνούχων ἀνεῖλε δῆθεν ὡς ἄδικον, τὴν τοῦ δικαίου λαβεῖν δόξαν θηρώμενος. ἔδιωξε δὲ τοῦ παλατίου εὐνούχους διὰ τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν τὴν γαμετήν, ἣν αὐτῷ συνάψας ἦν Κωνσταντίος ἀδελφὴν ἑαυτοῦ Κωνσταντίαν τοῦνομα, μαγεῖρους διὰ τὸ λιτόν (φησι) τῆς διαίτης, κουρεῖς διὰ τὸ ἕνα ἀρκεῖν (ὡς ἔλεγε) πλείοσιν. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δημοσίου δρόμου καμήλους καὶ ὄνους καὶ βόας καὶ ἡμιόνους ἐκώλυσεν· μόνους δὲ τοὺς ἵππους τῷ δημοσίῳ δρόμῳ ὑπουργεῖν συνεχώρησε.

<sup>48</sup> Theod. Lect. 149 (19-20): Πολλὰ καὶ παντοδαπαὶ θεήλατοι ὄργαϊ τὴν Ῥωμαίων γῆν κατειλήφασιν, ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ Ἰουλιανὸς ἐβασίλευε

Chron. 1234 preserves a fuller version with elements that Michael does not have: Julian's negative depiction of Constantius (Chron. 1234 has Constantine) and the eviction of Eusebius.

The path of transmission of this material is difficult to determine from this case alone. Neither later account deviates from Theodore's/the Epitome's opinion in any significant way. However, it may be worth noting that Theophanes and Chron. 1234 share one element against the testimony of the Epitome: both use the phrase "similarly" or "in the same manner" when talking of Julian's expulsion of the cooks from the imperial palace, but this may be purely coincidental as well.

### 18.2.3.3 Valentinian's two wives

Like the Epitome, Theophanes and Michael preserve much longer narratives on the issue of Valentinian I's two wives than Chron. 1234, whose account is much more simplified. Ultimately, this material goes back to Socrates (HE IV 31.10, 14-18).

Theod. Lect. Epit. 212 (74.9-17 <sup>49</sup> )	Theophan. Chron. AM 5860 (ed. 56.23-57.3; <sup>50</sup> trans. 88)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 7 (149-51T; vol. 1: 293V) <sup>51</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 167.29-168.2T <sup>52</sup>
---	--	---	--

<sup>49</sup> Οὐαλεντινιανὸς ὁ μέγας Σευήραν εἶχε πρὸ τῆς βασιλείας γυναῖκα, ἐξ ἧς ἔσχε Γρατιανόν, ὃν βασιλέα ἤδη προὔβαλετο. ζώσης δὲ τῆς Σευήρας ἔγημε καὶ Ἰουστίναν ἐκ τῆς μαρτυρίας Σευήρας ἧς περὶ κάλλους αὐτῆ ἐμαρτύρησε, νόμον γράψας ἐξεῖναι τῷ θέλοντι νομίμους ἔχειν δύο γυναῖκας. γήμας δὲ Ἰουστίναν ἔσχε τέκνα ἐξ αὐτῆς Οὐαλεντινιανὸν τὸν νέον, ὃν μετὰ θάνατον αὐτοῦ ὁ στρατὸς βασιλέα ἀνηγόρευσε, καὶ θυγατέρας τρεῖς, Ἰούσταν, Γράταν, Γάλλαν· ἦν καὶ ἔγημε Θεοδόσιος ὁ μέγας κατὰ δεύτερον γάμον, ἐξ ἧς αὐτῷ Πλακιδία τίκεται· Ἀρκάδιον γὰρ καὶ Ὀνώριον ἐκ Πλακίλλης ἔσχε τῆς πρώτης αὐτοῦ γαμετῆς.

<sup>50</sup> Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Οὐαλεντινιανὸς ὁ μέγας ζώσης τῆς αὐτοῦ γαμετῆς Σευήρας, τῆς μητρὸς Γρατιανοῦ, ἔγημε παρανόμως Ἰουστίναν διὰ κάλλος μαρτυρηθεῖσαν ὑπὸ Σευήρας, ἐξ ἧς ἔσχε τέκνα Οὐαλεντινιανὸν νέον λεγόμενον, ὃν ὁ στρατὸς μετὰ θάνατον τοῦ πατρὸς βασιλέα ἀνηγόρευσε, καὶ θυγατέρας τρεῖς, Ἰούσταν, Γράταν, Γάλλαν, ἦν καὶ ἔγημεν ὁ μέγας Θεοδόσιος κατὰ δεύτερον γάμον, ἐξ ἧς ἐτέχθη αὐτῷ ἡ Πλακιδία· Ἀρκάδιος γὰρ καὶ Ὀνώριος ἐκ Πλακίλλης ἦσαν Θεοδοσίῳ τῆς πρώτης γαμετῆς. ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ νόμον παράνομον τῷ θέλοντι δύο γυναῖκας ἔχειν κατ' αὐτὸν μὴ κωλύεσθαι.

<sup>51</sup> ,... ..

<p>Valentinian the Great had as his wife in the empire Severa, from whom he had Gratian who he had proclaimed emperor. While Severa was still alive he also married Justina after Severa had testified to her beauty (and) after having written a law that anyone who wished could have two lawful wives. Having married Justina, he had children from her: Valentinian the younger, whom the army proclaimed emperor after his death, and three daughters, Justa, Grata and Galla, whom Theodosius wed at his second marriage and by whom he had Placidia. For he had Arcadius and Honorius by his first wife, Placilla.</p>	<p>In this year Valentinian the elder, while his wife Severa, Gratian's mother, was still living, illegally married Justina after Severa had testified to her beauty. The children he had by her were Valentinian the younger, whom the army proclaimed emperor after his father's death, and three daughters, Justa, Grata, and Galla, whom Theodosius the elder wed at his second marriage and by whom he had Placidia. Arcadius and Honorius were Theodosius' children by his first wife Placilla.</p>	<p>Emperor Valentinian transgressed the law: (apart from) the mother of his son Gratian, he married another woman who shone in corporeal beauty (and) whose name was Justina. <u>Because of this</u>, he wrote that every (one) who wished could possess two wives. He fathered Valentinian the Younger. (...<sup>53</sup>) His young daughter Justina remained an orphan. Severa, the wife of Valentinian, loved her and she praised her before the emperor. He married her and Valentinian the Younger and three daughters were (born) from her, one of whom, Galla, Theodosius the Great married and from whom he fathered Arcadius and Honorius and a daughter, Placidia.</p>	<p>This Valentinian had two wives. One was called Severa, the mother of Gratian, and the other Justina, mother of Valentinian. <u>Because of this</u>, he promulgated a law that a Christian was allowed to have two wives.</p>
---	---	---	---

...  
 ...  
 ...

<sup>52</sup> ...  
 ...

<sup>53</sup> Inserted in the middle of this copy of fr. 212 of the epitome is a reference to Valentinian's death in Gaul (a synopsis of Socr. HE IV 21 and Soz. HE VI 27), on Valentinian's condemnation of Valens' Arianism and the former's lack of help for the latter against the Goths (Theod. Cyr. HE IV 31), an account of Valentinian's death at the time of his confrontation with the Sarmatians (on which, see below), and a short narrative on the vision and Valentinian's murder of Justus, the father of Justina (Socr. HE IV 31).

	Valentinian composed an illegal law that there was no bar to anyone who wished having two wives at the same time.		
--	---	--	--

There are some verbal similarities between Theophanes and Michael, who preserve similar narratives. Both emphasise the illegality of Valentinian’s actions, an opinion that is not extant in Socrates nor in the Epitome, but may go back to a connection between Theophanes and Michael, perhaps a source shared by Theophanes and Michael’s Syriac source. Because of the simplified nature of Chron. 1234’s account and its lack of mention of the legalities of these matters, we are unable to deduce if the Anonymous Chronicler is dependent on the same intermediary as Michael for this information, or if he is reliant on Socrates directly here.

#### 18.2.3.4 Theodosius I

The vocabulary in the Anonymous Chronicler’s description of Theodosius I indicates that he ultimately relied on the same source as Theophanes and Michael. A comparison with the equivalent fragment in the Epitome’s description reveals some verbal agreements, but also certain discrepancies.

Theod. Lect. Epit. 225 (76.26-8 <sup>54</sup> )	Theophan. Chron. AM 5871 (ed. 66.16-20; <sup>55</sup> trans. 101)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 8 (155-6T; vol. 1: 306V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 168.29-30T	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 169.11-3T
--	--	---	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

<sup>54</sup> Γρατιανός ὁ βασιλεὺς κοινωνὸν τῆς ἡγεμονίας Θεοδόσιον προσελάβετο, τῷ μὲν γένει Ἰβηρα, εὐγενεῖ δέ τινα καὶ θαυμάσιον. Θεοδόσιος δὲ πολεμήσας εὐθύς τοὺς ἐν Θράκῃ βαρβάρους κατὰ κράτος ἐνίκησεν

<sup>55</sup> Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Γρατιανός ὁ βασιλεὺς κοινωνὸν τῆς βασιλείας Θεοδόσιον προσελάβετο, τῷ γένει μὲν Ἰβηρα Ἐσπέριον, εὐγενῆ δέ τινα καὶ θαυμάσιον περὶ τοὺς πολέμους γενόμενον. οὗτος εὐθύς τοὺς ἐν Θράκῃ βαρβάρους κατὰ κράτος ἐνίκησεν, εὐσεβῆς ὢν καὶ ὀρθόδοξος.



πολλάκις ἐν πολέμοις διαγενόμενον) but not extant in the Epitome. Theophanes' and the Syriac chroniclers' use of the same expression against the testimony of the Epitome suggests that the underlying Syriac source of Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler was not dependent on the Epitome here, but on a later Greek intermediary, probably Theophanes' source.

### 18.2.3.5 The death of Theodosius I and the reigns of Arcadius and Honorius

Chron. 1234 and Theophanes' descriptions of the end of Theodosius I's reign and the beginning of Honorius' and Arcadius' are similar, nearly identical to the Epitome's, whose author probably (slightly) reworked Theodore's copy of Sozomen's account (HE VII 4 and VIII 1). Michael's narrative is similar, but contains additional material.

Theod. Lect. Epit. 279 (85.27-6.3 <sup>57</sup> )	Theophan. Chron. AM 5886 (ed. 74.15-8; trans. 113)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 1 (164T; vol. 2: 1V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 170.30-171.3T
(Theodosius) left life the following night at the age of 60, having been emperor for sixteen years, leaving as emperors the elder son Arcadius in the East and Honorius in the West.	(...) (Theodosius) died in the Lord at the age of 60, having been emperor for sixteen years, and leaving his two sons as emperors, the elder Arcadius in the East and Honorius in the West.	And when (Theodosius) died, he left the empire to his two sons, Arcadius reigning in Constantinople and in the East and Honorius, aged 9, in Rome.	When emperor Theodosius had lived for 60 years and reigned 16 of these years, he died and he left behind two sons in the empire: his eldest son Arcadius in the East and Honorius in the West.

The verbal agreements between the Epitome, Theophanes and Chron. 1234 indicate that their testimonies are related. Given the rarity of the reliance of Syriac chroniclers, especially the Anonymous Chronicler, on Sozomen, Chron. 1234 must somehow be dependent on the Epitome. Michael's testimony, however, differs slightly from the

<sup>57</sup> τῇ δὲ ἐχομένῃ νυκτὶ τὸν βίον μετέλλαξεν, ἐτῶν ὑπάρχων ἐξήκοντα, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἔτη δέκα ἕξ, καταλιπὼν βασιλεῖς Ἀρκάδιον μὲν τὸν υἱὸν τὸν πρεσβύτερον τῶν ἐψῶν, Ὀνώριον δὲ τῶν πρὸς ἐσπέραν.

others, claiming that Honorius was 9 years old, when he started to reign. This additional element, which I have not been able to locate in any other source, may indicate Michael's reliance on another or an additional source than the Anonymous Chronicler. This is also suggested by the fact that elsewhere Michael relies on Socrates (HE V 26) for information on the length of Theodosius' reign (16 years and 8 months).<sup>58</sup>

### 18.2.3.6 The birth and baptism of Theodosius II

In the same entry as an account of Arcadius' purported construction of the Praetorium in Constantinople,<sup>59</sup> the Anonymous Chronicler mentions the birth of the later emperor Theodosius II and his baptism by John Chrysostom. Theophanes' entry is almost identical. The Epitome preserves a similar account, but does not have the reference to John Chrysostom's baptism of the child.

Theod. Lect. Epit. 284 (87.8-9 <sup>60</sup> )	Theophan. Chron. AM 5892 (ed..1-3; <sup>61</sup> trans. 116)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 171.8-10T <sup>62</sup>
At that time Theodosius the Younger was born to the emperor Arcadius by Eudoxia.	In the same year a son was born to the emperor Arcadius by the Augusta Eudoxia, namely Theodosius the Younger whom John Chrysostom sponsored at his baptism.	A son was born to empress Eudoxia and he called him Theodosius, after the name of his father. He received the baptism from John, the bishop of the imperial city, who is Chrysostom.

This is another indication that the Syriac tradition is not merely dependent on the Epitome, but on a later Greek intermediary. As regards Theophanes' relationship to Theodore and the Epitome, it is worth noting that Theophanes' *Chronographia* preserves

<sup>58</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 9 (163T; vol. 1: 322V). The length of his life, however, is given as 60 years, the same as in Soz. HE.

<sup>59</sup> On which, see the following chapter.

<sup>60</sup> ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ τίκεται τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἀρκαδίῳ ἐξ Εὐδοξίας ὁ μικρὸς Θεοδόσιος.

<sup>61</sup> Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει ἐτέχθη τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἀρκαδίῳ υἱὸς ἐξ Εὐδοξίας τῆς Αὐγούστης Θεοδόσιος ὁ μικρὸς, ὃν ἐδέξατο Ἰωάννης ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι ὁ Χρυσόστομος.

<sup>62</sup> ~~Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ τίκεται τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἀρκαδίῳ υἱὸς ἐξ Εὐδοξίας ὁ μικρὸς Θεοδόσιος ὁ βαπτισθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπιφανοῦς.~~



		remained in the temple. <u>Immediately</u> , the entire temple fell and everyone believed that the people were saved through the emperor's prayer.	emperor's prayer.
--	--	--	-------------------

Despite the discrepancies between the Syriac accounts (Chron. 1234 does not mention the name of the city, Carya, and Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler spell 'Acacius' differently), the verbal similarities, especially the use of the word 'immediately', which was not used by Socrates, suggest that the Syriac witnesses, like Theophanes, are somehow dependent on the Epitome.

### 18.2.3.8 Theodosius II and Pulcheria

Chron. 1234 also discusses Theodosius II's age at the start of his reign and Pulcheria's education of Theodosius II and her foundation of churches, monasteries and hostels. The first part of this entry also seems to be extant in Michael's *Chronicle*. Like Theophanes, the Syriac chroniclers appear to be dependent on the Epitome, who paraphrased Theodore's copy of Sozomen's (HE IX 1.10, 12) account of these events.

Theod. Lect. Epit.	Theophan. Chron. AM 5901 (ed. 80.35-81.15; <sup>68</sup> trans. 125)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 1 (165T; vol. 2: 2V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 178.19-24T
--------------------	--	---	---------------------------------

<sup>68</sup> Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Ἀρκαδίου τοῦ βασιλέως τελευτήσαντος, ὃς ἐβασίλευσε μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν Θεοδοσίου τοῦ πατρὸς ἔτη ιδ', μῆνας γ', ἡμέρας ιδ', συμβασιλεύσας καὶ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ ἔτη ιβ', κατέλιπε Θεοδοσίον τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ βασιλέα ἐτῶν ἡ' ὄντα, συμβασιλεύσαντα δὲ τῷ πατρὶ Ἀρκαδίῳ ἔτη ζ'. Θεοδοσίου δὲ αὐτοκράτορος γενομένου, Πουλχερία, ἡ τούτου ἀδελφή, παρθένος δέκα καὶ πέντε ἐτῶν οὕσα τὴν βασιλείαν σὺν τῷ καλῶς διώκει. εἶχε δὲ καὶ ἄλλας δύο ἀδελφάς, Ἀρκαδίαν καὶ Μαρίναν· καὶ ταύτας παρθενεύειν ἡ Πουλχερία ἔπεισεν. Θεοδοσίον δὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐπαίδευσε σοφωτάτῃ τυγχάνουσα καὶ θεῖον νοῦν κεκτημένη. τὸν δὲ ἀδελφὸν Θεοδοσίον πρὸ πάντων μὲν εἰς τὴν κατὰ θεὸν εὐσέβειαν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ εἰς ἦθος καὶ λόγον καὶ βάδισμα καὶ γέλωτα καὶ στολὴν καὶ καθέδραν καὶ στάσιν βασιλικῶς ἐξεπαίδευσεν. πολλὰς δὲ ἐκκλησίας καὶ πτωχεῖα ξενωνάς τε καὶ μοναστήρια κτίσασα πᾶσι καὶ τὰς ἀρμοδίους προσόδους βασιλικῶς ἀπένειμεν. ὁ δὲ Σωζομενὸς φησὶ περὶ αὐτῆς, ὅτι καὶ θείας ἐμφανείας ἤξιοῦτο.

<p>The emperor <u>Arcadius</u> <u>died</u>,</p> <p><u>leaving his son Theodosius, 8 years old,</u></p> <p>and three daughters, Pulcheria, Arcadia and Marina [299 (90.20-1<sup>69</sup>)]. Pulcheria, fifteen years old, managed the empire excellently with the help of God. She also educated (her) brother Theodosius. For, being very wise and acquiring a holy mind as well as her own virginity, she shone besides God and taught her sisters to do the same. She prescribed rules for (her) brother in everything (and) gave (him) a royal training character, speech, gait, laughter, dress, posture</p>	<p>In this year, on the death of the emperor Arcadius, <i>who had ruled after the death of his father Theodosius 14 years, 3 months and 14 days (having already ruled jointly with his father for twelve years)</i> he <u>left his son Theodosius as emperor, then 8 years old</u>, who had <u>ruled</u> jointly with his father Arcadius for six years. When Theodosius became sole ruler, his sister Pulcheria, who was a virgin 15 years old, managed the Empire excellently with the help of God. He had two other sisters, Arcadia and Marina, whom Pulcheria persuaded to live a virgin life. Possessing great <u>wisdom</u> and a holy mind, she <u>educated</u> her brother Theodosios. She gave her brother Theodosios a royal training, above all in piety towards God, but also in character, speech, gait, laughter, dress, deportment, and</p>	<p>After this <u>Arcadius died</u>,</p> <p><u>leaving as emperor his son Theodosius the Younger, an 8-year-old</u> child.</p>	<p><u>Theodosius the Younger ruled when he was 8 years old</u></p> <p>and was <u>educated for the empire</u> in all of the magnificent <u>wisdom</u> by the diligence of his older sister</p> <p>Pulcheria (فيلادلفيا) who also <u>built</u> beautiful <u>churches</u>, <u>monasteries</u> and <u>many xenodokia</u> (مدارس).</p>
--	---	---	---

<sup>69</sup> Ἀρκάδιος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐτελεύτησε κατλιπὼν ὀκταετῆ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ Θεοδοσίον καὶ θυγατέρας τρεῖς, Πουλχερίαν Ἀρκαδίαν καὶ Μαρίναν.

<p>of imperial sitting and standing, but above all she carefully educated him in the piety towards God (...)</p> <p>After building many churches, poor-houses, hostels, and monasteries, the empress Pulcheria endowed all of them with income. Sozomen says before countless other things about her, and that the grace appeared to her [301-2 (91.4-5, 11-2<sup>70</sup>)].</p>	<p>behaviour. After <u>building numerous churches</u>, poor-houses, <u>hostels</u>, and <u>monasteries</u>, she endowed all of them with appropriate income in imperial style. Sozomen says about her that she was even deemed worthy of divine manifestation.</p>		
---	--	--	--

Given the rarity with which material from Sozomen has made it into Syriac, it is likely that Theodore and the Epitome are ultimately responsible for the appearance of this material in Chron. 1234. In addition, it is not entirely certain if Michael is dependent on the same Syriac source in this case. He only mentions Theodosius' age, which he could have also found in the work of another Syriac dependant of Socrates, but gives no further information on Pulcheria.

### 18.2.3.9 Leo I

All of the previously discussed entries ultimately go back to Theodore's synopsis of the Theodosian church historians. One passage in Chron. 1234, however, concerning the

---

<sup>70</sup> Πουλχερία ἡ βασιλις ἰε ἐτῶν οὕπω τυγχάνουσα ἄριστα τὴν βασιλείαν διώκει. ἐπαίδευε δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Θεοδοσίον· σοφωτάτη γὰρ οὕσα καὶ θεῖον νοῦν κεκτημένη τὴν τε ἰδίαν παρθενίαν θεῶ προσανέθηκε καὶ τὰς ἀδελφὰς τὸ ὅμοιον πρᾶξαι ἐδίδασκεν. εἰς πάντα δὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἐκανονίζεν, ἡθὸς τε καὶ λόγον καὶ βᾶδισμα καὶ γέλωτα καὶ ἐνδυμάτων περιβολὴν καὶ σχῆμα καθέδρας καὶ στάσεως βασιλικῶς ἐπαίδευε, πρὸ δέ γε ἀπάντων τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον εὐσέβειαν αὐτὸν ἐπιμελῶς ἐδίδασκεν. Πολλὰς ἐκκλησίας καὶ πτωχεῖα καὶ ξενῶνας καὶ μοναστήρια ἡ βασιλις Πουλχερία κτίσασα πᾶσι προσόδους ἀφῶρισεν. λέγει δὲ πρὸς ἄλλοις μυρίοις αὐτῆς κατορθώμασιν ὁ Σοζομενός, ὅτι πολλάκις αὐτῇ καὶ τὸ θεῖον ἐφαίνετο.

identity of Leo I, corresponds to original material from Theodore’s *Ecclesiastical History*. Similar entries are extant in Theophanes’ *Chronographia* and Michael’s *Chronicle*.

Theod. Lect. Epit. 367 (103.19-20 <sup>71</sup> )	Theophan. Chron. AM 5950 (ed. 110.19-21; <sup>72</sup> trans. 170)	Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 1 (241T; vol. 2: 126V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 185.7-9T
A certain Leo, <u>Thracian by race and tribune in rank</u> was elected as emperor.	In this year Leo became emperor, a <u>Thracian by race and a tribune in rank</u> , and was crowned by the patriarch Anatolios in February of the 10th indiction.	In year 770 of the Greeks, Leo ruled over the Romans. This (man) was <u>Thracian by race and a tribune in rank</u> ( <u>ῥωμαῖος ἑθνεῖς καὶ τριβουνός</u> ). And because Marcian died without leaving offspring, this (man) was elected by the senate and started to reign.	When Marcian died without child, a man called Leo who was a <u>Thracian tribune</u> ( <u>ῥωμαῖος τριβουνός</u> ) started to reign over the Roman empire.

All four witnesses describe Leo as a tribune of Thracian descent, indicating that they are dependent on Theodore for this information. Malalas, for instance, describes the accession of Leo in a very different manner:

“After the reign of Marcian, the most sacred Leo the Elder, the Bessian, was crowned by the senate and reigned for 16 years and 11 months.”<sup>73</sup>

Theophanes and the Syriac source on which Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler rely independently supplemented the passage with material from other sources. Theophanes added information on Leo’s coronation by Anatolius and the date of the

<sup>71</sup> προχειρίζεται δὲ εἰς βασιλέα Λέων τις, Θραξ μὲν τῷ γένει, τριβουνός δὲ τὴν ἀξίαν.

<sup>72</sup> Τούτῳ τῷ Λέων ἐβασίλευσεν, Θραξ τῷ γένει, τριβουνός τὴν ἀξίαν, μηνὶ Φεβρουαρίῳ, ἰνδικτιῶνι ἰ’ στεφτεῖς ὑπὸ Ἀνατολίου τοῦ πατριάρχου.

<sup>73</sup> Joh. Mal. Brev. XIV 35 (ed. 290.65-7; trans. 202).

coronation, whereas the Syriac source added that Marcian, Leo's predecessor, died without leaving offspring. The detail that Leo was elected by the senate, which is only extant in Michael's *Chronicle*, may have originated from Malalas, in which case it came from John of Ephesus.<sup>74</sup>

### 18.2.3.10 Provisory conclusions and further observations

Because of the generality of the subject matter and Theodore/the Epitome's reliance on Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, it is nearly impossible to unequivocally attribute material in Chron. 1234 to the Epitome. It may well be that other fragments in Chron. 1234 that go back to Socrates, in fact also came from Theodore/the Epitome. Nevertheless, on the basis of their identical description of Julian's executive decisions we can positively attribute pieces of information in the Anonymous Chronicler's descriptions of the reigns of Julian, Theodosius I, Arcadius and Honorius, Theodosius II and Leo I, and possibly also for Constantius II and Valentinian I to the Epitome. This material predominantly pertains to the births, baptisms, geographical and socio-political background, character, accessions and deaths of these emperors.

From our observations follows that Chron. 1234 is a valuable resource for the study of the afterlife of Theodore/the Epitome in Syriac: this chronicle preserves fragments that are not extant in Michael's *Chronicle*, on the birth of Theodosius II and his baptism by John Chrysostom (fr. 284), and on Pulcheria's education of Theodosius and her building politics (frs. 301-2). In addition, some of the fragments of the Epitome in Chron. 1234 are more extensive than those preserved by Michael, or contain elements that are not extant in Michael's *Chronicle* and vice versa.

How this material got into Syriac is difficult to ascertain from a comparison of these fragments in Chron. 1234 and Theophanes alone. It is unlikely that the material from Theodore and the Epitome reached Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler via more than one Syriac source. Let us call this source, SSE, a Syriac source for (adaptations of)

---

<sup>74</sup> On Joh. Eph.'s use of Jo. Mal, see the chapter on the former in this volume. If Michael did not combine this material from Theod. Lect. and Joh. Eph. himself, this may be evidence for a Syriac chronicler who fused material from Joh. Eph./Joh. Mal. and Theod. Lect.

fragments of the Epitome. Given the similarities between the material in SSE and Theophanes' *Chronographia*, the former must be dependent not on the Epitome, but on another Greek source for (adaptations of) fragments of the Epitome, which we shall call GSE. The unknown factors in this equation are the identities of SSE and GSE and their relation to Theophanes. The discrepancies between the Epitome and Theophanes have been explained by the supposition that the latter was perhaps dependent on a more complete epitome. In the second part of this chapter, however, I wish to propose the idea that GSE was not an epitome of Theodore, but a full-blown Greek history, whose author fused fragments of the Epitome with material from other sources.

In this respect, it is worth further investigating other similarities in source material between Theophanes and the later Syriac chronicles. Crucial in this respect is the observation that Theophanes, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler preserve a large number of materials that are only attested in one other source: Photius of Constantinople's epitome of the *Ecclesiastical History* of the Anomoean author Philostorgius of Borissus (c. 368 - c. 425).<sup>75</sup> These similarities have traditionally been explained by the assumption of the existence of a now lost fourth-century Arian history, but it is doubtful that this work ever existed.<sup>76</sup> Given our previous conclusions, however, concerning a connection between the Epitome, Theophanes and SSE, it is perfectly plausible that these parallels between Philostorgius, Theophanes and the later Syriac chroniclers are due to the involvement of GSE and SSE. If we assume the involvement of a Greek intermediary between Philostorgius on the one hand Theophanes and SSE on the other, there is no need to assume the existence of a now lost Arian source, but simply of a late ancient or early medieval Greek history which contained fusion of materials from the *Ecclesiastical History* of Philostorgius with materials from other texts, most notably the Epitome.

---

<sup>75</sup> Bidez 1913 is a collection of fragments from Philost. HE, preserved in Photius' epitome and other sources, Bidez 1913 was translated into English by Amidon 2007.

<sup>76</sup> Bidez 1913, app. VII, 202-41, but also Mango/Scott/Greatrex 1997, lxxx-lxxxii. Some of these materials have since been attributed to other sources, most notably the Antiochene continuation of Eusebius' canons.

The clearest indicator of my hypothesis that the Syriac afterlife of the Epitome should be studied in conjunction with the material from Philostorgius is the fact that Theophanes' *Chronographia*, Michael's *Chronicle* and Chron. 1234 preserve similar accounts of the death of Valentinian I and the proclamation of Valentinian II, where the former account is an adaptation of a passage from the Epitome but the material for the proclamation of Valentinian II only has counterparts in Photius' epitome of Philostorgius.

### 18.2.3.11 The death of Valentinian I

All four authors describe the death of Valentinian in the same way, ultimately using vocabulary that was originally used by Sozomen (HE VI 36.1-4) and Socrates (HE IV 31.7). Valentinian dies, while negotiating with the Sauromatians (the Syriac sources have 'Sarmatians').

Theod. Lect. Epit. 210 (73.23-74.6 <sup>77</sup> )	Theophan. Chron. AM 5867 (ed. 61.25-62.2; <sup>78</sup> trans. 95-6)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 7 (150-1T; vol. 1: 293V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 168.2-11T
The Sauromatai revolted against Valentinian. Having been defeated, they sent envoys to seek	In this year, Valentinian the elder, <u>having been emperor for eleven years</u> , died <u>at the age of</u>	When Valentinian (ܘܠܘܠܠܝܢܘܫܐ) went to war against the Sarmatai (ܣܪܡܬܐܝܐ),	After a while, when (Valentinian) was <u>84 years old</u> , he went to war with the people of the Sarmatai

<sup>77</sup> Σαυρομάται Ουαλεντινιανῶ ἐπανέστησαν. ὑττηθέντες δὲ πρέσβεις ἔπεμψαν ἐξαιτοῦντες εἰρήνην· οὓς Ουαλεντινιανὸς θεασάμενος ἤρετο εἰ πάντες Σαυρομάται τοιοῦτοι τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες τὰ σώματα· τῶν δὲ εἰπόντων ὅτι τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀρίστους ἀπέστειλαν, ἀνακράξας μέγα, δεινὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων βασιλείαν εἶπεν ὑπομένειν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐλθοῦσαν, εἰ Σαυρομάται ὧν οἱ ἄριστοι τοιοῦτοι, Ῥωμαίοις τολμῶσι πολεμεῖν. ἐκ δὲ τῆς διατάσεως φλεβὸς ῥαγείσης καὶ πλείστου ἀναδοθέντος αἵματος ἔν τινι φρουρίῳ Γαλλίας ἐτελειώθη, ἐτῶν ὑπάρχων πενήκοντα τεσσάρων, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἔτη ιγ'.

<sup>78</sup> Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Ουαλεντινιανὸς ὁ μέγας ἐτελεύτησεν ἐτῶν πδ', βασιλεύσας ἔτη ια', τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· Σαυρομάται, ἔθνος [μικρὸν τε καὶ] οἰκτρὸν, ἐπαναστάντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἠττηθέντες πρέσβεις ἔπεμψαν αἰτοῦντες τὴν εἰρήνην. Ουαλεντινιανοῦ δὲ τοὺς πρέσβεις ἐρωτῶντος, εἰ πάντες οἱ Σαυρομάται τοιοῦτοὶ εἰσι τοῖς σώμασιν οἰκτροί, καὶ αὐτῶν εἰπόντων, ὅτι "τοὺς κρείττονας πάντων ὧδε ἔχεις καὶ ὀρᾶς", ἀνακράξας βιαίως ἔφη· "δεινὰ Ῥωμαίων ἡ βασιλεία ὑπομένει εἰς Ουαλεντινιανὸν λήξασα, εἰ Σαυρομάται τοιοῦτοι ὄντες Ῥωμαίων κατεξανίστανται." ἐκ δὲ τῆς διατάσεως καὶ τοῦ κρότου τῶν χειρῶν φλεβὸς ῥαγείσης καὶ πλείστου ἀναδοθέντος αἵματος, ἔν τινι φρουρίῳ Γαλλίας θνήσκει μηνὶ Διω ιζ' ἰνδικτιῶνος γ'.



The Epitome preserves adaptations of the narratives of Socrates and Sozomen: expressions have been (slightly) modified and vocabulary has been added.<sup>80</sup> Whether these modifications are due to the author of the Epitome or to Theodore cannot be ascertained. Theophanes' account has verbal agreements with the Epitome, words that do not appear in Socrates' and Sozomen's narratives.<sup>81</sup> Furthermore, there are two major differences between Theophanes' and the Epitome's accounts: whereas Theodore follows Socrates and Sozomen and says that Valentinian died when he was 54 years old and had reigned for 13 years, Theophanes says that he died, aged 84 after a reign of 11 years.<sup>82</sup> The change in Valentinian's age at the time of his death is probably due to a misreading of the Greek number ΝΔ' (54) for ΠΔ' (84). The difference in regnal years is less simple to explain. I have not found any other source that attributes eleven regnal years to Valentinian I. Crucially, the Syriac sources preserve identical numbers to Theophanes, which confirms that SSE does not rely on the Epitome but on GSE.

#### 18.2.4 Conclusion

Before moving on to the discussion of these chroniclers' accounts of the proclamation of Valentinian II, I provide a catalogue of fragments of the Epitome in Chron. 1234, with their equivalents in Theophanes and Michael. To be clear, this is not a full catalogue of

---

<sup>80</sup> Comp. ήττηθέντες δὲ πρέσβεις ἔμεψαν ἔξαιτοῦντες εἰρήνην (Theod. Lect. Epit.) and ἀλλὰ πρεσβευσάμενοι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤτοῦντο ἐπὶ συνθήκαις εἰρήνης τυχεῖν (Socr.) and πρέσβεις πέμψαντες εἰρήνην ἤτουν (Soz.); or comp. also εἰ πάντες Σαυρομάται τοιοῦτοι τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες τὰ σώματα (Theod. Lect. Epit.) with εἰ τοιοῦτοι Σαυρομάται πάντες εἰσὶν ἐπυθάνετο (Soz.) and εἰ τοιοῦτοι Σαυρομάται πάντες εἰσὶν (Socr.).

<sup>81</sup> Comp. ήττηθέντες δὲ πρέσβεις ἔμεψαν ἔξαιτοῦντες εἰρήνην [Theod. Lect. Epit. 210 (73.23-4)] with ήττηθεντες πρέσβεις ἔπεψαν αἰτοῦντες τὴν εἰρήνην (Theoph.) and εἰ πάντες Σαυρομάται τοιοῦτοι τυγχάνουσιν ὄντες τὰ σώματα (Theod. Lect. Epit.) with οἱ Σαυρομάται τοιοῦτοὶ εἰσι τοῖς σώμασιν οἰκτροί (Theoph.).

<sup>82</sup> The reign of 11 years is also attested in Georg. Cedr. Brev., vol. 1, 547.1-2.

the Syriac fragments of Theodore nor of the fragments of Theodore in Theophanes.<sup>83</sup> It should be worthwhile to catalogue (and compare) all the (adaptations of) fragments of the Epitome in Theophanes and Michael in order to further reconstruct the contents of GSE (and SSE). This enterprise, however, will not be undertaken here.

Subject	Theod. Lect. Epit.	Theophan. Chron.	Mich. Syr. Chron.	Chron. 1234, I
Gallus' rebellion and execution; Julian to Athens	90 (43.17-23); 121 (56.14-6)	AM 5846 (ed. de Boor, 41.12-9; trans. Mango and Scott, 69)	VII 4 (136-7T; vol 1: 267V)	154.22-5
Reign of Julian	117 (55.20-1), 123 (57.1-2), 124 (57.3-9)	AM 5853 (ed. de Boor, 46.32-47.15; trans. Mango and Scott, 76-7)	VII 4 (138T; vol. 1: 268V); VII 5 (144T; vol. 1: 280V)	155.28-156.9
Valentinian I's two wives	212 (74.9-17)	AM 5860 (ed. de Boor, 56.23-57.3; trans. Mango and Scott, 88)	VII 7 (149-50T; vol. 1: 293V)	167.27-29 (possibly)
Death of Valentinian I	210 (73.23-74.6)	AM 5867 (ed. de Boor, 61.25-62.2; trans. Mango, Scott and Greatrex, 95-6)	VII 7 (150-1T; vol. 1: 293V)	168.2-11
Theodosius I	225 (76.26-8)	AM 5871 (ed. de Boor, 66.16-20; trans. Mango and Scott, 101)	VII 8 (155-6T; vol. 1: 306V)	168.27-30; 169.11-3
Death of Theodosius; reigns of Arcadius and Honorius	279 (86.1-3)	AM 5886 (ed. de Boor, 74.15-8; trans. Mango and Scott, 113)	VIII 1 (164T; vol. 2: 1V)	170.30-171.3
Birth and baptism of Theodosius II	284 (87.8-9)	AM 5892 (ed. de Boor, 76.1-3; trans. Mango and Scott, 116)	/////	171.7-10

<sup>83</sup> For the latter, see Hansen's notes in his edition of Theod. Lect. Epit., for the former, see perhaps D'yakonov 1908, while taking into account the fact that D'yakonov must have ignored the involvement of the Epitome and assumed that Joh. Eph. was responsible for this information in Mich. Syr. Chron.

Arcadius and the shrine of Acacius	299 (90.21-4)	AM 5899 (ed. de Boor, 79.32-80.3; trans. Mango and Scott, 123)	VIII 1 (164T; vol. 2: 1V)	173.10-4
Theodosius II and Pulcheria	299 (90.20-1); 301-2 (91.4-5, 11-2)	AM 5901 (ed. de Boor, 80.35-81.15; trans. Mango and Scott, 125)	VIII 1 (165T; vol. 2: 2V); ///	178.19-24
Leo I	367 (103.19-20)	AM 5950 (ed. de Boor, 110.19-21; trans. Mango and Scott, 170)	IX 1 (241T; vol. 2: 126V)	185.7-9

### 18.3 Philostorgius of Borissus (c. 368 - c. 425)

This chapter will continue with a discussion of the influence of Philostorgius on Chron. 1234, Michael's *Chronicle* and Theophanes' *Chronographia* in order to attempt to reconstruct SSE and GSE. The starting point of this reconstruction is the account of the proclamation of Valentinian II, which follows the adaptation of the Epitome's description of Valentinian I's death in Theophanes, Michael as well as in Chron. 1234. This account of Valentinian II's proclamation is very different from the Epitome's, which is based on Socrates (HE IV 31.7) or Sozomen (HE VI 36.5).

Theod. Lect. Epit. 211 (74.7-8)	Theophan. Chron. AM 5867 (ed. 62.2-10; trans. 96)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 7 (150-1T; vol. 1: 294V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 168.7-11T
Valentinian having died, the soldiers in Italy proclaimed his son Valentinian as emperor on the sixth day after his death.	Since his son Gratian was not there and Valens was residing in Antioch, the army that happened to be at the place where Valentinian the elder died proclaimed his 4-year-old son Valentinian	And when Valentinian (βασιλευσας) was dead and his son Gratian was not nearby, Justina was nearby. The troops gathered and made Valentinian the Younger reign, when he was 4	Because when he died, his son Gratian was not nearby and his brother Valens was residing in Antioch, the troops proclaimed his youngest son Valentinian, who was 4 years old, emperor,

	<p>Augustus, his mother Justina being also present in Pannonia. When Gratian heard this, he accepted his brother as joint emperor with him, but punished those who had proclaimed him in various ways since this had taken place without his consent.</p>	<p>years old.</p>	<p>because his mother Justina (جستينا) was nearby.</p>
--	---	-------------------	--

The account in the Epitome is very brief, because the information that Socrates and Sozomen provided on the proclamation was equally limited. Therefore, there can be no doubt that the Epitome preserves Theodore’s narrative. Some information may have been left out, but given that Socrates’ and Sozomen’s narratives are equally succinct, it is extremely unlikely that Theodore’s synopsis contained more information than what was provided by the Theodosian church historians.

Theophanes’, Michael’s and Chron. 1234’s accounts are much longer, suggesting that these go back to another source. This is also indicated by Theophanes’ localisation of the army in Pannonia rather than in Italy and the fact that none of the three later sources mentions “the sixth day after Valentinian’s death.” Instead, these medieval accounts contain elements that do not occur in Socrates, Sozomen nor Theodoret: Valentinian II is said to have been 4 years old and emphasis is put on the fact that his mother Justina was present at the time of his proclamation, but his brother Gratian was not. Chron. 1234 includes a further emphasis on the absence of Valens. Crucially, these elements only find counterparts in the *Ecclesiastical History* (IX 16) of Philostorgius, who mentions Valentinian’s age, the proclamation in Pannonia, Gratian’s absence as well as Justina’s presence, and, like Theophanes, also emphasises Gratian’s consent to having his brother as co-emperor.

“Valentinian died after reigning for twelve years and left his son Gratian as heir to the realm. He also left two other children, a daughter Galla and Valentinian, who was about four years old and whom his mother Justina and the army in Pannonia

immediately made emperor. Gratian, however, when he found out about the proclamation, did not approve of it, since it had been made without his consent, and he even punished some of those involved there in this illegal move. He did, however, consent to have his brother as emperor and to take the place of a father for him.”<sup>84</sup>

These similarities have been noted before, but have been traditionally attributed to a common reliance on the hypothetical fourth-century Arian history.<sup>85</sup> Hypothesising the existence of such a text, however, is no longer necessary. Firstly, The testimony of Photius demonstrates that Philostorgius’ work was still available as late as the second half of the ninth century. Secondly, the fact that Theophanes and the later Syriac chroniclers preserve the exact same combination of material from Philostorgius and the Epitome indicates that the later Syriac chronicle tradition relies on the early medieval Greek chronicle tradition, i.e. that Michael’s and the Anonymous Chronicler’s use of Philostorgius and the Epitome goes back to SSEA, a Syriac source for (adaptations of) fragments of the Epitome and Arian material, who used GSEA, a Greek source for (adaptations of) fragments of the Epitome and Arian material.

