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Abstract

The subject of this thesis is the Synopsis Chronike (or Synopsis Sathas), a Byzantine chronicle of the thirteenth century that conveys the history of the world, starting from Adam and concluding with the recapture of Constantinople in 1261. The study focuses on the first part of the text (Adam – Nikephoros Botaneiates), and more specifically on the comprehensive presentation and analysis of the whole corpus of its sources, passage by passage, in order to reconstruct the background of the chronicle and to determine its place in the Byzantine chronicle tradition.

Following the introductory first chapter, which sets out the aims of the thesis and establishes its methodology, chapter two offers an overview of the chronicle itself, and a first discussion of the main issues it presents: the key characteristics of its narrative structure, its manuscript tradition, and – mainly – the problem of its authorship, with special reference to the commonly supposed author, Theodore Skoutariotes, bishop of Kyzikos. Chapter three conveys a detailed presentation of the results of our research; following the discussion of the sources and influences of the proem, it attempts to place each passage of the Synopsis Chronike in the context of any related texts, which are then identified as 'main sources', 'other sources' and 'parallel passages', depending on their link to the Synopsis Chronike. Chapter four discusses individually each text that appears as a source of the Synopsis Chronike, and locates its place amongst the whole corpus of the sources. Furthermore, it examines the passages for which we were not able to identify a main source, and suggests possible sources that have not survived. Finally, the concluding chapter of the thesis summarises the earlier discussion, and attempts to combine the different pieces of information, and to provide an overall picture of the background of the Synopsis Chronike in order to establish – to the degree that it is possible – its position in the Byzantine chronicle tradition.
"Bond had a nagging headache, brought on by hours of poring over small-print reference books […]"

Ian Fleming, *On Her Majesty's Secret Service*
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Note on transliteration

The span of the SynChron creates the difficult task of transliterating numerous foreign proper names of various origins into English. Although we have tried to be consistent, this is not always possible without using bizarre forms, which would appear out of place in an English text. Hence, we are using the following guidelines:

For proper names that derive from the Bible, we are using the English equivalents, as they appear in the King James Bible (1850 revision).

For names of Hebrew, Babylonian, or Persian origin, we have attempted to use the English standard form; nevertheless, this is not always possible, as more than one form seems to be considered standard.

We also tried to use the English standard form of Latin names. However, following the transfer of the capital of the Roman Empire to the east, Latin names and titles were gradually adapted to Greek; as a result, we have tried to use the English form for the period up to the reign of Justinian, and thereafter the Greek form, as described below.

In regard to Greek names, in the cases where a familiar English equivalent exists, we have tried to use it (for example, Constantine, Theodore, Heraclius, Marcian, Porphyrogenitus, Procopius etc). Less familiar names and forms, however, have been transliterated according to the ALA-LC Romanization Tables of the Library of Congress (http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/roman.html).
Chapter One: Introduction

Introduction – Aims of the thesis

The Synopsis Chronike\(^1\) (or Synopsis Sathas, as it is often called after its editor, Constantine Sathas) is a chronicle that was written in the second half of the thirteenth century, after the recapture of Constantinople from the Latins. In fact, the narrative of the text concludes with a description of the events and celebrations that took place in Constantinople in 1261, upon the return of the Byzantine emperor to the traditional capital of his state. However, the text cannot be categorised exclusively under the history or the chronicle genre.\(^2\) It is divided into two major parts. The first part (SynChron, 3-173), which is the focus of this thesis, forms a typical Byzantine chronicle, and relates the events from the Creation of the world until the enthronement of the emperor Alexios Komnenos, starting from Adam and the biblical patriarchs and covering the history of the Roman Empire and the sequence of the emperors and their deeds. The second part (SynChron, 177-556) is an extensive historical narrative, and describes in detail the events following Alexios' accession to the throne in 1081, until the recapture of Constantinople in 1261. For this last part, the text follows closely the histories of Niketas Choniates and George Akropolites, with only a few modifications or additions, particularly in the text of the latter.\(^3\)

Scholarship has not been kind to the SynChron. Only a small number of studies have actually concentrated on the text itself, and they will be discussed in the literature

---

\(^1\) Hereafter, SynChron.

\(^2\) It is noteworthy that Hunger used the example of the SynChron to depict the vague distinction between the genres of history and chronicle (Hunger, Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur, I, 253-254). The debate in scholarship about the validity of such a distinction is still open (see esp. Beck, "Zur byzantinischen Mönchschronik", 188-97, Ljubarskij, "New Trends", 131-8 and Jeffreys, "Byzantine Chroniclers", 199-200). In this thesis, we use the term 'chronicle' in its traditional meaning as a convention, and we recognise that it does not always correspond to the characteristics of the different texts that are customarily placed under this title.

\(^3\) See Akropolites, Opera, 277-302.
review. Moreover, its historical value was underrated, and the text has been used or referred to as a noteworthy historical source by only a handful of scholarly studies. However, sections of the text do provide different points of view, or unique pieces of information that are not to be found in any of the other historical sources. Apart from the additional or different information that we find in the treatment of Akropolites' history, the SynChron is the sole historical source for events such as the change of the name of Perinthos to Herakleia by the emperor Vespasian (SynChron, 29.30-30.1), the edict of the emperor Constantine on the privileges of bishops (SynChron, 53.3-6), the commissioning of a land census by the emperor Heraclius (SynChron, 110.5-7), the exile of Leo to Thessaloniki following his argument with his father, the emperor Basil I (SynChron, 145.21-8), the circulation of otherwise unknown coins during the reign of the emperor Romanos I (SynChron, 149.21-2), the role of the emperor Alexios I in the instigation of the First Crusade (SynChron, 184.28-185.17); it is also the single carrier of a different historiographical tradition which presented early Roman emperors (such as Didius, Septimius Severus and Antoninus Elegabalus) in a uniquely positive light. However, as the chronological gap between the events and the actual writing of the text is considerable, the reliability of the account depends predominantly on the credibility of its sources, and the lack of a study that presents them comprehensively contributes further to the rare use of the SynChron in modern historical studies.

Similarly, we see a considerable lack of studies dealing with the literary aspects of the SynChron, which should mainly be attributed to the perceived low historical value of the text. However, as modern scholarship is beginning to distinguish between the historical and literary characteristics of the texts, historiographical texts are being studied as literature on the merit of their literary virtues, and not their historical value (or lack of it). As far as the SynChron is concerned, an additional obstacle for such a literary approach is the lack of a study of the sources of the text; as the origin of the

---

4 For example, Dolley, "Historical Significance", 65-7, Hanson, "Manuel", 80 n.56, Lundgreen, "The Great Bronze Athena", 190 n.8, Macrides, "George Akropolites' rhetoric", 210 n.51, Magdalino, Manuel, 181 n.4, Mango, "The Monastery of St. Constantine", 332 n.10, Moravcsik, "Sagen und Legenden", 69 n.38; also see n. 539.

5 We discuss in further detail all the passages with unique information or unknown source in a separate section of this thesis, in pp. 290ff.

different parts is unknown, or is only assumed, students of the chronicle's literary perspectives are unable to proceed to a comprehensive discussion of the text.

Consequently, the present thesis aspires to cover this gap in our knowledge of Byzantine chronicles, and Byzantine history. Although the study of textual sources (the *Quellenforschung* of nineteenth-century German scholarship) is not currently fashionable, this should not deter a study of the sources of the *SynChron*. By identifying the sources of the text, we cannot only contribute to its further utilisation in historical research, but also provide a primary insight into the text itself. This will be achieved by studying the selection of the particular passages used to present certain events, by examining the manner in which the material was incorporated in the text (through abridgment, combination of more than one source, expansion of the information, omission of events or opinions found in the main sources), by juxtaposing the treatment of the sources (and the events) in the *SynChron* to other – more or less contemporary texts – that present their material in similar form and have used the same or related sources.

Hence, the aims of this thesis are:

- A preliminary analysis of the *SynChron*, with regard to its content and structure, its manuscript tradition, and the issue of its authorship.

- The comprehensive presentation of the whole corpus of the sources of the *SynChron*, passage by passage, indicating the nature of their relationship to it. This will not only contribute to further investigation of the different aspects of the *SynChron*, but will also assist in establishing the relationships between the different linked texts, usually Byzantine chronicles and histories.

- The discussion of all the texts that appear to be connected to the *SynChron* (in relation to it), and the presentation and examination of the links among themselves and with the *SynChron*. Such a juxtaposition of texts and passages will enhance our understanding of the chronicle genre and its tradition, and the transmission of information through the centuries.
The reconstruction of the background of the *SynChron*, and the determination of its place in the Byzantine chronicle tradition.