Since at the present time it cannot be confirmed if the later Syriac chronicle tradition is dependent on Theophanes, as Günther Christian Hansen supposed,<sup>86</sup> we can only conclude that GSEA must have been written sometime between the early seventh century, after the composition of the Epitome in the 610s, and AD 818, the year of the death of Theophanes. Similarly, the time of production of SSEA can only be pinpointed between the middle of the seventh century and the latter half of the twelfth century, when Michael was writing his *Chronicle*. If we can confirm that the Syriac sources are dependent on Theophanes, then SSEA must have been written between the beginning of the ninth and the latter half of the twelfth century. If this is not the case, if SSEA did not use Theophanes but an earlier source, then Theophanes must be dependent on GSEA as

---

<sup>84</sup> Ed. 123.1-9; trans. 130-1.

<sup>85</sup> Bidez 1913, appendix 7.

<sup>86</sup>

well, which would mean that Theophanes did not have access to Philostorgius and the Epitome.

Having concluded that GSEA and SSEA contained material from Philostorgius, a comparison of information that is found in Photius' epitome of Philostorgius, Theophanes and the later Syriac sources yields further results for the reconstruction of GSEA and SSEA.

Subject	Philost. HE (epit. Phot.)	Theophan. Chron.	Mich. Syr. Chron.	Chron. 1234, vol; 1,
Death of the priest Theotecnus	VII 13	AM 5855 (ed. 50.34–51.3; trans. 81)	VII 6 (146T; vol. 1: 289V)	/////
Reconstruction of the temple in Jerusalem and its destruction	VII 9	AM 5855 (ed. 51.27-52.7; trans. 81)	VII 6 (146T; vol. 1: 288-9V)	///
The consulship of Jovian and Varronian in Ancyra of Galatia	VIII 8	AM 5856 (ed. 54.15-8; trans. 84)	147	///
Valens in Marcianoupolis <sup>87</sup>	IX 7	AM 5859 (ed. 56.9-10; trans. 87)	VII 7 (149T; vol. 1: 292V)	///
Proclamation of Valentinian II	IX 16	AM 5867 (ed. 62.2-10; trans. 96)	VII 7 (151T; vol. 1: 293-4V)	168.7-11
Valens' death in a straw-barn	IX 17	/////	VII 7 (153T; vol. 1: 294-5V)	168.22-3

From this catalogue we learn that Theophanes' *Chronographia* and Michael's *Chronicle* preserve much more material from GSEA and SSEA than Chron. 1234. Apart from the

---

<sup>87</sup> On this account, see also the following chapter. In Theophan. Chron. it is used as an introduction to an account of an earthquake that occurred in the Eastern Mediterranean and caused a tsunami that affected many cities including Alexandria. Mich. Syr. and Chron. 1234 also commemorate this earthquake and tsunami, but only Mich. Syr. mentions Marcianoupolis, though wrongly as the city where the earthquake occurred and caused a tsunami.

account of the proclamation of Valentinian II and one other detail, that Valens died in a straw-barn, Chron. 1234 shows no discernible influence of Philostorgius whatsoever. Crucially, the latter detail is only extant in Michael's *Chronicle* and in Chron. 1234. Since it is unlikely that the later Syriac chronicle tradition was influenced by Philostorgius via two different intermediaries, the latter detail must have been transmitted from Philostorgius via GSEA to SSEA. However, given that Theophanes' *Chronographia* does not bear witness to this fact (Theophanes mentions the death of Valens, but does not mention the haystack or barn), SSEA cannot be dependent on Theophanes and hence Theophanes cannot be GSEA.<sup>88</sup> The logical conclusion therefore is that SSEA and Theophanes are both dependants of GSEA, a seventh-, eighth- or early ninth-century Greek historian who fused information from the Epitome and Philostorgius.

## 18.4 Conclusion

Let us sum up what we know about SSEA, Chron. 1234's Syriac source for (adaptations of) fragments of the Epitome and Arian history. The author of SSEA wrote in Syriac, a work that contained longer narratives and covered at least the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries. This unknown author translated and adapted these narratives from a Greek history (GSEA), which was written between the early seventh century and the turn of the ninth. Identifying SSEA is difficult. Only one other Syriac historian is known to have been writing after the beginning of the seventh century, to have covered the fourth and fifth centuries, and to have used Greek sources: Ignatius of Melitene (d. 1094). Though this remains the most likely scenario, there are some uncertainties attached to this

---

<sup>88</sup> In this context, it is also worth noting that some of this material from Philost. is also extant in Chron. Pasch. Because Chron. Pasch. was not influenced by Theod. Lect. Epit., its source cannot have been GSEA, perhaps the author of Chron. Pasch. used Philost. HE directly.

hypothesis, which is why I have decided to separate this issue from that of Ignatius' influence on Chron. 1234.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> For my remarks on the identification of Ign. Mel. with SSEA , see the chapter on his chronicle in this volume.

# Chapter 19 Other points of contact between Theophanes and the later Syriac chronicle tradition for information on the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries

## 19.1 Introduction

As I have explained in the previous chapter, the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael are dependent on a now lost Syriac history (SSEA) for (adaptations of) fragments of the Epitome and Philostorgius. In turn, for this information SSEA relied on a Greek source (GSEA) that was also used by Theophanes. Given that SSEA and GSEA definitely covered the fourth and fifth centuries, and perhaps also the sixth century, the present chapter collects information, pertaining to the period between the fourth and the sixth century, that is shared by Theophanes, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler but is not, or barely, extant in earlier sources, i.e. materials for which Theophanes is almost always our earliest Greek witness. Some of the information that will be discussed in this chapter has already been noted by other scholars and tentatively attributed to specific sources, most notably Bidez' hypothetical fourth-century Arian history<sup>1</sup> and Theodore

---

<sup>1</sup> Philost., HE, app. VII, 202-41.

Lector.<sup>2</sup> Though it is impossible to prove, and probably unlikely that all of the materials discussed in this chapter go back to GSEA and SSEA, this chapter aims to further reconstruct these two now lost late ancient texts and identify some of their sources by cataloguing other pieces of information that Theophanes and the later Syriac chronicle tradition have in common.

In the previous chapter, I have already cited the example of an account of the Gothic invasion during the reign of Valens that is shared by Theophanes and Michael.<sup>3</sup> There are four other passages that are only shared by Theophanes and Michael, which I will list here in the order in which they appear in Theophanes' *Chronographia*, but not discuss, because they are not extant in Chron. 1234. This list is by no means complete, but represents those passages to have come to my attention in the process of my research.

Subject	Theophan. Chron.	Mich. Syr. Chron.
The martyrdom of Dorotheus of Tyre during the reign of Julian	AM 5854 (ed. 48-9; trans. 78-9)	VII 6 (146T; vol. 1: 289V)
The cross appears in the sky and on the clothes of Jews and Christians	AM 5855 (ed. 52.10-9; trans. 82)	VII 6 (146T; vol. 1: 288-9V)
The appearance of man-shaped clouds and the birth of a deformed child at the time of the Gothic invasion of twenty Roman provinces	AM 5870 (ed. 64.34-65.1-2; trans. 100)	VII 7 (152T; vol. 1: 294V)
birth of Siamese twins in Emmaus	AM 5878 (ed. 70.12-19; trans. 106-7)	VIII 1(163-4T; vol. 2: 2-3V)
The empress Eudoxia's erection of a silver statue near the Church of Saint Irene <sup>4</sup>	AM 5898 (ed. 79.4-12; trans. 121)	VIII 1 (164T; vol. 2: 1V)

<sup>2</sup> E.g. the account of the earthquake, which has some similarities with Socr. HE IV 3, on which, see below.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. Theophan. Chron. AM 5870 (ed. 64.34-65.1-2; trans. 100) and Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 7 (152T; vol. 1: 294V). On this passage, see the introduction to the previous chapter. See also Philost. HE, app. VII, 240 (47 and 47a); Theod. Lect., introd., xxxiv-v.

<sup>4</sup> In Mich. Syr. this entry immediately follows the entry on the construction of the portico and the column on the Xerolophus in Constantinople, and the foundation of Arcadioupolis in Thrace (on which, see below).

Reign and murder of Constantius, father of Valentinian	AM 5913 (ed. 84.7-9; trans. 131)	VIII 2 (169T; vol. 2: 10V)
Disorder and slaughter in Alexandria	AM 5916 (ed. 85.6-7; trans. 133)	VIII 2 (170T ; vol. 2: 11V)
Zeno and Basiliscus are made commanders (strategos) of the East and of Thrace	AM 5956 (ed. 113.17-19; trans. 176)	IX 1 (241T; vol. 2: 126V) <sup>5</sup>

By examining Chron. 1234 and comparing its source material to information provided by Theophanes and Michael, I have been able to isolate twelve additional sets of materials, pertaining to the fourth until sixth century and which are shared by Theophanes and Chron. 1234, and usually, but not always, also by Michael. The majority of this information is not extant in earlier sources, but similar material was on occasion known to Malalas (c. 565) and Theophylact Simocatta (630s).

This information will be discussed in the order in which it appears in Chron. 1234, which does not necessarily agree with the chronological order in which the events in question occurred or are said to have occurred. As will become clear, the extent of the relationship between the testimony of Theophanes and that of the Syriac sources is not always determinable. In several cases there is an evident direct relationship, but in others, these chroniclers merely share material that could have reached them via very different paths of transmission.

---

<sup>5</sup> A similar fragment is attested in Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 185.9-11T, immediately after the reference to Leo I as a Thracian tribune, after Theod. Lect. And Theod. Lect. Epit., but Chron. 1234 seems to be dependent on Joh. Mal. (through Joh. Eph.) rather than Michael's source for this information.

## 19.2 Constantine's construction of churches and anti-pagan legislation

The earliest Greek material that is shared by Theophanes and Chron. 1234, and in one of the three cases also Michael, pertains to the reign of Constantine the Great. The witnesses focus on Constantine's construction of churches and his anti-pagan legislation, his last dealings with Licinius (writing rescripts), and the coronation of Constantine's mother Helen, and her coinage. This last bit of information appears as early as in Sozomen (HE II 2), and in the Epitome (only the coinage), but for all three sets of information there are parallels to be found in two Greek panegyrics: Alexander the Monk's *On the Finding of the Cross* (Alex. Mon.), a panegyric on the cross of uncertain date (extant in manuscripts as early as the tenth century and written between 543 and the early ninth century<sup>6</sup>), and a *Life of Constantine*<sup>7</sup> (Vit. Const.) preserved in several manuscripts ranging from the eleventh until the sixteenth century but probably written in the ninth or tenth century. The first entry discusses Constantine's construction of churches and his legislation which forbade pagans from serving in the army and made idolatry a capital offence. The Greek witnesses in fact include a third law, that "public business was to cease for two weeks of Easter."<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The *terminus ante quem* is provided by a ninth-century Georgian version of this text. Kazhdan 1987, 199, 221, 247 suggests dating this text or the use of this text to the reign of Constantine V (741-75).

<sup>7</sup> BHG 364.

<sup>8</sup> Translation from Theophan. Chron. AM 5810 (ed. 16; trans. 27). The same law is also mentioned by Alex. Mon. 4057D and *Vit. Const.* 333.4-8. Theoph. adds another law, "that in Egypt a cubit of the rise of the river Nile was to be offered to the Church and not in the Sarapion as was the pagan custom," perhaps after, see Theod. Lect. 29 (14.28-15.1) [cf. Socr. HE I 18].



<p>(ἀφιερωμένα) for the idols were to be handed over to the Christian Church, and that idolaters were to suffer capital punishment. Second, he legislated that only Christians were to serve in the army and to command foreign races and armies. (...)</p>	<p>ἔγραψε) that the temples used for idols were to be handed over to persons consecrated (ἀφιερωμένοις) to Christ (his son Crispus was co-signatory of this legislation); second, that only Christians were to serve in the army and to command foreign races and armies, while those who persisted in idolatry were to suffer capital punishment (...).</p>	<p><u>building</u> (ἀνεγείρων) <u>churches</u> and enriching them lavishly from public funds. First, he decreed (ἔθέσπισε) a law that the temples of the idols were to be handed over to persons consecrated to Christ. His son Crispus was co-signatory of this legislation. His second law (stated that) only Christians were to serve in the army and were deemed worthy of imperial honour, while those who persisted in idolatry and attempted to blaspheme Christ were to suffer capital punishment.</p>	<p>He <i>pulled down</i> all the houses of idols and <u>legislated</u> (ܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ) that no pagan should ever be in military service (ܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ).</p>	<p>he <i>ordered</i> that no pagan should be seen in military service (ܘܨܘܒܘܢܐ); and that if anyone should persist in paganism, his head should be cut off.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

The extent of the relationship between the Greek witnesses themselves and between the Greek and the Syriac sources is difficult to determine. Unlike the Greek sources, which say that Constantine became *monocrator*, sole ruler, the Syriac witnesses use the term

*autocrator*.<sup>14</sup> Apart from that, all we can say is that Michael and 1234 undoubtedly rely on the same Syriac source, which they copied and reworked independently; both have preserved elements which the other has not. The identity of this Syriac source cannot be determined and could have been written at any given time between the fourth and the twelfth century, but given that this material occurs in Greek for the first time from the sixth century onwards, it is much more likely that the Syriac tradition is secondary.

As for the relationship between the Greek witnesses, some literally identical phrases are extant in all three texts. All of the material preserved by Theophanes has literal or virtually literal parallels in one or both of the other witnesses, but Theophanes has more in common with the *Life* than with Alexander (e.g. the reference to Constantine's son Crispus and his co-signing of the legislation).

The Syriac accounts have much more in common with Theophanes' and the *Life*'s narratives than with Alexander's. How this material got into Syriac, however, is difficult to determine, because this issue largely depends on the relationship between the Greek sources, which is in itself unclear. Theophanes and Alexander cannot be dependent on one another, that much is clear.<sup>15</sup> Mango, Scott and Greatrex "assume a common source" for Theophanes, Alexander and the author of the *Life of Constantine*, which could date from anywhere from the fourth until the ninth century.<sup>16</sup> At the same time, because of its relatively late date, it is theoretically possible that the *Life* is dependent on Theophanes.<sup>17</sup> Yet, it also contains some additional materials that are not extant in the other two witnesses and that may go back to an earlier common source.<sup>18</sup> In the end we can only conclude that Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's common Syriac source used a Greek source. Given the conclusions in the previous chapter, it is plausible that this Greek source was also one Theophanes' source, presumably GSEA.

---

<sup>14</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler also uses this term for Arcadius and Leo II.

<sup>15</sup> Kazhdan 1987, 221; Scott 2012, 67, n. 36.

<sup>16</sup> Theophan. Chron., introd., lxxvii.

<sup>17</sup> Winkelmann 1964, 408-10; Burgess 1999, 203; Kazhdan 1987, 201.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. the story of Helena's mission, Kazhdan 1987, 224.

## 19.3 Constantine and Licinius

The second set of materials concerns the relationship between Constantine and Licinius. In this case, Chron. 1234 is our only Syriac witness. Both Theophanes and Chron. 1234 preserve a similar paraphrase of Eusebius, saying that Licinius came to Antioch (cf. Eus. HE IX 11.6) before he went mad (or became bitter; cf. Eus. HE IX 9.2 or 9.12). This might be considered a coincidence, were it not that both sources continue (Theophanes in the entry on the following year), with references to Licinius' persecution of the Christians that were under his dominion and Constantine's writing of rescripts, ordering Licinius to stop the persecution. Both sources also say that Constantine, when seeing that Licinius did not obey his order, went to war with him. The war is attested in Eusebius, but the verb *to see* is only used by Theophanes and 1234. For all of these non-Eusebian materials, there are parallels in Alexander the Monk and/or the *Life of Constantine*.

Alex. Mon. 4057B <sup>19</sup>	Theophan. Chron. (ed. 16.26-8, 16.30-17.2, 19.25-20.5; <sup>20</sup> trans. 27-8, 33)	Vit. Const., 333.26-334.10 <sup>21</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 141.1-9T <sup>22</sup>
	Licinius, before he finally went mad, went <u>to Antioch</u> and there killed the magician Theotecnus and his associates after subjecting them to many tortures (AM 5810). (...) In this year (AM 5811) Licinius began to set in		(Licinius) had not yet fallen in the bitterness that would later come to him. (...) When Licinius came <u>to Antioch</u> , however, he rebelled against the emperor and organised

<sup>19</sup> Ταῦτα μαθὼν ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ Κωνσταντῖνος σεβαστὸς, καὶ συσχεθεὶς τῇ λύπῃ ἔγραψεν αὐτῷ, παραινῶν ἀποστήναι αὐτὸν τῆς κατὰ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ μανίας. Ὁ δὲ καταφρονήσας μανικωτέρως τὸν διωγμὸν ἐχρήσατο, καὶ λοιπὸν κρυπτῶς κατὰ τοῦ εὐεργέτου ἐπιβουλὰς ἐπενόει, ὕστερον καὶ δημόσιον πόλεμον συνεκρότει κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὑπὸ θείας δυνάμεως φρουρουμένου τοῦ αυτοκράτορος. Καὶ συμβολῆς γενομένης ἐν τοῖς τῆς Βιθυνίας μέρεσι, καὶ τοῦ ἐνδόξου σταυροῦ προάγοντος, ὑποχείριος γέγονεν ὁ δειλαῖος τῷ αὐτοκράτορι, ζῶν συλληφθεὶς. Φιλανθρώπως δὲ χρησάμενος ὁ κατὰ πάντα πραότατος βασιλεὺς τῷ δυσμενεῖ, ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ διάγειν ἡσυχάζοντα.

<sup>20</sup> Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Λικίνιος ἤρξατο κατὰ Χριστιανῶν διωγμὸν κινεῖν. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τοὺς ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ Χριστιανοὺς ἐδίωξε λήτην λαβῶν τῆς τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ τυράννων καθαιρέσεως καὶ τῶν πρὸς τὸν μέγαν Κωνσταντῖνον συνθηκῶν. γυναικομανῶν δὲ καὶ ἀδικῶν καὶ φονεῦων Χριστιανούς οὐκ ἐπαύετο· τούτῳ διὰ γραμμάτων ὁ θεῖος Κωνσταντῖνος κελεύσας ἀποστήναι τῆς μανίας οὐκ ἔπεισεν. (...). Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει ιδῶν Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβῆς Λικίνιον μανικώτερον τῷ διωγμῷ χρώμενον καὶ ἐπιβουλὴν κατὰ τοῦ εὐεργέτου μελετῶντα ὀπολιζέται κατ' αὐτοῦ διὰ τε ζηρᾶς καὶ θαλάσσης· καὶ δὴ πολ'μου δημοσίου κροτηθέντος κατὰ τὴν Βιθυνίαν, ζῶν συλλαμβάνεται ἐν Χρυσοπόλει καὶ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας Κωνσταντίνου παραδίδοται. ὁ δὲ τῇ συνήθει φιλανθρώπιᾳ χρησάμενος χαρίζεται αὐτῷ τὴν ζωὴν καὶ εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην τοῦτον ἐκπέμπει φρουρεῖσθαι.

<sup>21</sup> τούτῳ διὰ γραμμάτων ὁ θεῖος Κωνσταντῖνος κελεύσας ἀποστήναι τῆς μανίας, οὐκ ἔπεισεν· τότε ιδῶν ὁ μέγας Κωνσταντῖνος Λικίνιον, ὅτι μανικώτερον τῷ διωγμῷ ἐχρήτο καὶ ὅτι ἐπιβουλὴν κατὰ τοῦ εὐεργέτου ἐμελέτα, ὀπλιζέται κατ' αὐτοῦ διὰ ζηρᾶς καὶ θαλάσσης καὶ δὴ, πολέμου δημοσίου κροτηθέντος κατὰ τὴν Βιθυνίαν, ἤττηθεις ὁ Λικίνιος φυγὰς ᾗχετο πρὸς τὴν Χαλκηδόναν, γενόμενος δὲ ἐν τῇ Χρυσοπόλει συνελήφθη καὶ ζῶν ὁ ἄθλιος παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρα τοῦ μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου. ὁ δὲ τῇ συνήθει φιλανθρώπιᾳ χρησάμενος, οὐ κτείνει μὲν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ζῆν αὐτῷ χαρισάμενος εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην ἐξόριστον ἐκπέμπει φρουρεῖσθαι.

<sup>22</sup> \*σὴλῆλαε δὲσθὸι ἑθὶοῖθις ῥοσῆλο εορκ .κῆλῆρῶτῖ ἔ κῆσθὸι ῥοσθῶκ .κῆλο ἔ τῖτο κῆσῶλῆρῆ κῆθῖκ ἔκ .ῥῖ σῶλῆρῶλ .σῶσθὸο σῶλα εἰοκ .κῆθῶσθῖ κῆ σῆλοῖ, σῶλῶ ῥῖ ἔ .εῶθῆρῶ κῆο \*κῆθῶσθῖ ῥῖ ἡσῶσθῖ σῶλῆρῶλῶσῶ κῆλο σῆλοῖ εῶθῶ .σῶλῶσῶλῆρῶ σῖθῖε .κῆθῶσθῖ δῶσθῖ σῶλα σῶσθῖκ ἔκ

<p>Having learnt these things, Constantine Augustus, the servant of God, holding back (his) grief, <u>wrote to him</u>, exhorting him to stop the madness against the Christian Church.</p> <p>Having ignored (Constantine), (Licinius) inflicted a persecution in a more enraged manner and finally secretly planned a plot against (his) benefactor. He also clashed with him in a final and open war, against an emperor protected by the divine power.</p> <p>And when the engagement occurred in parts of Bithynia and the venerable cross was leading the way, the wretched man was handed over to the sole ruler, having been captured alive. <u>Treating</u> his enemy <u>with philanthropy</u>, the emperor, very mild in everything, pacifying him, ordered him to spend his time in Thesalonica.</p>	<p>motion a persecution of Christians. First he pursued the Christians in the palace, forgetful of the fall of the tyrants before him and of his agreements with Constantine the Great. He also did not cease fornication, behaving unjustly and slaughtering Christians. The godlike Constantine <u>ordered him in rescripts to stop the madness</u> but did not persuade him. (...) In this year (AM 5815) the pious Constantine, <u>seeing</u> that Licinius was continuing his persecution in a more enraged manner and was planning a plot against his benefactor, took up arms against him on land and sea. In the clash of open war in Bithynia, Licinius was captured alive at Chrysopolis and handed over to Constantine, who, treating him with his customary humanity, granted him life and <u>sent him to</u> be imprisoned in <u>Thessalonica</u>.</p>	<p><u>Ordering him in rescripts to stop the madness</u>, but he did not persuade him. When Constantine the Great <u>saw</u> that Licinius began his persecution in a more enraged manner and was planning a plot against his benefactor, he took up arms against him on land and on sea. In the clash of open war in Bithynia, the defeated Licinius fled to Chalcedon. When he was at Chrysopolis the wretched man was captured and handed over alive to Constantine the Great. <u>Treating</u> him with his customary <u>philanthropy</u>, Constantine did not kill him, but granted him life and sent the banished man to be imprisoned in Thessalonica.</p>	<p>a persecution against the Christians, and also in all the regions under his dominion. And the emperor Constantine <u>wrote to him</u> (ordering him) to return from tyranny, but he was not heard.</p> <p>When (Constantine) <u>saw</u> that (Licinius) considered tyranny, he waged war with him and defeated him.</p> <p>After he had <u>treated</u> him <u>with philanthropy</u>, he <u>sent him to Thessalonica</u>.</p>
---	---	---	---

Though the Syriac account only has a few verbal agreements with the Greek witnesses and some of the material ultimately goes back to Eusebius (“came” or “went to Antioch,” “persecution” against Christians, “sent him to Thessalonica” and “treated him with philanthropy”), there is undoubtedly a connection, because the references to Constantine’s writing of rescripts to Licinius and Constantine’s “seeing” that Licinius was not behaving properly are not extant anywhere else, except in these three Greek sources and Chron. 1234. Again, there are more verbal agreements between Theophanes’ *Chronographia* and the *Life* than between these two texts and the *Finding of the Cross*. In turn Chron. 1234’s narrative is also closer to the two former Greek texts than to the latter.

## 19.4 A crown and coinage for Helen

The third entry concerns Helen, her status of empress and the fact that she was granted the privilege to have coins struck with her image. These matters are in fact not only discussed by Theophanes, the *Life* and Chron. 1234, but also by Sozomen (HE II 2) and the Epitome. I include the latter two testimonies to demonstrate that the Epitome was not Theophanes’ source in this case.

Soz. HE II 2.4 (ed. 51.2-4 <sup>23</sup> )	Theod. Lect. 26 (13.22-3 <sup>24</sup> )	Theophan. Chron. AM 5816 (ed. 23.17- 8; <sup>25</sup> trans. 37)	Vit. Const. 642.9-11 <sup>26</sup>	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 144.24-7T <sup>27</sup>
(Helena) was proclaimed Augusta and her image was stamped on golden coins. Having been invested by her son with authority over the imperial treasury, she used it according to her judgement.	Helen, honoured by coinage by her son, inscribed her own image on coins.	In this year he crowned Helena, his god-minded mother and assigned to her as empress the privilege of coinage.	Behaving beautifully in all these matters, he crowned Helena, his god-minded and very holy mother and assigned her the privilege of coinage.	But (Constantine) also built a magnificent and great city in the name of his mother, and he called it Helenopolis, because by that time she too wore a crown and made her own coins.

The verbal agreements between Sozomen and the Epitome show the dependence of the latter, and probably of Theodore, on the former, but their Greek vocabulary differs from that used by Theophanes' and the *Life*'s. The vocabulary of the latter two sources is virtually identical, suggesting one's dependence on the other or their dependence on a common source. The account in the *Life* is slightly longer, because it has a different introduction than Theophanes, which just starts with "in this year," but this does not give us any indication as to who is dependent on whom.

<sup>23</sup> Σεβαστή τε ἀνεκηρύχθη, καὶ εἰκόνι ἰδίᾳ χρυσοῦν νόμισμα κατεσήμανε, καὶ βασιλικῶν θυσσαυρῶν ἐξουσίαν παρὰ τοῦ παιδὸς λαβοῦσα κατὰ γνώμην ἐχρήτο.

<sup>24</sup> Ἑλένη τιμήσαντος αὐτὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ μονήταν ἐν τοῖς νομίσμασιν ἰδίας εἰκόνοσ ἐνέγραψεν.

<sup>25</sup> τῷ δ' αὐτῷ, ἔτει Ἑλένην, τὴν θεόφρονα αὐτοῦ μητέρα, ἔστεψε καὶ μονήταν ὡς βασιλίδι ἀπένειμεν.

<sup>26</sup> Ἐν τούτοις ὄντων τῶν πραγμάτων καλῶς, τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ τὴν θεόφρονα καὶ ἀγιωτάτην Ἑλένην ἔστεψε καὶ μονήτας ὡς βασιλίδι ἀπένειμεν.

<sup>27</sup> ἡ ἰστορία ἀπὸ τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἀρχαίας ἱστορίας ἀναφέρεται ὡς ἀληθινή. ἡ ἀρχαία ἱστορία ἀναφέρει ὅτι ἡ ἑλένη ἦν ἡ μητέρα τοῦ βασιλέως ὁ ἀρχαῖος βασιλεὺς ἀναφέρει ὅτι ἡ ἑλένη ἦν ἡ μητέρα τοῦ βασιλέως.

In Theophanes' *Chronographia* this entry appears between two entries that are almost identical to entries from Alexander the Monk's *On the Finding of the Cross*: on Constantine's command to Macarius of Jerusalem to search for "the site of the holy Resurrection and that of Golgotha (...)" and on Helen's vision to go to Jerusalem and "bring to light the sacred sites which had been buried by the impious."<sup>28</sup> In a larger context, Theophanes entire description of the events that occurred in this year (AM 5816) seems to be based on material taken from the Epitome and from the treatise of Alexander the Monk or a similar source. In Chron. 1234 this material is attached to a commemoration of the refounding of Drepanum as Helenopolis, an adaptation of a passage from Socrates (HE I 17.1), which is unlikely to have been made by the Anonymous Chronicler, because a fairly literal copy of this entry appears later on in the same text.<sup>29</sup> This entire entry is wedged between two fairly literal copies of passages from Socrates on Constantine's naming of Constantinople as the 'second Rome' (HE I 16.1) and the construction of the churches of Irene and the Holy Apostles in it (HE I 16.2). In a larger context, however, these three passages immediately follow Dionysius of Tell-Mahre's account of the mythical foundation of Byzantium by king Byzas and Constantine's refounding of the city, which the Anonymous Chronicler took out of its context<sup>30</sup> and inserted here.

Given the difference in context in which this material appears in Theophanes' *Chronographia* and Chron. 1234, it is difficult to determine how the paths of transmission of this material overlap. Ultimately this material probably goes back to Sozomen and there is clearly a relation between Theophanes' and the Anonymous Chronicler's knowledge of this material, but the involvement of the Epitome in the case of Theophanes and the Anonymous Chronicler is unlikely, because the Epitome only

---

<sup>28</sup> Alex. Mon. 4061A-B.

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 150.17-9.

<sup>30</sup> Judging from Mich. Syr. Chron. XI 18 (452-5T; vol. 2: 486-8V), Dion. TM originally joined this foundation myth to his account of the second Arab siege of Constantinople in 717-8 AD. Palmer 1993, 219, n. 552 believed that originally the two passages from Socr. HE, the passage on Helen's crown and coinage and one other passage on Constantine's decoration of Constantinople were part of Dion. TM's narrative and that Michael merely preserves an abbreviated version, but this is unlikely.



Constantius the Augustus, and he was killed on the island of Istrus. And he put the purple on Julian, the brother of the same Gallus who was also Constantius, and appointed him Caesar on day 8 before Ides of October [8 Oct.]; Constantius Augustus gave to him in marriage his sister Helena, and dispatched him to Gaul.	brother Julian from prison, promoted him to <u>Caesar</u> and, after uniting him in marriage to his own <u>sister Helena (also known as Constantia)</u> , sent him to Gaul.	appointed Julian <u>Caesar and he gave him his sister Helen, who was called Constantia, as a wife.</u>	Julian <u>from</u> Athens, made him <u>Caesar and he gave him his sister Constantina (sic!) as a wife</u> , who died, when she had been with him for only a short while, holding on to the orthodox doctrine.
---	---	--	---

Theophanes, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler emphasise that Constantius returned to Constantinople in order to promote Julian, and the equivalent passage in the *Chronicon Paschale*, which says that Gallus “was summoned,” but this information is not extant in Socrates, Sozomen nor Theodoret. In addition, all the later sources, including the *Chronicon Paschale*, say that Julian married Constantius’ sister Constantia, after Socrates (HE III 1.25) and Sozomen (HE V 2.20), but Theophanes and Michael identify her as Helen first and Constantia second, and the *Chronicon Paschale* only calls her Helen, (Chron. 1234 preserves the erroneous ‘Constantina’, who was Constantius’ other sister), suggesting the influence of another intermediary between Socrates/Sozomen and the later Greek and Syriac chronicle tradition. The involvement of Theodore Lector or the Epitome<sup>34</sup> can be ruled out in this case, because the *Chronicon Paschale* was not influenced by Theodore or the Epitome.

---

<sup>34</sup> Theod. Lect. Epit. 90 (43.20-3): ὅπερ γνοῦς ὁ Κωνσταντίος μετάπεμπτον ποιησάμενος Γάλλον περὶ Θαλμωναίτην νῆσον ἀναιρεθῆναι προσέταξεν. τούτου δὲ γενομένου Ἰουλιανὸν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Γάλλου προβαλόμενος Καίσαρα κατὰ τῶν ἐν Γαλλίαις βαρβάρων ἀπέστειλε.

## 19.6 The proclamation of Gratian Augustus (and his appointment as consul)

Theophanes, Michael and Chron. 1234 also commemorate Valentinian I's proclamation of Gratian Augustus. Because this was a major historical event, it is mentioned by several historians. In this case, however, the testimonies of Theophanes, Michael and Chron. 1234 are clearly much more related to each other than to the other witnesses. For comparison, I have added the testimonies of Jerome and the *Chronicon Paschale*.

Eus. Chron. Lat. 245 <sup>b</sup>	Chron. Pasch. a. 367 (ed., vol. 1, 557.7-9; <sup>35</sup> trans. 46)	Theophan. Chron. AM 5857 (ed. 55.1-5; <sup>36</sup> trans. 85)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 7 (148-9T; <sup>37</sup> vol. 1: 292V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 167.27-29T <sup>38</sup>
Gratianus Valentiniani filius Ambianis imperator factus	And in the same year Gratian was elevated as Augustus in Gaul by Valentinian Augustus his father in the month Lous, day 9 before Kalends of September [24 Aug.].	<u>In this year the Augustus Valentinian proclaimed his son Gratian Augustus,</u> both as partner in the Empire and <u>as consul,</u> having previously proclaimed, as has been said, <u>his brother Valens</u> emperor, and ardent <u>Arian</u> who	(Valentinian) <u>proclaimed his son Gratian Augustus,</u> and he made him <u>consul.</u> The <u>Arian Valens</u> was in the <u>east</u> (...)	(Valentinian) <u>proclaimed his son Gratian Augustus Caesar,</u> and he also sent <u>his brother Valens</u> to the East.

<sup>35</sup> Καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἔτει ἐπήρθη Γρατιανὸς Αὐγούστος ἐν Γαλλίαις ὑπὸ Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ Αὐγούστου πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μηνὶ λῶω πρὸ θ' καλανδῶν σεπτεμβρίων.

<sup>36</sup> Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Οὐαλεντινιανὸς ὁ Αὐγούστος Γρατιανὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν Αὐγούστον - ἀνηγόρευσεν, κοινωὸν τῆς βασιλείας ὁμοῦ καὶ ὑποτον, προαναγορεύσας καὶ Οὐάλεντα τὸν ἀδελφὸν βασιλέα, ὡς προλέλεκται, διάπυρον Ἄρειανὸν ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ὑπὸ Εὐδοξίου βαπτισθέντα.

<sup>37</sup> .κασϩ ιαε κωιαε κωικ ρι ωλοε ..ωιαε ωαφωεα .ωιαε ωαφωεα κ ωαφικ ωλι ρι ιαε

<sup>38</sup> \* κωιαε ιαε ,ωωε ωλοε κ εαε .ιωε ωαφωεα κ ωιαε ωαφικ ωλι ρι ιαε

		had been baptised by Eudoxius.		
--	--	-----------------------------------	--	--

The *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes do not seem to rely on the same source for this information. Instead, Theophanes' account more closely resembles Michael's, including the emphasis on Gratian's position as consul and the reference to the Arian Valens, emperor in the East. The Anonymous Chronicler's account slightly differs from Michael's and does not include the reference to the consulship, but this need not surprise us, given the Anonymous Chronicler's consistent disinterest in this position and its use as a dating system. It is likely therefore that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler used the same Syriac source. This source must have used a Greek source that was also used by Theophanes, but this Greek text cannot have been the *Epitome*, which does not mention Gratian's proclamation.<sup>39</sup>

## 19.7 An earthquake in Alexandria during the reign of Valens (21 July AD 365<sup>40</sup>)

A well-known passage that is shared by Theophanes, Michael and Chron. 1234 is a description of the earthquake of 365 that affected the entire Mediterranean, but especially Alexandria where a tsunami caused much harm. Not surprisingly therefore, these events are commemorated by several Latin, Greek and Syriac historians including Jerome<sup>41</sup> (earthquake), Ammianus Marcellinus<sup>42</sup> (earthquake and tsunami), Socrates<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Theod. Lect. 158 (63.5-6): Οὐάλης μέντοι Ἀρειανὸς ὑπῆρχε διάπυρος ὑπὸ Εὐδοξίου βαπτισθεὶς καὶ ἀπατηθεὶς.

<sup>40</sup> Grumel 1958, 477. On this earthquake and its consequences, see Jacques/Bousquet 1984. For the possible use of this earthquake to date Libanius eighteenth *oratio*, see Van Nuffelen 2006.

<sup>41</sup> Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.244<sup>c</sup>: Terrae motu per totum orbem facto mare litus egreditur et Siciliae multarumque insularum urbes innumerabiles populos oppressere.

<sup>42</sup> Amm. Marc. XXVI 10.15.

(earthquake and tsunami), the *Chronicon Paschale*<sup>44</sup> (tsunami) and Chron. Zuqn.<sup>45</sup> (tsunami). Michael incorrectly identifies Marcianoupolis as the Egyptian city where the earthquake occurred, but the testimony of Theophanes shows that this was in fact the Moesian city where the emperor Valens was staying at the time of the earthquake in Alexandria. Some of these accounts are more extensive than others, but none of them explicitly mentions Alexandria and the Adriatic Sea as Theophanes, Michael and Chron. 1234 do.

Theophan. Chron. AM 5859 (ed. 56.9-21; trans. 87-8)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 7 (149T; vol. 1: 292V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 169.2-9T
<p>In the same year the emperor Valens spent some time at Marcianoupolis in Mysia.<sup>46</sup> In indiction 8 there was a great earthquake by night throughout the whole world, so that <u>in Alexandria</u> ships moored to the shore were lifted high up over the top of tall buildings and walls and were carried within [the city] into courtyards and houses. When the water had receded, they remained on dry land. The people fled from the city because of the earthquake but when they saw the ships on dry l and they went up to them to loot their cargoes. But the returning water covered them all. Other sailors related that they were</p>	<p>Valens came to Egypt (ⲉⲃⲃⲏⲩⲟⲩ) and when he was in Marcianoupolis, an earthquake occurred whose likeness had not occurred from the days of the world. The sea was disturbed and threw the ships on the walls of the city. They fell in houses. The sea left its place, dry land appeared and the ships remained (where) they had been thrown. The people hastened for loot, but the sea returned towards them and swallowed them.</p> <p>Sailors relate that these things also</p>	<p>At that time an earthquake occurred <u>in Alexandria</u>. The sea was disturbed and ships leaped over the walls and fell in the houses of the city. The sea left its usual place again and turned back and dry land appeared, (but) the ships remained where they had been thrown. The people came out to plunder the riches that were in the ships and the sea returned over them and covered them.</p> <p>Sailors related that the</p>

<sup>43</sup> Socr. HE IV 3.

<sup>44</sup> Chron. Pasch. a. 365 (ed., vol. 1, 556.15-6): Τούτω τῷ ἔτει ἡ θάλασσα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ὄρων ἐξῆλθεν μηνὶ πανέμῳ πρὸ ἰβ' καλανδῶν σεπτεμβρίων (trans. 46: "In this year the sea departed from its proper limits in the month Panemus [July], day 12 before Kalends of September [21 Aug.]").

<sup>45</sup> Chron. Zuqn. a. 676 (vol. 1, 180.20-5T, 134.23-6V).

<sup>46</sup> Moesia.

sailing in the Adriatic at that hour when they were caught up and suddenly their ship was sitting on a sea-bed; after a short time the water returned again and so they resumed their voyage.	happened in the Adriatic sea ( ܩܝܘܨܬܐ ), (that) the sea trembled, rain over many miles of dry land, buried villages and their inhabitants (until) its entire bed was seen as dry land. Ships fell on earth and the men who were in them were alarmed. And immediately, the sea returned and softly turned back to its place. The ships were lifted up on the sea and floated, while men never predicted (it).	ships had withdrawn when the sea came back again.
---	---	---

Because of the observation that some details in these accounts have parallels in Socrates (HE IV 3), and the presence of this entry in Theophanes as well as Michael, the translators of the *Chronographia* of Theophanes proposed the idea that Theodore Lector may have been the source for this entry.<sup>47</sup> However, this seems unlikely because the Epitome does not mention this earthquake and the evidence suggests that, though Theodore did alter the narratives of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret somewhat, he does not appear to have added material from other sources.<sup>48</sup>

It is much more likely that this account of the earthquake and the tsunami, was taken by Theophanes and Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's Syriac source from an unknown Greek source. This Greek historian may have created his own narrative from material taken from Socrates, Philostorgius (the reference to Valens' stay in Marcianoupolis) and other sources. The possible involvement of Philostorgius suggests the involvement of GSEA and thus also SSEA.

---

<sup>47</sup> Mango/Scott/Greatrex 1997, 88, n. b.

<sup>48</sup> Emerance Delacenserie, personal communication, 27 February 2014.

## 19.8 Arcadius' building operations in Constantinople and foundation of Arcadioupolis

The Anonymous Chronicler also commemorates the construction of a “great Praetorium” in Constantinople. However, the testimony of Theophanes and Michael shows that the ultimate source in fact credited Arcadius with the construction of a “great portico (embolon)” opposite this building.

Theophan. Chron. AM 5887 (ed. 74.23-4; <sup>49</sup> trans. 113)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 1 (164T; <sup>50</sup> vol. 2: 1V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 171.5-7T <sup>51</sup>
In this year <u>Arcadius</u> , on being appointed <u>autocrator</u> , <u>built the big portico</u> (ἔμβολον) <u>opposite the Praetorium</u> .	<u>Arcadius</u> <u>built the great portico</u> (ἄλυσσος) <u>opposite the Praetorium</u> , and he erected the ξηρόλοφον (ἄλυσσος) and built Arcadioupolis in Thrace.	After Theodosius had died, <u>Arcadius</u> <u>the autocrator</u> appeared in the imperial city and <u>built the great Praetorium</u> .

The source for this material has not yet been positively identified and as far as I know, this information is not attested elsewhere. The testimony of Chron. 1234 (“in the imperial city”) suggests that these buildings stood in Constantinople, not in Alexandria as has been suggested.<sup>52</sup> Chron. 1234’s localisation of these buildings is confirmed by Michael, who groups this information together with material from another entry which

<sup>49</sup> Τούτω τῷ ἔτει Ἀρκάδιος αὐτοκράτωρ ἀναδειχθεὶς τὸν μέγαν ἔμβολον ἀντικρυς τοῦ πραιτωρίου ἔκτισεν.