**Methodology and structure of the thesis**

**Methodology**

A common method of identifying the sources of a text, which is mainly used by the works discussed in the literature review below, is the analysis of a sample of selected passages, and the comparison of their similarities and differences to other texts. Although such a technique is sufficient for an initial approach to a text and can produce sound results, it can also lead to partial or misleading conclusions. The *SynChron* uses a wide variety of sources, some of which are not always common to other chronicles, that could easily be overlooked if we are to focus our attention on specific passages. Also, numerous sections of the *SynChron* appear to be an amalgamation of material from more than one source, in which case, identifying the source of a single passage or sentence would not necessarily confirm the source of the whole. Similarly, by focusing only on isolated passages, there is the risk of overlooking the general structure, or patterns in the chronology of the events and people presented, which also contribute to our better understanding of the tradition followed by the *SynChron*, if not to the identification of a single source.

As a result, in order to identify comprehensively all the sources of the first part of the *SynChron*, we have focused on all passages individually, and made every effort to juxtapose them with the respective sections of all relevant texts. Although the focus was naturally on historiographical texts, we took into account a large number of other sources, such as hagiographical texts, theological treatises, homilies, poems, etc. Additionally, we have used the tools of the on-line electronic database 'Thesaurus Linguae Graecae', which has produced significant linguistic clues and links to the text, which – on first sight – would not have seemed relevant to chronicle writing. In addition to the passage-by-passage study of the text, we have compared its general structure with the other chronicles, as well as their chronology, and taken the results into account for the presentation and subsequent discussion of the sources.

---

7 Apart from the available texts, we have also tried to consult any unpublished texts and manuscripts, although this was not always possible.
In order to do that, we have used a set of four criteria: content, language, structure, chronology. The content criterion is usually the first indication of a connection between the texts; it can be a single incident or the description of a series of events. Although it is a straightforward criterion, it cannot be used alone in establishing the sources; even in the cases where an incident is only mentioned in one other text, it is possible that the source of the SynChron may be another text that has not survived. The language criterion includes comparison of the expression and vocabulary, and can extend from a single word to whole sentences or even passages; it can provide the most positive evidence, since even minor similarities and differences can designate the links between the texts. An additional linguistic criterion is the style used by the different authors, although it can be more dubious, and cannot always be trusted – at least alone – to draw conclusive inferences; we use it sparingly, and in conjunction with other criteria. The third criterion is the structure of the content. Within a section or a passage, it mainly has to do with the order of the events, as compared or opposed to their organisation in the related texts. On a larger scale, it is the overall structure of the chronicle, both in the larger narratives (for example, the SynChron, 3-19, which is a close narrative itself and deals with the world history from Adam to Julius Caesar) or the whole first part of the SynChron, which is the subject of this thesis, and its juxtaposition to other chronicles. This is a secondary criterion, which can seldom reveal the sources by itself, as the order could have been changed by the author in the process of writing.

The final criterion that we have used is the chronological structure of the text. The SynChron provides various pieces of chronological information, and it consistently conveys (and founds its whole structure on) the duration of the reigns of the kings and emperors. A comparison of this information with the related texts and chronicles and the detection of common patterns can be a sound indication of the texts being part of

---

8 The criteria that we are using is primarily based on the study of Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, esp. 114-34, to which we have added the criterion of chronology.

9 Naturally, when the source was preserved in a language other than Greek (for example, in the cases of the Excerpta Barbari, or Jerome's chronicle), it is not possible to use the language criterion in order to define a source. Sometimes, if there is a strong similarity between the texts that could be attributed to use of the same words, we take the information into account with reservations and make further comparisons with other related texts.

10 Initially, the lives of the biblical Patriarchs and the rulers of Israel.
the same tradition. The chronology is a valuable factor in identifying the sources of the SynChron in other aspects as well; for example, the text makes a point of including the duration of the tenures of all the bishops and the patriarchs of Constantinople,\textsuperscript{11} thus creating a secondary chronological structure that can also be used to identify possible sources. Finally, the text conveys much other chronological information (for example, the age of certain emperors at the time of their death), which can also be used as a supplementary criterion in the comparison of the different sources, although we are particularly cautious when using this aspect of chronology, as we cannot know if such partial occurrences reflect the content of one source, or the selective gathering of information from different texts.

**Presentation of the results**

Following the identification of the sources, there is the issue of the use of an appropriate system for their presentation. A common division of textual sources is the distinction between direct and indirect sources. However, in the case of the SynChron, such an approach appears to be impractical. First, as the bibliography has already established, and as our research also shows, the SynChron did not draw the bulk of its material directly from earlier chronicles, but from one or more intermediary archetypes, which were compilations that included most of the narrative that we find in the present chronicle.\textsuperscript{12} In addition to the use of the archetype(s), we also have to deal with the unclear tradition of other chronicles, most importantly the family of the Epitome.\textsuperscript{13} As we discuss in the respective section,\textsuperscript{14} numerous passages of the SynChron appear to stem from one or more branches of the Epitome; for example, various linguistic evidence seems to suggest that certain passages of the SynChron derive directly from Leo the Grammarian, whereas in other cases it appears that this cannot be so, and the direct source of the SynChron is Pseudo-Symeon. Such contradictory signs about the exact origin of the passages are probably due to the disappearance of the member (or members) of the Epitome family that was the source

\textsuperscript{11} See Table 23. Patriarchs of Constantinople, in the appendix.


\textsuperscript{13} We do not italicise the term Epitome, as we are not using it to refer to a specific text but to the family of texts that derive from the Epitome and the related texts of the tradition of Symeon Logothetes.

\textsuperscript{14} See pp. 250ff.
of the *SynChron*; furthermore, the situation becomes more complex if we are to take into account that Glykas, Manasses and Zonaras, all with close but unclear relationships to the *SynChron*, which we discuss later, seem to have similar indistinct connections to the Epitome. As a result, and as we are not able to find which parts of the text originate from the archetype(s), and which parts derive from which independent text, any attempt to distinguish the direct and indirect sources of the *SynChron* is a futile exercise.

Consequently, we present the sources of each passage of the *SynChron* divided into three categories: 'main sources', 'other sources', and 'parallel passages'. However, for the purpose of this thesis, these terms are not to be understood with their literal meaning, but in accordance with our following explanations of them. The term 'main sources' is used to describe a passage of another text with similarities to the respective passage of the *SynChron* (according to the earlier mentioned criteria) strong enough to suggest a solid link – not necessarily direct – between them. They usually indicate that the text of the passages is identical (or almost identical), but when this is not the case, the degree of the relationship is defined by the use of the other criteria. In the cases of Zonaras, Glykas, Manasses and Xanthopoulos, as we discuss in the respective sections in chapter four, the use of the term 'main source' (and 'other source') does not suggest that they were the source of the *SynChron*, but that they have followed a common archetype so closely that their connection is almost direct. In the 'other sources' we put the passages of texts, which present differences to the relevant passages of the *SynChron* that do not allow us to distinguish the degree of the connection between them. They are positively related to the *SynChron*, but the above criteria do not produce a conclusive suggestion; for example, the structure of a passage may indicate a connection to another text, but as none of the other criteria are met, we cannot establish a strong connection, and hence the passage is placed in the category of the 'other sources' and discussed further either in an adjacent note, or in the respective section of chapter four. All in all, they are passages that *are* part of the tradition of the *SynChron*, they are potentially 'main sources', and their study, in combination with the 'main sources', is necessary for the overall description of the
overall programme of the sources of the chronicle. Finally, the 'parallel passages' of a part of the SynChron refer to the same event, incident or person, but none of the criteria seem to be met in order to suggest that they are anything more than carriers of a separate tradition. Nevertheless, they can often provide indications concerning the background or the practice of the SynChron, especially when the passages are from texts that are sources of the SynChron on other occasions, or they reflect a distinct indirect common source.

However, the first part of the SynChron (4.19-19.16) presents certain particularities, which do not allow for a complete application of the above mentioned system of presentation. The section is itself a concise chronicle which covers the period from the Creation of the world to the abolition of the Roman republic by Julius Caesar. It mainly consists of catalogues of the biblical patriarchs and the consequent rulers of Israel, with the addition of relevant supplementary information. As with other chronicles that deal with the period, it is always difficult (or even impossible) to identify the indirect sources for all the information or establish with certainty the relationships between the texts, either because the original sources are now lost or because the sequence of the compilation of the different texts (often prepared for different uses and purposes) is considerably blurred. As far as the SynChron is concerned, it has already been noted that its main source for the period was the Chronikon Epitomon (or another text of the same tradition, such as the source the Vind. Gr. 99 or the unpublished chronicle of Vat. Gr. 433 (ff. 244-259)). The similarities in the structure and the chronological information confirm the suggestion.

In addition to them, we add a synopsis of the Bible, attributed to Athanasios, which was the source of the part that relates the Judges (8.26-10.6) and the Kings of Israel (10.7-13.18), probably through the Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99.

---

15 On a few occasions, we flag a reference with a question mark; this signifies that the inclusion of the text in the respective category ('main sources' or 'other sources') is not conclusive, but that the passage satisfies our criteria sufficiently enough to be considered a 'main' or 'other' source respectively.

16 For example, see Karpozelos' comment on the sources of the universal and concise chronicles; Karpozelos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, II, 536-7.