<sup>50</sup> .כבד וספ מיכהני, תלמודי תלמוד .אשכולי תורה שמואל .אשכולי תורה שמואל .אשכולי תורה שמואל

<sup>51</sup> .כבד וספ מיכהני תלמוד .אשכולי תורה שמואל .אשכולי תורה שמואל .אשכולי תורה שמואל

<sup>52</sup> Mango/Scott/Greatrex 1997, 113, n. 2. There are other examples in which Theod. Lect. does not specify the location, but he is clearly referring to Constantinople: e.g. the empress Eudoxia’s erection of a silver statue near the Church of Saint-Irene (see above), Theod. Lect. Epit. 203 (89.24-6) also discusses this event, after Socr., but Theophan. and Mich. Syr. are clearly dependent on a common intermediary.

commemorated the erection of a column on the Xerolophus, the location of the forum of Arcadius on the seventh hill of Constantinople, as well as recording the foundation of Arcadioupolis in Thrace. This information was not copied by the Anonymous Chronicler, but a similar entry is also extant in Theophanes' *Chronographia*, which suggests that this material came from the same source.<sup>53</sup>

Theophan. Chron. AM 5895 (ed. 77.24-5; <sup>54</sup> trans. 118)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 1 (164T; vol. 2: 1V)
In the same year <u>Arcadius set up the column of Xerolophus and founded Arcadioupolis in Thrace.</u>	<u>Arcadius</u> built the great portico (ܥܠܡܥܘܪܐ) opposite the Praetorium and he <u>erected the ξηρόλοφον (ܥܠܡܥܘܪܐ), and built Arcadioupolis in Thrace.</u>

Most likely, the same Greek source transmitted this information to Theophanes and to the same Syriac source. The identity of these sources remains unknown, but given the focus on Arcadius' construction of the column in Constantinople, the author of Theophanes' source may have been writing in Constantinople.

## 19.9 The adoption of Theodosius II by Yazdegird

Theophanes, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler also preserve near identical narratives on Arcadius' appointment of the Persian king Yazdgird as custodian of Theodosius II, and on Marutho of Maipherqat's mediation between the Romans and the Persians.

<sup>53</sup> An expanded version of this entry, with reference to statues on this column, appears in later Greek sources: Georg. Mon. Brev. 489.9-12 and Leo. Gramm. Brev. 104.19-105.2.

<sup>54</sup> Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει Ἀρκάδιος ἔστησε τὸν κίονα τοῦ Ξηρόλοφου, καὶ τὴν Ἀρκαδιούπολιν ἔκτισε τῆς Θράκης.

Theophan. Chron. AM 5900 (ed 80.8-24; <sup>55</sup> trans. 123-4)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 1 (165T; vol. 2: 2V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 173.18-174.7T
<p>Arcadius, perceiving that his son, the young Theodosius was still very small and unprotected and fearing that someone would plot against him, proclaimed him emperor and in his will appointed the Persian emperor Yazdgird his guardian. Yazdgird, the Persian emperor, after accepting Arcadius' will, behaved most pacifically towards the Romans and preserved the Empire for Theodosius. After dispatching Antiochus, a most remarkable and highly educated adviser and instructor, he wrote to the Roman senate as follows: 'Since Arcadius has died and has appointed me as his child's guardian, I have sent</p>	<p>After these (events), Arcadius died and left behind his son Theodosius as emperor, a younger child, aged 8 years. But Honorius did not have a son and when this (child) was the only (emperor that remained) to them, they feared for him that certain men would ambush him. For this reason Arcadius made a will and wrote in it (that) he made the king of the Persians curator (ἰαλγῖα) of his son and of his affairs. Yazdgird accepted the will and took very good care of Theodosius. For this reason the Romans were in a profound peace. And Yazdgird sent an educator to Theodosius, a well-spoken man called Antiochus and wrote to the entire senate (σοφιστῶν) thusly: 'Arcadius is dead and has left me curator of his wishes. If you plot against</p>	<p>When Arcadius had lived for 13 years in the empire, he died, aged 31 years, and left behind his minor son Theodosius, who was 8 years old and a minor and not fit for the empire. But Honorius was in Rome.</p> <p>For this reason, the emperor Arcadius made a will, handed it over to Marutho, bishop of Maipherqat, and sent him towards Yazdgird, king of the Persians, to be the curator (ἰαλγῖα) of his son Theodosius. When bishop Marutho went to Persia, he performed many virtuous deeds there and educated many people. The king loved him greatly (because Marutho) brought forth a demon from his daughter. King Yazdgird accepted the will and</p>

<sup>55</sup> Τὸν δὲ νέον Θεοδοσίον μικρότατον ὄντα καὶ ἀπερίστατον κατανοήσας Ἀρκάδιος ὁ πατήρ, καὶ δέισας, μὴ ἀπὸ τινος ἐπιβουλευθῆ, βασιλέα αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύσας κουράτορα αὐτοῦ κατὰ διαθήκας κατέστησεν Ἰσδιγέρδη, τὸν τῶν Περσῶν βασιλέα. Ἰσδιγέρδης δέ, ὁ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεὺς, τὴν Ἀρκαδίου διαθήκην δεξάμενος εἰρήνην ἀφθόνω πρὸς Ῥωμαίους χρησάμενος Θεοδοσίῳ τὴν βασιλείαν διεσώσατο· καὶ Ἀντίοχόν τινα θαυμαστόν τε καὶ λογιώτατον ἐπίτροπόν τε καὶ παιδαγωγὸν ἀποστείλας γράφει τῇ συγκλήτῳ Ῥωμαίων τάδε· Ἀρκαδίου κοιμηθέντος χάμῃ κουράτορα τοῦ παιδὸς καταστήσαντος, τὸν ἀναπληροῦντα τὸν ἐμὸν τόπον ἀπέστειλα. μὴ τις οὖν εἰς ἐπιβουλήν τοῦ παιδὸς ἐπιχειρήσῃ, ἵνα μὴ πόλεμον ἄσπονδον κατὰ Ῥωμαίων ἀνακαινίσω. ὁ δὲ Ἀντίοχος ἐλθὼν ἦν σὺν τῷ βασιλεῖ· ὑπὸ δὲ τῷ αὐτοῦ θείῳ Ὀνωρίῳ καὶ Πουλχερίᾳ τῇ ἀδελφῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιστημόνως ἐπαιδεύετο. καὶ ἦν εἰρήνη ἀναμεταξὺ Ῥωμαίων καὶ Περσῶν, μάλιστα τοῦ Ἀντίοχου πολλὰ ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν γράποντος· καὶ οὕτως ἐπλατύνθη ἐν Περσίδι ὁ χριστιανισμός, Μαρουθᾶ, τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Μεσοποταμίας, μεσιτεύοντος.

<p>the man who will take my place. Let no one attempt a plot against the child so that I need not stir up an implacable war against the Romans.’ After Antiochus had come, he stayed at the emperor’s side. Theodosius was educated wisely in Christian matters by his uncle Honorius and his sister Pulcheria. And there was peace between the Romans and the Persians, especially since Antiochus produced many writings on behalf of the Christians; and thus Christianity was spread in Persia, with the bishop of Mesopotamia, Marutha, acting as mediator.</p>	<p>Theodosius, there will be an internecine war from us against you. Theodosius and his sister Pulcheria (ܩܘܠܚܝܐ) were raised near their uncle Honorius. For this reason Christianity grew among the Persians, while Marutho of Maipherqat mediated between them.</p>	<p>sent an educator to his son Theodosius, a wise and well-spoken man with the name Antiochus, and stewards (ܩܘܠܚܝܐ) with him. He wrote a letter with him to the Romans, saying as follows: ‘Arcadius autocrator is dead and has appointed me executor of his will. Then, if you deceive Theodosius, his son, who has been educated near his uncle Honorius, and also his sister Pulcheria (ܩܘܠܚܝܐ), you know that there will be an irreconcilable war between me and you.’ For this reason, the Romans were rejoicing in a profound peace. Christianity grew larger among the Persians, because Marutho, bishop of Maipherqat mediated.</p>
--	---	--

Without going into the historicity of these facts, I would like to focus on the origin of this account, though determining the identity of Theophanes’ and the Syriac chroniclers’ sources for this entry is difficult. Not only is Theophanes the earliest witness for this account, he is also the earliest historian to explicitly associate Antiochus with the story of the adoption of Theodosius. In fact, contemporary histories such as the church histories of Sozomen, Theodoret and Socrates do not mention Antiochus and “these sources also pass over the adoption of Theodosius by Yazdgird entirely.”<sup>56</sup> Socrates (HE VII 1), for instance, says nothing of Arcadius’ will or the curatorship of Yazdgird, he only speaks of Anthimus’ management of public affairs. The reason for the Theodosian church historians’ silence on Antiochus is probably the bad state of Roman-Persian relations at the time when they were writing. The contemporary sources

---

<sup>56</sup> Greatrex/Bardill 1996, 177.

therefore ascribe Theodosius' survival either to his piety (Sozomen and Theodoret) or to "the genius of Anthemius"<sup>57</sup> (Socrates HE VII 1). The earliest witnesses to the presence of Antiochus at the court in Constantinople date from the sixth century: Malalas and Procopius. However, neither connects Antiochus to the adoption story.

Four authors have thus far been proposed as Theophanes' source for this account: Priscus<sup>58</sup> of Panium (c. 410 - after 474) by way of Eustathius<sup>59</sup> of Epiphania (d. between 518 and 527),<sup>60</sup> Priscus by way of another intermediary,<sup>61</sup> Eunapius<sup>62</sup> of Sardis (c. 347 - c. 404) or Olympiodorus<sup>63</sup> of Thebes (fl. c. 412-25).<sup>64</sup> It is not necessary to repeat the arguments for these identifications here, but Geoffrey Greatrex and Jonathan Bardill have convincingly argued that Priscus was Theophanes' source, but not by way of Eustathius. Their theory, if correct, ties in with my hypothesis of the existence of an unknown Greek historical source that was used by Theophanes. If this source used Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History*, a source even earlier than Priscus, it is perfectly plausible that its author had access to Priscus, directly or via an intermediary, as well.

## 19.10 The usurper John

Theophanes and the later Syriac Orthodox chroniclers also preserve similar descriptions of John's usurpation of the Western Empire and Valentinian's 'coronation' after the death of Honorius.

---

<sup>57</sup> Greatrex/Bardill 1996, 179.

<sup>58</sup> On whom, see Treadgold 2010, 96-102.

<sup>59</sup> On whom, see Treadgold 2010, 114-119.

<sup>60</sup> For this theory, see Rubin 1957, col. 361; Pieler 1972, 413.

<sup>61</sup> Greatrex/Bardill 1996, 182.

<sup>62</sup> On whom, see Treadgold 2010, 81-9.

<sup>63</sup> On whom, see Treadgold 2010, 89-96.

<sup>64</sup> Eunapius and Olympiodorus, see Greatrex/Bardill 1996, 178-9, n. 33.

Theophan. Chron. AM 5915 (ed. 84.16-85.3; <sup>65</sup> trans. 132-3)	Theophan. Chron. AM 5916 (ed. 85.8-9; <sup>66</sup> trans. 133)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 2 (169-70T; vol. 2: 10V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 178.24-179.2T
After his (= Honorius') death, a certain John one of the imperial secretaries, seized the Empire in Rome and sent an embassy to Theodosius asking to be accepted as emperor. Theodosius locked the envoys up in prison and sent the general Ardaburius against him; but Ardaburius was apprehended by the usurper and locked up in Ravenna. When Theodosius learned of this, he sent the general's son, Aspar, against the usurper, and in answer to		And the emperor Honorius died in Rome and Constantius, father of Valentinian, reigned and was killed. John, one of the scribes, usurped the empire and sent (envoys) towards Theodosius in order that he would give him the empire, but this (man) imprisoned the envoys and sent the general Ardaburius to fight with the tyrant. The tyrant conquered Ardaburius, took hold of him and imprisoned him. Theodosius again sent Aspar (ms.: 𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌸𐌹𐌸), the	Emperor Honorius died in Rome and (John, one of the imperial scribes) wrote letters and sent messengers to Theodosius in order to hand the empire over to him. But having incarcerated the messengers, Theodosius armed many troops and sent them off with the general Ardaburius. He conquered John (𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌸𐌹𐌸), killed him and came back. Theodosius made a man called Valentinian (𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌸𐌹𐌸) Caesar and sent him to Rome.

<sup>65</sup> τούτου δὲ τελευτήσαντος, Ἰωάννης τις ἐκ τῶν βασιλικῶν ὑπογραφέων τὴν ἐν Ῥώμῃ βασιλείαν ἀρπάζει καὶ πρεσβείαν πρὸς Θεοδόσιον ἀποστέλλει δεχθῆναι εἰς βασιλέα δεόμενος. ὁ δὲ Θεοδόσιος τοὺς πρεσβευτὰς ἐν φρουρᾷ κατακλείσας Ἄρδαβούριον τὸν στρατηγὸν ἀποστέλλει κατ' αὐτοῦ· ὃν τινα ὁ τύραννος εἰς Ῥάβενναν χειρωσάμενος κατέκλεισεν. τοῦτο μαθὼν Θεοδόσιος Ἄσπαρα, τὸν τούτου υἱόν, ἀποστέλλει κατ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ θεοφιλοῦς βασιλέως εὐχῇ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐν σχήματι ποιμένος πάνεις ὠδήγησε τὸν Ἄσπαρα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ· καὶ ἄγει αὐτοὺς διὰ τῆς παρακειμένης τῇ Ῥαβέννῃ λίμνης ἀβάτου οὕσης, ἣν ὁ θεὸς βατὴν εἰργάσατο ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰσραηλιτῶν. καὶ διαβάντες διὰ ξηρᾶς, ἀνεωγμένας τὰς πύλας τῆς πόλεως εὐρόντες, τὸν μὲν τύραννον ἀνείλον, τὸν δὲ Ἄρδαβούριον τῶν δεσμῶν ἀπέλευσαν. τούτου δὲ ἀναιρεθέντος, ὁ βασιλεὺς Θεοδόσιος Οὐαλεντινιανόν, τὸν υἱὸν Κωνσταντίου καὶ Γαλλας Πλακιδίας, καίσαρα ποιήσας ἐπὶ τὰ ἐσπέρια ἀπέστειλε μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας μητρὸς, Ἡλίωνα δὲ τὸν πατρικίον συναπέστειλεν ὡς ὀφείλοντα καταστῆσαι αὐτόν· καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ἔτη λβ'.

<sup>66</sup> Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει Θεοδόσιος διὰ Ἡλίωνος πατρικίου στέφανον βασιλικὸν ἔπεμψε τῷ Οὐαλεντινιανῷ ἐν Ῥώμῃ.

<p>the prayer of the god-loving emperor, an angel of the Lord appeared in the shape of a shepherd who guided Aspar and his companions and led them across the lake adjacent to Ravenna, which was impassable but which God made passable as He did in the time of the Israelites. So having got across by a dry path and finding the city gates open, they killed the usurper and freed Ardaburius from his chains. With the usurper killed, the emperor Theodosius, having appointed Valentinian, the son of Constantius and Galla Placidia, as Caesar, sent him to the West with his mother and also sent out the patrician Helion to see that he became established. He ruled 32 years.</p>	<p>In the same year Theodosius <u>sent</u>, through the patrician Helion, <u>the imperial crown to Valentinian</u> in Rome.</p>	<p>son of Ardaburius, and an army with him. By the pious emperor's prayer to God, an angel appeared in the likeness of a shepherd who made them pass on foot over a lake of water (ms.: ܨܘܪܐ = ܨܘܪܐ?<sup>67</sup>). They found the city gate(s) open. They led Ardaburius out from prison and killed the tyrant John. Then, Theodosius made Caesar Valentinian who was the son of his aunt and sent him to Rome with his mother. After a while, he <u>sent him the imperial crown</u>. And Valentinian reigned for 32 years.</p>	
--	---	--	--

All three accounts are paraphrases of material from Socrates [HE VII 23.1-10 (the usurpation and defeat of John), 24.1-2 (Valentinian III is sent to Rome), 24.5 (Helion delivers Valentinian's crown to Rome)], though the Anonymous Chronicler incorrectly

---

<sup>67</sup> A plausible suggestion, made by Chabot, 10, n. 6.

states that Ardaburius defeated John, whereas the former was in fact imprisoned by John and later freed by his son Aspar, who conquered John.<sup>68</sup> A sign that the Syriac tradition is related to Theophanes' testimony is Theophanes' and Michael's incorrect attribution of 32 regnal years to Valentinian III (Valentinian III in fact reigned from 425 until 455), a number that may have originated from a misinterpretation of Socrates' (HE VII 48) statement that his seventh book covered that many years.

On this occasion the later witnesses are not dependent on the Epitome for this information. It contains a paraphrase of Socrates' discussion of the usurpation of John (HE VII 23<sup>69</sup>) and of the reign of Valentinian (HE VII 24<sup>70</sup>), but it is very different and does not preserve all the elements from Socrates that are extant in the later witnesses. Theophanes and Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's common Syriac source must therefore be dependent on another Greek dependant of Socrates. In theory this author could be Theodore Lector, but this would have required a Greek author, Theophanes or his source, most likely the latter, to have used Theodore's writings as well as the Epitome, which seems unlikely.

## 19.11 Cyrus, prefect of Constantinople

The Anonymous Chronicler also commemorates the reconstruction of the city wall of Rome by a prefect called Cyrus. A comparison with the testimony of Theophanes and Michael, however, shows that the Anonymous Chronicler's source in fact identified

---

<sup>68</sup> Comp. Joh. Mal. Brev. XIV 7 (ed 356.6-16; trans. 193-4).

<sup>69</sup> Theod. Lect. Epit. 320 (94.3-9): Ὀνωρίου τοῦ βασιλέως τελευτήσαντος Ἰωάννης τις πρῶτος τῶν βασιλέως ὑπογραφέων εἰς τυραννίδα ἐξήρθη. ἐφ' ὃν Θεοδόσιος τὸν στρατηγὸν ἔστειλεν Ἀρδαβούριον ἀλλὰ σκαιᾶ τύχη εἰς τὰς χεῖρας Ἰωάννου ἐνέπεσεν. Ἄσπαρ δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ θεοῦ ἀγγέλου ὀδηγηθεὶς τὸν τύραννον ἐχειρώσατο καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἐξείλατο. Θεοδόσιος δὲ ἵπποδρομίαν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει θεώμενος τὴν νίκην μαθὼν προσεφώνησε τῷ δήμῳ, καὶ λιτανεύων ἐκ τῆς ἵπποδρομίας σὺν τῷ δήμῳ παντὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἔδραμεν εὐχαριστῶν τῷ σεσωκότι θεῷ.

<sup>70</sup> Theod. Lect. Epit. 332 (95.15-7).

Cyrus as a prefect of Constantinople, which suggests that the Anonymous Chronicler may have mistaken a reference to “the imperial city” as a reference to Rome. Furthermore, the reference to Cyrus’ reconstruction of the city wall was part of a larger narrative that discussed Theodosius II’s disagreements with Cyrus, the former’s deposition of the latter, and Cyrus’ turning to the priesthood.<sup>71</sup> For comparison I include the testimony of the *Breviarium* of Malalas here, which is similar because this information ultimately stems from the same source as the information provided by Theophanes and Michael.<sup>72</sup> The *Chronicon Paschale* contains a similar account of the struggles between Theodosius and Cyrus, but does not mention the building operations of Cyrus at all, so I do not include it here.<sup>73</sup>

Joh. Mal. Brev. XIV 16 (ed. 281.15-282.26; <sup>74</sup> trans. 197-8)	Theophan. Chron. AM 5937 (ed. 96.33-97.8; <sup>75</sup> trans. 151)	Mich. Syr. Chron. VIII 4 (173T; vol. 2: 16V)	Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 179.3-4T
The emperor appointed the patrician Cyrus the	In this year Cyrus,	At that time Cyrus	At that time Cyrus

<sup>71</sup> I have left the material on Cyrus’ priesthood out of this discussion because it is not mentioned in the Syriac sources.

<sup>72</sup> Interestingly, Joh. Nic. Chron. 84.49, who refers to the reconstruction of towers instead of walls, seems to be dependent on Prisc. Pan. via another intermediary than Eust. Epiph. and Joh. Mal. as well.

<sup>73</sup> Chron. Pasch. a. 450 (ed. vol. 1, 588.6-589.5; trans. 78).

<sup>74</sup> Ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς προεβάλετο ἑπαρχὸν πραιτωρίων καὶ ἑπαρχὸν πόλεως τὸν πατρίκιον Κῦρον τὸν φιλόσοφον, ἄνδρα σοφώτατον ἐν πᾶσι. καὶ ἤρξεν ἔχων τὰς δύο ἀρχὰς ἔτη τέσσαρα, προϊὼν εἰς τὴν καρούχαν τοῦ ἐπάρχου τῆς πόλεως καὶ φροντίζων τῶν κτισμάτων καὶ ἀνανέωσας πᾶσαν Κωνσταντινούπολιν· ἦν γὰρ καθαριώτατος. περὶ οὗ ἔκραξαν οἱ Βυζάντιοι εἰς τὸ ἵππικὸν πᾶσαν τὴν ἡμέραν τέωροῦντος Θεοδοσίου ταῦτα· “Κωνσταντῖνος ἔκτισεν, Κῦρος ἀνενέωσεν· αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τόπον, Αὔγουστε.” Κῦρος δὲ ἐκπλαγεῖς ἀπεφθέγγατο· “οὐκ ἀρέσκει μοι τύχη πολλὰ γελῶσα.” καὶ ἐχόλεσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὅτι ἔκραξαν περὶ Κύρου καὶ μετὰ Κωνσταντίνου αὐτὸν ἔκραξαν, ὡς ἀνανέωσαν τὴν πόλιν· καὶ κατεστρευσάσθη λοιπὸν καὶ ἐπλάκη ὡς Ἑλλήν ὁ αὐτὸς Κῦρος, καὶ ἐδημεύθη παυθεὶς τῆς ἀρχῆς.

<sup>75</sup> Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Κῦρον, τὸν ἑπαρχὸν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν πραιτωρίων, ἄνδρα σοφώτατον καὶ ἰκανὸν κοτίσαντά τε τὰ τεῖχη τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἀνανέωσαν πᾶσαν Κωνσταντινούπολιν, περὶ οὗ ἔκραξαν οἱ Βυζάντιοι ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππικοῦ καθεζομένου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀκούοντος. “Κωνσταντῖνος ἔκτισεν, Κῦρος ἀνενέωσεν.” καὶ ἐχόλεσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς ὅτι ταῦτα εἶπον περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ προπάσιάμενος αὐτὸν ἐλληνόφρονα εἶναι καθεῖλεν αὐτὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐδήμευσεν αὐτόν.

<p>philosopher, a man of great learning in every field, to be praetorian prefect and city prefect. He was in power for four years, holding the two offices, riding out in the carriage of the city prefect, supervising building operations and <u>reconstructing the whole of Constantinople</u>, for he was a most refined man. The Byzantines chanted about him in the hippodrome all day, while Theodosius was watching the races, as follows, “Constantine built, Cyrus rebuilt, put them at the same level, Augustus!” Cyrus was amazed and commented, “I do not like fortune when she smiles too sweetly. The emperor was angered that they chanted about Cyrus and he was charged with being a Hellene, so that his property was confiscated and he was stripped of his office.</p>	<p>the City prefect and praetorian prefect, a very learned and competent man, who had both <u>built the city walls</u> and <u>restored all Constantinople</u>, was acclaimed by the Byzantines in the Hippodrome, in the presence and hearing of the emperor [as follows], ‘Constantine built [the city], Cyrus restored it.’ The emperor became angry that they said this about him and, alleging that Cyrus was a pagan, he removed him from office and confiscated his property.</p>	<p>the prefect <u>restored the wall of Constantinople</u> and the citizens started to praise him, saying: “Constantine built and Cyrus rebuilt.” When the emperor heard this, he was afraid and stripped Cyrus of his dignity, saying: “Behold, Cyrus thinks (like) these pagans.”</p>	<p>the prefect <u>rebuilt and renovated the wall of Rome.</u></p>
---	---	--	---

In their biographical article on Antiochus and his career in Constantinople, Greatrex and Bardill discussed this entry on Cyrus as well. Comparing the narratives and sequences of events in Malalas, the Chronicon Paschale, Theophanes and Nicephorus Callistus, they noticed that whereas Malalas, the author of the Chronicon Paschale and

Nicephorus are dependent on Priscus<sup>76</sup> through Eustathius for the information on Antiochus and Cyrus, Theophanes appears to have had access to Priscus directly or via another, unidentified, intermediary, because the sequence of events in Theophanes' *Chronographia* is accurate in contrast to that in the works of the dependants of Eustathius.

As regards Michael's testimony, Greatrex and Bardill indicated that it is unlikely that he is dependent on Malalas (through John of Ephesus), because "Michael places Cyrus' fall somewhat more accurately."<sup>77</sup> More importantly, however, this material (on Cyrus as well as Antiochus) is not extant in Chron. Zuqn., another dependant of John of Ephesus. Though not conclusive, the fact that neither Cyrus nor Antiochus is mentioned by Chron. Zuqn., suggests that this material came to Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler via another Syriac author than John of Ephesus, and hence via another Greek author than Malalas. Most likely, the underlying sources for this material are SSEA and GSEA.

## 19.12 The speech of Justin II

The last piece of information that I include in this catalogue is a special case, because on this occasion, it reveals something of the date of the intermediary between the Greek and the later Syriac tradition. Unfortunately, we cannot be certain if the presence of this material is connected to the issue of GSEA and SSEA.

Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's version of Justin II's speech at the proclamation of Tiberius Caesar in AD 574 is a fusion of material from the Third Part<sup>78</sup> of John of Ephesus' *Ecclesiastical History* and from the Greek chronicle tradition, only extant in the *History* (III 11.8-13) of Theophylact Simocatta, written in the 630s, and in

---

<sup>76</sup> Blockley 1981-3, vol. 1, 116 and vol. 2, 381.

<sup>77</sup> Greatrex/Bardill 1996, 184-5.

<sup>78</sup> Joh. Eph. HE (part 3), III 5, 126-129T, 92-5V.

Theophanes' *Chronographia*.<sup>79</sup> As far as the relationship between the Greek sources is concerned, Theophanes is thought to have used Theophylact. With respect to the Syriac sources, van Ginkel, who only noted its presence in Michael's *Chronicle* and in Theophylact, suggested that Michael knew this speech via a Syriac chronicler with access to John and Theophylact, possibly Ignatius of Melitene (d. 1094).<sup>80</sup>

The Syriac accounts are closer to Theophylact's than Theophanes'. It is certainly possible that a Syriac chronicler who knew Greek used Theophylact directly. However, given our previous conclusions, Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's common source may have been SSEA, which could have accessed Theophylact through an intermediary, possibly GSEA, which was then also used by Theophanes. More research needs to be done on this issue: this requires a detailed investigation into the nature of the relationship between Theophanes and Theophylact for which this is neither the time nor the place so I will not expand on this hypothesis further.

## 19.13 Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed commonalities between Theophanes and Chron. 1234 that cannot be ascribed to the usual Greek sources. I have catalogued them for easier reference in the table below.

Subject	Theophan. Chron.	Mich. Syr. Chron.	Chron. 1234, I (ed.)	Additional witnesses
Constantine's construction of churches and anti-pagan legislation	AM 5810 (ed. 16.12-24; trans. 27)	VII 7 (123T; vol. 1: 240V)	140.29-141.1	Alex. Mon. 4057D; Vit. Const., 332.22-333.4

<sup>79</sup> Theophan. Chron. AM 6070 (ed. 248.14-249.9; trans. 368-9). On the various versions, see Cameron 1976.

<sup>80</sup> Van Ginkel 2010, 116-7, n. 13.

Constantine and Licinius	AM 5810-1, 5815 (ed. 16.26-8, 16.30-17.2, 19.25-20.5; trans. 27-8, 33)		141.1-9	Alex. Mon. 4057B; Vit. Const., 323.26-334.10
Helen: a crown and coinage	AM 5816 (ed. 23.17-8; trans. 37)		144.24-7	Vit. Const., 642.9-10.
Proclamation of Julian Caesar and marriage to Helen/Constantia	AM 5849 (ed. 45.5-9; trans. 73)	VII 5 (137-8T; vol. 1: 268V)	154.25-31	Chron. Pasch. a. 355 (ed. vol. 1, 541.19-542.3; trans. 32)
Proclamation of Gratian Augustus and consul	AM 5857 (ed. 55.1-5; trans. 85)	VII 7 (148-9T; vol. 1: 292V)	167.27-29	
Building operations of Arcadius in Constantinople (portico opposite the Praetorium and the column of Xerolophos); foundation of Arcadioupolis in Thrace	AM 5887 (ed. 74.23-4; trans. 113); AM 5895 (ed. 77.24-5; trans. 118)	VIII 1 (164T; vol. 2: 1V)	171.5-7 (without column and Arcadioupolis)	
The adoption of Theodosius II by Yazdgird	AM 5900 (ed. 80.8-24; trans. 123-4)	VIII 1 (165T; vol. 2: 2V)	173.18-174.7	
The usurper John	AM 5915 (ed. 84-5; trans. 132-3); AM 5916 (ed. 85; trans. 133)	VIII 2 (169-70T; vol. 2: 10V)	178.24-179.2	Socr. HE VII 23.1-10; 24.1-2, 5; 48
Building works of the prefect Cyrus	AM 5937 (ed. 96.33-97.8; trans. 151)	VIII 4 (173T; vol. 2: 16V)	179.3-4	Joh. Mal. Brev. XIV 16 (ed. 281.15-282.26; trans. 197-8)
Justin II's speech	AM 6070 (ed. 248.14-249.9; trans. 368-9)	X 15 (364-6T; vol. 2: 334-6V)	207.13-208.23	Joh. Eph. HE (part 3), III 5, 126-129T, 92-5V; Theoph. Sim. Hist III 11.8-13

Evidently, Theophanes, Michael and Chron. 1234 share several pieces information for the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries aside from the usual sources and the Epitome-Philostorgius continuum. The nature of this material varies, but it mostly concerns political matters, mostly accessions, proclamations and installations, and also building operations of the emperors Constantine, Constantius II, Valentinian I and Valens, Valentinian II, Theodosius I, Honorius and Arcadius, Theodosius II, Leo I, Justin II and Tiberius II Constantine, and also of the Constantinopolitan prefect Cyrus at the time of Theodosius II.

It is impossible to determine whether all of the materials discussed in this chapter followed the same path of transmission, but the overall pattern shows that Theophanes not only relied on GSEA, an unknown Greek historical source for information from the Epitome and Philostorgius, but also on an unknown source for material from other sources, including Socrates, and possibly Priscus and Sozomen. It is likely that these two Greek intermediaries are one and the same, because this material also appears together in two twelfth- and thirteenth-century Syriac sources. In theory, it is possible that Theophanes as well as Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's common source are reliant on the same two Greek sources, but this seems highly unlikely.

The logical conclusions therefore are that (1) Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler are dependent on SSEA, an unknown Syriac historian who was writing sometime between the middle of the seventh century and the latter half of the twelfth century, for all of the information catalogued in this and the previous chapter, (2) that SSEA used GSEA, a seventh, eighth- or early ninth-century Greek historian who fused material from Philostorgius, the Epitome, Priscus of Panium, Socrates and other sources and (3) that Theophanes used GSEA.

This still leaves us in the dark about the identity of the Syriac historian that influenced Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler. As stated before, the most likely Syriac source is the *Chronicle* of Ignatius of Melitene (d. 1094), which covered the period between Constantine the Great and the middle or late eleventh century. Ignatius does cite John of Ephesus as one of his sources, so he could be Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's source for Justin II's speech.



## Chapter 20 Dionysius of Tell-Mahre (d. 845)

### 20.1 Introduction

For the period between 582 and 842, the Anonymous Chronicler largely relies on the *History* of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, patriarch of the Syriac Orthodox church from 818 until his death in 845. In his work, which he wrote for his friend Iwannis, the metropolitan of Dara, Dionysius covered the period between the beginning of the reign of Mauricius, until the death of the Byzantine emperor Theophilus (829-42) and the death of caliph al-Mutasim (833-42) and the start of the reign of his son al-Wathiq (842-47).<sup>1</sup> Dionysius' *History* has not survived, except for an extract on heresies from the time of patriarch Peter of Antioch, preserved in ms. Vat. Syr. 144.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the chronicles of Elias of Nisibis, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler, who independently used Dionysius, are vital witnesses for the study of his work.<sup>3</sup> In this context it is worth noting that Ignatius of Melitene (d. 1094), whose chronicle was used by Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler, also indicates his use of Dionysius and may have therefore transmitted material from Dionysius to the two former authors.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 21 (543T; vol. 3: 111V). On which, see Baumstark 1922, 275, §44a.

<sup>2</sup> For a German translation, see Abramowski 1940, 138f.

<sup>3</sup> Abramowski 1940, 19.

In spite of characterising his work as a *pragmateia* (ܩܪܝܬܐ),<sup>4</sup> a term that was used by classical authors to denote a scientific treatise, philosophical, medical, but especially historical (e.g. Polybius,<sup>5</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus,<sup>6</sup> Diodorus of Sicily<sup>7</sup>) Dionysius presents himself as the successor of Jewish and Christian chronographers, writing in Greek and Syriac: Josephus, Andronicus, Africanus, Annianus, George of the Arabs, Malalas and Eusebius.<sup>8</sup>

Michael informs us that Dionysius structured his work in two parts, an Ecclesiastical and a Secular Part, each containing eight books which were divided into chapters. For this reason, we know that it was Dionysius who influenced the morphology of the later Syriac Orthodox chronicles: following Dionysius' innovations, the Anonymous Chronicler divided his chronicle into a Secular and an Ecclesiastical Part, Michael arranged his material in three separate columns and Barhebraeus wrote his *Chronicon Syriacum* and his *Ecclesiastical History*.<sup>9</sup>

The first modern scholar to produce a detailed analysis of Dionysius' description of Persian, Byzantine, Islamic and ecclesiastical history was Rudolf Abramowski in 1940.<sup>10</sup> Though his work is several decades old and contains some errors, it remains the definitive study on the history of Dionysius.

In his *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles*, Andrew Palmer produced a reconstruction of the part of Dionysius' Secular History that covered the period between 582 (the beginning of the reign of Maurice) and 717 (the Arab siege of Constantinople), by offering a translation of Chron. 1234's Secular Part and including additional information from Michael in a footnote when necessary.<sup>11</sup> Despite the undeniable historical importance of his endeavour, Palmer's reconstruction was not without

---

<sup>4</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 357V). On which, see Palmer 1993, 93 and Hoyland 1997, 416.

<sup>5</sup> Polyb. 1.1.4 and 1.3.1.

<sup>6</sup> Dion. Hal. 1.74

<sup>7</sup> Diod. Sic. 1.1.

<sup>8</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 358V).

<sup>9</sup> See my introduction.

<sup>10</sup> Abramowski 1940.

<sup>11</sup> Palmer 1993, 85-221.

methodological errors. Because he believed that Chron. 1234 preserves Dionysius' narrative more completely and truthfully than Michael who tended to paraphrase Dionysius, Palmer included all the material that Chron. 1234 offers for this period. Recently, however, Robert Hoyland pointed out that this chronicle contains Muslim material that is consistently absent from Michael's *Chronicle* and thus did not derive from Dionysius, but must have been taken by the Anonymous Chronicler from one or more Islamic sources that were not consulted by Michael.<sup>12</sup>

An additional issue with Palmer's work is that his translation contains some errors<sup>13</sup> and is often very free, departing too far from the Syriac text, which, though making it a better read, sometimes makes it virtually unusable for the purposes of textual comparison, for instance for research into the issue of Theophilus of Edessa and the possible common source of Theophanes, Agapius and Dionysius (on which see below).

In the most recent book on this very issue, in which Robert G. Hoyland gathers translations of excerpts from Theophanes, Agapius, Michael and Chron. 1234 (and other sources), Hoyland tends to prefer Chron. 1234 over Michael as well, though largely excluding the material from the Anonymous Chronicler's Islamic source(s).<sup>14</sup> In the case of long narratives (from Dionysius), Hoyland omits Michael's account, saying that it is "very similar" and gives a translation of the Anonymous Chronicler's, while indicating discrepancies between the two Syriac accounts and providing translations of additional materials that Michael may provide. On occasion, these translations appear under the heading 'Dionysius'.<sup>15</sup> In the case of shorter or medium length narratives, Hoyland provides translations of both accounts and places verbal agreements in bold. Hoyland's translations of Chron. 1234 are sometimes his own, but usually copies of Palmer's translations with some adaptations and minor corrections.

I do not wish to go into detail here about Dionysius' sources, because the research is still ongoing and will partially be discussed below. Dionysius' use of Islamic Arabic

---

<sup>12</sup> Hoyland 2011, 13 n. 43.

<sup>13</sup> Anthony 2010, 210.

<sup>14</sup> Hoyland 2011.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Hoyland 2011, 270-3.

sources remains controversial,<sup>16</sup> but he undoubtedly used Syriac and Greek sources. Among his Syriac sources were the Third Part of the Church History of John of Ephesus, and “narratives resembling ecclesiastical history” written by John, son of Samuel, by Daniel, son of Moses, of Tur ʿAbdin, by Dionysius’ own brother, Theodosius, metropolitan of Edessa, and by the maronite historian and astrologer Theophilus of Edessa (d. 785). Dionysius also quarried the refutation against the maronites of Simeon of Qenneshrin for material from a Syriac (and Maronite) *Life of Maximus the Confessor*.<sup>17</sup>

Among Dionysius’ Greek sources was “an intelligent man from the imperial city of the Romans, who understood the times of four of their emperors,”<sup>18</sup> referring to the emperors Stauracius (811), Michael I (811-813), Leo V (813-820) and (probably) Nicephorus I (802-11).<sup>19</sup> The identity of this source remains unknown, but seems to have been well-informed about Roman-Bulghar relations. He was decisively pro-Bulghar and anti-Nicephorus I, which suggests that he should be identified with “the Chalcedonian author who accused Nicephorus [I] of many things” who is mentioned by Michael<sup>20</sup> and

---

<sup>16</sup> Dion. TM never admits to consulting Arabic Islamic sources, but there are some indications that he did, e.g. the misreading of (Abu Qarib) Yazid (ibn Abi Sakhr) [يزيد] as Burayd (بريد) in an Arabic source [Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 293T and Mich. Syr. Chron. XI 15 (445T; vol. 2: 469V)], on which see Hoyland 2011, 178, n. 470 and 184, n. 490. In this respect it is worth noting that recent research suggests that what information on Islamic history has been attributed to Theoph. Ed. in Agap., Theophan. and Dion. TM/Michael/Chron. 1234 could equally have come from an Arabic source [Conterno 2014a (forthcoming); Conterno 2014b (forthcoming)]. In the process of his analysis of Dion. TM’s account of ʿUmar I’s assassination, Sean W. Anthony (Anthony 2010) concluded that Dion. TM fused material from the work of a dependant of al-Zuhri (d. 742) [on whom, see Robinson 2004, 25 (also n. 9) and 26, n. 10; and Lecker 2014] with elements from the narrative of a source who also influenced Agap. and Theophan. in order to create an account of his own. Anthony assumes that this source was Theoph. Ed., but this could have been another Islamic source. Hoyland 2011, 28-9 who suggests that what looks like Dion. TM’s combination of material from two sources could also be a fuller version or an adaptation of material taken from the common source with Theoph. and Agap., which he assumes is Theoph. Ed.

<sup>17</sup> Comp. Mich. Syr. Chron. XI 9 (423-7T; vol. 2: 433-7V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 264-7T. On which, see Brock 1973. Because this is the only occasion on which Chron. 1234 seems to be dependent on Simeon, I have not devoted a separate chapter to this author.

<sup>18</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 15 (530T; vol. 3: 70V).

<sup>19</sup> Dickens 2010, 18.

<sup>20</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 5 (489T; vol. 3: 16V).

his (or Dionysius') source who records the murder of Nicephorus by a Roman.<sup>21</sup> The same source may also have provided Dionysius with information about the excesses of Constantine VI (780-97) in his war with the Bulgars.<sup>22</sup> It has been suggested that Dionysius' source was George Syncellus,<sup>23</sup> but there is no basis for this assumption since most of the information offered by Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler is not extant in Theophanes' *Chronographia*.<sup>24</sup> It is possible that this work even covered the reign of Leo IV the Khazar (775-80), because Dionysius cites a "Chalcedonian" source who described Leo as an iconoclast like his father.<sup>25</sup>

Dionysius' use<sup>26</sup> of this Greek source is probably also reflected in Michael's knowledge<sup>27</sup> of the Story of the Three Scythian Brothers, a combination of various Greek legendary traditions about the origins of the Turks that have parallels in the writings of Procopius, patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople (c. 780) and Theophanes the Confessor (of whom Dickens suggests that they relied on a now lost common source) and Leo the Deacon (c. 995).<sup>28</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler explicitly refers to Dionysius as a source on seven occasions: six times in the Secular Part,<sup>29</sup> once in the Ecclesiastical Part.<sup>30</sup> Dionysius' work is referred to as 'his book,' there are no references to its division in parts, books or chapters. In all but one of the Anonymous Chronicler's references to Dionysius, the latter was a direct witness to the events in question, not merely a transmitter of

---

<sup>21</sup> E.g. the emphasis on the fact that Nicephorus was killed by a Roman, Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 5 (489T; vol. 2: 16V).

<sup>22</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 4 (485T; vol. 3: 12V).

<sup>23</sup> Brooks 1906, 586.

<sup>24</sup> Palmer 1993, 95-6.

<sup>25</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 1 (479T; vol. 3: 2V).

<sup>26</sup> For Dion. TM's knowledge of a Greek legendary tradition about Syrus and Cilicus, after whom Syria and Cilicia were named, Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 16 (522-4T; vol. 3: 76-8V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 113T, on which, see Debié 2009a, 105.

<sup>27</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 21 (381-2T; vol. 2: 363-4V).

<sup>28</sup> Dickens 2010.

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 17T, 12V; 18-9T, 13V; 21T, 14V.

<sup>30</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 257T, 193V (for material from Joh. Eph.).

information from other sources. We can therefore conclude that the Anonymous Chronicler did indeed adopt a somewhat critical attitude towards his sources.<sup>31</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler used Dionysius for his description of the period between 582 and 842 in his Secular and Ecclesiastical Part, for information on the end of the Persian empire, early Islamic history, (Syriac Orthodox) ecclesiastical history, and detailed accounts of Dionysius' own experiences, such as his journey to Egypt as ambassador for the caliph al-Ma'mun (813-33) to the inhabitants of Tanis, his visit to the pyramids and the Nilometer.<sup>32</sup>

Dionysius was also the source for a short geographical note on "the name of Syria," which the Anonymous Chronicler took from Dionysius' narrative on the early tenth century (AD 830-1 to be precise) and moved it forward, inserting it into his pre-Christian narrative, around the time of the Maccabees (163-63 BC), perhaps in order to use it as an introduction to the foundation of the kingdom of Osroene (132 BC).<sup>33</sup> A comparison of Michael's and Chron. 1234's version of this short narrative shows that the latter's account contains some additional elements<sup>34</sup> that probably go back to Dionysius as well and that both texts attest to the same two scribal errors, Cilia<sup>35</sup> (ܥܝܠܝܐ) for Cilicia (ܥܝܠܝܥܝܐ) and Natra<sup>36</sup> (ܢܬܪܐ) for Ḥatra (ܚܬܪܐ), indicating their use of the same manuscript or manuscript tradition. Given that it is unlikely that there were many copies of Dionysius' *Chronicle* around (there are none preserved), it is very probable that Michael and the

---

<sup>31</sup> A parallel for this can be found in the Anonymous Chronicler's citation of Josephus as the source for information on the events that preceded the siege of Jerusalem in AD 69-70, whereas this information was actually transmitted via Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*.

<sup>32</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 17-21T, 11-5V (§205-8); Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 13 (513-6T; vol. 3: 60-4V); XII 16 (522-4T; vol. 3: 76-8); XII 17 (525-7T; vol. 3: 79-83V).

<sup>33</sup> The manuscript of Chron. 1234 has a lacuna immediately after this excerpt which lasts until the time of the birth of Christ. We cannot know for certain what the Anonymous Chronicler discussed immediately after "the name of Syria", but since this excerpt was placed after the time of Judas Maccabeus (167-160BCE), Edessa and the Abgarid dynasty may have been discussed thereafter.

<sup>34</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 112:23-4T states that the name Syria is used for the western land "and also the localities surrounding Edessa, those that lie between our two rivers."

<sup>35</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 16 (523T; vol. 3: 77V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 113.12T.

<sup>36</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 16 (524T; vol. 3: 78V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 114.3T.

Anonymous Chronicler had access to the same manuscript in the same library, most likely that of the monastery of Mor Barsaumo near Melitene.

Similarly, the Anonymous Chronicler also removed Dionysius' account of the mythical foundation of Byzantium by king Byzas and its restoration by Constantine the Great from its original context, after an account of the second siege of Constantinople in 717, and moved it to his discussion of the reign of Constantine.<sup>37</sup> Thus, there appears to have been a certain intent to adjust Dionysius' a-chronological approach, but at the same time, the Anonymous Chronicler followed the same methodology (though it is possible that he only started using Dionysius later on and at that point it was much too late to insert the mythical foundation account in its rightful place in pre-Constantinian, and even pre-Christian, history).

The Anonymous Chronicler and Michael used Dionysius independently from each other: each dependant preserves information that the other one has not copied. As is already suggested by the state of the brief geographical excursus in Michael's *Chronicle* and Chron. 1234, the Anonymous Chronicler usually copied Dionysius' narrative much more fully than Michael whereas Michael tends to paraphrase or abbreviate Dionysius. This is especially visible in the case of battle and siege accounts, in which the Anonymous Chronicler appears to have been much more interested than Michael. More often than not, Michael simply leaves out important details such as names of key figures or descriptions of pivotal events. A simple example is Dionysius' account of king Khusro's battle against the rebel Vahram: in contrast to the Anonymous Chronicler, Michael does not record the identity of Khusro's messenger to Mauricius, Abu Jafna Nu'man ibn Mundhir, an Arab general in Rusapha, nor the rebel Vahram's capture of the Persian capital Ctesiphon.<sup>38</sup> Michael also cuts down Dionysius' narratives of several lines or even pages to merely a few words: for instance, Michael replaced Dionysius' account of the treason of Sittas the city guard of Maipherqat and its capture by the Persians

---

<sup>37</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 142.23-144.2T.

<sup>38</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 215-7T and Mich. Syr. Chron. X 23 (386-7T; vol. 2: 371-2V).

under king Hormizd IV (579-90) in 589 with one sentence, a brief allusion to these events.<sup>39</sup>

Although it is true that Dionysius must have been responsible for the vast majority of the information on the period between 582 and 842 in Chron. 1234 and Michael's *Chronicle* and that it seems clear that in those cases Michael paraphrased Dionysius (or in some cases perhaps used Ignatius' paraphrase of Dionysius?), we should be careful in simply attributing all of the material that is in Chron. 1234, but not in Michael (or vice versa), to Dionysius. In those cases, the authors may have used different sources. For instance, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler accessed the Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John of Ephesus directly and through Dionysius. In addition, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler also used the *Chronicle* of Ignatius of Melitene, who himself used Dionysius, which could suggest that paraphrases of Dionysius, in Michael's *Chronicle* and in Chron. 1234, may in fact go back to Ignatius, at least as far as the history of the (Eastern) Roman and the Byzantine empire and ecclesiastical history are concerned.<sup>40</sup>

Crucial in this respect is also the recent observation that the Anonymous Chronicler used one or more Islamic source(s), among which a dependant of the Arabic chronicler Muhammad ibn ʿAbdallah al-Azdi (late eighth century?), to supplement Dionysius' narrative.<sup>41</sup> Therefore, when Michael appears to preserve a paraphrase of an account in Chron. 1234, but is missing the bulk of the detailed information on Islamic history, we should not assume outright that the Anonymous Chronicler preserves a fuller version of Dionysius' narrative, it is possible that this additional material in Chron. 1234 originated from a Muslim source, whose narratives the Anonymous Chronicler fused with information from Dionysius.

---

<sup>39</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 214T (§78) and Mich. Syr. Chron. X 21 (380T; vol. 2: 359-60V).

<sup>40</sup> This was probably not the case. I suspect that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler did not use Ign. Mel. for the period for which they used Dion. TM, only before 582 and after 842, see chapter 22.

<sup>41</sup> Hoyland 2011, 13 n. 43, correcting his previous erroneous assumption (Hoyland 1991, 219-224, 232-3), on the basis of Palmer 1993, that this material came from Dion. TM.

How then should we approach these cases? A useful indicator of the Anonymous Chronicler's use of a Muslim source rather than Dionysius seems to be his use of the Muslim dating. Generally speaking, whenever an account in Chron. 1234 is accompanied by an *anno hijra* date alone, his use of an Islamic source is possible. However, there are instances in which the Anonymous Chronicler only uses the Islamic era, but may still be dependent on Dionysius.<sup>42</sup> Therefore, we should also be careful in using this element as a criterion for the Anonymous Chronicler's use of an Islamic source outside of the Dionysius continuum.

Another possible barometer are textual comparisons with the *Chronographia* of Theophanes and the *Chronicle* of Agapius. Much literature has been written on the subject of the 'Eastern source' of Theophanes, which supplied him with detailed information on the history of Syria and Palestine between 630 and 780.<sup>43</sup> For the period between 630 and 746 (perhaps even until 750), Theophanes shares information, to the point of verbal agreements, with Agapius, Michael and Chron. 1234. Because of Agapius' and Dionysius'/Michael's source reference to the maronite historian Theophilus of Edessa (d. 785), who was the court astrologer of al-Mahdi, Lawrence I. Conrad has concluded Agapius', Theophanes', and Dionysius' reliance on Theophilus for the bulk of their information on the period between 630 and 750, possibly also for the period between 590 and 610 (and in extension also between 610 and 630); Dionysius and Agapius possibly even as late as 754-55. Because Theophanes' knowledge of Syrian and Palestinian history continues until 780 and includes the succession of Melkite patriarchs of Antioch from 742-56, it has been assumed that his 'Eastern source' was a Greek continuation of a Syriac source, written in the 780s by a Melkite author, possibly George Syncellus himself.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> See chapter 21.

<sup>43</sup> For the opinions before Brooks 1899 and Brooks 1906 and until Conrad 1990, see Conrad 1990, 5-6. See also Breydy 1990; Hoyland 1991, 226-31; Conrad 1992; Conrad 1996; Anthony 2010; Hoyland 2011; Conterno 2014a (forthcoming); Conterno 2014b (forthcoming).

<sup>44</sup> Brooks 1906, 587 (Palestinian Melkite author); Conrad 1992, 336-8 (Northern Syrian Melkite author); Hoyland 1991, 230 (West Syrian chronicler); Hoyland 2011, 9-10 (Syrian Melkite author with Palestinian connections: George Syncellus).

Though I do not wish to go into this issue in too much detail, because entire books can – and have – been written about this subject, I will briefly sum up what we know about Theophilus and his work in order to dispel some of the confusion that has arisen.<sup>45</sup> Dionysius classifies Theophilus’ writings as “narratives resembling ecclesiastical history,” dissociating it from short chronicles, developed chronicles and ecclesiastical histories.<sup>46</sup> The genre is difficult to pinpoint, because the work is not preserved and because this conclusion is based on hypothetical reconstructions of his work, which may attribute material that did not come from Theophilus and ignore material that is no longer preserved, but the evidence does suggest that Theophilus wrote a classicizing history.<sup>47</sup> In any case, from now on, I will refer to Theophilus’ work as a ‘history,’ in order to dispel the confusion regarding the nature of this work, which was not a ‘chronicle’, as Dionysius’ classification suggests. Dionysius may refer to the work once as a ܩܘܕܫܐܘܬܐ, but this should be translated here as “text,” not as chronography or chronicle, as Chabot believed.<sup>48</sup>

We do not know exactly which information Dionysius borrowed from Theophilus, he merely says that he used the narratives of Theophilus who was biased towards the Orthodox and thus did not discuss them.<sup>49</sup> Agapius, however, offers more information about Theophilus and his work. After his discussion of the defeat of Marwan II (744-50) at the battle at the Zab in AD 750, Agapius quotes Theophilus who identifies himself as an “eyewitness” to “these wars,” and Agapius adds that Theophilus wrote “many books” on this subject.<sup>50</sup> It cannot be ascertained if Theophilus discussed earlier or later events, but Agapius and Chron. 1234 do share material until c. 754-55. Furthermore, Agapius and Michael (or Dionysius?) also appear to be ultimately dependent on a common source for the period between 760 and 767, and some of this material is also extant in

---

<sup>45</sup> For similar objections, see Papaconstantinou 2013.

<sup>46</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 358V).

<sup>47</sup> Hoyland 2011, 23.

<sup>48</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 358V).

<sup>49</sup> See previous note.

<sup>50</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 265.

Theophanes.<sup>51</sup> Thus some commonalities may in fact not be due to a common reliance on Theophilus, but on other Semitic sources, possibly even Islamic Arabic.

Because of the uncertainties regarding the nature and extent of Theophilus' work, we should be wary of these attempts to attribute all the commonalities between Theophanes, Agapius, Michael and Chron. 1234 to Theophilus. Dionysius is known to have used other sources, we do not know enough about Theophanes' sources, and it is not because Agapius refers to Theophilus as a source for the battle at the Zab in 750, that Theophilus needs to be Agapius's source for all, or the majority of information on Islamic history between the 630s and 750s/760s.<sup>52</sup>

This is not the place to go into detail about this issue any further, I will leave future research to others, but I wish to finish this discussion with a few observations concerning Dionysius and his sources, especially the issue of Theophilus and Chron. 819, on the basis of evidence from Chron. 1234.

## 20.2 Theophilus of Edessa and the Secular Part

If we compare Chron. 1234's account of the battle at the Zab in 750 with that of Theophanes, Agapius and Michael, we notice that Chron. 1234 independently shares material with Agapius and Michael. Theophanes' account is very brief, equally brief as Michael's but very different from all others. Only the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael agree that the ʿAbbasid loot after the battle consisted of 700 loads of gold and silver coins that were loaded on camels, so this information must have come from Dionysius. Because this information is not provided by Theophanes and Agapius, it cannot be ascertained if Dionysius found this information elsewhere or if it goes back to the ultimate common source of Theophanes and Agapius as well, but was not copied by

---

<sup>51</sup> Hoyland 2011, 301-9.

<sup>52</sup> Conterno 2014a (forthcoming); Conterno 2014b (forthcoming).

these authors or their sources. Pertinent to our investigation, however, is the question whether Michael preserves a paraphrase of Dionysius, or Dionysius' full account.

As stated, it is certain that the Anonymous Chronicler also had access to an additional Muslim source, whose narratives he fused with material from Dionysius, when the latter provided insufficient information. In the case of the battle at the Zab, the information provided by the Anonymous Chronicler, but not by Michael, is also extant in Agapius. Since the latter refers to Theophilus as a source for this information, he is also likely to be Chron. 1234's source, but the question remains whether Chron. 1234 is dependent on Theophilus via Dionysius, or had direct access to Theophilus' history.<sup>53</sup> Interesting in this respect is the fact that only Agapius and Chron. 1234 use the Muslim dating for this event, which suggests the involvement of an Islamic Arabic source. It is perfectly possible that Agapius<sup>54</sup> and the Anonymous Chronicler used an Islamic source, independently from Theophilus and Dionysius, because they often share information about early Islamic history, in the form of longer narratives, which are not extant in Theophanes and Michael. More research needs to be done on this issue, but the relationship between Theophanes, Agapius, Michael, Chron. 1234 clearly needs to be re-examined.

### 20.3 Chron. 819, Chron. 846 and the Secular Part

In 1906, when Chron. 819, the chronicle of Agapius and Chron. 1234 had not yet been edited, E.W. Brooks noticed similarities in wording in material shared by Michael, Theophanes and Chron. 846 and concluded that Michael used Dionysius and Theophanes a Greek chronicler who was writing not long after 780, that Dionysius and this Greek

---

<sup>53</sup> A direct reliance on Theoph. Ed. would also explain the presence of the story of the Trojan war in Chron. 1234. This highly literary account, which is largely based on the Epic Cycle rather than the Iliad, would indeed befit a classicizing history, Conrad 2005, 388; Hilken 2013, 301-310.

<sup>54</sup> Conrad 1996, 173 and Hoyland 2011, 14-5 acknowledge that Agap. used at least one Islamic source.

chronicler used a chronicle written not long after 746, to be identified either as John, son of Samuel, or Theophilus of Edessa, who in turn used a chronicle that was written between 724 and 731 and also used by the chronicler of 846.<sup>55</sup> After the edition of Chron. 819, the chronicle of Agapius and Chron. 1234, however, Palmer concluded that Chron. 846 was a continuation and expansion of Chron. 819, probably compiled by bishop David of Harran.<sup>56</sup>

A series of articles by Lawrence I. Conrad shows the gradual development of his conviction that the ultimate common source of Theophanes' 'Eastern source', Agapius and Dionysius was the '*Chronicle*' of Theophilus of Edessa.<sup>57</sup> This hypothesis was followed by Robert Hoyland.<sup>58</sup> Regarding Chron. 819, Hoyland comments that though it is possible that the chronicler of 819 used Theophilus, it is more likely that Theophilus shared a common source with Chron. 819. Hoyland further suggests that the common source of Theophilus and Chron. 819 may have been the chronicle of John of Litharb (d. 737).<sup>59</sup>

There are several problems with these conclusions. First of all, Chron. 846 contains entries that are not extant in Chron. 819, for the period for which the former is supposed to rely on the latter.<sup>60</sup> This may indicate the author of Chron. 846's reliance on another source aside from Chron. 819 or on Chron. 819's source rather than on Chron. 819 directly. Secondly, Michael preserves at least one entry that is only extant in Chron. 846, but not in Chron. 819, which suggests that Michael, or possibly Dionysius, is dependent on Chron. 819's source.<sup>61</sup> Thirdly, some entries in Chron. 819 only have

---

<sup>55</sup> Brooks 1906.

<sup>56</sup> Palmer 1990, 8-13; Palmer 1993, 83.

<sup>57</sup> Nothing is said of Theoph. Ed. in Conrad 1990, but see Conrad 1992 and Conrad 1996.

<sup>58</sup> Hoyland 1991 and Hoyland 2011, 10.

<sup>59</sup> Hoyland 2011, 26-7 and 316-8 (Appendix 2).

<sup>60</sup> The chronicler of 846, for instance, knows of the amount of captives taken from Amida by the Persian king Qawad in 503 [Chron. 846 (219.22-5T, 167.23-6V)] and taken from Dara by king Khosrow in AD 573 [Chron. 846 a. 885 (230T; 174V)].

<sup>61</sup> Hoyland 2011, 316; Chron. 819 a. 1006 (13T; 9V); Chron. 846 a. 1006 (232T; 175-6V); Mich. Syr. Chron. XI 15 (446T; vol. 2: 470V).

counterparts in Michael and/or Chron. 1234, suggesting Michael's, the Anonymous Chronicler's and/or Dionysius' independent reliance on Chron. 819 or Chron. 819's source. In two cases, that of Dahhak's reign over Mesopotamia,<sup>62</sup> and the description of Walid I as a smart man who increased taxes,<sup>63</sup> Chron. 1234 is the only witness except for Chron. 819 and Chron. 846. Two other examples of this are entries on (the consequences of) the governorship<sup>64</sup> of Musa ibn Mus'ab over Mosul from his appointment by al-Mansur, and on the release<sup>65</sup> from prison of patriarch George at the start of the reign of Mahdi (775-85). In all four cases, Michael and/or Chron. 1234 use almost exactly the same wording as Chron. 819. Though Theophanes<sup>66</sup> and Agapius<sup>67</sup> also comment on the consequences of the harsh rule of al-Mansur (754-75), they do not appear to have used the same source as Dionysius, because there are no verbal agreements with his narrative, which survives in slightly different forms in Michael's *Chronicle* and in Chron. 1234. Only Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler mention the governorship of Musa ibn Mus'ab over Mesopotamia/Mosul in almost exactly the same wording as Chron. 819, which suggests that Dionysius used Chron. 819 or (one of) Chron. 819's source(s).<sup>68</sup> The latter is perhaps more likely, because of the chronological discrepancies. Michael/Dionysius dates the appointment of Musa to AG 1083/AD 771-2 and his death to the same year as al-Mansur's death three years later (i.e. in AG 1086/AD 775), thereby agreeing with Islamic sources,<sup>69</sup> whereas Chron. 819 dates the governorship of Musa between AG 1080/AD 768-9 and AG 1083/AD 771-2.

Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler note the release from prison of George, the Syriac Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, on the accession of caliph al-Mahdi in 775 in near

---

<sup>62</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 309T; Chron. 819 a. 1033 (16T; 11V); Chron. 846 a. 1033 (235T; 178V).

<sup>63</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 299.1-3T; Chron. 819 a. 1016 (14T; 9V) and Chron. 846 a. 1016 (232-176V)

<sup>64</sup> Chron. 819 (20T; 14V); Mich. Syr. Chron. XI 26 (476-7T; vol. 2: 526-7); Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 340T.

<sup>65</sup> Chron. 819 (20T; 14V); Chron. 846 (237-8T; 180V); Mich. Syr. Chron. XI 26 (476-8T; vol. 2: 527-9V); Chron. 1234, 340-1T.

<sup>66</sup> Theophan. Chron. AM 6249 (ed. 430; trans. 595).

<sup>67</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 2, 286.

<sup>68</sup> It is worth noting that this entry is not extant in Chron. 846.

<sup>69</sup> Crone 1980, 16 referred to by Hoyland 2011, 307 n. 960.

identical wording as Chron. 819 and Chron. 846. Clearly therefore Dionysius and Chron. 819 share a common Syriac Orthodox source. Though Dionysius may have independently accessed this source, this raises doubt about the involvement of Theophilus in the transmission of other entries which are also extant in Chron. 819 and Chron. 846.

## 20.4 Dionysius and the Ecclesiastical Part

Having mainly focused on Dionysius' influence on the Secular Part, only a few observations can be provided regarding material of Dionysius that survives in the Ecclesiastical Part, because the ecclesiastical narrative between 582 and 842 is largely missing due to lacunas in the manuscript. What remains seems to have come from Dionysius in its entirety. The majority of the information concerns the succession of orthodox patriarchs of Antioch and matters of the Syriac Orthodox church, but attention is also devoted to the capture<sup>70</sup> of the monastery of saint Simeon the Stylite during the Islamic conquest of Syria and the succession of Coptic patriarchs in Alexandria.<sup>71</sup> In addition, due to two references in the Secular Part, we can also deduce that the Ecclesiastical Part also discussed the synod, held in Callinicum in 818, during which Dionysius was elected patriarch,<sup>72</sup> and Dionysius' journey to Baghdad to discuss ecclesiastical affairs with Abu Ishaq.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 260T, 195-6V. Comp. Mich. Syr. Chron. X 16 (417T; vol. 2: 422V).

<sup>71</sup> Death of Jacob in AG 1142/AD 831 and the ordination of Joseph: Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 266T, 200V.

<sup>72</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 13.13-6T, 9.6-8V.

<sup>73</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 33.9-13T, 23.26-30V.



## Chapter 21 Arabic sources

Though he was writing in Syriac, the Anonymous Chronicler's knowledge of Arabic often shines through, not only through his use of certain Arabic words such as 'minaret' (written in Syriac as ܡܢܪܬܐ), not only for a minaret as such,<sup>1</sup> but also applied to the Pharos of Alexandria.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, he uses the Syriac ܟܬܒܐ, *katīb* for *ḥatīb*, the Arabic term for a Muslim preacher.<sup>3</sup> His knowledge of Arabic and love for the language is also suggested by his references to the *Dialogues*<sup>4</sup> between Theodore Abu Qurra (d. after 829?), the Melkite bishop of Harran and al-Ma'mun (813-33), an astronomical work<sup>5</sup> written by that caliph, and a laudation of the poet al-Mutanabbi (d. 965).<sup>6</sup>

The Secular Part of Chron. 1234 also preserves a large number of excerpts from Islamic historiographical sources. Some of this material may have been transmitted to him via Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, who has been suggested to have used a dependant of al-Zuhri.<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately, it is often difficult to distinguish between material that may have been available in Dionysius' *History*, but was not copied by Michael, and information that the Anonymous Chronicler took from an Islamic source. That this

---

<sup>1</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 48.28T, 35.32V.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 112.5T.

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 210:2T, 157.26V (§496).

<sup>4</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 23T, 16V.

<sup>5</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 7T, 4V.

<sup>6</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 40T, 29V. This reference appears among materials that were presumably taken from Ign. Mel., who does not seem to have known Arabic.

<sup>7</sup> Anthony 2010.

information is not extant in Michael's *Chronicle*, coupled with the use of the Muslim era, suggests the use of an Islamic source, but these two criteria are still not sufficient to determine with certainty the Anonymous Chronicler's use of an Islamic source for all these materials. Other elements may ultimately derive from Theophilus of Edessa, but the investigation is still ongoing and will not be covered in detail here. In addition, the Anonymous Chronicler knew Muslim historical and etymological traditions, probably through one or two Islamic historiographical sources that he consulted. This/these source(s) provided him with information on Muhammad (d. 632), and the reigns of the caliphs Abu Bakr (632-34), ʿUmar I (634-44), ʿUthman I (644-56), ʿAli (656-61) and Muawiyah (661-680), Marwan II (744-50), and then possibly again for the reigns of al-Ma'mun (813-33) and al-Mutawakkil (847-61).

This material concerns internal political and territorial struggles, i.e. the circumstances of the deaths and accessions of certain caliphs, and usually very positive descriptions of the character of certain caliphs. A large chunk of the material concerns the Islamic expansion in Syria – particular attention is devoted to the events at Damascus, Homs (and Qenneshrin, which paid tribute to Homs) – and the material is pro-Muawiyah, so his source for the seventh century may have been written in Syria. However, there was also an interest in Northern Mesopotamia, in Harran.

The identity/ies of the Anonymous Chronicler's Islamic source(s) is/are unknown. One of them was an unknown dependant of Muhammad ibn ʿAbdallah al-Azdi.<sup>8</sup> Chron. 1234 often provides “an adept summary of Azdi (...) occasionally [with] (...) word for word correspondences,” but there are certain cases in which the Anonymous Chronicler in fact follows the “general consensus of the Muslim sources” rather than the opinion of Azdi.<sup>9</sup> One example of this is the account of the capture of Damascus by the generals Khalid ibn al-Walid and Abu ʿUbayda.<sup>10</sup> This event was also mentioned by Azdi, but

---

<sup>8</sup> Hoyland 1991, 224; Hoyland 1997, 419, n. 105; Hoyland 2011, 13, n. 43. It must be pointed out, however, that at the time of the appearance of the first two publications, Hoyland still believed that Chron. 1234 was dependent on Dion. TM for this information.

<sup>9</sup> Hoyland 1991, 224.

<sup>10</sup> Hoyland 1991, 223.

Chron. 1234 agrees with the later Islamic sources that Khalid ibn al-Walid “made terms just as Abu ʿUbayda was entering by force, whereas Azdi reports the converse.”<sup>11</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler quarried the same source source for information on events concerned the early Islamic conquests of Syria and Palestine between Jumada I AH 13/July AD 634 and AH 18/AD 639: their taking of the desert route to the south of Damascus, Heraclius’ stationing of patrols and his departure for Antioch;<sup>12</sup> the plundering of the region of Baalbek;<sup>13</sup> the battle of Ajnadayn;<sup>14</sup> the siege and conquest of Damascus after the death of Abu Bakr in AH 13/AD 635;<sup>15</sup> the invasion of Jordan, Balqa’, Baalbek and Palmyra; the siege and conquest of Homs and the appointment of governor Habib ibn Maslama;<sup>16</sup> the battle of the Yarmuk;<sup>17</sup> the conquest of Aleppo and Qenneshrin, which would become subjected to the power of the emir of Homs until the time of Yazid I (680-3);<sup>18</sup> the siege of Jerusalem;<sup>19</sup> ending with the death of Abu ʿUbayda during the plague of ʿAmwas in AH 18/AD 639 and his replacement by Muʿadh ibn Jabal.<sup>20</sup>

The only other materials pertaining to events that occurred in the 630s that originated from Islamic sources and did not reach the Anonymous Chronicler via Dionysius, are a genealogy from Ishmael to Muhammad<sup>21</sup> and Abu Bakr’s speech to his

---

<sup>11</sup> Hoyland 1991, 224.

<sup>12</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 240.24-241.2T (§107).

<sup>13</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 244.26-9T.

<sup>14</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 244.29-245.4T.

<sup>15</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 245.4-15T (siege); 248.7-23T (§114).

<sup>16</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 248.24-249.18T (§115).

<sup>17</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 249.19-250.12T (§116-7).

<sup>18</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 254.1-11T (§119).

<sup>19</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 254.12-255.6T (§120).

<sup>20</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 255.28-256.2T. On all of these materials, see Hoyland 1991, 224. However, it must be pointed out that originally Hoyland 1991, 233 catalogued Heraclius’ farewell to Syria among this material as well, but that, since this information is also extant in Mich. Syr. Chron., it is more likely that the Anonymous Chronicler copied it from Dion. TM.

<sup>21</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 239.3-23T.

generals.<sup>22</sup> Chron. 1234's version of Abu Bakr's speech seems to be a combination of two traditions: the first, like at-Tabari,<sup>23</sup> focuses on the sparing of old men, women and children, stylites and monks, trees, plants and animals, but the second, like for instance al-Waqidi,<sup>24</sup> lays down the rules on how to treat the citizens of the invaded lands (i.e. the men?).<sup>25</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler may also have quarried an Islamic source for biographical information on ʿUthman I (AD 644-56): he praises ʿUthman's skill in writing and politics and records the Muslim tradition that this caliph supervised the canonization of the Qur'an.<sup>26</sup> The additional – and erroneous – claim that ʿUthman was an ʿUmayyad, not a Qurayshite, whereas the Quraysh were in fact an ʿUmayyad clan does not go back to the Islamic source, but probably reflects the Anonymous Chronicler's relative unfamiliarity with tribal relations.<sup>27</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler's account of ʿUthman's death is decidedly different from that of Theophanes, Agapius and Michael. The account of ʿUthman's letter to Muawiyah with the order to kill Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr, ʿUthman's messenger almost certainly came from an Islamic source.<sup>28</sup> However, there are some agreements between the two Syriac witnesses, suggesting that at least some of the material in Chron. 1234 came from Dionysius.<sup>29</sup>

The first civil war or *fitna*, (“the struggle that fell between (ʿAli) and Muawiyah”) and its consequences is also described at length on the basis of the same Islamic source.<sup>30</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler focuses on the disagreement between Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr, the representative of ʿAli, and Muawiyah who did not recognize ʿAli's rule and

---

<sup>22</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 240.4-22T.

<sup>23</sup> Comp. Tabari, vol. 1, 1850 (trans., vol. X, 16).

<sup>24</sup> Waqidi, vol. 2, 757.

<sup>25</sup> Hoyland 1991, 220.

<sup>26</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 261.8-31T. On which, Hoyland 2011, 146, n. 356.

<sup>27</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 261.31-262.2T.

<sup>28</sup> Hoyland 2011, 146-7, n. 361.

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 275-7T (§135).

<sup>30</sup> Hoyland 2011, 147, n. 365.

demanded the extradition of ʿUthman’s murderer; on the battle of Siffin in AH 37/AD 657 and the arbitration agreement between ʿAli and Muawiyah, or more precisely between Abu Musa al-Ashʿari and ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAs, their respective representatives.<sup>31</sup> The source for this information was evidently pro-Muawiyah and pro-Syrian: ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAs is identified as “wise and astute”<sup>32</sup> and elsewhere Muawiyah is said to have been tolerant and philanthropic, and an example is given in which Muawiyah forgave a man for having caused the death of one of the former’s sons.<sup>33</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler also provides additional information on the deaths of ʿAli, and his sons al-Hasan and al-Husain. The murderer of ʿAli is identified as ʿAbd ar-Rahman ibn Muljam,<sup>34</sup> a name which does not appear in Michael’s *Chronicle*, even though the latter knew of the plot of the Kharijites to kill ʿAli, Muawiyah and ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAs, presumably via Dionysius.<sup>35</sup> Chron. 1234’s detailed description of the circumstances of ʿAli’s death is clearly taken from an Islamic source: ibn Muljam is said to have approached ʿAli in the mosque, while he was praying, and to have killed him with one blow of the sword. ʿAli turns out to be alive and orders his guards, after his own death (which occurred two days later), to strike ibn Muljam once with the sword.<sup>36</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler’s version of ibn Muljam’s punishment and death is similar to

---

<sup>31</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 277-9T (§136). In this context it is worth noting that the other purported dependants of Theoph. Ed. either do not record the battle of Siffin at all (Agap.) or offer a brief and general description of the outcome of the battle (Theophan. and Mich. Syr.), without even mentioning the name ‘Siffin’. Considering the importance of this event, of which Theoph. Ed., must have surely been aware, it is possible that Theoph. Ed. did not write about this event or that his work did not cover the seventh century, which suggests that some similarities between Chron. 1234, Mich. Syr., Agap. and Theophan. in material pertaining to that period may be due to their (ultimate) reliance on other sources.

<sup>32</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 277.26T.

<sup>33</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 280-1T.

<sup>34</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 280.6-7T.

<sup>35</sup> Comp. Mich. Syr. Chron. XI 11 (434T; vol. 2: 450V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 279.24-30T.

<sup>36</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 279.30-80.11T.

that recorded by at-Tabari,<sup>37</sup> among others, in that it also emphasises ʿAli’s “strict observance of the *lex talionis*.”<sup>38</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler also knows that al-Hasan ibn ʿAli was poisoned after he had begun to rule.<sup>39</sup> Chron. 1234 provides no further details, but the assassination is traditionally attributed to one of al-Hasan’s wives. The date of his death differs in the sources.<sup>40</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler states that al-Husain ibn ʿAli was killed at Karbala during his war with Muawiyah by “one of the Arabs, called Shamir,” referring to Shamir Ibn Dhi l-Jawshan.<sup>41</sup> With this identification of al-Husain’s assassin, Chron. 1234 agrees with Muslim traditions recorded by al-Baladhuri<sup>42</sup> (d. AD 892) and others, but disagrees with the opinion of Abu Miḥnaf<sup>43</sup> (d. AD 774), cited by at-Tabari,<sup>44</sup> as well as another tradition preserved by al-Baladhuri<sup>45</sup> and others who identify Sinan ibn Anas an-Nakhaʿi as the murderer of al-Husain.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, the Anonymous Chronicler’s claim that the assassination occurred in the war between Muawiyah and al-Husain contradicts the evidence from the Islamic sources who place these events during the reign of Yazid I, Muawiyah’s son, twenty years later.<sup>47</sup>

The last piece of information concerning the first *fitna* that may have come from this Islamic source concerns the city of Harran: its citizens are said to have switched sides to Muawiyah after ʿAli had killed many of their compatriots, and are said to honour Yazid Ibn Muawiyah “until this day,” because he was “an eternal enemy of the party of ʿAli.”<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Tabari, vol. 2, 3464 (trans., vol. XVII, 222).

<sup>38</sup> Veccia Vaglieri 2014a.

<sup>39</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 280.11-3.T.

<sup>40</sup> Veccia Vaglieri 2014b.

<sup>41</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 280.21T.

<sup>42</sup> Baladhuri, vol. 3, 418 (referenced by Kohlberg 2014).

<sup>43</sup> Gibb 2014.

<sup>44</sup> Tabari, vol. 2, 366 (trans., vol. XIX, 160-1).

<sup>45</sup> Baladhuri, vol. 3, 418.

<sup>46</sup> For these and other relevant sources, see Kohlberg 2014.

<sup>47</sup> Hoyland 2011, 148, n. 370.

<sup>48</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 281T (§136).

The fact, however, that this entry focuses on Northern Mesopotamia rather than Syria may indicate the use of another source, perhaps even Dionysius himself.

For further material from Islamic sources, we must skip eighty years to the reign of al-Walid II (743-44). The Anonymous Chronicler copied Dionysius' statement<sup>49</sup> that al-Walid granted power to his son al-ʿAbbas, but adds that the ʿAbbasids were named after this ʿAbbas and not after al-ʿAbbas ibn ʿAbd al-Muttalib, the half-brother of Muhammad's father ʿAbdallah, indicating his knowledge of, but his disagreement with the Islamic etymological explanation of the term 'ʿAbbasid'.<sup>50</sup>

The focus on Homs also returns, because the Anonymous Chronicler states that after the death of Walid II (743-44), the citizens of Homs killed their emir Bashir ibn ʿAbdallah, because he was of the party of Yazid III (744).<sup>51</sup> He further implicates Marwan ibn Muhammad (then governor of Armenia but later caliph from 744 until 750) in the conspiracy to kill Bashir.<sup>52</sup> This information is not available in Theophanes, Agapius nor Michael, and probably came from an Islamic source. A governor of Homs by the name of Marwan ibn ʿAbdallah ibn ʿAbd al-Malik is mentioned by at-Tabari<sup>53</sup> and the connection to Homs reflects the interest in this city of the earlier source used by the Anonymous Chronicler. The same can perhaps also be said for Harran: in this case the Anonymous Chronicler deduces Marwan's involvement in the murder of Walid from the fact that Marwan's son ʿAbd al-Malik took Harran on the day of Walid's murder. Later on, the Anonymous Chronicler also seems to be dependent on an Islamic source for saying that Marwan came to Harran from Armenia before his march against Homs after the death of Yazid III.<sup>54</sup> The problem in this case is that this information appears among material concerning the end of Marwan II's reign and the ʿAbbasid revolution that was

---

<sup>49</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 314T (§168) and Mich. Syr. Chron. IX 21 (463T; vol. 2: 502V).

<sup>50</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 314T (§168). Interestingly however, later on in Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 162T, 122V (§444) exactly the latter theory is defended.

<sup>51</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 316.5-10T (§170).

<sup>52</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 361.1-15T (§170).

<sup>53</sup> Tabari, vol. 2 1826 (trans. XXVI, 184).

<sup>54</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 317T (§172).

presumably taken from Theophilus of Edessa (whether through Dionysius or not), because it is also extant in the chronicle of Agapius.<sup>55</sup>

It is not clear if the Anonymous Chronicler was still using an Islamic Arabic source for information on the eighth and ninth centuries. Among events that occurred during the reign of as-Saffah (749-54), the Anonymous Chronicler recounts the tale of his murder of the last relatives of king Hisham, his son Sulayman and grandson Ayyub, who had returned to as-Saffah after the death of Marwan from whom they had fled,<sup>56</sup> but Islamic sources tend to say that Sulayman fled to India (with Mansur ibn Jumhur).<sup>57</sup>

After the reign of as-Saffah, we must skip to the reigns of the ninth-century caliphs al-Ma'mun and al-Mutawakkil for possible evidence of the Anonymous Chronicler's use of Islamic sources. As mentioned above, particular attention is given to al-Ma'mun's book on astronomy, which is said to have been celebrated by astronomers "until the present day,"<sup>58</sup> and this focus is absent from Michael's *Chronicle*. On the other hand, Muslim affairs during the reign of al-Ma'mun, not only internal political struggles but also his Roman campaigns, are described at length in Chron. 1234 as well as in Michael's *Chronicle*, mostly on the basis of information provided by Dionysius. Because of Dionysius' use of Islamic sources and the fact that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler excerpted him differently, it is difficult to determine what in Chron. 1234 came from Dionysius and what from other sources.

The material on the reign of Muhammad al-Amin (809-13), al-Ma'mun's brother, was taken by the Anonymous Chronicler from a common source with Michael, presumably Dionysius, but thoroughly abbreviated.<sup>59</sup> Chron. 1234 contains some minor elements and phrases that are not extant in Michael's *Chronicle*, but for the most part, Chron. 1234 preserves paraphrases of Dionysius, nothing seems to be added from other sources.

---

<sup>55</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 319-335, 338-9T (§174-181, 184). On this material, see the chapter on Dion. TM.

<sup>56</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 339.4-12T.

<sup>57</sup> Hawting 2000, 101.

<sup>58</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 7T, 4V.

<sup>59</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 8-10T, 5-6V (§194-6) and Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 6 (490-2T; vol. 2: 21-2V); XII 7 (492-5T; vol. 2: 25-7V); XII 8 (496-7T; vol. 2: 29-30V).

From the assassination onwards, i.e. for the reign of al-Ma'mun, however, Chron. 1234 contains material that is often absent from the *Chronicle* of Michael, and this information is often only furnished by an Islamic date. However, these dates are often incorrect. For instance, the Anonymous Chronicler dates the assassination of Muhammad and the accession of al-Ma'mun to AH 197/AD 812-3,<sup>60</sup> whereas this event is in fact traditionally dated to 26 Muharram AH 198/AD 813, a date followed by Michael (AG 1124/AD 813) and Barhebraeus (AH 198), and presumably also Dionysius.<sup>61</sup> That the sole use of a Hijra date is not always an indicator of the use of an Islamic source, is demonstrated by the Anonymous Chronicler's report on the destruction of the sanctuaries of Mor Giworgis of Qubbe and of Mor Ahudemme in Harran during the reign of al-Mutasim (833-42). The Anonymous Chronicler dates this event on the Saturday of the Annunciation in AH 221/AD 836-7, but this material is Christian in origin and, except for the date, also extant in Michael's *Chronicle* (and therefore presumably taken from Dionysius). It appears therefore, that on occasion the Anonymous Chronicler either only preserved the Islamic date that was offered by Dionysius or changed the Seleucid date for an Islamic one.

During the reign of al-Ma'mun, the Anonymous Chronicler (unlike Michael) focuses in detail on the deeds of Hubayb ibn Jaham, the Numayrite emir of Resh ʿAyna, who came to claim the territory of Mesopotamia that al-Ma'mun had promised him. Hubayb is met with resistance by ʿAbdallah ibn Saʿid, emir of Kafartuta, culminating in a battle Atfa (between Dara and Kafartuta) in AH 197/AD 812-3, the latter's defeat and unsuccessful siege of Resh ʿAyna on Saturday 1 October (or November) AH 199/AD 814-15.<sup>62</sup> Later on, the Anonymous Chronicler also commemorates Hubayb's death in Baghdad in AH 210/AD 825-6, and praises his wealth, construction works in Mesopotamia and his freeing of several slaves.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 10-11T, 7V.

<sup>61</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 8 (496-7T; vol. 2: 30V).

<sup>62</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 10-12T, 7-8V (§198).

<sup>63</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 15-6T, 11V (§203).

The Anonymous Chronicler continues his narrative (which is interrupted by a title) with the arrival in Mesopotamia of Tahir ibn al-Husain, the Persian general and preacher (مُحَدِّث), who was sent by al-Ma'mun to pacify 'the West' in AH 200/AD 815-6. It is also said that Nasr ibn Shabath al-'Uqayli, the emir of Resh Kepha, Sarug<sup>64</sup> and Kaisum, rebelled against Tahir.<sup>65</sup> This information is extant in Michael's *Chronicle*, but described in a very different way: it is furnished only by a Seleucid date (AG 1126/AD 814-5); Tahir is said to have arrived in Callinicum with 4,000 men; and Nasr's full name is never given.<sup>66</sup> Then again, nothing is said in Chron. 1234 of Tahir's struggle with Nasr, whereas Michael describes these events in some detail. Instead, the Anonymous Chronicler adds other information about the situation in Mesopotamia at that time: 'Abdallah ibn Sa'id, emir of Kafartuta, is said to have died in the meantime and Hubayb is said to have slayed 'Ubayda and 180 Kharijites near Takrit after their murder of his brother Kulthum. The Anonymous Chronicler also chose to mention independent treaties of Hubayb and Tahir with the citizens of a town or region called Gšum (perhaps a reference to Kaisum), which apparently was a thing that had never been done by any Muslim, but for which Tahir was highly esteemed.<sup>67</sup>

This description is quite different from Michael's (and presumably Dionysius') who says that, when Tahir learnt that Ibrahim ibn al-Mahdi had been elected (counter-)caliph in Baghdad (in AH 202/24 July AD 817<sup>68</sup>), he began to unite the rebels in the west against Ibrahim, despite the evil deeds that they had committed. Dionysius blames Tahir for having given control over Harran to Ibrahim the Qurayshite who permitted pagans to hold public sacrifices, and to have allowed Nasr and a certain 'Abbas, emir of Mardin, to move against 'Uthman, the emir of Hira.<sup>69</sup> The positive view of Tahir, who united rebels against Ibrahim, the usurper of the caliphate, suggests the Anonymous

---

<sup>64</sup> Not mentioned by the Anonymous Chronicler.