18 Athanasios, "Synopsis". John Chrysostom, "Synopsis" is another copy of the same text, attributed to John Chrysostom.

19 We examine elsewhere (pp. 238ff) the connections between this family of texts and discuss specific examples of structures and passages, as well as the links in the chronological information of the texts.
Consequently, in the presentation of the sources of the first part of the SynChron, we do not attempt to provide a detailed account of the sources and parallel passages of each section but focus on the additional information provided in the SynChron and attempt to trace its origins, especially if the source is other than the Chronikon Epitomon, the Vind. Gr. 99 or the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae.

**Structure of the thesis**

Following a review of the literature, which discusses the works that have focused their attention on the SynChron, this thesis presents the results of our research and their analysis in the following structure.

In chapter two we offer an overview of the chronicle itself, and the main issues that arise from its study. After a brief summary of the text, we give an initial analysis of the structure of the text, namely its chronological character, with regard to contemporary attitudes towards time and their reflection in chronicle writing. Then, we include a presentation of the manuscript tradition of the SynChron; we not only look at the witnesses of the SynChron (or parts of it) itself, but also at other manuscripts with connections to the texts – either genuine or only proposed by the bibliography. Subsequently we concentrate on the issue of the authorship. We examine Heisenberg's suggestion that the author of the text was Theodore Skoutariotes; we present all the information we have about the historical person, collate it with the historical, literary and palaeographical information at our disposal, and offer our view on the subject.

In chapter three we convey a detailed presentation of the results of our research, as proposed earlier. After the discussion of the sources and influences of the proem, we examine the two parts of the text (which coincide with the two major time frames in two sections. In the first section, we deal with the first part (SynChron, 4.19-19.16), in which the chronicle appears to follow closely – often verbatim – a text from the family of the Chronikon Epitomon; as a result, we do not provide a detailed account of the sources and parallel passages of each section of the SynChron, but focus on the

---

20 See pp. 18ff.
additional information provided and attempt to trace its origin, especially if it is other
than the above-mentioned source.\footnote{See our discussion of the place of the Chronikon Epitomon (and the related Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae) in the sources of the SynChron (pp. 228ff.).} In the second section we present the sources of
the second part of the text (SynChron, 19.17-173.8) as follows. First, we divide the
part into sections that deal with the reigns of each king and emperor, then we
subdivide them into smaller passages, by contextual and morphological criteria
(which usually produce the same passages), and then we present their sources in the
manner we have described earlier, divided into 'main sources', 'other sources', and
'parallel passages'. Usually, this information is taken into account in the respective
discussion of chapter four. However, we frequently include notes about the passage in
this chapter as well: explanatory remarks about the placement of a text in any of the
three categories, comments about specific linguistic details, or preliminary
discussions, which are expanded further in subsequent chapters.

At the beginning of chapter four, we discuss the issue of the Synopsis Lambros, a text
with such strong similarities to the SynChron that, although it has been considered a
mere later version of the text, it reveals new aspects of the tradition of the SynChron
which are necessary for the further examination of the text. We then proceed to the
discussion of the texts that appear as sources of the SynChron in chapter three. We
focus on each text individually, discuss common passages, examine the nature of their
connection to the SynChron as well as to other related texts, and we attempt to depict
their place in the corpus of the sources of the text. As far as our presentation order of
the texts is concerned, we tend to keep a chronological order, to the degree that this is
possible; however, when necessary, we sometimes group relevant texts and discuss
them together rather than in the appropriate chronological sequence.\footnote{Hence, for example, we discuss the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae in connection to the Chronikon Epitomon family, notwithstanding its earlier date, and the same applies to the different texts of the Epitome family, which we discuss collectively in a separate section.} At the end of
the chapter, we focus on those passages for which we were not able to identify a 'main
source', and we use their similarities and possible connections to other texts to identify
any sources of the SynChron that have not survived.
Finally, in the conclusion of the thesis, we summarise our earlier discussion and attempt to combine the different pieces of information, in order to provide an overall picture of the background of the *SynChron*, and establish – to the degree that it is possible – its position in the Byzantine chronicle tradition.

**Literature review**

As we have already mentioned, the literature on the *SynChron* is rather limited. Constantine Sathas, being the editor of the text, was the first to discuss the main aspects and problems of the *SynChron*. The long introduction that precedes the critical edition of the *SynChron* deals mainly with Sathas' idea of a clash between ancient Greek culture and the Byzantine theocracy,\(^23\) and only focuses on the *SynChron* itself in a small section, in pages σμα’ – σνα’, as well as in a few scattered references. Nevertheless, he stresses his belief that the *SynChron* is a significant historical source ("είνε (sic) αληθὲς ἱστορικὸν μνημεῖον μεγάλης σπουδαιότητος" (σμβ’)), with its own individual style (σλγ’). Otherwise, the introduction includes a presentation of the manuscript *Marc. Gr. 407* (owners, scribes, contents), on which the edition is based, and a first attempt to resolve the problem of the authorship of the *SynChron*, mainly by describing the characteristics of the author, as they appear from the internal evidence of the text; at the end, no definite answer is forthcoming. The final section of the introduction attempts to trace the sources of the *SynChron*. Sathas notes the great similarities to the histories of Niketas Choniates and George Akropolites, and suggests that either they were the sources of the *SynChron* for the later part of his text, or that they were all using an otherwise unknown source, which could explain the differences in the accounts. As far as the early section of the text is concerned, Sathas notes various passages, whose content does not correspond to any other known texts and should be attributed to unknown sources, and resemblances to Malalas' chronicle, which suggest the use of a related text, but not that of Malalas himself.

However intuitive the study of Sathas may be, it is only an initial and vague introduction to the issues of the *SynChron*, which lacks any substantial scholarly examination of the text. In regard to the sources of the *SynChron*, the main subject of this thesis, Sathas' comments are more the product of educated guesswork than the

\(^{23}\) For a further discussion of Sathas' theory, see Heisenberg, "Review", 168-85.
result of in depth examination of the SynChron, and juxtaposition of its parts to the related passages of other relevant texts. Notably, it omits any reference to major sources of the SynChron, such as the Epitome or Theophanes, and does not take into account closely related texts, such as Glykas and Manasses. Nevertheless, Sathas' suggestions are not necessarily out of place; he correctly points out the use of an unknown source, especially for the early Roman emperors, and his suggestions about the connection to Malalas seem to be in the right direction, although not properly supported by sufficient argumentation. At the end, however, Sathas' introduction can only be of use to modern scholarship as a presentation of the setting of the edition, as well as an indication of the intentions of the editor.

Similarly, Krumbacher's entry\textsuperscript{24} for the SynChron in his Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur is mainly an introductory overview of the text. Krumbacher attempts to describe the background of the author, notes the compilatory nature of the text and the unequal division of the contents, and mainly focuses on the issue of the sources. He does make various accurate observations, such as the key position of Zosimos and Theophanes amongst the sources, the connection to the Chronikon Epitomon and the Epitome, the close relationship to the Synopsis Lambros, as well as the existence of an unknown text which was the common source with Zonaras. However, the suggestion of the existence of a compilation, from which the SynChron drew the bulk of its contents – although sound– is mainly based on a first reading of the text and Sathas' and Patzig's remarks rather than on any extensive research. In any case, we should bear in mind that Krumbacher's study is part of a general overview of Byzantine literature, and hence would not be expected to offer an extensive analysis of the text, but a first indication of the issues surrounding the then newly published text, a task which it duly accomplishes.

In the other survey of Byzantine literature, Hunger devotes a short section to the SynChron,\textsuperscript{25} touching on the main aspects of the text. He seems to accept

\textsuperscript{24} Krumbacher, Geschichte, 388-90, Krumbacher and Soteriades, Historia, 788-91.

\textsuperscript{25} Hunger, Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur, I, 477-8.
Heisenberg's suggestion about the identity of the author, and provides a brief overview of the contents of the chronicle. As far as the sources are concerned, Hunger mainly repeats Krumbacher's comments, stressing the connection to Zonaras and Manasses, and adds Skylitzes and a continuation of George the Monk. As with Krumbacher's entry, Hunger's comments are – not unexpectedly – a short review of the scarce bibliography on the subject and a reflection of the first impressions from the text, and not a thorough discussion of the SynChron.