<sup>65</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 12T, 8V (§199).

<sup>66</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 8 (498T; vol. 31V): to be fair, Michael rarely provides detailed names of key figures and Nasr had been mentioned at an earlier time.

<sup>67</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 12T, 8-9V.

<sup>68</sup> Kennedy 1981, 159.

<sup>69</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 9 (498-500T; vol. 2: 35-6V).

Chronicler's use of a source that was pro-al-Ma'mun. Dionysius was often also positive of al-Ma'mun's policies, but not in this case. Moreover, whereas Dionysius was not afraid to criticise al-Ma'mun, Chron. 1234 is consistently fairly positive. He emphasises the positive consequences of al-Ma'mun's reign by saying that wrongdoers received amnesty and that initially, there was peace in his realm, which contrasts with the view of Michael, who says, presumably after Dionysius, that al-Ma'mun had had general Harthamah executed, when the latter started to regret his complicity in the assassination of al-Ma'mun's brother Muhammad.<sup>70</sup> In the context of al-Ma'mun's campaigns, the Anonymous Chronicler also says that al-Ma'mun was just, peace-loving and compassionate, whereas Michael says that he was "cursed by everyone," because of the costs involved.<sup>71</sup> When praising al-Ma'mun's book on astronomy, the Anonymous Chronicler also describes al-Ma'mun as a "wise and eloquent man, well-versed in astronomy and grammar."<sup>72</sup>

After a short interlude, in which the Anonymous Chronicler discusses the reigns of the Roman emperors Stauracius (811), Michael I (811-3) and Leon V (813-20), his focus returns to Nasr who, after Tahir's death, rebels against Tahir's son 'Abdallah, the new governor of Mesopotamia and the West, and harass Kaisum which has become part of Nasr's domain. Eventually, 'Abdallah is said to have besieged Kaisum in AH 206/AD 821-2 and pardoned its inhabitants, but Nasr is sent to the court of the caliph in Baghdad.<sup>73</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler's use of the Muslim dating alone suggests that he used an Islamic source for these events, but he may be dependent on Dionysius. There are some similarities<sup>74</sup> between Chron. 1234's and Michael's accounts of these events, especially of 'Abdallah's siege of Kaisum. Both Michael (October AG 1135/AD 823) and the Anonymous Chronicler have the wrong year: Kaisum was in fact captured and destroyed

---

<sup>70</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 8 (497T; vol. 2: 31V).

<sup>71</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 16 (525T; vol. 2:75V).

<sup>72</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 7T, 4V.

<sup>73</sup> AH 206 is also the year in which at-Tabari, vol. 2, 1045 (trans., vol. XXXII, 108-9) dates this event.

<sup>74</sup> Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler both use the name 'Abdallah ibn Tahir, which is rare for Michael, describe him as compassionate and say that al-Ma'mun allowed him to treat Nasr and his men the way that he pleased. Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 14-5T, 10V and Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 12 (509-10T; vol. 2: 52-3V).

in AH 209/AD 824<sup>75</sup>. On the other hand, Michael knew that Tahir died in Baghdad, not in Khorasan as the Anonymous Chronicler claimed.<sup>76</sup>

Similarly, the Anonymous Chronicler may have completed Dionysius' descriptions of three campaigns of al-Ma'mun into Roman territory on the basis of an Islamic source, but this seems unlikely. All three campaigns, one in AH 215/AD 830 (§212),<sup>77</sup> one in 'the following year' (§213),<sup>78</sup> and one in AG 1144/AD 832-3 (§215)<sup>79</sup> are also mentioned by Michael. The Anonymous Chronicler's account of the first campaign is very different and much more elaborate than Michael's, and only furnishes an Islamic date.<sup>80</sup> It may be that the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael have independently reworked Dionysius, but this is not certain. As regards the other two accounts, however, they are probably indeed paraphrases or adaptations of Dionysius' narratives: Michael's version of the second account is longer, containing many details that are not extant in Chron. 1234, and the third account in Chron. 1234 seems to be a fuller version of Dionysius', which Michael has paraphrased.

A clear example of how the Anonymous Chronicler sometimes only kept the Muslim date from Dionysius' narrative is the case of the date of the death of al-Ma'mun. In

---

<sup>75</sup> E.g. Tabari, vol. 2, 1072 (trans. vol. XXXII, 144).

<sup>76</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 12 (511T; vol. 2: 54V). This is confirmed by Islamic sources, e.g. Tabari, vol. 2, 1063-5 (trans. vol. XXXII, 131-3).

<sup>77</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 23-4T, 16-7V (§212).

<sup>78</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 24-5T, 17V (§213).

<sup>79</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 27T, 19V (§215).

<sup>80</sup> According to the Anonymous Chronicler, al-Ma'mun captured seventy-two Roman fortresses and cities in AH 215/AD 830. Particular attention is devoted to the capture of a city called Semalus, whose walls were destroyed, whose army of 4,000 warriors were killed, and whose inhabitants al-Ma'mun deported because the city had not submitted voluntarily. Then again, it is also emphasized that al-Ma'mun spared the cities that surrendered and even gave them provisions in case of hunger. The Roman patrician Manuel, who had switched sides to al-Ma'mun, is appointed as governor, strengthened by an army of Persians and Arabs. Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 16 (523T; vol. 2: 74V) is very brief, saying that "al-Ma'mun invaded Roman territory in the month of June: he captured four fortresses in Capadocia and returned to spend the winter in Damascus." Mich. Syr.'s information in fact more or less agrees with what we know from Islamic sources. According to Tabari, vol. 2, 1103 (trans. vol. XXXII, 185-6), in July AH 215/AD 830 al-Ma'mun's forces captured the fortresses of Qurrah/Koron, Majidah, Sundus and Sinan, before returning to Damascus.

Chron. 1234 it is specified as Wednesday 23 July AH 218/AD 833.<sup>81</sup> Michael, however, only says that he died in July AG 1144/AD 833.<sup>82</sup> Most likely Dionysius offered the Seleucid as well as the Muslim dating, but Michael chose to keep the former date, whereas the Anonymous Chronicler took the latter. This goes to show that the sole date of the Muslim era is in itself not a valid criterion to suppose the Anonymous Chronicler's directly dependence on an Islamic source.

One such case is an account of a hail storm that killed 30,000 inhabitants of Mosul on the night of Tuesday 6 March in AH 232/AD 847, during the reign of al-Mutawakkil.<sup>83</sup> This material cannot have come from Dionysius nor from Ignatius of Melitene, the Anonymous Chronicler's main source after Dionysius. The use of the Muslim date need not necessarily point to the involvement of an Islamic source, but the fact that the Anonymous Chronicler calls Ja'far ibn Harun ibn al-Mu'tasim 'al-Mutawakkil billah', rather than simply al-Mutawakkil, suggests the involvement of an Islamic tradition.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 28T, 19V (§216).

<sup>82</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 16 (525T; vol. 2: 76V).

<sup>83</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 39T, 28V.

<sup>84</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 40T, 29V (§229).



## Chapter 22 Ignatius III of Melitene (d. 1094)

### 22.1 Introduction

Ignatius was the son of the sister of patriarch Athanasius VII Hoyo and a monk of the convent of Mar Aaron in Singar.<sup>1</sup> Just before the start of a Roman attempt for the reunification of the churches during the reign of Constantine X Ducas (1059-67), probably in AD 1062, he was appointed metropolitan in Melitene after the death of his predecessor John. After the death of patriarch Athanasius on the road to Constantinople, Ignatius was taken to Constantinople before the Chalcedonian patriarch and ordered to attempt a reconciliation. When these talks failed, he was imprisoned on Mount Gaius in Macedonia.<sup>2</sup> After three years, the emperor died and Ignatius was released along with the other prisoners by decree of the empress Eudocia. Michael says that Ignatius died in October AG 1406/AD 1094.<sup>3</sup>

According to Michael, Ignatius was well-versed in Greek and applied this knowledge to the translation of Greek works. This would make sense, because in Ignatius' day,

---

<sup>1</sup> For all the following details on Ign. Mel.'s life, see Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 1 (575T; vol. 3: 164V); XV 2 (576-7T; vol 3: 167-8V). On which, see van Ginkel 2010, 114-8.

<sup>2</sup> Patriarch John VIII Bar 'Abdun, Athanasius' predecessor, was sent to the same monastery for four years, see Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 7 (565T; vol. 3: 147V).

<sup>3</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 7 (586T; vol. 3: 185V). Van Ginkel 2010, 114 mentions another date: AD 1104, for an unknown reason.

Melitene had been in Byzantine hands since AD 934.<sup>4</sup> Among the works attributed to Ignatius is a chronicle, which is now lost. Not much is known about this text. All the information we have on it is provided by Michael.

Like Dionysius',<sup>5</sup> Ignatius' preface is identified as a 'proemium' (ܩܘܡܝܘܡܐ), using the Greek term.<sup>6</sup> In this preface Ignatius identifies the chronicles of Jacob of Edessa and Dionysius of Tell-Mahre as his main sources and says that the latter's work was the most recent Syriac historical text that he knew. Ignatius boasts that he did not change Jacob's and Dionysius' narrative and supplemented them with material from one or more Greek chronicles.<sup>7</sup> Given that he preserves detailed information on Byzantine imperial affairs of the ninth, tenth and eleventh century, it is theoretically possible that Ignatius used a Maronite or Melkite chronicle, but given his knowledge of Greek, Ignatius is likely to have used a Greek history or chronicle. This would also explain many of the commonalities between Theophanes and the later Syriac chronicle tradition in the source material for the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries.<sup>8</sup>

Ignatius' *Chronicle* was the most recent Syriac chronicle known to Michael who says that it covered the period from Constantine the Great until his own time<sup>9</sup> and that Ignatius' information was usually very brief. This is confirmed by the state of the material that Michael used for his thirteenth and fifteenth book and that the majority of the material that the Anonymous Chronicler used to continue his own post-842 narrative until the end of the eleventh century (though Ignatius' information on troubles in the Church were often quite long).

The Anonymous Chronicler never cites Ignatius and does not even mention his election, but he must have used his *Chronicle*. Of the seven entries for which Michael

---

<sup>4</sup> Vest 2007, 901ff.

<sup>5</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 357V).

<sup>6</sup> Thus, this does not necessarily point to a Greek focus, van Ginkel 2010, 114-8.

<sup>7</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 1 (546T; vol. 3: 115V).

<sup>8</sup> On this issue, see chapters 18 and 19. See also the similarity in the accounts of the Persian king Shapur's second siege of Nisibis in Theophan. Chron. AM 5838 (ed. 38.9-11; trans. 63) and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.3-7T.

<sup>9</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 1 (121T; vol. 1: 241V); XIII 1 (544T; vol. 3: 112V); XIII 1 (546T; vol. 3: 115V) [= Ign.'s preface].

cites Ignatius, one is attested in Chron. 1234: like Michael, the Anonymous Chronicler claims that a rain, that was sent by God, spread a disease among the Persians and ended Shapur I's second siege of Nisibis that lasted for 78 days in AD 343.<sup>10</sup> In this context it is worth noting that Chron. 1234's account of the siege, which ultimately goes back to the Antiochene continuation of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, is similar in wording to that of Theophanes, but not Jerome.<sup>11</sup> In addition, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler rely on a common source for information on Byzantine imperial and Syriac Orthodox ecclesiastical matters between 842 and 1077, but Michael may have borrowed material from the same source until 1089 (start of the reign of Alexius I Comnenus) but probably until 1090 (accession of patriarch Athanasius VII, at which Ignatius was present). Since Michael says that Ignatius' work was the only Syriac chronicle after Dionysius' that he had access to and that some of this material is explicitly Byzantine in nature, Ignatius' influence seems probable, but the fact that the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael rely on another common source, presumably Basil of Edessa, for information on the reign of John II Comnenus

Though it is difficult to determine what pre-842 material in Chron. 1234 and Michael's *Chronicle* came from Ignatius, some initial observations that emerge from a comparison of the post-842 narratives in Michael's *Chronicle* and Chron. 1234 may provide an insight into the original contents of Ignatius' work and how his dependants used it.

## 22.2 Ignatius and the Secular Part

Though the starting point of Ignatius' *Chronicle* is known, in which year exactly the work ended is difficult to determine. After the borrowings from Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, the

---

<sup>10</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.3-7T; Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (134-6T; vol. 1: 266V). See Blockley 1989, 475.

<sup>11</sup> See chapter 8.5.

Anonymous Chronicler's focus on the Roman imperial succession continues from the start of the reign of Michael III until the start of the reign of Michael VII Ducas and the death of Romanus IV Diogenes in 1071. The Anonymous Chronicler copied the imperial succession and Ignatius' positive or negative verdicts on certain emperors, but sometimes abbreviated longer narratives on Roman affairs.<sup>12</sup> After the entry on Romanus' death, the Secular Part reveals a temporary disinterest in the Roman imperial succession: the brief entries on the imperial succession in Chron. 1234 end and the Anonymous Chronicler's focus shifts to the struggles between the Turks and the Crusaders ('Franks'), especially in and around Edessa, suggesting perhaps the Anonymous Chronicler's use of Basil of Edessa's writings. In the context of these struggles, Alexius I Comnenus is briefly mentioned (by name and as "emperor of the Romans"), but only in passing.<sup>13</sup>

The reason why the Anonymous Chronicler included barely any information on the Byzantine empire between the death of Romanus Diogenes (1071) and the beginning of the reign of John II Comnenus (1118) cannot be determined. He says that "God abandoned the empire of the Romans,"<sup>14</sup> during the reign of Romanus, but this opinion may go back to a source that was also used by Michael, who continues (in chapters four, five and six of book fifteen) with more information on the Byzantine empire which may also have come from Ignatius. Michael not only gives a negative verdict on Michael VII's defensive behaviour towards the Turkish invaders, especially in Pontus, his *Chronicle* also preserves a lengthy account of Nicephorus III Votaniates' rebellion against Michael VII in AG 1397/AD 1084 and the rebellion of Alexius I Comnenus and his accession in AG 1400/AD 1089 (chapter 5). In chapter 6, he records the oppression of the Roman empire "from all sides," a Frankish attack on Constantinople (i.e. the arrival of the Crusaders), and an earthquake in Constantinople in AG 1396/AD 1084-5 (chapter 6).<sup>15</sup> Furthermore,

---

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Leo VI the Wise (886-912) and his four wives: comp. Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 2 (548-9T; vol. 3: 117-8V) with Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 40T, 28V.

<sup>13</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 54-5T, 39-41V.

<sup>14</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 47T, 35V.

<sup>15</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 4-6 (579-585T; vol. 3: 172-80V).

Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler also quarried a common source, most likely Basil of Edessa,<sup>16</sup> for information on the reign of John II Comnenus (1118-43), intrigues at the Constantinopolitan court, and Roman-Hungarian relations, which the Anonymous Chronicler has preserved more fully than Michael.<sup>17</sup> Since it is possible that some of the material on matters of the Byzantine empire before John II also goes back to Basil of Edessa rather than Ignatius, this may also be the case for other information. Unfortunately, except when there is a clear focus on Edessa or Melitene, it is virtually impossible to ascertain the source.<sup>18</sup>

One criterion to distinguish material from Ignatius and Basil is the former's lack of interest in the empire of the Arabs. Michael notes this aspect of Ignatius' work and says that he had to supplement this information from other (Arabic) sources.<sup>19</sup> That Ignatius was not interested in the caliphal succession is confirmed by the fact that Chron. 1234's description of the period from 842 until the invasion of the Turks does not mention any Arab caliph, except for Ja'far al-Mutawakkil (847-61), al-Mutasim's successor.<sup>20</sup> It is possible, however, that the Anonymous Chronicler himself was not interested in the caliphal succession any more either: he emphasises that al-Mutawakkil became a puppet of the Turks when he sued for peace with them,<sup>21</sup> and that for this reason the Arab

---

<sup>16</sup> Basil of Edessa mentioned John II Comnenus and diplomatic relations between the Romans and other nations, see a fragment from Basil on Roman-Pečeneg [Basil calls them Cumans] struggles during John's reign: Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 12 (600-1T; vol. 3: 207V).

<sup>17</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 84-5T, 63-4V (§283-4). Cf. Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 12 (598-9T; vol. 3: 204V); XVI 2 (609T; vol. 3: 224V).

<sup>18</sup> E.g. the details on the Byzantine recapture of Edessa in 1031-2, see the chapter on Bas. Ed. in this volume.

<sup>19</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 1 (544-5T; vol. 3: 112V).

<sup>20</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 40T, 28-9V. Michael, however, continues the caliphal succession after Dion. TM's mention of al-Wathiq (842-847), with references to all caliphs from al-Mutawakkil (847-61) until al-Qadir (991-1031), who was caliph at the time of the Turkish invasion. He may have used an Arabic work to which the Anonymous Chronicler did not have access and which also provided him with the Roman imperial succession that he used to complete or check Ign. Mel. (Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 2 (548T; vol. 3: 117V).

<sup>21</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 40T, 29V and 39T, 28V.

kingdom weakened and was later overrun by the Seljuqs.<sup>22</sup> He also (incorrectly) adds that from that point onwards the Arab rulers called themselves caliphs “successors of the Prophet,” to distinguish them from the Turkish rulers who called themselves sultans and had real power.<sup>23</sup>

Not surprisingly, Melitene seems to have taken up an important place in Ignatius’ *Chronicle*.<sup>24</sup> All that the Anonymous Chronicler says about Romanus I Lecapenus (919-59) is that he retook Melitene, but Michael’s chapter on Romanus’ reign contains a detailed account of the recapture of Melitene by the Roman general Cyriacus.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, Michael and Chron. 1234 preserve similar details about the Turkish destruction of Melitene, which Michael dates to AD 1369/AD 1058: that Tughril-Beg sent 3,000 forces and that Melitene did not have a city wall (according to Michael, because Cyriacus had destroyed it).<sup>26</sup> In this case Michael’s account is again much longer than Chron. 1234’s. It seems that Michael used material from additional sources including an Islamic Arabic source,<sup>27</sup> and possibly three treatises of a monk called Joseph and a four-book poem of lamentation, written by patriarch John IX, to enrich Ignatius’ description of Melitene’s downfall, but the Anonymous Chronicler probably also paraphrased the account which Michael preserves in a more complete version.

Again, however, Michael’s and the Anonymous Chronicler’s knowledge of Melitene’s history continues well into the twelfth century: both chroniclers record the deception of Philaretus Brachiamos (an Armenian who ruled over several Cilician cities including Melitene and Edessa) by Alp Arslan, Gabriel’s dealings with al-Firij and Turkish control

---

<sup>22</sup> Instead of Tughril-Beg, Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 45T, 33V and 47T, 35V identifies “Sulayman Ibn Seljuq” as the leader of the first Seljuq invasion, dated to AG 1356/AD 1045, probably because he was already thinking of Sulayman-Shah, the son of Tughril Beg’s cousin Qutlumush and the later Seljuq sultan of Anatolia (1077-86). Sulayman-Shah is also incorrectly connected with the battle of Manzikert in 1071 (Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 46T, 33-4V), which was fought by Alp Arslan, Tughril-Beg’s nephew and successor.

<sup>23</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 46T, 34V.

<sup>24</sup> Also in case of the ecclesiastical material, see below.

<sup>25</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 40T, 29V and Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 3 (551-4T; vol. 3: 121-3V).

<sup>26</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 45-6T, 33V; Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 1 (572-3T; vol. 3: 158-9V).

<sup>27</sup> The account is preceded by an introduction with a date of the Islamic era: year 430 of the Arabs.

over the city, though Gabriel remained governor;<sup>28</sup> the capture of Bohemond of Antioch by Gümüshtegin Ibn Danishmend (d. 1104) and the Danishmendid siege and capture of Melitene in 1101 or 1102;<sup>29</sup> the crimes of the city's governor Gabriel who is said to have killed eight prominent Christian inhabitants of the city as well as Ignatius' successor John Sa'id bar Sabuni;<sup>30</sup> Michael also mentions Gümüshtegin's appointment<sup>31</sup> of an Armenian called Vasilag (Basil) as governor after his capture of Melitene; and Qilij Arslan's capture of Melitene from the Danishmendid emir Muhammad Ibn Gümüshtegin (d. 1134) on 2 September AG 1417/AD 1105.<sup>32</sup> All of these events are mentioned by Michael in chapters that follow the seventh chapter of book XV, in which he discussed the death of Ignatius as the first ecclesiastical event. It is therefore extremely unlikely that any of this material came from Ignatius. Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler must therefore be dependent on a common source, or at least on sources other than Ignatius for the information on the history of Melitene after 1094.

To sum up: as far as secular history is concerned, Ignatius' *Chronicle* covered the Roman imperial succession from Constantine the Great probably until Alexius I Comnenus. This work did not discuss the succession of the Arab caliphs nor Turkish sultans, but the history of Melitene, his see, was clearly his main focus, politically as well as ecclesiastically speaking. Perhaps Ignatius attempted to emphasise Melitene's place in the renewed Byzantine territory in Northern Syria and Cilicia.

---

<sup>28</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 49T, 36V, whose account is rather different from Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 6 (584-5T; vol. 3: 179V though probably ultimately based on the same source.

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 61-3T, 45-6V (§252 and 255); Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 8 (589-90T; vol. 3: 188-9V). According to the latter, this occurred on Wednesday 18 September AG 1413, which is AD 1101, but as Chabot 1905, 188 notes 18 September was a Wednesday only in AD 1102.

<sup>30</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 63-4T, 47V. Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 6 (583-4T; vol. 3: 180V) dates the murder of these Christians to 28 May of AG 1408/AD 1096 and identifies these inhabitants as Barsaumo, son of Dairaita, and his two sons; George of Hatna and his two sons, Basil of Hawa and his son, 'Abdallah of 'Arqaya and Sahda, deacon of Tantini. Mich. Syr. adds that Gabriel took and looted their houses, and the house of Abu Mansur, son of Malka, destroyed other houses and rebuilt the citadel and the city wall.

<sup>31</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 8 (590T; vol. 3: 188V).

<sup>32</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 9 (591T; vol. 3: 192V).

Given that we know that the Anonymous Chronicler relied on Ignatius for a detail regarding a Persian siege of Nisibis during the reign of Constantius II, and for the succession of the Roman emperors from Michael III (842-67) until Michael VII, it stands to reason that at least some of the material that the Anonymous Chronicler used to describe secular history between 313 and 842 originated from Ignatius as well. It may be possible to measure Ignatius' influence on Chron. 1234 and identify some of his sources.

Ignatius definitely discussed the second Persian siege of Nisibis, most likely on the basis of the Antiochene continuation of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, but through which intermediary is still uncertain.<sup>33</sup> To this entry, he added a reference to a rain that was sent by God to deliver the inhabitants of Nisibis.<sup>34</sup> Since the influence of the Antiochene continuation is only attested in Chron. 1234 on three other occasions, these may also have come from Ignatius. One of these concerns the first siege of Nisibis, which both Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler erroneously place before the death of Constantine the Great rather than during the reign of Constantius II, suggesting that they used a common source.<sup>35</sup> Unfortunately however, we know that John of Ephesus also used the Antiochene continuation of Eusebius, so either John or Ignatius may have been involved in the transmission of this material.

This conclusion may in fact also be applicable to some of the material from Malalas, Socrates and Theodoret (and Sozomen?) in Chron. 1234. The short entries from Malalas' chronicle that John used and that are preserved in Michael's *Chronicle* and in Chron. 1234 would have been perfect material for Ignatius to use. Similarly, the Anonymous Chronicler's description of the end of Constantine I's reign (§27) is a combination of entries from the Antiochene continuation of Eusebius' *Chronicle* (including that of the first siege of Nisibis, but also the length of Constantine's reign) and paraphrases of and extracts from Socrates. Though the Anonymous Chronicler also sometimes paraphrased

---

<sup>33</sup> Burgess 1999, 121 (§43), 160, 272. Cf. Eus. Chron. Lat. 2.236<sup>h</sup> and Theophan. Chron. AM 5838 (ed. 38.9-11; trans. 63). See chapter 8.

<sup>34</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 155.3-7T. In Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 4 (134-6T; vol. 1: 266V) this information follows an account from Theod. Cyr. HE II 30 which is in fact an account of the third siege.

<sup>35</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. VII 3 (132T; vol. 1: 259-60V); Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 153.23-8T.

Socrates himself, some of these paraphrases (on the children of Constantine; the proclamation of his sons as Caesars; his becoming ill, baptism in Nicomedia and his appointment of his sons as heirs; his death and burial) were passed on to him via an intermediary to whom Michael had access as well.<sup>36</sup> We know that for the First and Second Part of his *Ecclesiastical History* John used and paraphrased Theodoret, so it is not a big leap to suppose that he used Socrates as well. In turn, Ignatius may also have used John, but in his preface he only refers to “John of Asia” as one of his predecessors, not as one of his sources. In addition, Ignatius’ incorrect reference to Sozomen as ‘Zosimus’, as in Dionysius’ preface, suggests that he simply copied these names from Dionysius.<sup>37</sup>

Recently, van Ginkel suggested that Ignatius may have been the source for Michael’s and Chron. 1234’s version of the speech that Justin II gave at the inauguration of Tiberius II Constantine in 574, which, as we have seen, is a fusion of material from the Third Part of the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus and from a Greek source, possibly the *History* of Theophylact Simocatta (630s), one of its sources or dependants.<sup>38</sup> If van Ginkel’s suspicions are correct, Ignatius’ use of John would have wider repercussions for the study of Michael’s and the Anonymous Chronicler’s sources. Some of the materials previously attributed to John, such as those originating from Malalas, may have been passed on Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler via Ignatius. Unfortunately, since it has also proven difficult to determine what in Michael’s *Chronicle* and Chron. 1234 came from John, we are left in the dark as to Ignatius’ involvement as well.

Nevertheless, the Anonymous Chronicler’s use of Ignatius could explain the appearance of other information on the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries in Chron. 1234. For instance, we have seen that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler may be reliant on a Syriac intermediary for material that was taken from PZ, or at least for an entry on

---

<sup>36</sup> See my chapter on Socrates.

<sup>37</sup> Comp. Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 358V) [Dion. TM] with Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 1 (545T; vol.: 3: 114V).

<sup>38</sup> This theory was first proposed by van Ginkel 2010, 116-7.

a Persian siege of Edessa that was integrated into material taken from PZ.<sup>39</sup> More importantly, however, Michael's suggestion that Ignatius used Greek sources could connect the latter to the issue of SSEA and GSEA, and the appearance of a large number of fragments of Philostorgius, the *Epitome* and other sources in the *Chronographia* of Theophanes and the later Syriac chronicle tradition.

I have shown that an unidentified Greek historian (GSEA), writing between the early seventh and the turn of the ninth century fused material from Socrates, Philostorgius, the *Epitome* with information from other sources. In turn, this Greek history was used by Theophanes and by SSEA, a Syriac historian on whom Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler are dependant.<sup>40</sup>

Given the fact that there is no apparent trace of Ignatius' discussion of the imperial succession from Julian (361-3) until Michael VII (842-67), and that he says that he used Greek sources, it seems plausible that Ignatius may have been SSEA. Typical for Michael's *Chronicle* and Chron. 1234 are the social and geographical backgrounds, and positive or negative descriptions of late ancient Roman emperors; and the fragments of Philostorgius and the *Epitome* provide information on births and baptisms of emperors, their geographical, political and social backgrounds, accessions and proclamations, and deaths: the perfect contents of a chronicle that focused on the Roman imperial succession.

At the same time, however, the speech of Justin II is a longer narrative, which seems to contrast with what we know of the nature of Ignatius' *Chronicle*, containing very brief entries. Secondly, Ignatius is said to have mostly focussed on ecclesiastical matters relating to the Syriac Orthodox church, whereas Michael also preserves information from the *Epitome* that pertains to the succession of the patriarchs of Constantinople (e.g. Constantius II's deposition of Macedonius and appointment of Eudoxius). Thirdly, this theory would have required Ignatius, an eleventh-century Syriac historian, to have had access to a relatively early Greek chronicle, which seems somewhat unlikely. In the

---

<sup>39</sup> See chapter 14.

<sup>40</sup> Unless Theophan.'s source was a Syriac historian (in translation), in which case we should presume the involvement of Theoph. Ed., which seems unlikely.

end, the matter cannot be resolved here; we cannot be certain about the extent of Ignatius' involvement in the Anonymous Chronicler's presentation of secular history for the period between 313 and 842. I leave these questions unanswered in the hope that future research provides new insight into Ignatius' sources.

## 22.3 Ignatius and the Ecclesiastical Part

Michael reveals that Ignatius focused on the pontiffs of the Syriac Orthodox church not those of other churches, except when necessary.<sup>41</sup> This is confirmed by the sources. From the death of Dionysius in 842 (§150) until the election of Iwannis in the late eleventh century, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler rely on a common source that listed the succession of Syriac Orthodox patriarchs, with their birth and adopted names, the dates and place of their ordination, the length of their pontificate, the date of their death, the place where they were buried and the number of bishops they consecrated.

The exact end of Ignatius' Chronicle is also difficult to determine on the basis of the ecclesiastical material in the works of his dependants. Chron. 1234's ecclesiastical narrative breaks off in the middle of an account of the pontificate of patriarch Iwannis who was elected in 1077. The lacuna ends in the middle of an account of the disagreements between Athanasius VII (1090-1129) and Athanasius Barishay, the metropolitan of Edessa.<sup>42</sup> Ignatius is a possible source, but this material could also have come from Basil of Edessa. In the last chapter before mention of Ignatius' death, Michael still reports on the election and accession of Athanasius VII Abu 'l-Faraj in 1090, which he says took place in Melitene and in the presence of Ignatius, and the patriarch's imprisonment (and release after ransom) by Gabriel, the governor of Melitene.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 1 (544-5T; vol. 3: 112V).

<sup>42</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 294T, 221V.

<sup>43</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 6 (584-5T; vol. 3: 181V). He further records the foundation of the monastery of Pesqin, but this was probably taken from other sources, because the Anonymous Chronicler never includes

For the period between 842 and the 1090s Ignatius not only provided the succession of the patriarchs, but also information about internal troubles in the Syriac Orthodox church (e.g. the case of ʿAbdun) and Chalcedonian persecutions of the (Syriac) Orthodox (also references to the Armenians).

In his *Chronicle* Michael provides the succession of the metropolitans of Melitene from Thomas (consecrated in AG 1180/AD 869) and Ezechiel (consecrated in AG 1200/AD 889) until his own time,<sup>44</sup> and several details about ecclesiastical matters of Melitene.<sup>45</sup> This information almost certainly goes back to Ignatius. Virtually nothing of this information has made it into Chron. 1234; the Anonymous Chronicler's attention was focused on Edessa rather than Melitene, suggesting that Edessa may have been his city of birth or residence.

It is difficult to determine if Ignatius also influenced Chron. 1234's narrative from Constantine the Great until the time when Dionysius of Tell-Mahre was writing, not in the least because of the lacunas in the Ecclesiastical Part of Chron. 1234. It's pre-842 narrative only shows the influence of Dionysius and John of Ephesus. Michael does not start providing the succession of metropolitans of Melitene until the year 869, so he is unlikely that he used Ignatius for ecclesiastical matters at any point before 842. Perhaps the same conclusion is valid for the Anonymous Chronicler who may have preferred using a more narrative text like the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus or Dionysius' *Chronicle*. However, it is worth noting that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler describes the pontificates and backgrounds of the ninth-, tenth- and eleventh-century Syriac Orthodox patriarchs in a similar way as the seventh-century patriarchs John III, Theodore and Severus (§63-5). The question remains, however, if the Anonymous Chronicler copied this information from Ignatius, who may have paraphrased Dionysius,

---

foundation accounts of monasteries comp. the case of the monasteries of Sergisyeh and Bar Gagai, written by a certain Lazarus in AG 1024. (Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 3 (551-4T; vol. 3: 124-7V).

<sup>44</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 2 (548T; vol. 3: 119) until Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 1 (575T; vol. 3: 164V). Michael continues this list until his own time. His source is unknown.

<sup>45</sup> E.g. troubles between the Chalcedonians and the Syriac Orthodox after the election of Athanasius VI: Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 7 (565-6T; vol. 3: 147V).

or directly from Dionysius, whose method of writing was later mimicked by Ignatius and applied to the later patriarchal succession.

## 22.4 Conclusion

Ignatius' *Chronicle* covered the period from the early years of Constantine the Great until the early years of Alexius I Comnenus. Ignatius mostly focused on the history of the Roman empire and matters of the Syriac Orthodox Church, including the succession of the Syriac patriarchs of Antioch and the metropolitans of Melitene. In addition he wrote down his own experiences such as his ordination as metropolitan of Melitene.

Ignatius' sources include an unknown (Greek?) dependant of the Antiochene continuation of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, the *History* of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, and other unknown sources, possibly an unidentified late ancient Greek historian whose work, which was also used by Theophanes, contained fragments of Philostorgius, *Epitome* and other sources.

The Anonymous Chronicler accessed Ignatius' *Chronicle* independently from Michael. Ignatius' impact on Chron. 1234 for the period between 842 and the 1080s is virtually certain, though it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the influence of Ignatius and that of Basil of Edessa. The extent of the Anonymous Chronicler's use of Ignatius for secular events in the period between 313 and 842 remains equally unclear: only one brief passage in Chron. 1234 may be attributed to Ignatius with certainty. As stated before, I suspect the commonalities between Theophanes and the later Syriac chronicle tradition are due to Ignatius and his unknown Greek source, but future research will hopefully shed further light on the position of Ignatius among the Syriac Orthodox historiographers of the Syriac Renaissance.



## Chapter 23 Basil of Edessa (d. 1169)

### 23.1 Introduction

Abu l-Faraj bar Shumono, was the son of Theodore and the brother of Michael, the administrator of Edessa under Joscelin II. He was ordained metropolitan of Kaisum in 1129, taking the name of Basil, and later transferred to Edessa. He held the position of metropolitan of Edessa until his death in 1169. He is best known for being a direct witness to Zangi's capture of his see in 1144 and its destruction in 1146. Having escaped from Edessa to Samosata after the destruction of the former, Basil was captured by Joscelin and imprisoned at Hromkla (Qala'at Romaita/Qala'at ar-Rum) for three years, and presumably released after the capture of Joscelin by the Turcoman forces of Nur ad-Din in May 1150. During his captivity he "wrote his *memrē* on this history of (these) events." After his release, Basil went to Antioch and Jerusalem to collect money to pay the ransom of several Edessan captives. Eventually he was given authority over the diocese of Sibaberek, which had been dependent on Edessa.<sup>1</sup>

None of Basil's writings have survived, but fragments are preserved in the *Chronicle* of Michael, Chron. 1234, and in an unedited and unstudied manuscript (without shelf

---

<sup>1</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 6 (637-8T; vol. 3: 277V). For Basil's flight to Samosata, see also Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 147T, 110V (§432).

number), containing extracts from chronicles, that is currently being kept in the monastery of Mor Gabriel in Midyat.<sup>2</sup>

The nature of Basil's work remains uncertain. The Anonymous Chronicler cites Basil on two occasions, in the Secular as well as the Ecclesiastical Part, calling Basil's work a ܟܬܒܐ, 'book' and ܟܬܒܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, 'description' and adding that he abbreviated Basil's narrative, shortening his lengthy negative descriptions of various people, though at the same time staying true to his source.<sup>3</sup> Michael<sup>4</sup> uses the term ܟܬܒܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ to describe Basil's work as well, though he also mentions three memrē "in the meter of Mor Jacob" that Basil wrote in response to Zangi's capture of Edessa.<sup>5</sup> ܟܬܒܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ could be short for ܟܬܒܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ, "chronicle" or "chronography," but in this case probably has "the broad meaning of text."<sup>6</sup>

Michael's Book XVII 7, which offers an overview of the contents of Basil's work, indicates that it covered the history of Edessa from its foundation by Nimrod over the Abgarid dynasty and Roman (republican and imperial, pagan and Christian), Arab, Turkish, Byzantine and later Frankish rule until its destruction in AG 1458/AD 1146.<sup>7</sup> That this work was a local history<sup>8</sup> of Edessa, ending with Zangi's capture of Edessa in 1144 and its later destruction in 1146, seems to be confirmed by the fact that Michael anachronistically inserted his overview of Basil's work after two chapters on the destruction of Edessa in 1146 and its consequences (Book XVII 5-6) as well as the Anonymous Chronicler remarks<sup>9</sup> which indicate that Basil was his source for

---

<sup>2</sup> Some information on this manuscript can be found in the searchable database of the Hill Museum and Manuscripts Library at <http://news2.arcasearch.com/hmmlsearch/>.

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 131T, 99V; 309T, 231V.

<sup>4</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 7 (639T; vol. 3: 278V).

<sup>5</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVI 3 (633T; vol. 3: 267V).

<sup>6</sup> See Witakowski 1987, 149. The same term is used by Chron. Zuqn., vol. 1, 160.1T, 120.2V and Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 160.15-7T, to denote Socr. HE (see the chapter on the Anonymous Chronicler's use of this author in this volume).

<sup>7</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 7 (639-40T; vol. 3: 278-81V).

<sup>8</sup> Van Ginkel 2010, 118.

<sup>9</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 131T, 99V.

information regarding the consequences of Zangi's capture of Edessa in 1144 and Edessan ecclesiastical matters of that period, specifically the case of a certain Barsaumo of Isma'îl, archpriest of Edessa.<sup>10</sup>

Although the temporal scope of Basil's work is more or less confined between the foundation of Edessa by Nimrod and its destruction in 1146 (or perhaps the date of the capture of Joscelin II of Edessa in 1150 or his death in 1159, see below), the geographical scope may have been broader. Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler are dependent on a common source for information on twelfth-century Byzantine history, specifically the reign of John Comnenus (1118-43) and diplomatic relations between the Romans and Turkic peoples, as well as the geo-political and social implications of the arrival of the Crusaders in Syria, Mesopotamia, Palestine and Cilicia, which directly impacted the political situation of the Edessans from 1098 onwards. Furthermore, commonalities between Michael's *Chronicle* and Chron. 1234 continue until the 1180s and 1190s, suggesting their use of another common source after, and perhaps in conjunction with, Basil.<sup>11</sup>

## 23.2 Basil and the Secular Part

Before going into more detail about Basil's narrative on the eleventh and twelfth centuries, let us first briefly investigate the extent of Basil's influence on Chron. 1234's description of the time before the Crusades. From Michael's remarks we know that Basil's work started with the foundation of Edessa by Nimrod. The Anonymous Chronicler explicitly mentions this event in the Pre-Constantinian Part, but is probably not dependent on Basil for this information: the former records none of the material on the early history of Edessa that Michael attributes to Basil.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 309T, 231V.

<sup>11</sup> On this issue, see the chapter on the unknown twelfth-century historical source.

<sup>12</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 48.17-9T.

In Book XVII Chapter 7 Michael quotes Jacob of Edessa for a passage on the ruination of Edessa in the time of Sennacherib, its reconstruction by Seleucus I Nicator, and the origin of its Greek name. Unless it was Michael himself who introduced the quote from Jacob in his seventh chapter, Basil must have relied on Jacob's *Chronicle*.<sup>13</sup> In the Pre-Constantinian Part of Chron. 1234, the Anonymous Chronicler also pays particular attention to Edessa's foundation by Seleucus – in fact his work preserves a very long description of its contents – and also offers an explanation of the origin of the name 'Edessa'.<sup>14</sup> If Basil used Jacob, as Michael's testimony suggests, this material in Chron. 1234 cannot have come from the former, because the Anonymous Chronicler's explanation is completely different from Jacob's: whereas Jacob correctly says that Edessa was named after a city in Macedonia, the Anonymous Chronicler claims that Edessa was named after Seleucus' oldest daughter.<sup>15</sup>

The contents of the Pre-Constantinian Part of Chron. 1234 suggests the author's access to an entire dossier on the pre- and early Christian history of Edessa as well as his interest in the history of the city. It is possible but unlikely that some of the Anonymous Chronicler's information on Edessa in the Pre-Christian Part of Chron. 1234 came from Basil, because of the conflicting opinion in at least one case. More likely the Anonymous Chronicler only started using Basil for the history of the tenth or eleventh century onwards. As far as the pre-842 narrative in the Secular Part of Chron. 1234 is concerned, the Anonymous Chronicler probably relies on Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, a native of Edessa, for his information on this city. In theory, Basil could also have used Dionysius. If so, it would be nearly impossible to distinguish between the two,<sup>16</sup> but it seems

---

<sup>13</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 7 (639T; vol 3: 278V).

<sup>14</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 107.2-4T.

<sup>15</sup> Several others of Seleucus' foundations were indeed named after his sons (Antioch) and daughters (Apamea, Laodicea). A similar error is in fact also committed on account of his foundation of Aleppo, also called Beroea, which was in fact also named after a Macedonian city.

<sup>16</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 7 (640T; vol. 3: 279V) mentions the reconstruction of the city wall of Edessa by Abu Shaykh Genwoyo (ܓܢܘܝܘܟܐ) [same spelling in Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 9T, 6V], but when using Basil for the same event, Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 7 (494T; vol. 3: 27V) calls him Abu Shaykh Gundoyo (ܓܘܢܕܘܝܘܟܐ).

unlikely that the Anonymous Chronicler would turn to Basil for information which he could have found in an earlier source to which he also had access.

After Dionysius, Basil's influence on Chron. 1234 (and Michael) emerges much more clearly. The Anonymous Chronicler's focus on Edessan history returns during the reign of Romanus III Argyrus (1028-34). Among the little information that the Anonymous Chronicler provides about this emperor's reign is a lengthy account of events that took place in Edessa in 1031-2: the failed negotiations between Salman, the Muslim governor of Edessa, and George Maniaces, the Roman *catepan* of Samosata, the pillaging of the city by its Muslim inhabitants and their assault on the Church of Saint Sophia, in which the Syriac Orthodox Edessans had fortified themselves, the Roman retaking of the city and the governorship of the Armenian patrician Abu K<sup>c</sup>ab.<sup>17</sup> The testimony of Michael shows that Basil discussed this episode in Edessan history, and such a lengthy and detailed account seems typical for Basil.<sup>18</sup>

Michael's focus on Edessa in fact already returns in the time of Romanus I Lecapenus (919-44), during whose reign Edessa was captured by the Romans and the Mandyliion was transferred to Constantinople.<sup>19</sup> At this point the Anonymous Chronicler only mentions the restoration of Roman authority over Melitene during this emperor's reign, presumably after Ignatius of Melitene, who must have been also used by Michael for this information.<sup>20</sup> It is astounding that the Anonymous Chronicler does not refer to such an important episode in the history of Edessa, but easily explained by the fact that Chron. 1234 in fact records another tradition. According to the Anonymous Chronicler the Mandyliion was still present in Edessa, when it was captured by Zangi: it had been stolen from a church in Edessa but due to a miracle – the Mandyliion caught fire by itself – it was dropped in a well in the monastery of Saint Cosmas, which was found to

---

<sup>17</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 42-5T, 30-3V. Comp. Matt. Ed. Chron., vol. 1, §58-9 (trans. 51-5).

<sup>18</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 7 (640T; vol 3: 280V) seems to preserve a paraphrase that also contains several details that are not attested in Chron. 1234.

<sup>19</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 3 (553T; vol. 3: 123V).

<sup>20</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 40T, 29V. This information is also available in Mich. Syr. Chron. XII 3 (551-2T; vol. 3: 122-3V).

miraculously heal all the sick in the monastery.<sup>21</sup> The claim that Edessa was taken by Zangi in spite of the presence of Mandylion is in itself surprising, traditionally the removal of the Mandylion is seen as a contributing factor to the city's downfall. According to the Anonymous Chronicler, however, Edessa's destruction was due to God's anger over the city whose women married Turkish men after its capture in 1144.<sup>22</sup> The question remains where the Anonymous Chronicler found his information, because Michael's account of the transfer contradicts the Anonymous Chronicler's version of events, so they must have used different sources. I suspect Michael was using Ignatius of Melitene and the Anonymous Chronicler Basil of Edessa. Chron. 1234's account is a much longer narrative, consistent with what we know of Basil's history, and Michael's entry is much shorter, consistent with his emphasis on the briefness of Ignatius' *Chronicle*. Furthermore, the emphasis on a connection between Edessa and Constantinople would be perhaps more fitting for Ignatius' *Chronicle*, who was writing (partially) on the basis of Greek sources and writing to defend the renewed position of Syriac Orthodox Christians among the inhabitants of the (Eastern) Roman empire.

The Anonymous Chronicler describes the implications and consequences of the capture of Edessa by the Turkish general Buzan on Wednesday 3 March AG 1398/AD 1087 at length: a Turkish commander is appointed to the citadel, Thoros, son of Hethum, a Melkite Armenian, is appointed as *curopalates* (ܩܘܪܦܠܝܬܐ) of the city, and a minaret is built near the churches of Saint John (the Baptist) and the Theotokos.<sup>23</sup> Though this long narrative is not preserved by Michael, his references to Buzan's 'reign' over Edessa and Thoros' position as *curopalates* in Edessa in the chapter for which he refers to Basil, suggest that Basil wrote about these events and it is very likely that the material in Chron. 1234 came from him.<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless, if we accept the previous assumption that Ignatius was Michael's source for the account of the removal of the Mandylion from Edessa to Constantinople, we must accept the possibility that (some of) this material

---

<sup>21</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 134-5T, 101V. On this account, see Brock 2004, 53-4.

<sup>22</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 132T, 99V (§421).

<sup>23</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 48-8T, 35-6V (§238).

<sup>24</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 7 (584T; vol. 3: 280V).

may have come from Ignatius, not from Basil. However given that the majority of this information is part of longer narratives, not brief entries as one would expect in the 'brief' chronicle that Michael attributes to Ignatius, this is perhaps unlikely.

Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler also rely on a common source for their accounts of the arrival of Baldwin of Bologne at Edessa in February of 1098.<sup>25</sup> Immediately thereafter Chron. 1234 preserves part<sup>26</sup> of a much longer account of the murder of Thoros by Baldwin, future count Baldwin I of Edessa, who conspired with the inhabitants of the city.<sup>27</sup> Again, Michael only briefly refers to these events, but Basil was probably their common source.<sup>28</sup>

Clearly, Michael has thoroughly abbreviated Basil. Therefore, it is difficult to determine what in Chron. 1234 (and in Michael's *Chronicle*) came from the latter. The Anonymous Chronicler also records a failed siege of Edessa by Maudud, the atabeg of Mosul, in the spring of AD 1110 (in fact incorrectly AG 1417/AD 1105-7) the rescue of Edessa by the arrival of the Franks, and a second siege of Maudud in AD 1112 (§267-70).<sup>29</sup> Michael also briefly mentions Maudud's failed siege (with the correct date AG 1421/AD 1110-1) and the arrival of the Franks.<sup>30</sup> Despite the difference in date, it may be that Michael is using the same source as the Anonymous Chronicler, but has abbreviated it significantly. There is the verbal agreement that "Maudud besieged Edessa," but this is too general an expression from which to draw any definitive conclusions. Perhaps the Midyat manuscript, to which I did not have access, will allow us further determine the contents and scope of Basil's work.

The Anonymous Chronicler's focus on Edessa continues until its capture by Zengi in 1144 and its destruction in 1146. This is not the place to discuss this material in detail,

---

<sup>25</sup> Verbal agreements between Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 2 (587T; vol. 3: 183-4V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 56T, 41V (§245). See also Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 7 (584T; vol. 3: 280V) [Thoros delivers Edessa to the Franks and they reign there].

<sup>26</sup> Two folios were missing from the manuscript at the time of edition.

<sup>27</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 56-7T, 41-2V (§246).

<sup>28</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 8 (588-9T; vol. 3: 187V) and XVII 8 (640T; vol. 3: 281V).

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 73-7T, 54-7V (§267-70).

<sup>30</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 10 (594T; vol. 3 : 196V).

because of temporal and spatial limitations, but there is a clear interest in the succession of the Frankish rulers of Edessa [Baldwin I, Baldwin II (§254), regency of Richard of Salerno (§263-4), Joscelin I (§276), regency of Galeran of Birta (§278), and Joscelin II (§302)] and Turkish raids and sieges of Edessa and its vicinity [by Kerbogha, the atabeg of Mosul (§248), Jekermish (§259), Maudud, atabeg of Mosul (§267-70); Maudud's successor al-Bursuqi (§274); Gazi, the Artuqid atabeg of Mardin (§279, 282-3) and Gazi's successor Nur ad-Dawla Balaq (§289)].

In between these materials, however, we find information on the history of the Crusades that not only pertains to other Frankish counties, and Syrian, Cilician and Palestinian cities that were dominated by Turkish dynasties and their relations to the Crusader state of Edessa, but also surprisingly detailed accounts about Byzantine affairs, especially the actions of John II Comnenus (1181-43) and his relations with Turks, Hungarians and the Crusaders. The Anonymous Chronicler and Michael know of the circumstances of John's accession and diplomatic relations with the Hungarians, which culminated in his marriage to a Hungarian princess.<sup>31</sup> Though Michael's narrative is never as detailed as the Anonymous Chronicler's, there are verbal agreements which suggest their use of a common source rather than knowledge of the same basic events. The source for the information on Byzantine affairs in this period was probably Basil: not only was he in Constantinople during a Pečeneg attack<sup>32</sup> on the city, his brother Michael was Joscelin's minister and, given that there were regular contacts between John II and Joscelin, Basil could have received first-hand knowledge of some of John's political decisions through his brother.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 84-5T, 63-4V (§283bis-284). Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 12 (598-9T; vol. 3: 204V) [very briefly on the start of John's reign and the plot against him] and XVI 2 (609T; vol. 2: 224V) [submission of the Hungarians].

<sup>32</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 12 (600-1T; vol. 3: 207V): Basil calls them Cumans.

<sup>33</sup> Joscelin and Raymond of Poitiers, count of Antioch, meet John II Comnenus near Tarsus and Antioch [Mich. Syr. Chron. XVI 8 (621T; vol. 3: 2145V); Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 108-9T, 81-2V (§309)]; John Comnenus and Joscelin conquer the fortress of Buza<sup>ca</sup>, between Mabbug and Aleppo, and the former bequeaths it to the latter [Mich. Syr. Chron. XVI 8 (621T; vol. 3: 2145V); Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 112T, 84V (§402)]

The question remains, however, if Basil was also the Anonymous Chronicler's source for information on events that occurred between 1098 and 1144 (or 1146 or 1150) and were not (directly) related to Edessa. Basil must have surely mentioned some of these events, but to which extent is unclear. It may be that this material in fact came from another twelfth-century source, but more research needs to be done on this issue.<sup>34</sup>

For the material surrounding the capture of Edessa and its subsequent destruction Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler seem to be dependent on a common source, if so almost certainly Basil. Though Michael has significantly abbreviated his source material and the Anonymous Chronicler seems to have preserved Basil more fully, they know the same details such as the fact that Zangi's camp was located near the Gate of Hours near the Church of the Confessors and the date of the beginning of the siege on 28 November (Michael has AG 1456; Chron. 1234 has the correct AG 1455/AD 1144).

The material for the period after 1146, however, is a different matter. Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler describe the same events, but usually in very different ways (e.g. Joscelin's capture of the monastery of Mor Barsaumo<sup>35</sup>). Though this observation, together with Michael's testimony, may suggest that Basil's narrative probably ended in 1146, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler may still be dependent on a common source for an account of the taking prisoner<sup>36</sup> of Joscelin by the Turcoman forces of Nur ad-Din in May 1150. It is possible that Basil's work in fact ended with the beginning of Joscelin's captivity, though his death in captivity in 1159 would have been mentioned, because it was probably the reason why Basil was released from captivity. Furthermore, an end of Basil's work in 1150 would also explain why Chron. 1234 provides such little information about the period between 1150 and 1157-8.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> See chapter 24.

<sup>35</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 151-3T, 113-5V (§436). Cf. Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 9 (642-3T; vol. 3: 283-5V).

<sup>36</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 154-5T, 115-6V (§438); Mich. Syr. Chron. XVII 11 (649T; vol. 3: 295V).

<sup>37</sup> There is therefore no necessity for the theory that Chron. 1234 was a continuation of a chronicle of 1150 (Conrad 1992, 325-7; Anthony 2010, 224).

### 23.3 Basil and the Ecclesiastical Part

Finally, let us briefly consider the evidence in the Ecclesiastical Part for the Anonymous Chronicler's reliance on Basil. Unfortunately, there are lacunas of several folios, which means that we are missing the majority of Basil's narrative. In some cases Michael's *Chronicle* is useful, but not always, since he has considerably paraphrased his source material, and may have even used other sources. Furthermore, it must already be pointed out that some of this material may in fact not go back to Basil, but to another source, because Chron. 1234's focus on the ecclesiastical history of Edessa continues well after Basil's death.

After the lacuna, which would have contained material from Ignatius of Melitene as well as from Basil on events that occurred between the election of patriarch Iwannis (in 1086?) and the 1090s, Chron. 1234 continues with the end of an account on the disagreements between patriarch Athanasius and the Edessans, under their metropolitan Athanasius Barsaumo Barishay (d. 1099 or 1100) and his successor Basil Abu Ghalib Sabuni (whom the Edessans elected themselves but who was later excommunicated by Athanasius; §212-4).<sup>38</sup> Brief references to a monastery of women north of Edessa, whose administrator the deacon Abu Salem misbehaved (the contents of the scandal are not exposed), and to Abu Ghalib's interference are not extant in Michael's *Chronicle*, but both Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler mention Basil's unlawful ordination of priests and deacons, suggesting their use of a common source, probably Basil.<sup>39</sup> Not much remains in the Ecclesiastical Part that can be attributed to Basil. Before another lacuna, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler quarried a common source for their accounts of the end of the pontificate of patriarch Athanasius VII, his stay in Amida, his meeting with Joscelin in Tell-Bashir and his death in the

---

<sup>38</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 294-300T, 221-225V. Basil may have also discussed the appointment of Joshua, archimandrite of the monastery of Abhay, as (Athanasius) metropolitan of Edessa, cf. Mich. Syr. Chron. XIII 7 (566T; vol. 3: 148V).

<sup>39</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 300-1T; 225V (§215). Mich. Syr. Chron. XV 11 (595-6T; vol. 200-1V) also mentions Basil's unlawful ordinations.

monastery of Mar Barsaumo on Saturday 8 June AD 1129 (§216);<sup>40</sup> of the election and ordination of Maudiono, the archimandrite of the monastery of Duwayr, as John XI on 17 February AD 1130, and the death of Abu Ghalib (§217-9);<sup>41</sup> troubles between the patriarchate and the maphrianate, and the deposition of John Bar Andreas of Mabbug (§220);<sup>42</sup> the situation of the Edessan Church after the death of Abu Ghalib with the election and five- or seven-year pontificate of Basil, the archdeacon and steward of the Church of Edessa, as Athanasius, metropolitan of Edessa, under the influence of the archpriest Abdun, son of Habib, whose wife was Abdun's/Athanasius' niece, and the priest Sliwa, son of Hatora; the ordination of Abu l-Faraj bar Shumono (= Basil) as metropolitan of Kaisum; the reinstatement of John of Mabbug; and the death of patriarch John (§221).<sup>43</sup> The lacuna occurs in the middle of the account of John's death and burial, and continues until the election of Saba as Armenian counter-catholicos in 1166 in the last year of the catholicosate of Krikor III (1113-1166). The Armenian material is unlikely to have come from Basil, but seems to be an expression of the Anonymous Chronicler's own interests, since this information is not provided by Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler's focus on the succession of the Armenian catholicos continued at least as far as 1206.<sup>44</sup> After the brief excursus on Armenian ecclesiastical history, the Anonymous Chronicler continues with information regarding the arrival of Michael the Great in Antioch and his stay there from 7 May AG 1478/AD 1167 until June AG 1479/AD 1168, as well as a synod in 1169 at the monastery of Mor Barsaumo in which the bishop of Jihan is deposed.<sup>45</sup> There are some verbal agreements in these two entries in Michael's *Chronicle* and Chron. 1234, which suggest the involvement of a common source, but this was probably not Basil, who died shortly thereafter.

---

<sup>40</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVI 3 (611T; vol. 3: 228V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 301-3T, 225-6V.

<sup>41</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVI 4 (611-2T; vol. 3: 231V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 303-4T, 227-8V.

<sup>42</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVI 5-6 (613, 615-6T; vol. 3: 234-6, 238-9V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 304T, 228V.

<sup>43</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVI 6-7 (616, 618T; vol. 3: 239, 243V) and Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 305-6T; 228-9V.

<sup>44</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 345T, 257V (i). The manuscript broke off shortly thereafter.

<sup>45</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 307-8T; 230V (b; c) and Mich. Syr. Chron. XIX 3 (694T; vol. 3: 332V); XIX 4 (694T; vol. 3: 334V).

## 23.4 Conclusion

The Anonymous Chronicler and Michael independently used a historical work, written by Basil of Edessa, which may have been a history of Edessa, but whose scope is likely to have been larger, discussing Edessa's place in the multicultural and multilingual Near East between Crusaders, Romans and Turkish dynasties. Basil's chronicle covered the time between the city's foundation by Nimrod until its destruction in 1146, possibly even the capture of Joscelin by the Turcoman forces of Nur ad-Din in 1150 and/or his death in 1159.

It is difficult to further reconstruct the contents and form of Basil's history on the basis of the current textual evidence. Michael thoroughly abbreviated Basil and it is unclear how true the Anonymous Chronicler stayed to the text. As in the case he may have copied large chunks of Basil's narrative, but also admits to having abbreviated him, especially in those cases when Basil explicitly criticized the actions of certain people (e.g. Barsaumo of Isma'īl).

## Chapter 24 A twelfth-century historical source

As noted in the chapter on Basil of Edessa, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler share much more material for the period between the arrival of the Crusaders and the fall of Edessa in 1144 and its destruction in 1146 than merely the information that Basil provided on the history of Edessa. This material may go back to Basil of Edessa who may have ended his work with the imprisonment of Joscelin II of Edessa in AD 1150 or his release in AD 1159. At the same time, however, these commonalities continue throughout the 1160s, 1170s, 1180s and even the 1190s, indicating that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler used a common source that covered the period after Basil's death. It is therefore not impossible that some of the information on the history of the Crusades from the 1080s until the 1160s that was not relevant for the history of Edessa, came from another twelfth-century source than Basil's writings.

For the 1080s until 1160s, we are left in the dark about the exact identity of their common source, but on the basis of the material that Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler share for the period between the 1160s until the 1190s, we can deduce the characteristics of their shared twelfth-century source. Though in some cases, verbal agreements between Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler may simply be due to the fact that they are describing the same events (sieges of important cities and deaths and accessions of important Turkish and Frankish rulers), there are some agreements that can only be explained by their reliance on a common source. These agreements are not only of a verbal nature: both Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler misdate Baldwin

III of Jerusalem's siege of Ascalon in AD 1159 to AD 1152 (Michael: AG 1463;<sup>1</sup> Chron. 1234: AG 1464<sup>2</sup>) and the death of Nur ad-Din to 15 May AG 1485/AD 1174, instead of 23 May.<sup>3</sup> I suspect that they are sharing a short chronicle or list of rulers and siege accounts with or without dates, on which Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler expanded independently. More research needs to be done on this issue, perhaps from the perspective of Michael's *Chronicle*, but it may be that they are both relying on Doinysius bar Salibi (d. 1171) or Iwannis of Kaisum (d. 1171).

This common source could perhaps also explain why the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael also share two brief entries on ecclesiastical matters: on the arrival of Michael the Great in Antioch and his stay there from 7 May AG 1478/AD 1167 until June AG 1479/AD 1168, and a synod held at the monastery of Mor Barsaumo in AD 1169 during which the bishop of Jihan was deposed.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVIII 1 (656T; vol. 3 : 309V)

<sup>2</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 155-6T, 116-7V (§439).

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 169T, 127V (§450) and Mich. Syr. Chron. XIX 11 (705-6T; vol. 3: 352-3V).

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 307-8T; 230V (b; c) and Mich. Syr. Chron. XIX 3 (694T; vol. 3: 332V); XIX 4 (694T; vol. 3: 334V).

## Chapter 25 Remaining sources

This last chapter brings together various traditions that appear throughout Chron. 1234 and have not been discussed in previous chapters.

### 25.1 A source on the ancient and early Christian past of Edessa

The Anonymous Chronicler was much more interested in and informed about the pre-Christian and early Christian history of Edessa than Michael, undoubtedly through one or two additional sources. Four sets of materials that certainly belong together are:

- (1) a *Notitia Urbis Edessenaë* (with an etymological explanation of the Greek name of the city);<sup>1</sup>
- (2) a fragment from the *Chronicle*<sup>2</sup> of Jacob of Edessa on Abgar bar Ma<sup>c</sup>nu, the first king of Edessa;<sup>3</sup>
- (3) a unique foundation account of Mosul/Assur by king Assurin in AG 329/AD 17-8;<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 107.2-4T.

<sup>2</sup> Jac. Ed. Chron. (281-2T; 211V).

<sup>3</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 119.29-120.8T. Also extant in Mich. Syr. Chron. V 5 (77-8T; vol. 1: 119-20V).

<sup>4</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 120.14-29T.

(4) material on the legend of king Abgar V Ukkama and Christ: their correspondence (based on the version from the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, rather than from the Teaching of Addai<sup>5</sup>), the story of the Mandylion, the towel with the image of Christ's face; the story of the image of Christ, miraculously copied from the towel unto tiles, in a village near Mabbug; an account of the temple that Abgar converted into a church, which was named after him, and the construction works of canals and dams undertaken by the apostles Addai and Aggai, under Abgar's supervision.<sup>6</sup>

There are some indications in (3) and (4) that this dossier was compiled and written in the second half of the twelfth or in the first half of the thirteenth century. The foundation account of Mosul identifies its king Assurin as the mortal enemy of the Edessan king Abgar and says that Mosul "continuously harmed the kingdom of Abgar."<sup>7</sup> A reference to the Assyrians was also added to Christ's response to Abgar which promises Abgar that "the Assyrians will have no power in (Edessa)."<sup>8</sup> It seems to me that these emphasis on the animosity between Edessa and Mosul/Assur are later traditions, developed in response to Edessa's capture and destruction by Zangi, the atabeg of Mosul, in 1144 and 1146. In his *Chronicle*, Michael quotes Dionysius of Amida (d. 1171) who asks "Why has Edessa been struck by the rod of Assyrian anger more than all other lands?"<sup>9</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler, or rather his source, answers this question by implying that the rivalry between Zangi and Joscelin was merely a more recent variant of the historical animosity between Assurin and Abgar, and that Edessa's capture and destruction was the culmination of a thousand-year old struggle between Edessa and Mosul/Assur.

---

<sup>5</sup> Noted by Brock 2004, 51-2. On the Teaching of Addai (or Doctrine of Addai), see Guscini 2008, 144-5.

<sup>6</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 121.9-124.25T.

<sup>7</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 120.28-9T.

<sup>8</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 122.15-6T.

<sup>9</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. XVI 3 (631T; vol. 3: 265V). On which, see Morony 2005, 6.

Chron. 1234 contains one other set of materials that may have come from the same source: in his discussion of the reign of Theodosius II, the Anonymous Chronicler appends a list of its churches and monasteries (5), based on another Edessan chronicle.<sup>10</sup>

## 25.2 Letters

Like several of his colleagues before him (e.g. PZ<sup>11</sup>), the Anonymous Chronicler incorporated several letters into his chronicle. Among historiographical material pertaining to the reign of the emperor Julian, the Anonymous Chronicler introduces two letters<sup>12</sup> that purport to be written by Julian (PG nr. 40;<sup>13</sup> Iulp/Bas 1/40<sup>14</sup>) and Basil of Caesarea (PG nr. 41;<sup>15</sup> Iulp 1/41<sup>16</sup>). They are in fact Late Antique forgeries.<sup>17</sup> Originally composed in Greek, they survive in Syriac translation in a collection of translated letters of Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianze, preserved in an eighth- or ninth-century manuscript (BL Add. 14,549) between translations of works by Gregory of Nazianze and the Confession of Faith of John of Tella.<sup>18</sup>

The Anonymous Chronicler must have had access to such a collection of letters. BL Add. 14,549 and Chron. 1234 are witnesses to the same Syriac translation these two letters.<sup>19</sup> A comparison of the Syriac witnesses with Courtonne's edition of six Greek

---

<sup>10</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 179-82T.

<sup>11</sup> Greatrex et al 2011, 46-7.

<sup>12</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 157.7-160.9T.

<sup>13</sup> Migne 1857, 341C1-344C7

<sup>14</sup> Fedwick 1993-2004, vol. 1, 627-8.

<sup>15</sup> Migne 1857, 344C9-348A8.

<sup>16</sup> Fedwick 1993-2004, vol. 1, 624-6.

<sup>17</sup> Fedwick 1993-2004, vol. 1 catalogues them amongst the spurious letters.

<sup>18</sup> For a description of the manuscript, see Wright 1870-2, vol. 2, 428-31 (nr. DLVI). For catalogues of the Syriac translations of letters by Basil, see Fedwick 1993-2004, vol. 1, 575 and especially Brock 2001, 175-8.

<sup>19</sup> A comparison between the two Syriac witnesses only yields a few minor variants.

manuscripts shows that this Syriac translation was made from a Greek *Vorlage* that contains many of the same variants as those preserved in the Laurentianus Mediceus IV-14 (tenth or eleventh century) and the Parisinus Coislinianus 237 (eleventh century).<sup>20</sup>

The fact that a chronicle preserves these letters is surprising, as they were mostly used for teaching purposes.<sup>21</sup> From the perspective of the Anonymous Chronicler, however, these letters were valuable historical sources. “The letter of the tyrant to the holy Basil” and “the holy one’s response to the tyrant” are introduced as evidence that

“When Julian came to Constantinople, he planned to go down and wage war against the Persians. And when he was ready to come, he sent (a message) to the holy Basil, bishop of Caesarea, demanding a thousand pounds of gold from him.”

The Anonymous Chronicler also contextualises these letters by referring to the fact that when they were young Julian and Basil had studied together in Athens and that, because they knew each other, the former was unwilling to harm the latter, despite Basil’s directness:

“So, this Julian, because he was a man that was educated in doctrines and educated in philosophy, he (had) attended one school together with the holy Basil and the holy Gregory. When they were young men, they were educated in the city of Athens. Because of this freedom (ܠܚܘܬܐ) of speech, they conversed with each other; and due to this, Julian was unwilling to do evil things against them at that time; as he killed and slayed many bishops, many fled and hid themselves.”<sup>22</sup>

In the Ecclesiastical Part, the Anonymous Chronicler also incorporated three letters, written by Michael the Great in the capacity of Syriac Orthodox patriarch. One letter, written in October 1195, concerns the statute of the maphrian in the diocese of Mardin.<sup>23</sup> In the second of which only the first part is preserved Michael defends his

---

<sup>20</sup> *Saint Basile. Lettres*, ed. and trans. Courtonne 1957, vol. 1.

<sup>21</sup> Jonathan Loopstra, personal correspondence, March 2013.

<sup>22</sup> Chron. 1234, I, 156.22-157.6T.

<sup>23</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 331-3T, 247-8V (p).

ordination of his nephew Jacob as maphrian Gregory.<sup>24</sup> The third letter which is also only partially preserved is addressed to Theodore bar Wahbun, Michael's secretary and the later (counter-)patriarch, and offers him advice for his journey to Constantinople for the unification talks with the Greek patriarch.<sup>25</sup>

## 25.3 A historical-geographical compendium

Like Michael, the Anonymous Chronicler used some kind of geographical compendium. Chron. 1234 preserves a description of Rome, i.e. a catalogue of buildings, that is similar to but not the same as that preserved in PZ X 16.<sup>26</sup> In addition, the Anonymous Chronicler has copied a brief discussion of the measurements of the cities of the empire from an unknown Syrian source, which is presented as a letter written by the emperor Antoninus (Pius?) to the Antiochenes.<sup>27</sup> In this letter, it is said that Antioch was the sixth greatest city in the Roman empire, after Rome, Alexandria, Carthage, Ephesus and Nicomedia. In this context it is worth noting that Michael preserves similar material, but attributes it not to an imperial letter, but to an inscription on a column in Antioch.<sup>28</sup>

In the same place, the Anonymous Chronicler also adds a list of seven world wonders, among which the temple in Knossos (written as Colossus,  $\kappa\omicron\lambda\omicron\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ ) and the temple of Cyzicus, which may have come from the same source.<sup>29</sup> Worth noting is the description of the Pharos in Alexandria as a watch-tower with a mirror and built on four glass crabs. This tradition was known in Arabic, by al-Mas'udi<sup>30</sup> and Agapius,<sup>31</sup> but the latter

---

<sup>24</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 333-5T, 249-50V (s).

<sup>25</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 312-4T, 233-4V (g). On Theodore, see Kaufhold 2011.

<sup>26</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 110.16-111.6T.

<sup>27</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 111.16-112.3T.

<sup>28</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. V 3 (72T; vol. 1: 113V); V 4 (73T; vol. 1: 115V), which also preserves a *Notitia Urbis Alexandrinae*.

<sup>29</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 112.4-20T.

<sup>30</sup> Mas'udi, Prairies, vol. 2, p. 431-6.

amazingly refers to the English scholar Bede the Venerable as a source for this information. Even more curious is the fact that this detail is in fact extant in a Latin text (erroneously) attributed to Bede the Venerable: the treatise *de septem miraculis huius mundi*,<sup>32</sup> as well as the earlier *De Cursu Stellarum*<sup>33</sup> of Gregory of Tours, who only mentions four crabs.

## 25.4 Legendary traditions about Alexander the Great

The majority of the information pertaining to Alexander the Great in Chron. 1234 was transmitted to the Anonymous Chronicler via a Syriac translation or continuation of Eusebius: information regarding the historical Alexander – his birth, education by Aristotle, rule, and the construction of Alexandria – are also extant in the chronicle of Jerome and in the Armenian translation of the Eusebian canons. Information regarding Alexander’s death came from an unknown Syriac chronicler whose work was used by Agapius, Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler, so possibly Andronicus, and who adapted Eusebius and added the detail that he was poisoned.

In addition, the Anonymous Chronicler also knew of examples of Alexander literature, works that concerned the mythical Alexander. Thus, Chron. 1234 refers to the “special book of his history” for Alexander’s “heroics, the places that he conquered and the various peoples that he saw.”<sup>34</sup> An unexpected occurrence of traditions concerning the mythical Alexander appear in the Secular Part of Chron. 1234 among material

---

<sup>31</sup> Agap. Chron., vol. 1, 12-4.

<sup>32</sup> For an edition of this text, see Omont 1882, 47-9. For a German translation (with Latin text), see Brodersen 1992, 116-21.

<sup>33</sup> Greg. Tur. De cursu stell., 409.26-410.1: “Septimum est pharus Alexandrina, quae super quattuor mirae magnitudinis cancos constructa habetur; nec enim hi parvi esse poterant, qui tam immensum sustinent vel altitudinis vel latitudinis pondus.” For the text, with German translation, see also Brodersen 1992, 108-15.

<sup>34</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 104.23-5T.

pertaining to the twelfth century. After an account of the Venetian siege of Tyre in AG 1435/AD 1124, which may have been taken from a common source with Michael, possibly Basil of Edessa, the Anonymous Chronicler includes an account of Alexander's siege of the same city: according to the chronicle, Alexander used a giant mirror to burn the city, but an inhabitant of Tyre invented a substance which could counteract the sun's burning rays. Having handed over the inventor, Alexander left Tyre alone. Similarly, the twelfth-century inhabitants of Tyre kept resisting the Franks until they were tricked in surrendering their city, at which point they also remained unharmed.<sup>35</sup>

Given that this Alexander tradition is preceded by the words "it is said that," and the provided material is relatively vague it may be that the Anonymous Chronicler (or Basil or a yet unidentified source) is citing an oral tradition. As has been remarked before,<sup>36</sup> however, this tradition in fact somewhat recounts the events at Syracuse in 214-2 BC, during which the scientist and mathematician Archimedes kept the Romans, who were besieging his city, at bay with several inventions including a giant mirror. Whether this Alexander tradition was a local oral tradition in thirteenth-century Syria and Northern Mesopotamia or whether this error is due to the Anonymous Chronicler or his source cannot be determined. The confusion of the Archimedes legend with an Alexander tradition may be due to the legend that Alexander placed a mirror on a watchtower in order to be able to see further.

## 25.5 An account of the Trojan war

Chron. 1234 also preserves a unique Syriac literary account of the Trojan war which appears to be based on an adaptation of books from the *Epic Cycle*, especially the *Ilioupersis*, rather than on the *Iliad*.<sup>37</sup> I will not discuss this excerpt in detail here, because

---

<sup>35</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 95-6T, 72V (§293-4).

<sup>36</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 72V, n. 5.

<sup>37</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 66.8-78.24T.

I have described it in detail in my recently published article on Syriac historiographical references to the Trojan war.<sup>38</sup> The identity of the Anonymous Chronicler's source, however, is relevant. On the basis of Barhebraeus' attribution of a Syriac translation of two Greek books, written by Homer, to Theophilus of Edessa (d. 785), I have followed Lawrence I. Conrad in assuming that Theophilus was the author of this account.<sup>39</sup> If this account circulated independently or was part of another work cannot be determined. It may be one of Theophilus' "narratives resembling ecclesiastical history."<sup>40</sup>

## 25.6 Saints' lives

Various remarks and digressions in Chron. 1234 also demonstrates the Anonymous Chronicler's knowledge of the lives of certain saints such as Theodore of Euchaita,<sup>41</sup> Mor Behnam and his wife Sara,<sup>42</sup> and Mor Barsaumo (d. 458)<sup>43</sup> It cannot always be determined if he knew these traditions via his access to hagiographical literature, via oral traditions, or even via intermediaries. In the case of Mor Abhay of Nicaea, the Anonymous Chronicler seems to have known Michael's 1185 revision of John of Beth Rufina's life of this saint, because he includes an extract.<sup>44</sup> The Anonymous Chronicler may also have read the lives of Mor Cosmas and Mor Damianus, but the information that he provides on these saints could equally have come from Basil of Edessa.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Hilkens 2013.

<sup>39</sup> Conrad 2005, 388.

<sup>40</sup> Mich. Syr. Chron. X 20 (378T; vol. 2: 358V).

<sup>41</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 156.13-6T, cf. AMS, vol. 6, 500-35

<sup>42</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 156.16-22T, cf. AMS, vol. 2, 397-441

<sup>43</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 179.7-8T, cf. Grébaud 1908, 344.

<sup>44</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 1, 179.10-27T, cf. AMS, vol. 6, 557-614

<sup>45</sup> Chron. 1234, vol. 2, 134-5T, 101V. Worth noting is the fact that Chron. 1234 identifies Cosmas as an Edessan physician, possibly after Bas. Ed.

## Conclusion

Having been written before the middle of the thirteenth century by (a) Northern Mesopotamian Syriac Orthodox Christian(s), Chron. 1234 is an invaluable historical source which provides crucial information about the history of the Crusades from the perspective of the Syriac Orthodox community. The Anonymous Chronicler and his continuator also inform us of the history of the Syriac Orthodox Church and the city of Edessa, especially about its capture in 1144 and 1146. Despite of its historical importance for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Chron. 1234's historical narrative must be investigated with a critical eye: not only is it written from a subjective perspective, as ancient and medieval historiography tends to be, Chron. 1234 is riddled with historical errors.

In this dissertation I have approached Chron. 1234 from a literary historical perspective: rather than focusing on its historical value, I have investigated its historiographical value by studying its sources and thus using it as a lens to analyse the extent of exchange of historical, biblical, exegetical, apocryphal, epistolary and hagiographical information in the ancient and medieval multicultural and multilingual Near East. Though the majority of the Anonymous Chronicler's sources are now lost, this exercise has produced many positive results, some more remarkable than others. Partially through an investigation of source references in Chron. 1234, but primarily through textual comparisons with a wide range of Syriac, Greek, Arabic, Armenian, Hebrew and Ethiopic sources, I have shown how Hebrew, Christian and Islamic literary traditions converge in this thirteenth-century Syriac Orthodox chronicle.

Despite the fact that the Anonymous Chronicler was a Christian and only appears to have known Syriac and Arabic, he also had access to Greek Christian and Jewish sources,

via translations and other intermediate sources. Among his Jewish sources were the *Book of Jubilees* and the Jewish historians Artabanus and Flavius Josephus. Examples of Greek Christian authors fragments of whose works survive in Chron. 1234 are Hippolytus of Rome, Eusebius of Caesarea and the Anonymous Antiochene continuator of his chronological canons, Philostorgius of Borissus, John Malalas, Socrates of Constantinople, Sozomen, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Annianus of Alexandria, Theodore Lector, the early seventh-century author of the *Epitome of Church Histories*, and an unknown Greek historian of the seventh, eighth or early ninth centuries.

Though the Anonymous Chronicler had access to some of these sources in translation, more often than not fragments from these texts reached the Anonymous Chronicler via an intermediary or a series of intermediaries. Some sources were so influential that their information was even directly as well as indirectly transmitted. For instance, the Anonymous Chronicler had access to a Syriac translation of Socrates, which he often copied very literally, but sometimes also paraphrased. At the same time, however, paraphrases of Socrates reached Chron. 1234 via one or more intermediaries: sometimes fragments and paraphrases of Socrates in Chron. 1234 have literal equivalents in Michael's *Chronicle*, which indicates the involvement of a common Syriac source after Socrates. We know that Socrates was used by John of Ephesus, and he may be the source for some of these paraphrases, but at the same time, information from Socrates also reached Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler via a series of Greek and Syriac intermediaries outside the John of Ephesus-Michael-Chron. 1234 continuum. Socrates was used by Theodore Lector, whose *Ecclesiastical History* was reworked by the author of the seventh-century *Epitome*. Fragments of this *Epitome* survive in Chron. 1234 and in Michael's *Chronicle*. Independently from previous scholarly research I have – perhaps controversially – concluded that these fragments came into Syriac by another Greek intermediary first and only then via a Syriac intermediary.

Another example is Eusebius, whose chronological canons were continued by an anonymous Antiochene continuator and then translated into Syriac. In the Syriac chronicles, however, there is evidence for at least two Syriac Eusebian traditions: of the Syriac translation and of a Syriac *Epitome*. In addition, there are also the Greek chronicler Annianus of Alexandria (turn of the fifth century) and the Syriac chronicler

Andronicus (mid-sixth century) who adapted the Eusebian chronology and influenced the Anonymous Chronicler's views on chronology.

The same process of intercultural exchange and parallel transmissions of historical information is visible in the case of Chron. 1234's Syriac and Arabic sources. Though some Islamic Arabic historical material reached Chron. 1234 via the History of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre, the Anonymous Chronicler also had direct access to an Arabic Islamic source on the Muslim-Arab conquest of Syria and information about certain caliphs, and may have known of certain Arabic texts, such as the Dialogues of Theodore Abu Qurra, the writings of the poet al-Mutanabbi, and an astronomical work written by the caliph al-Ma'mun.

The majority of the Anonymous Chronicler's immediate sources were written in Syriac. Some of these were translations of Greek texts, but several of these sources were originally written in Syriac: the chronicles of Andronicus and Ignatius of Melitene, the *Miscellaneous History* of Pseudo-Zachariah of Mitylene, the *Ecclesiastical History* of John of Ephesus, the *Book of the Cave of Treasures*, and the histories of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre and Basil of Edessa.

The majority of the Anonymous Chronicler's sources are now lost. It has previously been known that Chron. 1234 was a valuable means by which to reconstruct now lost sources such as the *History* of Dionysius and to a lesser extent also the anonymous Antiochene continuation of Eusebius' chronological canons. In this dissertation, however, I have looked beyond what was known and focused on Chron. 1234's position as a crucial witness for the reconstruction of other sources which had thusfar been neglected.

The most notable example is that of Andronicus, whose mid-sixth-century chronicle was undoubtedly as influential as the Syriac translation of Eusebius. Andronicus' import, not only for Chron. 1234 in particular, but Syriac chronicle writing in general, is demonstrated by the fact that his work permeates confessional boundaries: fragments of Andronicus appear in the commentary on the Old Testament of the mid-ninth-century East-Syrian Isho'dad of Merv, a Syriac Melkite chronicle from the mid-seventh century, the *Chronicle* of Agapius, the mid-tenth-century Melkite bishop of Mabbug, and

the writings of several Syriac Orthodox historians, ranging from the turn of the eighth until the thirteenth century.

On those rare occasions when the Anonymous Chronicler's source is preserved, whether in its original language and form, or in later translation or adaptation, we have the unique opportunity to compare Chron. 1234's version of events with that of his source. From this comparison emerges the picture of a chronicler who tends to stay true to his sources, copying them fairly literally, as in the case, for instance of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates. At the same time, however, the Anonymous Chronicler did not hesitate to combine material from two or more sources or replace material from one source with that of another, when one provided no, less or erroneous information. Chron. 1234's narrative on the story of Creation, for instance, is an intricate patchwork of sentences, expressions and vocabulary from the *Cave of Treasures* and the *Book of Jubilees*.

On occasion, the Anonymous Chronicler abbreviated longer narratives from his sources through the omission of details. Nevertheless, Chron. 1234 fairly consistently preserves more complete entries or longer narratives than Michael's *Chronicle*. At the same time, however, paraphrases of longer narratives do appear in Chron. 1234. Unfortunately, it is often difficult to determine whether the Anonymous Chronicler himself was responsible for these paraphrases. In some cases, this is the most likely scenario, but often, a comparison with material from Michael's *Chronicle* shows the involvement of an intermediate source, as in the case for Socrates, whose *History* was used by several later authors such as John of Ephesus and Theodore Lector. Similarly, it is often difficult to distinguish between John of Ephesus, Dionysius of Tell-Mahre's use of John of Ephesus, and perhaps even Ignatius of Melitene's use of Dionysius. At the same time, we also know that John of Ephesus was also used by a historian after Dionysius, possibly Ignatius.

These trends (fusing material from different sources, staying true to sources, but sometimes paraphrasing longer narratives) are visible in the Anonymous Chronicler's use of now lost sources, such as the *History* of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre. A comparison with material from Michael's *Chronicle* shows that, though Michael often also preserves material that is not extant in Chron. 1234, the latter tends to preserve more complete

versions of longer narratives from Dionysius. However, it is often difficult to distinguish between material from Dionysius' *History* and from supplemental sources, most notably the unidentified Islamic Arabic history that the Anonymous Chronicler used.

Lastly, some words must be devoted to two subjects which have taken up the majority of this dissertation (together Andronicus): the influence of the *Book of Jubilees* on Chron. 1234, and the hypothesis that a now lost seventh-, eighth, or early ninth-century Greek historical source was used by Theophanes and a Syriac chronicler, possibly Ignatius of Melitene, whose work was used by Michael the Great and the Anonymous Chronicler.