The first extensive scholarly analysis of the sources of the SynChron comes in Patzig's two articles on the sources of the history of John Zonaras. Patzig quickly identifies the close relationship between the two texts and devotes a large section of his study solely to the sources of the SynChron (focusing mainly on passages on Roman and early Byzantine emperors), in order to pinpoint the common connection, and he suggests four main sources of the SynChron: the Epitome (and more specifically, a different version of the Epitome B), the chronicle of Malalas, a source common with Manasses, and Zosimos. Patzig's articles include numerous remarkable comments and accurate suggestions and references, which we note and discuss further in the respective sections of chapters three and four of this thesis. However, as far as our study of the sources of the SynChron is concerned, the two papers present certain drawbacks. Firstly, they are focused by default on Zonaras, and as a result they mainly deal with passages and events associated to Zonaras' text, and often leave out other unrelated sections (such as the biblical section), which may offer different perspectives on the subject. As a result, Patzig's study is not sufficiently extensive; it focuses on selected passages or structures, it does not necessarily refer to all related texts, and hence it often fails to determine or discuss in detail all the sources of the SynChron. Having said that, Patzig recognises such shortcomings, which – as the study focuses on Zonaras – cannot be avoided, and suggests further analysis of the subject, taking into account other related texts that were not discussed there, such as the Chronikon Epitomon. Finally, although both articles offer most useful and

---

26 Heisenberg, *Analecta*, 3-16, studied in detail the issue of the authorship of the text, and proposed the name of Theodore Skoutariotes, bishop of Kyzikos; we discuss his suggestion (and our objections) more extensively in pp. 24ff.


28 Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 53.
thoughtful insights, they suffer from the contemporary gaps of knowledge regarding the Byzantine chronicle tradition. All in all, this first scholarly study of the subject manages to identify the main themes regarding the Quellengeschichte of the SynChron, and offers most valuable suggestions and directions for any further research on the topic – this thesis included.

Similarly, Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou studied the SynChron as a result of her interest in (and in relation to) the chronicle of Glykas. The subject of her thesis is the identification of all the sources of Glykas, and offers a detailed presentation of the relationships between the relevant texts, not least the SynChron, to which there are numerous references throughout the thesis, and an exclusive section focusing on the relationship between the two texts. Based on that, Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou distinguishes a major common source, with great similarities to the SynChron, which she names the ‘Πρότυπο Σκουταριώτη’ (i.e. the archetype of Skoutariotes); it was based on a text from the family of the Epitome, and was also used by Zonaras; as indicated by various passages, Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou suggests that a different version of this text was also used by Glykas. However, notwithstanding the extensive examination of the SynChron by Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, it was still conducted in connection with Glykas; this resulted in a more restricted perspective, which produced a small number of omissions or oversights in regard to the sources of the SynChron, and may have influenced the accuracy of the conclusions. Also, Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou does not seem to be aware of the existence of the Synopsis Lambros, a text with even closer connections to Glykas than the SynChron, which may offer additional information about the sources of Glykas, and the characteristics of the archetype. Nevertheless, Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou's thesis offers a unique wealth of information and suggestions,

29 For example, see the reference to the chronicle of John Sikeliotes (Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 53), which scholarship has now established as forged (Kresten, "Phantomgestalten", 213-7).
30 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, passim, 294-318.
31 It should be noted that this is not necessarily the same text as the one we commonly refer to in this thesis as ‘the archetype of the SynChron and Synopsis Lambros’. Also, as far as the use of the name ‘Skoutariotes’ by Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou is concerned, she accepts as given Heisenberg's suggestion, without referring to it or discussing it in any way. We express our doubts on the identification elsewhere, but Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou's use of the term does not contradict our use of her material, as her arguments are only based on textual evidence and are not relevant to the issue of authorship.
32 We discuss further Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou's suggestions in our analysis of the relationship between Glykas and the SynChron (pp. 278ff.), where we note our objections.
not only in regard to Glykas but also about other related texts (such as the Epitome, Manasses, Zonaras, the SynChron, etc), and improves greatly our understanding of the chronicle tradition.

The more recent research on the SynChron comes from Tocci, whose main focus is the Chronica, an anonymous world chronicle, which provides a condensed account of events from Adam up to the death of Alexios I Komnenos, and is found in Vat. Gr. 1889, ff. 17-32. The text presents strong similarities to the first part of the SynChron (4-187); both texts follow the same structure, based on common chronological information concerning the tenures and reigns of the biblical patriarchs and Roman emperors; they both share the same content, although the SynChron often includes additional information and narratives, evidently drawn from different sources; and they both present strong similarities in the presentation and language of the material, in such an extent that confirms the existence of a close link between them. Especially in regard to this study, major points of interest would be the connection of the Chronica to the tradition of the Chronikon Epitomon and to the Synopsis Lambros, two texts whose relationships to the SynChron we examine in further detail later. The establishment of the place of the Chronica among the above texts is essential for our full understanding of the sources of the SynChron, but the lack of an edition does not allow for a more extensive discussion of the issue. The forthcoming edition of the text, and its juxtaposition to the results and suggestions of this study will hopefully provide a clearer understanding of the relationship between the SynChron and the Chronica, and their common links to the rest of the tradition.

In his studies, Tocci examines in detail the similarities and differences of the two texts, along with the relevant palaeographical evidence (mainly, the scripts of Marc. Gr. 407 and Vat. Gr. 1889, and samples of the handwriting of the suggested author) and the biographical information of Theodore Skoutariotes; his conclusion is that the Chronica was written by the same author as the SynChron as a preliminary draft of the latter, and that the text in Vat. Gr. 1889 is the autograph of Skoutariotes. Tocci’s

---

33 Tocci, "Zu Genese", 551-69; Tocci, "Chronika‘ und ‘Synopsis chronike‘", 168-9; we are also looking forward to his editio princeps of Theodori Scutariotae Chronica, announced for November 2007.

34 See pp. 187ff. and pp. ff. 228.
arguments establish sound connections between the texts, and the manuscript evidence substantiates the existence of a further link between them. However, his theory assumes Skoutariotes’ authorship of the SynChron, and uses this to establish that he was also the author (and not a mere scribe or owner) of the Chronica. Furthermore, Tocci is not aware of the Synopsis Lambros, which should also be studied in connection to the Chronica, especially if – as we argue later – it is based on an earlier version of the SynChron. Finally, we do not know of any other examples of ‘first drafts’ of Byzantine chronicles, and Tocci’s suggestion – if it proves accurate – would alter substantially our perception of chronicle writing, at least in later Byzantium. In any case, Tocci’s theory does not necessarily contradict the discussion of the SynChron that follows; in fact, it presents an additional perspective on its tradition, which illuminates further the background of its composition.
Chapter Two: The *SynChron* and its author

*The text*

**Summary of the *SynChron***

The proem\(^{35}\) (*SynChron*, 3.1-4.18) attempts to establish the modesty of the author and to provide the justification for undertaking such a task, that is, writing yet another text about a subject that is dealt with in numerous other histories. It states, however, that, in the case of the *SynChron*, the objective is to compose a more abridged synopsis of the facts for the convenience of the reader, in a simple but fine language.

The main narrative begins with the first man, Adam, and proceeds with the presentation of the events of the Old Testament, focusing on the lives and deeds of the Patriarchs (*SynChron*, 4.19-8.19), the Judges (*SynChron*, 8.20-10.6) and the Kings of Israel (*SynChron*, 10.7-13.18). In between, there are various relevant references and synchronisations, such as the mortal background of the Greek gods, other rulers and countries, important incidents like the Trojan War or the foundation of Rome, and significant individuals, such as poets, philosophers or generals. The narrative continues with the history of the Hebrews under the rule of Babylonians (*SynChron*, 13.18-15.2), Persians (*SynChron*, 15.3-17.26) and Macedonians (*SynChron*, 17.27-19.16), reaching the capture of Egypt by Gaius Julius Caesar and the establishment of the monarchy in Rome; afterwards, the narration goes back to the time of the Trojan War, in order to present Roman history from its beginnings, and in greater detail.

This second section starts with Aeneas, the progenitor of the Romans, followed by his successors, with a special reference to Romulus and Remus, and an extensive description of the foundation of Rome, its first rulers and the establishment of the Republic (*SynChron*, 19.19-24.12), later abolished by Julius Caesar. Thereafter, the text presents the sequence of the Roman emperors and their deeds (*SynChron*, 24.15-41.26), with the inclusion of noteworthy contemporary information such as the birth and teachings of Jesus Christ (*SynChron*, 25.23-7, 27.19-27). The life of Constantine

---

\(^{35}\) We discuss the sources and influences of the proem of the text in pp. 33ff.
the Great is presented in an extensive narrative, along with the story of his mother, the foundation of Constantinople and its bishops, and the first Ecumenical Council (*SynChron*, 41.26-54.9). The sequence of the Roman emperors continues (*SynChron*, 54.10-173.8), both in the West and the East, with references to the actions of the emperors, as well as significant events of ecclesiastical history, namely the ecumenical councils, various heresies and the serving patriarchs, and other interventions, which might have been entertaining or of special interest for the readers of the chronicle. Particular reigns of significant and influential emperors (such as Valentinian, Theodosius the Great, Theodosius the Younger, Marcian, Leo the Great, Justinian I, Heraclius, Leo Isauros, Theophilos, Theodora and Michael III, Basil I, Constantine Porphyrogenitus and Romanos Lekapenos) are treated in more detail. The sequence is interrupted after the reign of Nikephoros Botaneiates by the inclusion of a bull of Alexios Komnenos on the confiscation of consecrated vessels (*SynChron*, 173.9-176.22), followed by the second part of the *SynChron*, which starts with a more extensive description of the reign of Alexios I (*SynChron*, 177.2-187.10), and then, relates the history of the Byzantine Empire following closely the historical works of Niketas Choniates, until the fall of Constantinople to the Franks (*SynChron*, 187.11-450.9), and George Akropolites, until the recapture of Constantinople by the Byzantines (*SynChron*, 450.10-555.24); after the description of the return of the emperor Michael VIII to the city, the text concludes with a personal comment of the author concerning his ill health and old age, which force him to postpone the relation of the significant subsequent events for a later time (*SynChron*, 550.25-556.4).

**Chronological structure**

The conscious effort of the author of the *SynChron* to present the events in a firm chronological structure is rather evident; it is also stated clearly as the subject of the text from the beginning, with the phrase that gives the text its title: "Σύνοψις χρονικὴ" (*SynChron*, 4.19). Yet, in order to describe the structure in relation to the idea of chronology, we should first try to understand the past conception of time and the way the events would fall into the timeline for the contemporaries of the text. Mango notes that medieval people were basically ignorant of the succession of
years, and Augustine found himself in a difficult position when he attempted to provide an accurate definition of the notion of 'time'. Even today, with all the progress in the field of sciences, it is still difficult to define with certainty and accuracy essential aspects of the concept of time.

We know, though, that the people before the Enlightenment did not conceive time the same way as we do; that is to say, they did not perceive and relate the events – especially in the field of historiography, where longer periods of time are involved – in modern terms of time. Furthermore, a universally accepted chronological system did not exist before the establishment of the current chronological system, which counts the years from the birth of Christ (or the start of the Common Era). Historians in antiquity tried to give different solutions to the problem, but even the system of the Olympiads, first developed and used by Timaeus and Eratosthenes, lacked accuracy. The Creation of the World was another convenient point of reference, especially since it was the starting point for most of the chronicles, but its definition was problematic; different nations would use different dates for the *Annus Mundi*, and even the Byzantine chroniclers do not provide a common date. Consequently, the authors would use different chronological systems, in their effort to accommodate the different related events.

The lack of a common standard point of reference indicates an approach to historical events different from ours. Wilcox, who studied the chronological information and structure of various historians of antiquity, suggests that pre-Newtonian authors did not consider the approach to events in relation to a specific chronological point as an essential first step. Events create their own time frames. The historian would rather assess their significance and their thematic inter-connection, and then relate them within the time frame that they themselves created. The narrative structure of the

---

38 According to the Jewish tradition, the "era of the world" began at 3761 BC (see Finegan, *Handbook of biblical chronology*, 130-1).
39 For an overview of the subject, see Bickerman, *Chronology*.
SynChron is mainly based on this premise, and is structured in terms of time frames, on more than one level.

It is apparent from the introduction of the SynChron that the author comprehends the concept of universal history as a single time unit: "ἀρχόμενοι μὲν ὄθεν καὶ ἀνθρωποι ἐσχήκαμεν τὴν ἀρχήν, τοῦ Αδὰμ δηλαδὴ, λήγοντες δὲ εἰς τοὺς καθ' ἡμᾶς τὰ σκῆπτρα χειριζόμενους εὐσεβεῖς βασιλεῖς" (SynChron, 4.16-8). However, the chronological structure of the text is in agreement with the contemporary conception of time, and is divided into numerous time frames, which sometimes overlap. Nevertheless, it appears that there are time frames, which are clearly larger in size than others and include the body of the smaller time frames; these are the major time frames of the SynChron. There are several significant events in the chronicle that could constitute sufficient distinctive time points, if we are to define the major time frames in terms of historical significance; for example, the birth of Jesus Christ or the reign of Constantine. However, the acceptance of the historical significance of the event as the decisive criterion would result in subjectivity in the choice of the events, which would determine the time frames; they would rather reflect the judgement of the reader than the intention of the author and the actual nature of the text. The significance of the events could be the criterion, which would define and describe the minor time frames, but not the major ones. As far as the major time frames are concerned, we need a criterion which will take into account the nature of the text and the author's conception of the notion of time, both of which contributed to the specific structure of the text, namely the scope of the narrator. It covers the above presupposition by meeting both the time dimension of the narrated events and the object of the narrative, without overlooking the weight of the historical deeds.

Following from that, the text is primarily divided into two major time frames; the first one relates the most significant events from the time of Adam until the abolition of the republic by Julius Caesar (SynChron, 3-19). The second time frame includes the history (and pre-history) of the Roman Empire, from Aeneas until the start of the reign of Alexios I Komnenos (SynChron, 19-172).\footnote{Actually, the second frame expands until the recapture of Constantinople in 1261, as this is when the text concludes.}
focuses on the history of the Hebrews; the minor time frames consist of specific periods of the universal or Hebrew history, as determined by certain exceptional events, according to the judgement of the author. On a more reduced scale, the lives of the biblical patriarchs or the reigns of their rulers, who could have been Hebrew, Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian, are the microscopic time frames. In the second major time frame the scope moves to the Romans: "Ενταύθα καλὸν τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀναποδίσαντα περὶ τῶν ῾Ρωμαίων διαλαβεῖν" (SynChron, 19.17); the minor time frames are again distinct periods of the Roman history and on a lower level, the reigns of the rulers and, eventually, of the Roman emperors. In both cases, there is space for other parallel time frames, which are used to provide different aspects of the events or further information. In the appendix of this thesis, we provide the chronological tables that convey the chronological information used in the SynChron to structure the narrative of the chronicle.

Conclusion

Mango notes that although the first impression of the Byzantine chronicles on the reader is one of naïveté, they are extremely complex in their conceptual framework and they are the product of a long evolution. Indeed, the SynChron presents the events as part of a coherent chronological series. The author distinguishes several events for their significance and builds the narrative around them in considered time frames, which carry the continuation of the universal history on multiple levels. We notice major, minor and microscopic time frames, as well as parallel time frames, which are the spine of the narrative. Nonetheless, we should bear in mind Momigliano's advice and be cautious when dealing with philosophical ideas on time.

---

42 At the end of each of them, the author will summarise the number of the years past either from the Creation or from a significant time point in a previous time frame. Hence, the use of several time expressions to separate the time frames is usually the case; some of them are repeated to such an extent that they start to carry a new semantic value.

43 An objection which could be raised to this division is the great difference in the length of the respective passages. Nevertheless, it is in agreement with the criterion that was determined earlier; furthermore, the narrative time of the first frame is substantially larger than the one of the second frame; according to the reckoning of the years given by the text, which is analytic and careful enough to provide all the links from Adam until Julius Caesar, the first time frame runs for 5398 years, while the second time frame lasts 2309 years (6619–4310=2309; the first date is the date of the ascension of Alexios Komnenos to the throne, and the second corresponds to the fall of Troy, which marks the beginning of Aeneas' travel).

44 Mango, Byzantium, 191.
and their application in historical texts, since we cannot be certain that our perception of time reflects that of the period we are studying.45

**The manuscripts**

**The manuscript tradition of the SynChron**

**Venetus Marcianus Gr. 407**46

The *Venetus Marcianus Gr. 407* is the oldest manuscript that contains the whole *SynChron*, and the edition of Sathas is based solely on it. It has been dated to the fourteenth century and consists of 142 folia. Apart from the text of the *SynChron*, which is the main feature of the manuscript and occupies folia 8r-138v, it carries a small section with various historical notes, excerpts of ethnographic subject from Skylitzes, and thirty iambic verses, composed by Theophylaktos, bishop of Bulgaria. It was mostly copied by the scribe John Argyropoulos, and its owners were Alexios Panaretos, Theodore Skoutariotes, John Konstantes and Bessarion.

**Taurinensis 189 b II 43 [B V 13]**47

The *Taurinensis 189*, which dates from the fifteenth/sixteenth centuries, conveys on folia 102r-574v the last part of the *SynChron* (177-556), namely the section that relates the events from 1118 – 1261, and the conclusion of the chronicle. The manuscript also includes the *Patria Constantinopoleos* and, notably, the same excerpts from Skylitzes that also appear in the Marcian manuscript.

**Scorialensis Y I 4 (XVI)**48

The *Scorialensis Y I 4* has been dated to the sixteenth century, and carries the same section of the *SynChron* as the Turin manuscript, including the conclusion of the text, on folia 140v-234r. The fact that the scribe was aware of the rest of the *SynChron*

---

48 de Andres, *Catálogo*, II - Codices 179-420, 83-6, de Boor, "Logotheten", 81-5.
(and he either chose to copy only the included part consciously, or the first section was missing from his source-manuscript) is apparent from references to the first (and absent) part of the text, as noted by Heisenberg. Additionally, the manuscript carries the excerpts of Skylitzes that are also present in the Marc. Gr. 407 and the Taur. 189, and the thirty verses and a notice about the deaths of Andronikos and Manuel Palaiologos, which can also be found in the Marc. Gr 407.