Let us recapitulate the latter theory first. Firstly, I have shown that the fragments of the early sixth-century *Ecclesiastical History* of Theodore Lector in Michael's *Chronicle* and in Chron. 1234 could not have been transmitted into Syriac via John of Ephesus, because they passed through the seventh-century Epitome of Church Histories first. Secondly, I have suggested that these fragments of the Epitome reached Michael and the Anonymous Chronicler via the same Syriac source as the fragments of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Philostorgius. Thirdly, the presence of this material in Theophanes' *Chronographia*, in similar combinations with material from the Epitome, indicates that the author of this unknown Syriac source found this material in a Greek source and was not personally responsible for the fusion of material from Philostorgius and the Epitome. Fourthly, on the basis that at least one fragment of Philostorgius survives in the Syriac chronicles, but not in Theophanes' *Chronographia*, I have suggested that Michael's and the Anonymous Chronicler's common source was dependent on Theophanes' source, not on Theophanes, as has previously been suggested. Fifthly and lastly, I have attempted to (partially) reconstruct this Greek and this Syriac source by isolating common material in Theophanes', Michael's and Chron. 1234's description of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, and tracing this material back to Socrates, Priscus and other unknown sources. On the basis of these findings I have hypothesised that Chron. 1234 is dependent on a Syriac history or chronicle, written between the middle of the seventh and the latter half of the twelfth century and based on a Greek history that was written between the early seventh and the early ninth century. Though I have refrained from identifying the Greek intermediary, which presumably was also

Theophanes', source, I have suggested that this Syriac historian may be Ignatius of Melitene. I hope my hypotheses will function as a catalyst for future research to further investigate the relationship between Theodore, the Epitome, and Theophanes, and will take the Syriac witnesses into account.

Similarly, it has also proven worthwhile to qualify and quantify the influence of the Jewish apocryphal *Book of Jubilees* on Chron. 1234. We have seen that the Anonymous Chronicler not only extracted literal fragments of *Jubilees* from an unidentified source – either a Syriac translation of *Jubilees* (from Greek or Hebrew) or a chronicle – but also knew several adaptations of traditions from *Jubilees* via other intermediaries. The number of these intermediaries is unknown, but there are five discernible paths, some of which probably overlapped. Firstly, an account of the emergence of idolatry on earth in the time of Serug from the *Cave of Treasures* 25.8-14, which is extant in Chron. 1234, is in fact an adaptation of *Jubilees* 11:4-5. Secondly, the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael knew an adaptation of *Jubilees* 4:1-2, 7, which discussed the chronology between the birth of Adam and Seth, through a Syriac dependant of Annianus. Thirdly and similarly, Michael's *Chronicle* and Chron. 1234 preserve an adaptation of *Jubilees* 8:12-6, 21 which they found in a Syriac dependant of Hippolytus (or possibly also of Annianus). Fourthly, I have been able to detect the involvement of a source that also influenced Isho'dad of Merv, Agapius of Mabbug and Michael the Syrian for two adaptations of *Jubilees* 11:2, on the emergence of war after the Flood, and *Jubilees* 11:4-5 (the latter of which is not extant in Chron. 1234, but must have surely been read by the Anonymous Chronicler, but passed over in favour of the account from the *Cave of Treasures*). Based on the identity of the other three witnesses, however, most notably Isho'dad of Merv, I have suggested that the ultimate source was Andronicus, though it appears that the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael accessed Andronicus via a different path than Isho'dad and Agapius. Fifthly and lastly, an unidentified Syriac chronicler transmitted adaptations of *Jubilees* 5:1-2, 9-10 and *Jubilees* 10:27, 29, 32 to the Anonymous Chronicler and Michael, while Jacob of Edessa knew the same traditions. The relationship between Jacob and this source cannot be qualified beyond concluding that Jacob cannot be identified with this chronicler: it is possible that Jacob and Michael's and Chron. 1234's common source found these traditions in Andronicus' *Chronicle*, but Michael and Chron.

1234 may also be dependent on a dependant of Jacob. Though many questions remain about the identities of these intermediaries, questions which hopefully will be answered in the future, this research has proven fruitful.

These are but a few concrete examples of the results that this research has produced. Questions that were raised decades ago have been answered, but some of these answers have raised more questions. Despite the fact that the major Syriac chronicles have been edited and translated and have attracted a considerable amount of interest in recent years, and one, including at one point the present author, may believe that research in this field would not yield any more valuable results, the present volume shows otherwise. On the contrary, a close-reading and textual comparison of Greek, Syriac and Arabic chronicles allows us to reconstruct now lost Syriac, Greek and Arabic sources.

At the same time, my research has shown the importance of ground work, meaning critical editions, translations and source-critical analyses of already edited sources. Much of this remains to be done. It is remarkable that in the twenty-first century the edition of such an important witness as the Vatican manuscript of the Syriac translation of Socrates still is a *desideratum*. Similarly, even though it was edited and translated almost a century ago, and it is clearly a crucial witness to the Syriac tradition of chronicle writing, scholars of Syriac historiography have avoided the chronicle of Agapius, the import of which I have become aware of in recent years.

Hopefully all of this will change with this dissertation, which not only shows the necessity for the availability of critical editions and translations of the major texts, but also the import of Syriac literature for not only Eastern Christian, but also Byzantine, Islamic and even Jewish studies. It is the hope of the present author to be able to continue contributing in years to come to making these kinds of sources available to a wide range of scholars, while demonstrating the extent of circulation of information in the ancient and medieval Near and Middle East.



# Bibliography

## ANCIENT AUTHORS

- Abouna 2009 = *Chronicle of the Unknown Edessan*, ed. Abouna, Albert (*Abrohom Nuro Library* 5; Piscataway, 2009).
- Agap. Chron. = *Kitab al-'Unvan, histoire universelle, écrite par Agapius (Mahboub) de Menbidj*, ed. and trans., Vasiliev, Alexandre A., *Première partie (I)* [PO 5; Paris, 1910], 558-691; *Première partie (II)* [PO 11; Paris, 1915], 5-144; *Seconde partie (I)* [PO 7; Paris, 1911], 459-591; *Seconde partie (II)* [PO 8; Paris, 1912], 396-547.
- Alex. Mon. = *Alexander Monachus. De inventione crucis, ex Gretsero de cruce*, in *Procopii Gazaei, christiani retoris et hermeneutae opera quae reperiri potuerent omniae*, ed. and trans. Migne, Jacques P. (PG 87.3; Paris, 1863), coll. 4015-88.
- AMS = Bedjan, Paul, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*, 7 vols, Paris – Leipzig, 1890-7.
- Arr. Anab. = *Arrian. Anabasis of Alexander (Books V-VII). Indica (Book VIII)*, ed. and trans. Robson, E. Iliff [*The Loeb Classical Library* 269; Cambridge (Mss.) – London, 1933 (repr. 1964)].
- Azdi = *Ta'riḫ futūḥ al-Shām*, ed. ʿAbd al-Munʿim ʿAbdallah ʿĀmir, Cairo, 1970.
- Baladhuri = *The Ansāb al-ashrāf of al-Balādhurī*, ed. Goitein, Shelomo D., Jerusalem, 1936.
- Bas. Caes. Epist. = *Saint Basile. Lettres*, ed. and trans. Courtonne, Yves, 3 vols., Paris, 1957-66.
- Barhebr. Comm. Gen – II Sam = *Barhebraeus' Scholia on The Old Testament. Part 1: Genesis – II Samuel*, ed. Sprengling, Martin and Graham, William C. (*The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications* 13; Chicago, 1931).
- Barhebr. Comm. Job = *Gregorii Bar-Hebraei scholia in librum Iobi*, ed. Bernstein, Georg Heinrich, Bratislava, 1858.
- Barhebr. Comm. Duodec. Proph. = *Gregorii Barhebraei in duodecim prophetas minores scholia*, ed. Moritz, Bernhard, Leipzig, 1882.
- Black 1985 = *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*, trans. Black, Matthew, Leiden, 1985.
- Benedictus 1737 = Benedictus (p.), *Ephraemi Syri Opera Omnia*, 2 vols., Rome, 1737.
- Caus. Caus. = Kayser, Carl, *Das Buch von der Erkenntniss der Wahrheit oder der Ursache aller Ursachen*, Leipzig, 1889 (ed.); Strassburg, 1893 (trans.).
- Cave of Treasures = *La Caverne des Trésors. Les deux recensions syriaques*, ed. and trans. Ri, Su-Min (CSCO 486-7; Syr. 207-8; Leuven, 1987).

- Cave of Treasures (G)* = *La Caverne des Trésors. Version géorgienne*, ed. Kourcikidzé, C., (CSCO 562; *Ib.* 23; Leuven, 1993); trans. Mahé, Jean-Pierre (CSCO 563; *Ib.* 24; Leuven, 1992).
- Caverna dei Tesori* = *La Caverna dei Tesori; Testo Arabo con Traduzione Italiana e Commento*, ed. and trans. Battista, Antonio and Bagatti, Bellarmino (*Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Collectio Minor* 26; Jerusalem, 1979).
- Chron. 724 = “Chronicon miscellaneum ad annum domini 724 pertinens,” ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter, in *Chronica Minora II* [CSCO, Syr., ser. III, t. IV(2); Paris 1904 (repr. CSCO 3; Syr. 3; Leuven, 1960)], 77-155; trans. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste (repr. CSCO 4; Syr. 4; Leuven, 1960), 61-119.
- Chron. 775 = “Expositio quomodo se habeant generations et familiae et anni ab adamo usque ad hunc diem,” ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter, in *Chronica Minora III* [CSCO, Syr. ser. III, t. IV(3) (repr. CSCO 5; Syr. 5; Leuven, 1961)], 337-49; trans. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste (repr. CSCO 6; Syr. 6; Leuven, 1960)], 266-75.
- Chron. 813 = “Fragmenta chronici anonymi auctoris ad annum domini 813 pertinentia,” ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter, in *Chronica Minora III* [CSCO, Syr. ser. III, t. IV(3) (repr. CSCO 5; Syr. 5; Leuven, 1961)], 243-260; trans. Brooks, Ernest-Walter (repr. CSCO 6; Syr. 6; Leuven, 1960)], 185-96.
- Chron. 819 = *Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens I. Praemissum est chronicon anonymum ad A. D. 819 pertinens*, ed. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste [Syr. ser. III, t. 14; Paris, 1916 (repr. CSCO 81; Syr. 36; Leuven, 1916)]; *Anonymi auctoris chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens I*, trans. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste [CSCO Syr., ser. III, t. 14; Leuven, 1937 (repr. CSCO 109; Syr. 56; Leuven, 1965)].
- Chron. 846 = “Chronicon ad annum domini 846 pertinens,” ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter, in *Chronica Minora II* [CSCO Syr., ser. III, t. 4(2); Paris 1904 (repr. CSCO 3; Syr. 3; Leuven, 1960)], 157-238; trans. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste (repr. CSCO 4; Syr. 4; Leuven, 1960), 121-80.
- Chron. 1234 = *Chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens I. Praemissum est chronicon anonymum ad A. D. 819 pertinens*, ed. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste [Syr. ser. III, t. 14; Paris, 1916 (repr. CSCO 81; Syr. 36; Leuven, 1916)]; *Anonymi auctoris chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens I*, trans. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste [Syr. ser. III, t. 14; Leuven, 1937 (repr. CSCO 109; Syr. 56; Leuven, 1965)]; *Anonymi auctoris chronicon ad annum Christi 1234 pertinens II*, ed. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste [Syr. ser. III, t. 15; Paris, 1916 (repr. CSCO 82; Syr. 37; Leuven, 1916)]; trans. Abouna, Albert and Fiey, Jean-Marc (CSCO 354; Syr. 154; Leuven, 1974).
- Chron. Alex. = *Apocalypse - Pseudo-Methodius, An Alexandrian World Chronicle*, ed. and trans. Garstad, Benjamin, Cambridge (Mss.) – London, 2012, 141-311.
- Chron. Ed. = “Chronicon Edessenum,” ed. Guidi, Ignazio, in *Chronica Minora I* [CSCO Syr., ser. III, t. 4(1); Paris 1903 (repr. CSCO 2; Syr. 2; Leuven, 1960)], 1-13; trans. Guidi, Ignazio (repr. CSCO 1; Syr. 1; Leuven, 1955), 1-32.
- Chron. Maron. = “Chronicon Maroniticum,” ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter, in *Chronica Minora II* [CSCO III, t. 4(2); Paris, 1904 (repr. CSCO 3; Syr. 3; Leuven, 1960)], 43-74; trans. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste, in *Chronica Minora II* [CSCO III, t. 4(2); Paris, 1904 (repr. CSCO 4; Syr. 4; Leuven, 1960)], 35-57.
- Chron. Melk. = de Halleux, Antoine, “La chronique melkite abrégée de ms. Sinaï syr. 10,” *Le Muséon* 91 (1978), 5-44 [ed. and trans.].
- Chron. Or. = *Petrus Ibn Rahib. Chronicon Orientale*, ed. Louis Cheikho (CSCO Arab., III 1; Beirut – Paris – Leipzig, 1903).
- Chron. Seert = *Histoire nestorienne. Première partie. (I)*, ed. and trans. Scher, Addai [PO 4; Paris, 1908], 215-312; *Première partie (II)*, ed. and trans. Scher, Addai, [PO 5; Paris 1910], 221-34; *Seconde partie*

- (I), ed. and trans. Scher, Addai [PO 7; Paris, 1911], 99-201; *Seconde partie (II)*, ed. and trans. Scher, Addai [PO 13; Paris, 1919], 437-636.
- Chron. Zuqn. = *Incerti auctoris chronicon pseudo-dionysianum vulgo dictum I*, ed. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste [Syr. ser. III, t. 1; Paris, 1927 (repr. CSCO 91; Syr. 43; Leuven, 1927)]; trans. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste (CSCO 121; Syr. 66; Leuven, 1949); *Incerti auctoris chronicon pseudo-dionysianum vulgo dictum II Accedunt Iohannis ephesini fragmenta curante E.W. Brooks*, ed. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste [Syr. ser. III, t. 2; Paris, 1933 (repr. CSCO 104; Syr. 53; Leuven, 1965)]; *Chronicon anyonymum pseudo-dionysianum vulgo dictum II*, trans. Hespel, Robert (CSCO 507; Syr. 213; Leuven, 1989).
- Cyr. Ed. Expl. Pass. = *Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts by Cyrus of Edessa, an East Syrian Theologian of the Mid Sixth Century*, ed. Macomber, W.F., 2 vols. (CSCO 355-356, Syr. 155-156; Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1974).
- De Fam. Ling. = *De familiis linguarum*, ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter, in *Chronica Minora III* [CSCO, Syr. ser. III, t. IV(3) (repr. CSCO 5; Syr. 5; Leuven, 1961)], 355-7; trans. Brooks, Ernest-Walter (repr. CSCO 6; Syr. 6; Leuven, 1960)], 281-3.
- De pop. = *Treatise on the Peoples after the Confusion of Languages in Babylon*, preserved in Descr. Pop. Et Plag.
- Descr. Pop. et Plag. = *Descriptio populorum et plagarum*, ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter, Guidi, Ignazio and Chabot, Jean-Baptiste, in *Chronica Minora III* [CSCO, Syr. ser. III, t. IV(3) (repr. CSCO 5; Syr. 5; Leuven, 1961)], 350-4; trans. Brooks, Ernest-Walter (repr. CSCO 6; Syr. 6; Leuven, 1960)], 277-80 [= Andronicus, *Treatise on the Four Quarters of the Earth* + an anonymous *Treatise on the Peoples after the Confusion of Languages in Babylon*].
- Dion. Bar Salib. Comm. Gen. = *The Commentary of Dionysius bar Salibi on the book of Genesis*, trans. Boyes, Watson, PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1930.
- Dion. Bar Salib. Comm. Job = *The commentary of Dionysios bar Salibi on the Book of Job*, trans. Jacobsen, Thorkild, PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1929.
- Ecchelensis 1653 = *Ecchelensis, Abraham, Catalogus librorum Chaldaeorum, tam ecclesiasticorum, quam profanorum, auctore Hebediesu metropolita Sobensi*, Rome, 1653.
- El. Nis. Op. Chron. = *Eliae Metropolitae Nisibeni. Opus chronologicum I*, ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter [Syr. ser. III, t. VII; Paris, 1910 (repr. CSCO 62\*; Syr. 22; Leuven, 1962)]; trans. Brooks, Ernest-Walter [Syr. Ser. III, t. VII; Rome - Paris - Leipzig, 1910 (repr. CSCO 63\*; Syr. 23; Leuven, 1910)]; *Eliae Metropolitae Nisibeni. Opus chronologicum II*, ed. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste [Syr. Ser. III, t. VIII; Paris, 1909 (repr. CSCO 62\*\*; Syr. 22; Leuven, 1962)]; trans. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste [Syr. Ser. III, t. VIII; Paris, 1910 (repr. CSCO 63\*\*; Syr. 24; Leuven, 1954)].
- Epiph. Salam., Syr. Pond. et Mes. = *Epiphanius' Treatise on Weights and Measures. The Syriac Version*, ed. Dean, James E. (*The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization* 11; Chicago, 1935).
- Ephr. Syr. Comm. Gen. et Ex. = *Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim et in Exodum Commentarii*, ed. and trans. Tonneau, Raymond M. (CSCO 152-3; Syr. 71-2; Leuven, 1955).
- Eus. Chron. Arm. = Karst, Joseph, *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Kommentar (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 20; Eusebius' Werke 5; Leipzig, 1911)*.
- Eus. Chron. Lat. = Helm, Rudolf, *Die Chronik des Hieronymus (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 47; Eusebius' Werke 7; Berlin, 1956)*.

- Eus. Chron. Syr. = “Fragmentum Epitomes Eusebianae,” ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter, in *Chronica Minora*, III [CSCO, Syr. ser. III, t. IV(3) (repr. CSCO 5; Syr. 5; Leuven, 1961)], 358.
- Eut. Alex. Chron. = *Contextio gemmarum, sive, Eutychie patriarchæ Alexandrini annales*, ed. and trans. Pococke, Edward and Selden, John, 2 vols., Oxford, 1654-1656.
- García Martínez 1994 = *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English*, trans. García Martínez, Florentino, “Leiden – New York – Köln, 1994 (Engl. trans. Watson, Wilfred, G.E.).
- Georg. Cedr. Brev = *Georgius Cedrenus Ioannis Scylitzae ope*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. Bekker, Immanuel (*Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae*; Bonn, 1838).
- Georg. Mon. Brev. = *Theophanes continuatus, Joannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus*, ed. and trans; Bekker, Immanuel (*Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae*; Bonn, 1838).
- Georg. Sync. Chron. = *Georgii syncelli ecloga chronographica*, ed. Mosshammer, Alden A. [*Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum teubneriana*; Leipzig 1984 (repr. *Syncellus, Georgius: Ecloga chronographica*, De Gruyter 2010)]; *The Chronography of George Synkellos: a Byzantine Chronicle of Universal History from the Creation*, trans. Adler, William and Tuffin, Paul, Oxford, 2002.
- Goeller 1901 = Goeller, Emil, “Ein nestorianisches Bruchstück zur Kirchengeschichte des 4 und 5 Jahrhunderts,” *Oriens Christianus* 1 (1901), 80-97.
- Greatrex et al. 2011 = *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity*, ed. Greatrex, Geoffrey and trans. Phenix, Robert R. and Horn, Cornelia B. (TTH 55; Liverpool, 2011).
- Grébaut 1908 = Grébaut, Sylvain, “Vie de Barsoma le Syrien,” *ROC* 13 (1908), 337-45.
- Greg. Tur. De cursu stell. = *Gregorius Turonensis, De cursu stellarum ratio*, ed. Krusch, Bruno (*Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 1,2; Hannover, 1885), 407-22.
- Hipp. Chron. = *Hippolytus. Die Chronik*, ed. Bauer, Adolf and Helm, Rudolf (*Die griechischen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte* 46; *Hippolytus' Werke* 4; Berlin, 1955).
- Hipp. Comm. Dan. = *Hippolytus Werke. Erster Band: Exegetische und homiletische Schriften*, ed. and trans. Bonwetsch, Gottlieb N. and Achelis, Hans (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des altchristlichen Literatur* 1.1-2; Leipzig, 1897).
- Ibrahim 2009 = *The Edessa-Aleppo Syriac Codex of the Chronicle of Michael the Great. A Publication of St. George Parish and Edessan Community in Aleppo*, ed. Ibrahim, Gregorius Yuhanna (*Texts and Translations of the Chronicle of Michael the Great* 1; Piscataway (N.J.), 2009).
- Ish. Comm. Ex. = *Commentaire d'Išo'dad de Merv sur l'Ancien Testament II. Exode-Deutéronome*, ed. and trans. van den Eynde, Ceslas (CSCO 176, 179; Syr. 80-1; Leuvenb, 1958).
- Ish. Comm. Gen. = *Commentaire d'Išo'dad de Merv sur l'Ancien Testament*, ed. Vosté, Jacques-Marie and van den Eynde, Ceslas (CSCO 126; Syr. 67; Leuven, 1950); trans. van den Eynde, Ceslas (CSCO 156; Syr. 75; Leuven, 1955).
- Ish. Comm. Gosp. = *The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv, bishop of Ḥadatha (c. 850 A.D.)*, ed. and trans. Gibson, Margaret D. (*Horae Semiticae* 5-7, 10-1; Cambridge, 1911, 1916).
- Ish. Comm. Is. Et Duod. = *Commentaire d'Išo'dad de Merv sur l'Ancien Testament IV. Isaïe et les Douze*, ed. and trans. Van Den Eynde, Ceslas (CSCO 303-4; Syr. 128-9; Leuven, 1969).
- Jac. Ed. Chron. = “Chronicon Iacobi Edesseni,” ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter, Guidi, Ignazio and Chabot, Jean-Baptiste, in *Chronica Minora III* [CSCO, Syr. ser. III, t. IV(3) (repr. CSCO 5; Syr. 5; Leuven, 1961)], 197-258; trans. Brooks, Ernest-Walter (repr. CSCO 6; Syr. 6; Leuven, 1960)], 261-327.

- Jac. Ed. Epist. 7 = Nau, François, “Lettre de Jacques d’Édesse à Jean le Stylite sur la chronologie biblique et la date de la naissance du Messie,” *ROC* 5 (1900), 581-96.
- Jac. Ed. Epist. 12-13 = Wright, William (1867), “Two epistles of Mar Jacob, bishop of Edessa,” *Journal of Sacred Literature* 10 (1867), 430-3, 1\*-27\* (edition); Nau, François, “Traduction des lettres XII et XIII de Jacques d’Édesse,” *ROC* 10 (1905), 197-208, 258-82 (trans.).
- Joh. Eph. Vit. = John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints III*, ed. and trans. Brooks, Ernest-Walter (PO 19; Paris, 1926), 151-285.
- Joh. Eph. HE = *Iohannis ephesini historiae ecclesiasticae pars tertia*, ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter [Syr. ser. III, t. III; Paris, 1935 (repr. CSCO 105; Syr. 54; Leuven, 1935)]; trans. Brooks, Ernest-Walter [Syr. ser. III, t. III; Leuven, 1936 (repr. CSCO 106; Syr. 55; Leuven, 1964)].
- Joh. Mal. Brev. = *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*. ed. I. Thurn (Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae 35; Berlin, 2000); E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, R. Scott et al., *The Chronicle of John Malalas. A Translation (Byzantina Australiensia 4; Melbourne, 1986)*.
- Jubilees* = *The Book of Jubilees*, ed. and trans. VanderKam, James C. (CSCO 510-1; Aeth. 87-8; Leuven, 1989).
- Kitāb al-Magāll* = *Apocrypha Arabica*, ed. and trans. Gibson, Margaret D. (Studia Sinaitica 8; London, 1901).
- Leo. Gramm. Brev. = *Leonis Grammatici Chronographia*, ed. Bekker, Immanuel (CSHB 12; Bonn, 1842).
- Langlois 1868 = *Chronique de Michel le Grand, patriarche des syriens jacobites, traduite pour la première fois sur la version arménienne du prêtre Ischôk*, trans. Langlois, Victor, Venice, 1868.
- Lib. Med. = *Syrian Anatomy, Pathology and Therapeutics or the Book of Medicines*, ed. and trans. Budge, E.A. Wallis, 2 vols., Oxford – London, 1913.
- Mas<sup>c</sup>udi, *Prairies* = *Maçoudi. Les Prairies d’Or*, ed. and trans. de Meynard, Barbier and de Courteille, Pavet, 8 vols., Paris, 1861-77.
- Mich. Arm. Chron. 1 = Tearn Mixayēli Patriark'i Asorwoy Žamanakgrut'iwn, ed. Sawalaneanc', Tigran, Jerusalem, 1870.
- Mich. Arm. Chron. 2. = Tearn Mixayēli Asorwoy Patriark'i Žamanakgrut'iwn, ed. Sawalaneanc', Tigran, Jerusalem, 1871.
- Mich. Syr. Chron. = *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, Patriarche Jacobite d’Antioche (1166-1199)*, ed. and trans. Chabot, Jean-Baptiste, 4 vols., Paris, 1899-1910 (repr. Brussels, 1963).
- Migne 1857 = Migne, Jacques P., *S.P.N. Basilii, caesareae cappadociae archiepiscopi, opera omnia quae exstant*, vol. 4 (PG 32; Paris, 1857).
- Nau 1907 = Nau, François, “Traduction de la Chronique syriaque anonyme, éditée par Sa Béatitude Mgr Rahmani, Patriarche des Syriens catholiques,” *ROC* 2 (1907), 429-440.
- Nau 1908 = Nau, François, “Traduction de la Chronique syriaque anonyme, éditée par Sa Béatitude Mgr Rahmani, Patriarche des Syriens catholiques,” *ROC* 13 (1908), 90-99, 321-338, 436-443.
- Neusner 1985 = Neusner, Jacob, *Genesi Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the book of Genesis. A New American Translation (Brown Judaic Studies 104-6; Atlanta, 1985)*.
- Nic. Brev. = *Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople. Short History*, ed. and trans. Mango, Cyril (CFHB Series Washingtonensis 13; Dumbarton Oaks Texts 10; Washington, 1990).
- Philo Alex., Quaest. et Solut. Gen. et Ex. = *Questions and Answers on Genesis. Translated from the Ancient Armenian Version of the Original Greek*, trans. Marcus, Ralph (Loeb Classical Library 380; Philo Supplement I; London – Cambridge (Mss.), 1953).

- Philost. HE = *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochien und den Fragmenten eines arianischen Historiographen*, ed. Bidez, Joseph (*Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Drei Jahrhunderte* 21; Leipzig, 1913); *Philostorgius. Church History*, trans. Amidon, Philip R. (*Writings from the Greco-Roman World* 23; Houston, 2007).
- PJS = *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite*, trans. Trombley, Frank R. and Watt, John. W (TTH 32; Liverpool, 2000).
- Plut. Alex. = *Plutarch's Lives*, vol. VII: *Demosthenes and Cicero. Alexander and Caesar*, ed. and trans. Perrin, Bernadotte [*The Loeb Classical Library* 99; Cambridge (Mss.) – London, 1919 (repr. 1967)].
- PZ = *Historia ecclesiastica zachariae rhetoric vulgo adscripta I*, ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter [Syr., ser. III, t. V, Leuven, 1919 (repr. CSCO 83; Syr. 38; Leuven, 1953)]; trans. Brooks, Ernest-Walter [Syr., ser. III, t. V, Leuven, 1924 (repr. CSCO 87; Syr. 41; Leuven, 1924)]; *Historia ecclesiastica zachariae rhetoric vulgo adscripta II. Accedit fragmentum historiae ecclesiasticae dionysii telmahrensensis*, ed. Brooks, Ernest-Walter [Syr., ser. III, t. VI; Leuven, 1921 (repr. CSCO 84; Syr. 39; Leuven, 1953)]; trans. Brooks, Ernest-Walter [Syr., ser. III, t. VI; Leuven, 1924 (repr. CSCO 88; Syr. 42; Leuven, 1953)].
- Rordam 1861 = *Libri Judicum et Ruth secundum versionem syriaco-hexaplarum*, ed. Rordam, Thomas Skat, Havniae, 1861.
- Socr. HE = *Sokrates Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Hansen, Günther C. and Širinjan, Manja (*Series: Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, n. F. 1; Berlin, 1995).
- Socr. HE Arm. = *The Armenian Adaptation of the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates Scholasticus*, trans. Thomson, Robert W. (*Hebrew University Armenian Studies* 3; Leuven, 2001).
- Sol. Bosr. Lib. Ap. = *The Book of the Bee*, ed. and trans. Budge, Earnest A.W., Oxford, 1886.
- Soz. HE = *Sozomenus. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Bidez, Joseph (†) and Hansen, Günther C. (*Die Griechischen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte* 50; Berlin 1960).
- The Syriac World History* = *The Syriac World History*, ed. Cicek, Julius Yesu (Bar Ebroyo Kloster Publications 47; Piscataway, 2010).
- at-Tabari = Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Tabarī, *Ta'riḫ al-rusul wa-l-mulūk/Annales*, ed. de Goeje, Michael J. et al., Leiden, 1879-1901); *The History of al-PESHITTAabari*, vol. X: *The Conquest of Arabia*, trans. Donner, Fred. M, Albany, 1993; vol. XIV: *The Conquest of Iran*, trans. Smith, G. Rex, Albany, 1994; vol. XV: *The Crises of the Early Caliphate*, trans. Humphreys, R. Stephen, Albany, 1990; vol. XVII: *The First Civil War*, trans. Hawting, G.R., Albany, 1996; vol. XIX: *The Caliphate of Yazīd b. Mu'āwiyah*, trans. Howard, I.K.A., Albany, 9; vol. XXVI: *The Waning of the Umayyad Caliphate*, trans. Hillenbrand, Carole, Albany, 1989; vol. XXVII: *The 'Abbāsīd Revolution*, trans. Williams, John. A., Albany, 1985; vol. XXVIII: *'Abbāsīd Authority Affirmed*, trans. Dammen McAuliffe, Jane, Albany, 1995; vol. XXXII: *The Reunification of the 'Abbāsīd Caliphate*, trans. Bosworth, Cyril E., Albany, 1987.
- Theod. Cyr. HE = *Theodoret. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Parmentier, Léon, Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller 19, Leipzig, 1911.
- Theod. Lect. (Epit.) = *Theodoros Anagnostes Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Hansen, Günther Christian, Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 3, Berlin, 1995.
- Theophan. Chron. = *Theophanis Chronographia. Volumen 1: Textum Graecum Continens*, ed. de Boor, Carolus, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1883 (repr. Hildesheim, 1963); *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor: Byzantine and Near Eastern History 284-813*, trans. Mango, Cyril and Scott, Roger, Oxford, 1997.

Theophyl. Simoc. Hist. = *Theophylacti Simocattae Historiae*, ed. de Boor, Carl. and Wirth, P., Stuttgart, 1972; *The History of Theophylact Simocatta*, trans. Whitby Michael and Whitby Mary, Oxford, 1986.

Vit. Proph. Syr. = Nestlé, *Syrische Grammatik*, Berlin, 1888 (second edition), ۹۹ – ۱۰۰.

Waqidi = *Kitāb al-maghāzī of al-Wāqidī*, ed. Jones, Marsden, 3 vols., London, 1966.

## MODERN AUTHORS

Abramowski 1940 = Abramowski, Rudolph, *Dionysius von Tellmahre Jakobitischer Patriarch von 818-845. Zur Geschichte der Kirche unter dem Islam (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 25:2; Leipzig, 1940).*

Adler 1987 = Adler, William, "Abraham and the burning of the temple of idols: Jubilees' traditions in Christian chronography," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 77:2-3 (October 1986-January 1987), 95-117.

Adler 1989 = Adler, William, *Time Immemorial: archaic history and its sources in Christian chronology from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26; Washington (D.C.), 1989).*

Adler 1994 = Adler, William, "Jacob of Edessa and the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Chronography," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* ed. Reeves, John C. (*SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature* 6; Atlanta, 1994), 143-71.

Adler 2008 = Adler, William, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Jacob of Edessa's Letters and Historical Writings," in *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day*, ed. ter Haar Romeny, Robert Bas (*Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden* 18; Leiden - Boston, 2008), 49-65.

Aigle 2005 = Aigle, Dénise, "Bar Hebraeus et son public à travers ses chroniques en syriaque et en arabe," *Le Muséon* 118 (2005), 3-31.

Allan 1987 = Allan, Nigel, "Syriac Fragments in the Wellcome Institute Library," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1 (1987), 43-7.

Anthony 2010 = Anthony, Sean W., "The Syriac Account of Dionysius of Tell Maḥrē concerning the Assassination of 'Umar b. Al-Khaṭṭāb," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 69:2 (2010), 209-224.

Assemani 1719-1728 = Assemani, Giuseppe Simone, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana: in qua manuscriptos codices Syriacos, Arabicos, Persicos, Turcicos, Hebraicos, Samaritanos, Armenicos, Aethiopicos, Graecos, Aegyptiacos, Ibericos, & Malabaricos, jussu et munificentia Clementis XI ... ex Oriente conquisitos, comparatos, avectos, & Bibliothecae Vaticanae addictos*, 3 vols., Rome, 1719-28.

Assemani - Assemani 1756-1759 = Assemani, Giuseppe Simone, *Biblioteca apostolica vaticana. Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus in tres partes distributus: in quarum prima Orientales, in altera Graeci in tertia Latini Italici aliorumque Europaeorum idiomatum codices*, 3 vols., Rome, 1756-1759 (repr. Paris, 1926).

Barsoum 2003 = Barsoum, Ignatius Aphram I, *The Scattered Pearls. A history of Syriac literature and sciences* (trans. M. Moosa, second revised edition), Piscataway (N.J.), 2003.

Baumstark 1922 = Baumstark, Anton, *Geschichte der Syrischen Literatur*, Bonn, 1922.

Beaucamp/Agusta-Boularot 2004 = *Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas*, ed. Beaucamp, Joëlle and Agusta-Boularot, Sandrine (*Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, Monographies* 15; Paris, 2004).

- Becker 2013 = Becker, Carl H., "Bābalyūn," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. Brill Online, 2013, consulted on 19 June 2013.
- Bessières 1923 = Bessières, Marius, *La Tradition manuscrite de la Correspondance de S. Basile*, Oxford, 1923.
- Bettiolo 2006 = Bettiolo, Paolo, "Syriac Literature," in *Patrology: The Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon to John of Damascus*, ed. di Berardino, Angelo, Cambridge, 2006, 407-19.
- Binggeli 2012 = Binggeli, André, "Les collections de Vies de saints dans les manuscrits syriaques, » in *L'hagiographie syriaque*, ed. Binggeli, André (*Études syriaques* 9; Paris, 2012), 49-75.
- Blaudeau 2006 = Blaudeau, Philippe, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451-491). De l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie* (*Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 327; Rome, 2006).
- Blockley 1981-3 = Blockley, Roger C., *The fragmentary classicising historians of the later Roman Empire: Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus, and Malchus*, 2 vols., Liverpool, 1981-3.
- Blockley 1989 = Blockley, Roger C., "Constantius II and Persia," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, vol. 5, ed. Deroux, Carl (*Collection Latomus* 206; Brussels 1989), 465-90.
- Borrut 2005 = Borrut, Antoine, "Entre tradition et histoire: genèse et diffusion de l'image de 'Umar II," *Mélanges de l'Université de Saint-Joseph* 58 (2005), 345-54.
- Borrut 2009 = Borrut, Antoine, "La circulation de l'information historique entre les sources arabomusulmanes et syriaques: Élie de Nisibe et ses sources," in *L'historiographie syriaque*, ed. Debié, Muriel (*Études syriaques* 6; Paris, 2009), 137-59.
- Bosworth 1996 = Bosworth, Clifford E., *The New Islamic Dynasties. A Chronological and Genealogical Manual*, Edinburgh, 1996.
- Bowker 1969 = Bowker, John, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, Cambridge, 1969.
- Breydy 1990 = Breydy, Michael, "Das Chronikon des Maroniten Theophilus ibn Tuma," *Journal of Oriental and African Studies* 2 (1990), 34-46.
- Brock 1968 = Brock, Sebastian P., "A Fragment of Enoch in Syriac," *Journal of Theological Studies* NS 19:2 (1968), 626-633.
- Brock 1969 = Brock, Sebastian P., "Notes on some texts in the Mingana collection," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 14:2, 205-26.
- Brock 1973 = Brock, Sebastian P., "A Syriac Life of Maximus the Confessor," *Analecta Bollandiana* 91 (1973), 299-346.
- Brock 1978 = Brock, Sebastian P., "Abraham and the Ravens: A Syriac Counterpart to Jubilees 11-12 and Its Implications," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 9 (1978), 135-152.
- Brock 1979/1980 = Brock, Sebastian P., "Syriac historical writing: a survey of the main sources," *Journal of the Iraqi Academy* 5 (1979/1980), 296-326.
- Brock 1981 = Brock, Sebastian P., "Some New Syriac Texts Attributed to Hippolytus," *Le Muséon* 94 (1981), 177-200.
- Brock 1982 = Brock, Sebastian P., "Some Syriac Legends Concerning Moses," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33:1-2 (1982), 237-255.
- Brock 1997 = Brock, Sebastian P., *A Brief Outline of Syriac Literature* (*Moran 'Eth'o* 9; Kottayam, 1997).
- Brock 1999 = Brock, Sebastian P., "The Baptist's diet in Syriac Sources," *Oriens Christianus* 54 (1970), 113-24 [repr. in Brock, Sebastian P., *From Ephrem to Romanos: Interactions between Syriac and Greek in Late Antiquity* (*Variorum Collected Series* 664; Aldershot, 1999)].

- Brock 2001 = Brock, Sebastian P., "Traduzioni siriane degli scritti di Basilio," in *Basilio tra oriente e occidente. Convegno Internazionale "Basilio il Grande" e il monachesimo orientale*, Cappadocia, 5-7 ottobre 1999, ed. Baudry, Étienne et al., Magnano, 2001.
- Brock 2004 = Brock, Sebastian P., "Transformations of the Edessa Portrait of Christ," *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* 18, 46-56.
- Brock 2005 = Brock, Sebastian, "The Use of *Hijra* Dating in Syriac Manuscripts: A Preliminary Investigation," in *Redefining Christian Identity. Cultural Interaction in the Middle East since the Rise of Islam*, ed. van Ginkel, Jan J., Murre – van den Berg, Heleen, and van Lint, Theo M. (OLA 134; Leuven – Paris – Dudley (MA), 2005), 275-90.
- Brock 2006 = Brock, Sebastian P., "The Lives of the Prophets in Syriac: Some Soundings," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*, ed. Hempel, Charlotte and Lieu, Judith M. (*Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 111; Leiden – Boston, 2006), 21-37.
- Brock 2011 = Brock, Sebastian P., "Ya<sup>c</sup>qub Burd<sup>o</sup>yo," in *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage*, ed. Brock, Sebastian P., Butts, Aaron M., Kiraz, George A. and van Rompay, Lucas, Piscataway (N.J.), 2011, 431-2.
- Brock/Fitzgerald 2013 = *Two Early Lives of Severos, Patriarch of Antioch*, trans. with an introduction and notes by Brock, Sebastian and Fitzgerald, Brian (TTH 59; Liverpool, 2013).
- Brockelmann 1928 = Brockelmann, Carl, "Syriaca," *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 6 (1928), 1-4.
- Brodersen 1992 = Brodersen, Kai, *Reiseführer zu den Sieben Weltwundern: Philon von Byzanz und andere antike Texte*, 1992.
- Brooks 1899 = Brooks, Ernest-Walter, "The Chronology of Theophanes 607-755," *BZ* 8 (1899), 82-97.
- Brooks 1906 = Brooks, Ernest-Walter, "The Sources of Theophanes and the Syriac Chroniclers," *BZ* 15 (1906), 578-87.
- Bruns 2005 = Bruns, Peter, "Die Kreuzzüge in syrisch-christlichen Quellen," in *Vom Schisma zu den Kreuzzügen: 1054-1204*, ed. Bruns, Peter and Gresser, Georg, Paderborn, 2005, 41-65.
- Burgess 1999 = Burgess, Richard W., *Eusebian and Post-Eusebian chronography: 1. The "Chronici canones" of Eusebius of Caesarea: structure, content and chronology, AD 282-325 -- 2. The "Continuatio Antiochiensis Eusebii": a chronicle of Antioch and the Roman Near East during the Reigns of Constantine and Constantius II, AD 325-350* (*Historia. Einzelschriften* 135; Stuttgart, 1999).
- Burgess/Kulikowski 2013 = Burgess Richard W. and Kulikowski, Michael, *A Historical Introduction to the Chronicle Genre from its Origins to the High Middle Ages* (*Studies in the Early Middle Ages* 33; *Mosaics of Time. The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century BC to the Sixth Century AD* 1; Turnhout, 2013).
- Cameron 1976 = Cameron, Averil, "An Emperor's Abdication," *Byzantino-Slavica* 37 (1976), 161-7.
- Castelli 2001 = Castelli, Silvia, "Riferimenti a Flavio Giuseppe nella letteratura siriana," *Henoch* 23:2-3 (2001), 199-226.
- Chabot 1917 = Chabot, Jean-Baptiste, "Un épisode inédit de l'histoire des croisades," in *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 61:2 (1917), 77-84.
- Chabot 1924 = Chabot, Jean-Baptiste, "Un épisode de l'histoire des croisades," in *Mélanges offerts à M. Gustave Schlumberger à l'occasion du quatre-vingtième anniversaire de sa naissance*, Paris, 1924, 169-79.
- Chabot 1934 = Chabot, Jean-Baptiste, *Littérature syriaque*, Paris, 1934.