**Athonensis 3758 (Mon. Dionysiou 224)**

The Athonensis 3758 of the sixteenth century is the latest manuscript of the tradition of the SynChron. It is a voluminous manuscript of 680 folia, and comprises a variety of theological and historical works, amongst which a chronicle compiled by the scribe, Klemes, who tried to provide an overview of the world history up to the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453. A substantial part of the text (ff. 543v – 607v, 610r – 611v) presents significant similarities to the SynChron and is attributed by the scribe to a Theodore of Kyzikos.

**Ambrosianus Gr. 820 [A 202 inf.]**

The Ambrosianus Gr. 820, dating from the sixteenth century, conveys the text of the history of George Akropolites. Within the text, we also find some of the additions made by the author of the SynChron to Akropolites' history. Although the inserted passages are placed within the text, the copyist of the manuscript was aware that they were additions of a different author: "ὅτι τὸ ὑπὸ ἀστερίσκου ἀρχόμενον καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν καταλῆγον, οὐκ ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀκροπολίτου γεωργίου τοῦ συγγραφέως τῆς ἱστορίας" (marginal note in f. 12r).

**Other relevant manuscripts**

**Vaticanus Graecus 1889**

---

51 The note is discussed further in the discussion of the issue of the authorship of the text below (pp. 24ff.), and in the discussion of the relationship between the two texts, in pp. 187ff.
52 Some of the additions have been published by Heisenberg as a supplement in Akropolites, *Opera*, 275-302 (the editor omits some of the additions, and does not note all the differences between the *Ambr. Gr 820* and the *SynChron*).
The Vat. Gr. 1889, dating from the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries, carries the text of the Chronica in ff. 17-32. The text, which is a world chronicle from the Creation up to Alexios Komnenos, has major similarities to the SynChron; as we have seen earlier, Tocci has suggested that the text was authored by the same writer as the SynChron, namely Theodore Skoutariotes, as a first draft.

Ambrosianus Gr. 724 [R 117 sup.] (XVI)

The Ambrosianus Gr. 724 carries the same excerpts of Skylitzes that are also present in the Marc. Gr. 407, Taur. 189 and Escor. Y I 4. Although scholarship tends to incorporate them in the oeuvre of the author of the SynChron, they are not related to it in any other way than being included in the same manuscript.

Vindobonensis Hist. Gr 99 (XIV)

The Vind. Hist. Gr 99 carries a version of the Chronikon Epitomon that bears significant similarities to the SynChron, which we discuss elsewhere. More importantly, it also carries the proem of the SynChron; having said that, scholarship suggests that the insertion of the proem should be attributed to the forger Darmarios, and is not an indication of a further connection to the SynChron.

The issue of the authorship and Theodore Skoutariotes

The editor of the text, Constantine Sathas, published the SynChron as the product of an anonymous author, and Heisenberg suggested later that the text should be attributed to Theodore Skoutariotes, bishop of Kyzikos. The suggestion is based on two notes in the Marc. Gr. 407, which were interpreted by Heisenberg as notes of authorship. A further argument comes from the chronicle in Athon. 3758, which is attributed to a Theodore of Kyzikos; Heisenberg argues that the two chronicles are the same text, and that Theodore of Kyzikos is the same person as Skoutariotes, hence he

53 Canart, Codices 1745-1962, 497, Krumbacher and Soteriades, Historia, 790.
54 Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, 526, Trapp, et al., PLP, 11, 23 (26204). Hence, Hunger, Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur, I, 478 assumed that they were additions of similar practice to the ones in Akropolites in Ambr. Gr. 820.
55 See pp. 228ff.
57 Heisenberg, Analecta.
was the author of the *SynChron*. Additionally, Heisenberg argues that the common contents of the *Marc. Gr. 407*, *Taur. 189* and *Escur. Y 14* also point to a sole author for the texts, namely Skoutariotes. Similarly, Alexios' bull, which is found in the Marcian manuscript, is also present in *Paris. Gr. 1234*, whose owner was Theodore Skoutariotes, hence an additional – but not conclusive – point that connects Skoutariotes to the *SynChron*.

Before proceeding to further discussion of the authorship issue, a detailed presentation of Theodore Skoutariotes will be appropriate and necessary. The information about the person of Skoutariotes is rather limited, consisting of a few references in George Pachymeres’ history (V, 21-22, 509.17) and official documents, as well as notes and inscriptions in manuscripts that he owned. He was born in the last part of the first half of the thirteenth century. In May 1270, according to a directive issued by the emperor Michael Palaiologos, he was already a deacon and *epi ton deeseon*, and became *dikaiophylax*. The promotion is also mentioned in a letter of the emperor to the patriarch Joseph, and is confirmed by a short reference in Pachymeres:

![Pachymeres' reference](Pachymer., II, 509.11, 16-21)

At some point after the letter, he became *sakelliou* of the Great Church, as he noted himself in the appointing document. The titles of *dikaiophylax* and *sakelliou* are also confirmed in a document of 1277, found in *Vat. Chis. Gr. 54* and *Alexandr. 182*, in which we find his signature and his titles: "Ὁ δικαιοφύλαξ καὶ σακελίου τῆς ἁγιωτάτης τοῦ Θεοῦ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας, Θεόδωρος ὁ Σκουταριώτης,"

---


By that time, he must have already become bishop of Kyzikos, and also received the title of **hypertimos**, as seen in an order of the emperor directed to Theodore Skoutariotes himself. In 1277 he took part in an embassy to the Pope John XXI, as the bishop of Kyzikos, **hypertimos** and **exarchos of Ellespontos**, as mentioned in a letter of Michael Palaiologos to the pope:

[...] Qui non verebantur se timore divino contra tantum bonum opponere nec investigare iniqua, nec etiam in hujusmodi operis segete quam Dominus coluit discordie semina spargere in Christianorum contumeliam et eorum animarum damnationem eterna, cetera vero tam ipsis venerabilis nuntiis, de ipsorum religiositate ac probitate confusus, ac meis nuntiis quos confidenter cum eisdam transmitto ad presentiam vestre apostolice sanctitatis, videlicet sacratissimo metropolite Kysicensi Ypertimo, et exarcho totius Elisponti Theodoro quartam sedem in concilio obtinente, honorabilissimo sancario sancte ecclesie Constantinopolitane, et [...] instructis de omnibus plenarie prout ipsi presentialiter petractarunt et oculis inspexerunt universaliter singula et singulariter universa. [...] (Gay, Registres, 220)

The embassy was part of Michael Palaiologos’ drive for rapprochement between the churches of Rome and Constantinople, and the participation of Skoutariotes in the embassy, as well as his high position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, put him firmly on the pro-union side. However, by 1283, as things changed with the accession of Andronikos II and the rejection of church union, Skoutariotes was dismissed from his positions and persecuted; he had to seek refuge in the monastery of Prodromos in order to avoid arrest, but was later acquitted without further consequences.

Theodore Skoutariotes was also a scribe and the owner of a rich library. In addition to *Marc. Gr. 407*, he possessed the following manuscripts:

- An earlier version of *Athen. B.N. 1372*.
- *Athon. 3084* (*Koutloumousiou 15*).

---

65 The titles **hypertimos** and **exarchos of Ellespontos** were probably attributed to the office of the bishop of Kyzikos; see Laurent, “Les signataires”, 144.
• *Marc. Gr. 450*, the manuscript of Photios' *Bibliotheca*, which Skoutariotes annotated in numerous places (scribe A³).  

• *Oxon. Cromwell 19*.  

• *Paris. Gr. 1234*. Skoutariotes was also the copyist of a section of the manuscript. Amongst its other contents, the manuscript conveys Niketas Choniates' "Thesaurus Orthodoxae Fidei", and Alexios Komnenos' bull on the confiscation of consecrated vessels.  

• *Paris. Gr. 1741*, which was presented to Theodore Skoutariotes by Manuel Angelos, with the following inscription in folio 301v:

```
+ δῶρον ποθεινόν, ἐκ μανουὴλ ἀγγέλου +
+ δόσις μανουὴλ ἀγγέλου πιστοῦ φίλου +
+ σκουταριώτου λευίτου θεοδ(ώ)ρου +
```

Besides the possibility that he was the author of the *SynChron*, Theodore Skoutariotes appears to have written two short legal commentaries, one on a canon 'on the retirement of a bishop', and one on 'ordination', as well as two entries at the end of Niketas Choniates' "Thesaurus Orthodoxae Fidei", and a *vita* of the Apostle Paul, of which we know only from an obscure reference of Fabricius.  

To return to the problem of the authorship of the *SynChron*, Heisenberg made the initial connection between Theodore Skoutariotes and the chronicle through two notes

---

71 Also see Cavallo, "Ven. Marc. gr. 450", 157-74.  
72 Coxe, *Catalogi*, recensionem codicum graecorum continens, 446-7.  
74 Harlfinger and Reinsch, "Parisinus Gr. 1741", 34.  
81 Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, VII, 743-4. Sathas (σαθας) is reluctant to accept that the reference concerns the same Skoutariotes, while Heisenberg, *Analecta*, 17 leaves the subject open. Moravesik, *Byzantinoturcica*, 526-8, in his entry of Skoutariotes, does not include either of the last two texts.
in *Marc. Gr. 407*, both reading "ἡ βιβλίος ἡδὲ Κυζίκου Θεοδώρου Σκουταριωτῶν ἐκ φυλῆς κατηγμένου" (f. 5r, by a hand of the fifteenth century, and f. 8r by a different hand, either of the fourteenth or the fifteenth centuries). Sathas perceived them as mere notes of ownership,\(^{82}\) which is further supported by several marginal notes in the manuscript made by Skoutariotes himself. However, the later date of the note in f. 5r seems to suggest that it did not indicate ownership; it does not seem likely that a later owner would repeat the name of an earlier owner in such manner, unless it was copied by mistake by a scribe, or was perceived falsely to be an authorship note, when – in fact – it denoted the ownership of Skoutariotes. Although these possibilities seem valid, the idea that the later owner repeated the name of the author seems more plausible, and Heisenberg used this evidence in conjunction with two notes that accompany the chronicle in Athon. 3758 ("Ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἑξατό Θεόδωρος ὁ Κυζίκου ἀχρὶ Μιχαὴλ τοῦ Παλαιολόγου" (f. 607v) and "ἡ βιβλίος ἡδὲ κυζίκου θεοδώρου: Σύνοψις Χρονικῆ· ἀπὸ Ἀδαμ τὴν ἀρχήν λαβοῦσα [...]" (f. 610r)), to suggest that the author of the chronicle was Theodore Skoutariotes. Heisenberg assumed that the text was copied from the Marcian manuscript, and suggested that it would be a very uncharacteristic error for a scribe to copy a note of ownership from one manuscript to another. However, Heisenberg’s suggestions take for granted that a/ Theodore of Kyzykos and Theodore Skoutariotes, bishop of Kyzykos are one and the same person, and b/ the two manuscripts carry the exact same chronicle. There is not sufficient evidence to support either. The first assumption is based on the fact that both persons share the same name; although this indicates that they could have been the same person, it is not conclusive proof. As for the second assumption, we discuss it further elsewhere,\(^{83}\) where we establish that – despite their strong similarities – the two chronicles are not identical. Heisenberg’s identification has also been challenged by Kazhdan, who argued that the Skoutariotes note in *Marc. Gr. 407* should be perceived as a note of ownership, since the other note (the one referring to Argyropoulos) is in the past tense (πέφυκε) and the Skoutariotes one is in the present,\(^{84}\) and that the scribe of *Athon. 3758* is not very credible, as he states that Skylitzes’ chronicle ends with Alexios and John Komnenos (whereas, it ends with

---

\(^{82}\) *Synopsis Chronike*, σμγ’.

\(^{83}\) See pp. 187ff.

\(^{84}\) Kazhdan, "Excerpty Skilicy", 529-30.
Isaac Komnenos) and that the chronicle of Theodore of Kyzikos starts with the reign of the two emperors (whereas Alexios and John did not govern together).\(^\text{85}\) Similarly, Vogel and Gardthausen stress that the connection of Theodore of Kyzikos with Theodore Skoutariotes was only made through *Marc. gr. 407*, and they accept that Theodore of Kyzikos was the owner of the manuscript, not the author of the included chronicle.\(^\text{86}\)

The second set of arguments concern a series of texts that appear in manuscripts of the *SynChron* and manuscripts owned by Theodore Skoutariotes. On the one hand, the excerpts of Skylitzes, found in *Marc. Gr. 407, Taur. 189* and *Escor. Y I 4*, and Theophylaktos' poem, found in *Marc. Gr. 407* and *Escor. Y I 4*, which denote a definite relationship between the manuscripts,\(^\text{87}\) but do not point to a particular author. On the other hand, the bull of Alexios I, which is found in *Paris. Gr. 1234* that was owned by Theodore Skoutariotes, is also present in *Marc. Gr. 407*, and more specifically within the text of the *SynChron*, as if it is part of the chronicle. The argument suggests that the presence of the bull in both texts cannot be a coincidence, and it should be attributed to Theodore Skoutariotes using the material of his *Paris. Gr. 1234* as the source of his chronicle.\(^\text{88}\) However, although the point is sound, it can not be accepted as the conclusive argument that proves the authorship of Skoutariotes, especially since there is no evidence of inclusion of material from any of the other manuscripts that he owned in the *SynChron*.

The comparison between the internal evidence of the text in regard to its author and the information we hold for the person of Theodore Skoutariotes does not seem to support their identification either. The author must have been a cleric, although no such explicit statement is to be found in the text;\(^\text{89}\) he had lived at the court of Theodore II Laskaris and was close to the patriarch Arsenios,\(^\text{90}\) and as a result was

---

\(^\text{85}\) Kazhdan, "Excerpty Skilicy", 530. Also see the entry of Skoutariotes in Kazhdan, et al., *ODB*.


\(^\text{88}\) Also see Tocci, "Zu Genese", 559-61.

\(^\text{89}\) See *Synopsis Chronike*, σμστ´.

\(^\text{90}\) For the information he adds to his source, Akropolites, and his political stance on the matter see Macrides, "Saints and Sainthood", 76-7.
able to provide unique and detailed information about them, usually in a positive manner. Such an attitude comes in contrast to the established pro-Latin and pro-Union image of Skoutariotes. Although it could be argued that it would not have been unheard of for someone to change sides,\(^91\) this does not seem to be the case for Theodore Skoutariotes, as it would be hard to accept that such a proponent of the Union would include the following passage in his chronicle.

\[\text{Ἀλέξιος ὁ παῖς Ἰσαακίου τοῦ Ἀγγέλου} [...]\] 
\[\text{τὸ δὲ μείζον καὶ παρεκτροπὴν τῆς πίστεως ὅπως τοῖς Λατίνοις ἀσπάζεται καὶ τῶν τοῦ Πάπα προνομίων καινισμῶν, καὶ μετάθεσιν τῶν παλαιῶν τῆς ῾Ρωμαίου ἐθνὸς. (SynChron, 433.25-7)\(^92\)

There are two final points that seem to contradict the identification of Skoutariotes with the author of the SynChron. The first is the fact that in Vind. Gr. 99 of the fourteenth century, we find the introduction of the SynChron but without any references to the name of the author. Given the early date of the manuscript (which is contemporary to Marc. Gr. 407), it seems peculiar that the text was initially being circulated as anonymous, but then had the name of Skoutariotes attached to it. The second point concerns the contradiction between the emergence of any name as the author of the SynChron and the statement in the proem that declares the wish of the compiler to remain anonymous: "Ἐγὼ δ' ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον ἀπσχύριζομαι, μὴ φιλοτιμία τὴν δήμηταν ποιήσασθαι καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἱστορομένοις μέγα τι φοινῆσαι, ὅτι καὶ παραχωρῶ τῷ βουλομένῳ πατέρᾳ λέγειν τῆς βίβλου, ὅν βούλεται." If the owner of Marc. Gr. 407, Theodore Skoutariotes, was the same person as the author of the text, then how can we explain his name on the text as its author, in regard to the statement in the proem? Furthermore, the above statement in the proem also contradicts Skoutariotes’ use of his name in other texts he wrote (especially the legal commentaries). Although it could be suggested that the statement refers only to the chronicle (echoing the topos of modesty, common in chronicles and

\(^91\) A notable example of such an attitude would be John Bekkos, the one-time opponent of the Union of the Churches, who later changed sides to become the head of the Unionist party, and subsequently patriarch.

\(^92\) The passage is copied verbatim from Choniates (540.20-3); however, this does not weaken the argument, since the author of the SynChron made numerous alterations and abridgments to the text of Choniates; had the author of the text been the same as Theodore Skoutariotes, we would reasonably expect that the passage would not make it into the SynChron. Additionally, Sathas attributes a pro-Latin marginal note in the Marc. Gr. 407 ("Ἀλλὰ τότε ἥδη, βέλτιστε, εἰς Ἀρειόν καὶ τὸν Πρόσφυρον ἐπανελευσόμεθα, ὅπερ, Κύριε, μὴ δώης, προτιμήσομεν γάρ Ἑλλήνων οἱ Φράγκοι." (SynChron, 303 n. 1) to Skoutariotes; if this is indeed the case, it is an additional indication of his sustained pro-Latin stance.
histories), this is not necessarily the case, as it seems to apply to the general attitude of the author.