- Coakley 1981 = Coakley, James F., "The Old Man Simeon (Luke 2.25) in Syriac Tradition," *OCP* 47 (1981), 189-222.
- Conrad 1990 = Conrad, Lawrence I., "Theophanes and the Arabic Historical Tradition: Some Indications of Intercultural Transmission," *BF* 15 (1990), 1-44.
- Conrad 1992 = Conrad, Lawrence I., "The Conquest of Arwād: A Source-Critical Study in the Historiography of the Early Medieval Near East," in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East, I: Problems in the Literary Source Material*, ed. Cameron, Averil and Conrad, Lawrence I. (*Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam* 1; Princeton (N.J.), 1992), 317-401.
- Conrad 1994 = Conrad, Lawrence I., "On the Arabic Chronicle of Barhebraeus: His Aims and Audience," *Parole de l'Orient* 19 (1994), 319-78.
- Conrad 1996 = Conrad, Lawrence I., "The Arabs and the Colossus," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, ser. III, 6 (1996), 165-87.
- Conrad 1999 = Conrad, Lawrence I., "Varietas Syriaca: Secular and Scientific Culture in the Christian Communities of Syria after the Arab Conquest," in *After Bardaisan: Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honour of Professor H.J.W. Drijvers*, ed. Reinink, Gerrit-Jan and A.C. Klugkist (*Orientalia Lovaniensa Analecta* 89; Leuven, 1999), 85-105.
- Conrad 2005 = Conrad, Lawrence I., "The Mawālī and Early Arabic Historiography," in *Patronate and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam*, ed. Bernardts, Monique and Nawas, John (*Islamic History and Civilization Studies and Texts* 61; Leiden, 2005), 370-425.
- Conterno 2014a (forthcoming) = Conterno, Maria, *La "descrizione dei tempi" all'alba dell'espansione islamica. Un'indagine sulla storiografia greca, siriana e araba fra VII e VIII secolo*, Berlin, 2014 (forthcoming).
- Conterno 2014b (forthcoming) = Conterno, Maria, "Theophilos, "the more likely candidate"? Towards a reappraisal of the question of Theophanes' "Oriental Source(s)," in *The Chronicle of Theophanes: sources, composition and transmission*, ed. Jankowiak, Marek and Montinaro, Federico, 2014 (forthcoming).
- Cowan 1994 = *The Hans Wehr Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*, ed. Cowan, J. Milton, Urbana (Il.), 1994 (fourth edition).
- Crone 1980 = Crone, Patricia, *Slaves on Horses. The Evolution of the Islamic Polity*, Cambridge, 1980.
- D'yakonov 1908 = D'yakonov, Alexander Petrovic, *Иоаннъ Ефесскій и его церковно-историческіе труды*, Saint-Petersburg, 1908.
- Davenport 1971 = Davenport, Gene L., *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (*Studia Post-biblica* 20; Leiden, 1971).
- de Goeje 1900 = de Goeje Michael J., *Mémoire sur la Conquête de la Syrie*, Leiden, 1900.
- Debié 1998 = Debié, Muriel, "Temps linéaire, temps circulaire: chronologie et histoire dans les chroniques syriaques," in *Proche-orient ancien: temps vécu, temps pensé. Actes de la Table-Ronde du 15 novembre 1997 organisée par l'URA 1062 "Etudes Sémitiques"*, ed. Briquel-Chatonnet, Françoise and Lozachmeur, Hélène (*Antiquités sémitiques* 3; Paris, 1998), 177-196.
- Debié 2003 = Debié, Muriel, "Du grec en syriaque: la transmission du récit de la prise d'Amid (502) dans l'historiographie byzantine", *BZ* 96:2 (2003), 601-22.
- Debié 2004 = Debié, Muriel, "Jean Malalas et la tradition chronographique de langue syriaque," in *Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas*, ed. Beaucamp/Agusta-Boularot, Sandrine (*Travaux*

- et mémoires du Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, Monographies 15, Paris, 2004), 147-64.
- Debié 2005 = Debié, Muriel, "Homère chronographe: l'héritage grec antique dans l'historiographie syriaque," in *Les Syriques transmetteurs de civilisations. L'expérience du Bilâd el-Shâm à l'époque omeyyade. Patrimoine Syriaque, Actes du Colloque IX*, ed. Mouawad, Ray Jabre, Antélias – Paris, 2005, 69-93.
- Debié 2009a = Debié, Muriel, "Syriac Historiography and Identity Formation," *Church History and Religious Culture* 89 (2009), 93-114.
- Debié 2009b = Debié, Muriel, "L'héritage de l'historiographie grecque," in *L'historiographie syriaque*, ed. Debié, Muriel (*Études syriaques* 6; Paris, 2009), 11-31.
- Debié/Taylor 2012 = Debié, Muriel and Taylor, David, "Syriac and Syro-Arabic historical writing, c.500-c.1400," in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, Volume 2: 400-1400*, ed. Foot, Sarah and Robinson, Chase F., Oxford, 2012, 155-79.
- Desreumaux 2003 = Desreumaux, Alain, "La couronne de Nemrod: quelques réflexions sur le pouvoir, l'histoire et l'écriture dans la culture syriaque," in *Early Christian Voices in Texts, Traditions and Symbols: Essays in honor of François Bovon*, ed. Warren, David H., Brock, Ann Graham and Pao, David W. (*Biblical Interpretation Series* 66, Leiden, 2003), 189-96.
- de Halleux 1988a = de Halleux, André, "Une version syriaque révisée du commentaire d'Hippolyte sur Suzanne," *Le Muséon* 101:3-4 (1988), 297-341.
- de Halleux 1988b = de Halleux, André, "L'Histoire Ecclésiastique de Théodoret dans les floriglèges grégoriens syriaques," in *Mélanges Antoine Guillaumont*, 1988, 221-32.
- de Halleux 1989 = de Halleux, André, "Hippolyte en version syriaque," *Le Muséon* 102:1-2 (1989), 19-42.
- de Urbina 1965 = de Urbina, Ignatius Ortiz, *Patrologia Syriaca*, Rome, 1965.
- Donner 1981 = Donner, Fred M., *The Early Islamic Conquests*, Princeton, 1981.
- Drijvers/Drijvers 1997 = *The Finding of the True Cross: The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac*, ed. and trans. Drijvers, Han J.W. and Drijvers, Jan Willem (CSCO 565, Subs. 93; Leuven, 1997).
- El-Eid Bualwan 2011 = El-Eid Bualwan, Hayyat, "Syriac Historical Writing in the Thirteenth Century: the Histories of Ibn al-ʿIbri (Bar Hebraeus Abū l-Faraġ)," *Parole de l'Orient* 26 (2001), 145-58.
- Etheridge 1865 = Etheridge, John W., *The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch*, London, 1862-5.
- Fedwick 1993-2004 = Fedwick, Paul J., *Bibliotheca Basiliana Universalis*, 5 vols., Turnhout, 1993-2004.
- Fiey s.d. = Fiey, Jean-Marc, *Mossoul chrétienne: essai sur l'histoire, l'archéologie et l'état actuel des monuments chrétiens de la ville de Mossoul (Recherches publiées sous la direction de l'Institut de lettres orientales de Beyrouth* 12; Beirut, s.d.).
- Frishman 1992 = Frishman, J., *The Ways and Means of the Divine Economy: An Edition, Translation and Study of Six Biblical Homilies by Narsai*, PhD diss., Universiteit Leiden, 1992.
- Furlani 1927 = Furlani, Giuseppe, "Andronikos über die Bewohner der Grenzen der Erde in syrischer Sprache," *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 5 (1927), 238-249.
- Geiger 1860 = Geiger, Abraham, "Notizen," *ZDMG* 14 (1860), 277-9.
- Gelzer 1880-1898 = Gelzer, Heinrich, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1880-98.
- Gelzer 1894 = Gelzer, Heinrich, "Die vorflutigen Chaldäerfürsten des Annianos," *BZ* 2 (1894), 391-3.

- Gibb 2014 = Gibb, H.A.R., “Abū Mikhnaḥ,” *EI* 2, Brill Online, last consultation on 06 February 2014.
- Gibb/Tritton 1933 = Gibb, H.A.R. and Tritton, Arthur S., “The First and Second Crusades from an Anonymous Syriac Chronicle,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1933), 69-101 and 273-305.
- Gottheil 1887 = Gottheil, Richard J.H., “Kotték’s “Das Sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum,”” *Hebraica* 3 (1887), 136-151.
- Götze 1923 = Götze, Albrecht, “Die Nachwirkung der Schatzhöhle,” *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 2 (1923), 51-94.
- Götze 1924 = Götze, Albrecht, “Die Nachwirkung der Schatzhöhle,” *Zeitschrift für Semitistik* 3 (1924), 53-71, 153-177.
- Graf 1947 = Graf, Georg, *Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur, vol. 2: Die Schifsteller bis zur Mittle des 15. Jahrhunderts (Studi e Testi 133; Vatican, 1947).*
- Greatrex 2009 = Greatrex, Geoffrey, *Le pseudo-Zacharie de Mytilène et l’historiographie syriaque au Vie s, in L’historiographie syriaque*, ed. Debié, Muriel (*Études syriaques* 6; Paris, 2009), 33-55.
- Greatrex 2014 (forthcoming) = Greatrex, Geoffrey, “Théodore le Lecteur et son épitomateur anonyme du VIIe s., in *Historiographie tardo-antique et transmission des savoirs*, ed. Blaudeau, Philippe and Van Nuffelen, Peter, 2014 (forthcoming).
- Greatrex/Bardill 1996 = Greatrex, Geoffrey and Bardill, Jonathan, “Antiochus the “Praepositus”: A Persian Eunuch at the Court of Theodosius II,” *DOP* 50 (1996), 171-97.
- Greatrex et al. 2011 = Greatrex, Geoffrey, Phenix, Robert R. and Horn, Cornelia B., *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity (TTH 55; Liverpool, 2011).*
- Greenwood 2008 = Greenwood, Tim, “‘New Light from the East’: Chronography and Ecclesiastical History through a Late Seventh-Century Armenian Source,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 16, 197-254.
- Griffith 1997 = Griffith, Sidney H., “From Aramaic to Arabic: The Languages of the Monasteirs of Palestine in the Byzantine and Early Islamic Periods,” *DOP* 51 (1997), 11-31.
- Griffith 2001 = Griffith, Sidney H., “‘Melkites’, ‘Jacobites’ and the Christological Controversies in Arabic in Third/Ninth-Century Syria,” in *Syrian Christians under Islam. The First Thousand Years*, ed. Thomas, David () 9-55.
- Griffith 2006 = Griffith, Sidney H., “The Church of Jerusalem and the ‘Melkites’: The Making of an ‘Arab Orthodox’ Christian Identity in the World of Islam (750-1050 CE),” in *Christians and Christianity in the Holy Land. From the Origins to the Latin Kingdoms*, ed. Limor, Ora and Stroumsa, Guy (*Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* 5; Turnhout, 2006).
- Griffith 2010 = Griffith, Sidney H., *The Church in the Shadow of the Mosque. Christians and Muslims in the World of Islam*, Princeton and Oxford, 2008 (repr. 2010).
- Griffith 2013 = Griffith, Sidney H., *The Bible in Arabic. The Scriptures of the “People of the Book” in the Language of Islam*, Princeton – Oxford, 2013.
- Grumel 1958 = Grumel, Venance, *Traité d’études byzantines. I: La chronologie*, Paris, 1958.
- Grusková 2012 = Grusková, Jana, “Further Steps in Revealing, Editing and Analysing Important Ancient Greek and Byzantine Texts Hidden in Palimpsests,” *Graecolatina et Orientalia* 23-4 (2012), 69-82.
- Guscini 2008 = Guscini, Marc, *The Image of Edessa (The Medieval Mediterranean 82; Leiden, 2008).*
- Hage 1966 = Hage, Wolfgang, *Die syrisch-jakobitische Kirche in frühislamischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden, 1966.

- Hall 1887 = Hall, "The Lives of the Prophets," *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* 7:1 (1887), 28-40.
- Harvey 2001 = Harvey, Susan A., "Theodora the 'Believing Queen,'" *Hugoye* 4:2 (2001), 209-34.
- Hilkens 2013 = Hilkens, Andy, "Syriac Ilioupersides. The Fall of Troy in Syriac Historiography," *Le Muséon* 126:3-4 (2013), 285-318.
- Hilkens 2014 (forthcoming) = Hilkens, Andy, "Andronicus et son influence sur la présentation de l'histoire postdiluvienne et pré-abrahamique de la *Chronique syriaque anonyme jusqu'à l'année 1234*," in *Historiographie tardo-antique et transmission des savoirs*, ed. Blaudeau, Philippe and Van Nuffelen, Peter, 2014 (forthcoming).
- Hinds 1972 = Hinds, Martin, "The Siffin Arbitration Agreement," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 17 (1972), 93-113.
- Holladay 1983 = Holladay, Carl R., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Volume 1: Historians (Text and Translations 20, Pseudepigrapha 10; Chico, 1983)*.
- Honigmann 1944 = Honigmann, Ernest, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 64:3 (1944), review of Rozenthal, Franz, *Aḥmad b. aṭ-Ṭayyib as-Saraḥsī (American Oriental Series 26; New Haven, 1943)*.
- Hoyland 1991 = Hoyland, Robert G., "Arabic, Syriac and Greek Historiography in the First Abbasid Century: An Inquiry into Inter-Cultural Traffic," *Aram* 3 (1991), 211-33.
- Hoyland 1997 = Hoyland, Robert G., *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It. A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam (Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam 13; Princeton, 1997)*.
- Hoyland 2000 = Hoyland, Robert G., "The Earliest Christian Writings on Muhammad: an Appraisal," in *The Biography of Muhammad. The Issue of the Sources*, ed. Motzki, Harald (*Islamic History and Civilization. Studies and Texts* 32; Leiden-Boston-Köln, 2000), 276-97.
- Hoyland 2011 = Hoyland, Robert G., *Theophilus of Edessa's Chronicle and the Circulation of Historical Knowledge in Late Antiquity and Early Islam (TTH 57; Liverpool, 2011)*.
- Ibrahim 1994 = Filuksinōs Yuhannon Dōlabānī, Mhawwyono da-ktobe srite d-botay arke d-dayroto wa-d-<sup>ṣ</sup>idoto suryoyoto da-b-Madnho (Fihris mahtūtātas-suryānīya), ed. Grigōriyōs Yuhannon Abrohom [Ibrāhīm], Aleppo, 1994.
- Jacques/Bousquet 1984 = Jacques, François, and Bousquet, Bernard, "Le raz de marée du 21 juillet 365. Du cataclysme local à la catastrophe cosmique," *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Antiquité* T. 96 (1984), 423-461.
- Jakob 2005 = Jakob, Thomas, "Literar- und quellengeschichtliche Untersuchung der Mār Mattai-Legende," *Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientwissenschaft* 40 (2005), 71-104.
- James/Feldman 1971 = James, Montague R. and Feldman, Louis H., *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo [Translations of Early Documents Series 1; London, 1917 (repr. New York, 1971)]*.
- Jeffreys/Croke/Scott 1990 = *Studies on John Malalas*, ed. Jeffreys, Elizabeth, Croke, Brian and Roger Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 6; Sydney, 1990).
- Kaufhold 2011 = Kaufhold, Hubert, "Theodoros bar Wahbun," in *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage*, ed. Brock, Sebastian P., Butts, Aaron M., Kiraz, George A. and van Rompay, Lucas, Piscataway (N.J.), 2011, 406.
- Kawerau 1955 = Kawerau, Peter, *Die jakobitische Kirche im Zeitalter der syrischen Renaissance. Idee und Wirklichkeit*, Berlin, 1960 (second edition).

- Kazhdan 1987 = Kazhdan, Alexander P., ““Constantine imaginaire,” *Byzantine Legends of the Ninth Century about Constantine the Great*,” *Byzantion* 57 (1987), 196-250.
- Kennedy 1981 = Kennedy, Hugh, *The Early Abbasid Caliphate*, London, 1981.
- Keseling 1927a = Keseling, Paul, “Die Chronik des Eusebius in der syrischen Überlieferung,” *OC* 23 (1927), 23-48, 223-41.
- Keseling 1927b = Keseling, Paul, “Die Chronik des Eusebius in der syrischen Überlieferung,” *OC* 24 (1927), 33-57.
- Kiraz 2011 = Kiraz, George A., “Maphrian,” in *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage*, ed. Brock, Sebastian P., Butts, Aaron M., Kiraz, George A. and van Rompay, Lucas, Piscataway (N.J.), 2011, 264-5.
- Kleyn 1882 = Kleyn, Hendrik G., *Jacobus Baradaeüs. De stichter der syrische monophysietische Kerk*, Leiden, 1882.
- Kohlberg 2014 = Kohlberg, E., “Shamir (also al-Shamir, commonly Shimr) b. Dhi 'l-Djawshan,” *EI* 2, Brill Online, last consultation on 6 February 2014.
- Kottek 1886 = Kottek, Hermann, *Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum: nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet*, Berlin, 1886.
- Kruisheer 1997 = Kruisheer, Dirk, “Reconstructing Jacob of Edessa’s Scholia,” in *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian interpretation*, ed. Freshman, Judith and Van Rompay, Lucas (*Traditio Exegetica Graeca* 5; Leuven, 1997), 187-96.
- Lamoreaux 2014 = Lamoreaux, John C; “Agapius of Manbij,” in *The Orthodox Church in the Arab World (700-1700). An Anthology of Sources*, ed. Noble, Samuel and Treiger, Alexander, DeKalb (Ill.), 2014, 136-59.
- Lebram 1965 = Lebram, Jürgen C.H., “Nachbiblische Weisheitstraditionen,” *Vetus Testamentum* 15 (1965), 167-237.
- Lewis 1894 = Lewis, A.S., *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai (Studia Sinaitica* 1; London, 1894).
- Lüders 1964 = Lüders, Anneliese, *Die Kreuzzüge im Urteil syrischer und armenischer Quellen*, (*Berliner Byzantinistische Arbeiten* 29; Berlin, 1964).
- Meinecke 2014 = Meinecke, M., “al-Raḳḳa,” *EI* 2, Brill Online, last consultation on 13 March 2014.
- Mengozzi 2011 = Mengozzi, Alessandro, “Cause of Causes,” in *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage*, ed. Brock, Sebastian P., Butts, Aaron M., Kiraz, George A. and van Rompay, Lucas, Piscataway (N.J.), 2011, 90-1.
- Menze 2009 = Menze, Volker L., *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church* [*Oxford Christian Studies*; Oxford, 2008 (repr. 2009)].
- Milik 1971 = Milik, Józef T., “Recherches sur la version grecque du Livre des Jubilés,” *RB* 78 (1971), 545-57.
- Milik 1976 = Milik, Józef T., *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*, Oxford, 1976.
- Mingana 1917 = Mingana, Alphonse, “Some Early Judaeo-Christian Documents in the John Rylands Library,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester* 4:1 (1917), 3-62.
- Mingana 1948 = Mingana, Alphonse, *Catalogue of the Mingana collection of manuscripts, now in the possession of the trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham*, vol. 1: Syriac and Garshuni manuscripts, Birmingham, 1948.

- Molenberg 1986 = Molenberg, Corrie, "Habakkuk's Dinner: An Apocryphal Story and its Aftermath," in *Scripta Signa Vocis: Studies about Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes and Languages in the Near East, presented to J. H. Hospers by his pupils, colleagues and friends*, ed. Vanstiphout Herman L.J., Jongeling, K., Leemhuis, Fred and Reinink, Gerrit Jan, Groningen, 1986, 155-62.
- Moosa 2003a = Moosa, Matti, "A Sketch of Syriac Sources on the Crusades," in *The Crusades: Other Experiences, Alternate Perspectives. Selected Proceedings from the 32nd Annual CEMERS Conference*, ed. by Semaan, Khalil I., Binghamton (N.Y.), 2003, 47-58.
- Moosa 2003b = Moosa, Matti, "The Crusades: An Eastern Perspective, with Emphasis on Syriac Sources," *The Muslim World* 93:2 (2003), 249-289.
- Morony 2005 = Morony, Michael, "History and Identity in the Syrian Churches," in *Redefining Christian Identity. Cultural Interaction in the Middle East since the Rise of Islam*, ed. van Ginkel, Jan J., Murre - van den Berg, Heleen, and van Lint, Theo M. (OLA 134; Leuven - Paris - Dudley (MA), 2005), 1-33.
- Mosshammer 2008 = Mosshammer, Alden A., *The Easter Computus and the Origins of the Christian Era* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford, 2008).
- Nau 1915-17 = Nau, François, "Une liste de chronographes," *ROC* 20 (1915-1917), 101-4.
- Nau 1917 = Nau, François, "Révélation et légendes. Méthodius. - Clément. - Andronicus," *Journal asiatique* XI, 9 (1917), 415-471.
- Nau 1929-30 = Nau, François, "Sur Aaron de Saroug et ses deux monastères," *ROC* 27 (1929-30), 206-11.
- Nautin 1994 = Nautin, P., "Théodore Lecteur et sa « Réunion de différentes histoires » de l'église," *REB* 52 (1994), 213-43.
- Noegel 2003 = Noegel, Scott B. "Abraham's Ten Trials and Biblical Literary Convention," *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 21 (2003), 73-83.
- Noy/Bloedhorn 2004 = Noy, David and Bloedhorn, Hanswulf, *Inscriptiones Iudaicae Orientis. III Syria and Cyprus* (Texts and studies in ancient Judaism 102; Tübingen, 2004).
- Omont 1882 = Omont, Henri, "Les sept merveilles du monde au Moyen Âge," *Bibliothèque de l'école de Chartes* 43 (1882), 40-59.
- Palmer 1993 = Palmer, Andrew, *The Seventh Century in West-Syrian Chronicles* (TTH 15; Liverpool, 1993).
- Palmer 2009 = Palmer, Andrew, "Les chroniques brèves," in *L'historiographie syriaque*, ed. Debié, Muriel (*Études syriaques* 6; Paris, 2009), 57-87.
- Papaconstantinou 2013 = Papaconstantinou, Arietta, *Le Muséon* 126:3-4 (2013), review of Hoyland 2011.
- Payne Smith 1864 = Payne Smith, Robert, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae Pars vi codices Syriacos etc. complectens*, Oxford, 1864.
- Payne Smith 1903 = Payne Smith, J., *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith*, Oxford, 1903.
- Phillips 1864 = Phillips, George, *Scholia on Passages of the Old Testament by Mar Jacob, Bishop of Edessa*, London - Edinburgh, 1864.
- Pieler 1972 = Pieler, Peter E., "L'aspect politique et juridique de l'adoption de Chosroès proposée par les Perses à Justin," *Revue internationale des droits de l'Antiquité* 19 (1972), 399-433.
- Pigulevskaya 2000 = Pigulevskaya, Nina S., *Siriiskaye srednevekovaye istoriografiye*, St.- Petersburg, 2000 (in Russian).

- Pormann 2004 = Pormann, Peter. E., *The Oriental Tradition of Paul of Aegina's Pragmateia*, (*Studies in Ancient Medicine* 29; Leiden, 2004).
- Pouderon 1998 = Pouderon, Bernard, "Le codex Parisinus graecus 1555 A et sa révision de l'Épitomè byzantin d'histoires ecclésiastiques," *REB* 56 (1998), 169-91.
- Pownall 2013 = Pownall, Frances, "Aristoboulos of Kassandreia (139)," in *Brill's New Jacoby*, ed. Worthington, Ian, Brill Online. Last consultation on 19 June 2013.
- Prigent 1972 = Prigent, Pierre, "Hippolyte, commentateur de l'Apocalypse," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 28 (1972), 391-412.
- Prigent/Stehly 1973 = Prigent, Pierre and Stehly, Ralph, "Les fragments du De Apocalypsi d'Hippolyte," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 29 (1973), 313-333.
- Prigent/Stehly 1974 = Prigent, Pierre and Stehly, Ralph, "Citations d'Hippolyte trouvées dans le ms Bodl. syr. 140," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 30 (1974), 82-85.
- Pritula 2009 = Pritula, Anton, "Восточносирийские песнопения ('ониты) и гомилии Нарся: шесть гимнов из сборника "Варда","" *Символ* 55 (2009), 152-253.
- RECA = Wissowa, Georg, et al., *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Reihe I* (47 vols.), *Reihe II* (19 vols.), *Suppl.* (15 vols.), Stuttgart – München, 1893-1978).
- Reinink 2010 = Reinink, Gerrit J., "George Warda and Michael Badoqa," in *The Syriac Renaissance*, ed. Teule, Herman, Fotescu Tauwinkl, Carmen, ter Haar Romeny, Bas and van Ginkel, Jan (*Eastern Christian Studies* 9; Leuven – Paris – Walpole (MA), 2010), 65-74.
- Ri 2000 = Ri, Su-Min, *Commentaire sur la Caverne des Trésors: Étude sur l'histoire du texte et de ses sources* (CSCO 581, Subs. 103; Leuven, 2000).
- Riad 1988 = Riad, Eva, *Studies in the Syriac Preface* (*Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia semitica Upsaliensia* 11; Stockholm, 1988).
- Riva 1974 = Riva, Raimondo, "La "Introduzione ai Salmi" falsamente attribuita a Ippolito e il Cod. Ambr. C 313 inf.," in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant. Vol. 1: Écriture Sainte – Ancien Orient. (Studi e Testi* 231; Vatican City, 1964), 351-64.
- Robinson 2003 = Robinson, Chase F., "Ar –Raqqa in the Syriac Historical Tradition," in *Raqqa II. Die islamische Stadt*, ed. Heidemann, Stefan and Becker, Andrea, Mainz, 2003, 81-5.
- Rubin 1957 = Rubin, Berthold, "Prokopius von Kaisareia," in *PW*, vol. 23, Stuttgart - München, 1957, cols. 273-599.
- Ryan 2004 = Ryan, Stephen D., *Dionysius bar Salibi's Factual and Spiritual Commentary on Psalms 73-82* (*Cahiers de la revue biblique* 57; Paris, 2004).
- Ryssel 1893 = Ryssel, Victor, "Die astronomischen Briefe Georgs des Araberbischofs," *ZA* 8 (1893), 1-55.
- Sachau 1899 = Sachau, Eduard, *Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften*, 2 vols. (*Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin* 23; Berlin, 1899).
- Samir 1977 = Samir, Samir Khalil, "Un auteur chrétien de langue arabe, Elie de Nisibe," *Islamochristiana* 3 (1977), 257-84.
- Samir 1988 = Samir, Samir Khalil, "Date de la mort d'Elie de Nisibe," *OC* 72 (1988), 124-32.
- Satran 1995 = Satran, David, *Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine. Reassessing the Lives of the Prophets* (*Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha* 11; Leiden – New York – Köln, 1995).
- Schermann 1907 = Schermann, Theodor, *Propheten- und Apostellegenden* (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 31; Leipzig, 1907).

- Schove 1984 = Schove, D.J, *Chronology of Eclipses and Comets AD 1-1000*, Dover (N.H.), 1984.
- Schreckenberg 1972 = Schreckenberg, Heinz, *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 5; Leiden, 1972)*.
- Scott 1997 = Scott, James M., "The Division of the Earth in *Jubilees* 8:11-9:15 and Early Christian Chronography," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Albani, Matthias, Frey, Jörg and Lange, Armin (*Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum* 65; Tübingen, 1997), 295-323.
- Scott 2012 = Scott, Roger, "The Image of Constantine in Malalas and Theophanes," in *New Constantines: The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium, 4th-12th Centuries*, ed. Magdalino, Paul, Aldershot, 1994, 57-71 [repr. in Scott, Roger, *Byzantine Chronicles and the Sixth Century (Variorum Collected Studies Series; Farnham, 2012)*].
- Segal 1962 = Segal, Judah B., "Syriac Chronicles as source material for the history of Islamic peoples," in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. Lewis, Bernard and Holt, P.M., London – New York – Toronto, 1962 (repr. 1964), 246-58.
- Segal 2005 = Segal, Judah B., *Edessa. The Blessed City*, London, 1970 [repr. Piscataway (N.J.), 2005, (second edition)].
- Serruys 1913 = Serruys, Daniel, "Les Canons d'Eusèbe, d'Annianos et d'Andronicos d'après Élie de Nisibe," *BZ* 22:1 (1913), 1-36.
- Smit 1907 = Smit, Gabriël, *Bijbel en legende bij den Arabischen schrijver Jaqubi, 9de eeuw na Christus : vertaling en onderzoek naar de bronnen van Ibn-Wādhīh qui dicitur al-Ja'qubī, historiae. Pars prior pp. 1-89*, ed. Houtsma, M.Th., Leiden, 1907.
- Sokoloff 2009 = Sokoloff, Michael, *A Syriac Lexicon. A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*, Winona Lake – Piscataway, 2009.
- Takahashi 2002 = Takahashi, Hidemi, "The Greco-Syriac and Arabic Sources of Barhebraeus' Mineralogy and Meteorology in *Candelbarum of the Sanctuary*, Base II," *Islamic Studies* 41:2 (2002), 215-69.
- Takahashi 2005 = Takahashi, Hidemi, *Barhebraeus. A Bio-Bibliography*, Piscataway (N.J.), 2005.
- Takahashi 2009 = Takahashi, Hidemi, "Observations on Bar 'Ebroyo's Marine Geography," *Hugoye: Journal of Studies* 6 (2009), 77-130.
- Takahashi 2011 = Takahashi, Hidemi, "Bar 'Ebroyo, Grigorios," in *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage*, ed. Brock, Sebastian P., Butts, Aaron M., Kiraz, George A. and van Rompay, Lucas, Piscataway (N.J.), 2011, 54-6.
- Takahashi 2012 = Takahashi, Hidemi, "Also via Istanbul to New Haven. Mss. Yale Syriac 7-12," in *Islamic Philosophy, Science, Culture, and Religion: Studies in honor of Dimitri Gutas*, ed. Opwis, Felicitas and Reisman, David, Leiden-Boston, 2012, 157-76.
- Taylor 2010 = Taylor, David G.K., "The Patriarch and the Pseudepigrapha: Extra-biblical traditions in the writings of Kyriakos of Tagrit (783-817)," in *Sur les pas des Araméens chrétiens: mélanges offerts à Alain Desreumaux*, ed. Briquel-Chatonnet, Françoise and Debié, Muriel (*Cahiers d'études syriaques* 1; Paris, 2010), 35-61.
- Teule 1996 = Teule, Herman, "Barhebraeus' Syriac and Arabic Secular Chronicles," in *East and West in the Crusader States. Context-Contacts-Confrontations*, ed. Ciggaar Krijna N. et al. (*Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 75; Leuven, 1996), 39-49.
- Teule 1999 = Teule, Herman, "It is not right to call ourselves orthodox and the others heretics: Ecumenical attitudes in the Jacobite Church in the time of the Crusaders, in *East and West in the Crusader*

- States: Context, Contacts, Confrontations II*, ed. Ciggaar, Krijnie and Teule, Herman (*Orientalia Lovaniensa Analecta* 92; Leuven, 1999), 13-27.
- Teule 2005a = Teule, Herman, "The Transmission of Islamic Culture to the World of Syriac Christianity: Barhebraeus' Translation of Avicenna's *kitāb al iṣārāt wa l-tanbihāt*. First Soundings," in *Redefining Christian Identity. Cultural Interaction in the Middle East since the Rise of Islam*, ed. van Ginkel, Jan J., Murre – van den Berg, Heleen, and van Lint, Theo M. (OLA 134; Leuven – Paris – Dudley (MA), 2005), 167-84.
- Teule 2005b = Teule, Herman, "Syriac historiography," in *Nos sources. Arts et Littérature Syriaques*, Antélias, 2005, 325-43.
- Teule 2007 = Teule, Herman, "Jacob bar Shakko, the Book of Treasures and the Syrian Renaissance," in *Eastern Crossroads: Essays on Medieval Christian Legacy*, ed. Monferrer-Sala, Juan Pedro (*Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies* 1; Piscataway (N.J.), 2007), 143-54.
- Teule 2010 = Teule, Herman, "The Syriac Renaissance," in *The Syriac Renaissance*, ed. Teule, Herman, Fotescu Tauwinkl, Carmen, ter Haar Romeny, Bas and van Ginkel, Jan (*Eastern Christian Studies* 9; Leuven – Paris – Walpole (MA), 2010), 1-30.
- Teule 2012 = Teule, Herman G.B., "Chronicon ad annum 1234 pertinens," in *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History. Volume 4 (1200-1350)*, ed. Thomas, David R. and Mallett, Alex (*History of Christian-Muslim Relations* 17; Leiden – Boston, 2012), 307-9.
- Tisserant 1921 = Tisserant, Eugène, "Fragments syriaques du Livre des Jubilés," *RB* 30 (1921), 55-86, 206-32.
- Todt 1988 = Todt, Susanne R., "Die syrische und die arabische Weltgeschichte des Bar Hebraeus – ein Vergleich," *Der Islam* 65 (1988), 60-80.
- Treadgold 2010 = Treadgold, Warren, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, Houndmills – New York, 2010.
- Treadgold 2013 = Treadgold, Warren, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Houndmills – New York, 2013.
- Troupeau 1993 = Troupeau, Gérard, "Églises et chrétiens dans l'Orient musulman," in *Évêques, moines et empereurs*, ed. Dagron, Gilbert, Riché, Pierre and Vauchez, André (*Histoire du christianisme* 4; Berlin – New York, 1993) 375-456.
- van Ginkel 1995 = van Ginkel, Jan J., *John of Ephesus: a monophysite historian in sixth-century Byzantium*, PhD diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 1995.
- van Ginkel 2008 = van Ginkel, Jan J. "Greetings to a Virtuous Man: The Correspondence of Jacob of Edessa," in *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day*, ed. ter Haar Romeny, Bas (*Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden* 18; Leiden – Boston, 2008), 67-81.
- van Ginkel 2010 = van Ginkel, Jan, "A Man is not an Island," in *The Syriac Renaissance*, ed. Teule, Herman, Fotescu Tauwinkl, Carmen, ter Haar Romeny, Bas and van Ginkel, Jan (*Eastern Christian Studies* 9; Leuven – Paris – Walpole (MA), 2010), 113-121.
- Van Lint 1999 = Van Lint, Theo M., "Seeking Meaning in Catastrophe: Nersēs Šnorhali's Lament on Edessa," in *East and West in the Crusader States: Context, Contacts, Confrontations II*, ed. Ciggaar, Krijnie and Teule, Herman (*Orientalia Lovaniensa Analecta* 92; Leuven, 1999), 49-106.
- Van Rompay 2011 = Van Rompay, Lucas, "Theodosius of Edessa," in *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage*, ed. Brock, Sebastian P., Butts, Aaron M., Kiraz, George A. and van Rompay, Lucas, Piscataway (N.J.), 2011, 407.

- van Ruiten 1997 = van Ruiten, Jacques, "The interpretation of Genesis 6:1-12 in *Jubilees* 5:1-19," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Albani, Matthias, Frey, Jörg and Lange, Armin (*Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum* 65; Tübingen, 1997), 59-75.
- van Ruiten 1998 = van Ruiten, Jacques T.A.G.M., "The interpretation of the Flood Story in the Book of Jubilees," in *Interpretations of the Flood*, ed. García Martínez, Florentino and Luttikhuisen, Gerard P. (*Themes in Biblical Narrative. Jewish and Christian Traditions* 1; Leiden – Boston – Köln, 1998), 66-85.
- van Ruiten 2000 = van Ruiten, Jacques T.A.G.M., *Primaeval History Interpreted. The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the book of Jubilees* (*Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 66; Leiden – Boston – Köln, 2000).
- VanderKam/Milik 1994 = VanderKam, James and Milik, Józef T., "Jubilees," in Attridge, Harold, Elgvin Torleif, Milik, Józef T, Olyan Saul, Strugnell John, Tov Emanuel, VanderKam J and White, Sidnie, *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (*Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* 13, Oxford, 1994), 1-185.
- VanderKam 2001 = VanderKam, James C., *The Book of Jubilees (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* 1; Sheffield, 2001).
- Van Nuffelen 2006 = Van Nuffelen, Peter, "Earthquakes in A.D. 363-368 and the date of Libanius, *Oratio* 18," *The Classical Quarterly* 56 (2006), 657-61.
- Veccia Vaglieri 2014a = Veccia Vaglieri, L., "Ibn Muldjam," *EI* 2, Brill Online, last consultation on 06 February 2014.
- Veccia Vaglieri 2014b = Veccia Vaglieri, L., "(al-)Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib," *EI* 2, Brill Online, last consultation on 06 February 2014.
- Vest 2007 = Vest, Bernd A., *Geschichte der Stadt Melitene und der umliegenden Gebiete: vom Vorabend der arabischen bis zum Abschluss der türkischen Eroberung (um 600-1124)*, 3 vols. (*Byzanz, Islam und christlicher Orient* 1; Hamburg, 2007).
- Weltecke 2002 = Weltecke, Dorothea, "Überlegungen zu den Krisen der syrisch-orthodoxen Kirche im 12. Jahrhundert," in *Syriaca: Zur Geschichte, Theologie, Liturgie und Gegenwartslage der syrischen Kirchen. 2. Deutsches Syrologen-Symposium (Juli 2000, Wittenberg)*, Tamcke, Martin (*Studien zur Orientalischen Kirchengeschichte* 17; Münster, 2002), 125-45.
- Weltecke 2003 = Weltecke, Dorothea, *Die "Beschreibung der Zeiten" von Mōr Michael dem Grossen (1126-1199) : eine Studie zu ihrem historischen und historiographiegeschichtlichen Kontext* (*CSCO* 594; Subs. 110; Leuven, 2003).
- Weltecke 2008 = Weltecke, Dorothea, "60 Years After Peter Kawerau. Remarks on the Social and Cultural History of Syriac-Orthodox Christians from the XIth to the XIIIth Century," *Le Muséon* 121 (2008), 311-35.
- Weltecke 2009 = Weltecke, Dorothea, "Les trois grandes chroniques syro-orthodoxes des XIIIe et XIIIe siècles," in *L'historiographie syriaque*, ed. Debié, Muriel (*Études syriaques* 6; Paris, 2009), 107-135.
- Weltecke 2010 = Weltecke, Dorothea, "A Renaissance in Historiography? Patriarch Michael, the Anonymous Chronicle ad a. 1234, and Bar ‘Ebrōyō," in *The Syriac Renaissance*, ed. Teule, Herman, Fotescu Tauwinkl, Carmen, ter Haar Romeny, Bas and van Ginkel, Jan (*Eastern Christian Studies* 9; Leuven – Paris – Walpole (MA), 2010), 95-111.

- Wilde 2007 = Wilde, Clare E., “*Lingua sacra?* Some reflections on Christian discussions of *faḏā’il al-suryāniyya* and *i’jāz al-Qur’ān*,” in *Eastern Crossroads: Essays on Medieval Christian Legacy*, ed. Monferrer-Sala, Juan Pedro (*Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies* 1; Piscataway (N.J.), 2007), 61-82.
- Winkelmann 1964 = Winkelmann, Friedhelm, “Die vormetaphrastischen griechischen hagiographischen Vitae Constantini Magni,” in *Actes du XIIIe Congrès international d’études byzantines*, vol. 2, Belgrade, 1964, 405-14.
- Witakowski 1987 = Witakowski, Witold, *The Syriac chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahrē: a study in the history of historiography* (*Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia semitica Upsaliensia* 9; Stockholm, 1987).
- Witakowski 1990a = Witakowski, Witold, “The Idea of *septimana mundi* and the Millenarian Typology of the Creation Week in Syriac Tradition,” in *V Symposium Syriacum 1988. Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, 29-31 août 1988*, ed. Lavenant, René (*OCA* 236; Rome, 1990), 93-109.
- Witakowski 1990b = Witakowski, Witold, “Malalas in Syriac,” in *Studies on John Malalas*, ed. E. Jeffreys, B. Croke and R. Scott (*Byzantina Australiensia* 6; Sydney 1990), 299-310.
- Witakowski 1993 = Witakowski, Witold, “The Division of the Earth between the Descendants of Noah in Syriac Tradition,” *Aram* 5 (1993), 635-656.
- Witakowski 1999-2000 = Witakowski, Witold, “The Chronicle of Eusebius: Its type and continuation in Syriac chronography,” *Aram* 11-12 (1999-2000), 419-437.
- Witakowski 2007a = Witakowski, Witold, “Elias BarShenaya’s Chronicle,” in *Syriac Polemics: Studies in Honour of Gerrit Jan Reinink*, ed. Bekkum, Wout Jac. and Drijvers, Jan Willem and Klugkist, Alex C. (*OLA* 170; Leuven, 2007), 219-37.
- Witakowski 2007b = Witakowski, Witold, “Syriac Historiographical Sources,” in *Byzantines and Crusaders in Non-Greek Sources, 1025-1204*, ed. Whitby, Mary (*Proceedings of the British Academy* 132; Oxford, 2007), 253-282.
- Wood 2010 = Wood, Philip, “‘We have no king but Christ’. Christian Political Thought in Greater Syria on the Eve of the Arab Conquest (c.400-585)” (*Oxford Studies in Byzantium*; Oxford, 2010).
- Wood 2012 = Wood, Philip, “Syriac and the Syrians,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, ed. Johnson, Scott F., Oxford 2012, 170-92.
- Wood 2013 = Wood, Philip, *The Chronicle of Seert*, Oxford, 2013.
- Wright 1870-1872 = Wright, William, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum, Acquired since the Year 1838*, 3 vols., London, 1870-1872.
- Yakoub 2008 = Ignatius Yacoub III, *History of the Monastery of Saint-Matthew in Mosul*, Engl. trans. M. Moosa, (*Publications of the Archdiocese of the Syriac Orthodox Church in the Eastern United States* 2; Piscataway (N.J.), 2008).
- Youssif 2002 = Youssif, Ephrem-Isa, *Les chroniqueurs syriaques*, Paris – Budapest – Torino, 2002.
- Youssif 2006 = Youssif, Ephrem-Isa, *Les Syriaques racontent les croisades (Peuples et cultures de l’Orient)*; Paris, 2006).
- Youssif 2010 = Youssif, Ephrem-Isa, *Saladin et l’épopée des Ayyoubides: Chroniques syriaques*, Paris, 2010.