**Conclusion**

Although there is a case to be made for the suggestion the *SynChron* was written by Theodore Skoutariotes, with some valid and plausible arguments, at present – and until any new evidence emerges – they are not conclusive enough to establish the authorship of the text. On the contrary, the counter-arguments and the evidence that indicate that the author of the chronicle was not Theodore Skoutariotes seem to carry more weight, and suggest that the issue of the authorship of the text should remain open.
Proem (3.1-4.18)

The proem of the SynChron is one of the passages of the text for which a specific direct source cannot be identified. Since the passage is missing from the Synopsis Lambros, it would be safe to assume that it was not part of their common archetype, but probably the product of the author – compiler of the SynChron. Nevertheless, several of the ideas of the proem reflect concepts derived from previous texts and it has already been suggested that the proems of Zonaras and the SynChron originate from a common source. In the following, we note the relevant similarities (or differences) in style, language, structure and ideas between their proems, as well as any connections with other texts that could have been utilised in the composition of the proem of the SynChron.

a. Both authors begin their proems with the same rhetoric device; a hypothetical accusation against them about the necessity of their texts each followed by refutations of the claims:

Εὐστόχως ἀν τις εἶποι ἐπιτωθάξων μοι, μείζων σοι τοῦ ἔργου τὸ πάρεγγον. (Zon., 1.1.1-2)

Ἀλλ’ ἵνα τι καὶ ὑπεραπολογήσωμαι ἐμαυτοῦ, […] (Zon., 1.2.1)

Τῆς παρούσης πραγματείας ἴσως ἄν τις ἡμᾶς αἰτίάσατο, […] (SynChron, 3.1-2)

Ἐγὼ δ’ ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον ἀπισχυρίζομαι, […] (SynChron, 3.6-7)

b. Both authors discuss the necessity of the works and demonstrate the usefulness of the text by referring to previous authors and works. Zonaras' passage (1.2.6-4.6) is an extensive critique of previous historians and their texts, on various points. Although the approach of the SynChron is not as negative as Zonaras, the author still uses the shortcomings of previous works to justify the writing of the SynChron (3.13-4.). More

---

94 This topos of criticism and refutation can also be found in Syrian chronicles; see Riad, Syriac Preface, 207-8.
specifically, he focuses on their excessive length and the inclusion of unnecessary narratives, such as orations, an argument that is also present in Zonaras:

οἱ μὲν διεξοδικότερον τὰς ἄλλας τῶν παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τὰ στρατηγημάτα συγγράφασι, παρατάξεις διηγούμενοι καὶ συμπλοκάς στρατευμάτων καὶ στρατοπεδείας καὶ χάρακας καὶ εἰτὶ τούτοις ἐπόμενον (Zon., 1.2.8-12)

τοῖς δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν συντέθειται τὰ συγγράμματα, ἐπιδεικνυμένοις ὅπως εἶχον περὶ τὸ γράφειν δυνάμεως καὶ διὰ τούτο δημηγορίας τε μεταξὺ τίθειπ καὶ παρεκβατικότερον ἢ καὶ ῥητορικότερον κεχρημένοις τῷ λόγῳ (Zon., 1.2.16-20)

καὶ ταῦτα δ" ἔφασαν τοῖς πλείοσι τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων τὰ τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἔπειτα, τὸ τε καὶ ἀνομοίως δοκοῦντας τῆς ἀκριβείας ἔχεσθαι καὶ μᾶλλον ἀληθεύειν, τὸ κατὰ δύναμιν ἡ ἂν ἀποπληρώσω σοι. (Zon., 1.3.1-13)

A similar approach of using previous authors as point of reference is also used by Manasses; in that case, however, the author focuses on providing a truthful account, given the different versions of previous authors.

Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐνταῦθα μοι καὶ μέχρι τοῦτον στήτο, μὴ πως κολακικότερος δόξῃ τισὶν ὁ λόγος, καὶ τὸν σκοπὸν καταλιπὼν ἀλλήν ἀκούσει τρέχειν. πολλῶν ἱστορημάτων δὲ καὶ χρονογραφημάτων, καὶ στρατιωτικῶν μὲν εἶπεν ὅθεν καὶ φιλαλήθως, ἀλλήλως ἀνομοίως δὲ ταῦτα συγγραφαμένων, ἡμεῖς προχειρισμέναι τούς μάλιστα δοκοῦντας τῆς ἀκριβείας ἐχεσθαί καὶ μᾶλλον ἀληθεύειν, τὸ κατὰ δύναμιν ἢμῶν ἀποσπασμόσιμον συ. (Manass., 18-26)

* Also see Zafeiris, “Narrating the past”, 30-3
Nevertheless, the similarities in content and style could indicate the use of a parallel text, especially since the manner in which he states the subject of his poem is similar to Zonaras and the SynChron, as we show below in c.

καὶ τίνες ἠξίζαν ἀπ’ ἁρχής καὶ μέχρι τοῦ προηλθον καὶ τίνων ἐβασιλεῦσαν, ἐτῶν δὲ μέχρις τῶν [.](Manass., 10-1)

c. The last parts of both proems present substantial similarities that can be explained by the use of a common source. They state the main points and the subject of the text, and then proceed to describe the starting point of their narrative:

[...] καὶ τίνες μετ’ ἑκείνων ἐν αὐτῇ ἐβασιλεῦσαν, καὶ οἰς ἐκαστος ἦν τους τρόπους, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὸ σέβας, καὶ ὅσον ἐκράτησε τῆς ἁρχής, καὶ ὅπως μετηλλάζε τὴν ἱων’ τίνες τε της ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει προεστήσαν ἑκαλησίας, καὶ ἐφ’ ὅσον ἐκαστος, καὶ τίνες αὐτών του ὀρθον’ ἀντειχοντο ὅγματος, τίνες δὲ γεγόνασιν ἑτρόδεια, καὶ ὅπως τοῖς ἐναλήθησαν ἑκαστος· καὶ ἔπι τίνων αὐτοκρατόροιν καὶ πατριαρχῶν καὶ κατά τίνων αἰ σύνοδοι συγκεκρητηναι. [...] ἀρχιτεον δὲ κοι τῆς συγγραφῆς ἁρχήν ταύτης ποιουμένων την πρώτην ἁρχήν την τῶν ὅλων αἰτίαν την ἀναφέρχει τε καὶ ἁχρόνον, καὶ τῶν ὅπ’ ἑκείνης παραχθέντων ἐκ τοῦ μη ὄντος εἰς ὑπόστασιν καὶ ὑσιώσιν την τη παραγωγήν καὶ την γένεσιν. (Ζον., 1.10.28-11.13)

[...] το πῶς ἑκαστος την βασιλειαν διώκησε, καὶ πῶς τοὺς υπηκόους ἔποιμανεν, εἰτ’ ἐν εὐσεβεία δηλονότι καὶ δικαιοσύνη, εἴτε τοῦ ὀρθον’ ἐξετράπη καὶ τοῦ δικαίου ἠμέλησαν [...] ἀρχιμενοι μὲν δὲν καὶ ἀνθρώποι οἰσχήμαν την ἁρχήν, τοῦ ἄνδρον δηλαδη, λήγουντες δὲ εἰς τοὺς καθ’ ἡμᾶς τα σκήπτρα χειριζόμενους εὐσεβεῖς βασιλεῖς. (SynChron, 4.10-8)

Although the similarities between the two proems are not absolute,97 they suggest that the two authors patterned their proems on the same text, perhaps the same one that appears to be their common main source in other sections.98 Any differences do not contradict the idea that the two authors developed independently their proem from a previous work but suggest that the author of the SynChron did not agree entirely with its ideas and made necessary changes, in order to have a proem that reflected his own ideas and objectives, especially in regard to the theme of brevity in historiographical works. It appears that his model for the theme comes, probably indirectly, from the

97 In comparison to the SynChron, Zonaras' proem is much more extensive and – in fact – includes a manifestation of the author against excessive brevity in historiographical works (Zonaras, Epitome, 2.3.20-4.1), which is not included in the proem of the SynChron.

98 See pp. 187ff.
proem of the twentieth book of Diodorus. In that, Diodorus criticises strongly the insertions of orations in histories ("Τοῖς εἰς τὰς ἱστορίας ὑπερμήκεις δημηγορίας παρεμβάλλουσιν ἢ πικνάις χρωμένοις ῥητορείαις δικαίως ἢν τις ἐπιτιμήσειεν") (Diod., Bibl. Hist., 20.1.1-3), a point also present in the SynChron (4.1-2, 53.6-7), as seen above. Diodorus' criticism is twofold: on the one hand the orations break the flow of narrative (Diod., Bibl. Hist., 20.1.1.3-5), on the other they hinder the reader from studying the actual events: ("ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν φιλοτίμως ἐχόντων πρὸς τὴν τῶν πράξεων ἐπίγνωσιν <μεσολαβοῦσι τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν>" (Diod., Bibl. Hist., 20.1.1.5-2.1)). The second point is reflected in the SynChron, not only through the restating of the actual argument (SynChron, 4.3-5) but also in the mutual focus on the intended reader.99

Although the above references suggest a stronger connection between the SynChron and the respective texts, we would like to note the one point of resemblance between the proems of the SynChron and the chronicle of Theophanes Confessor, a text which – as we show elsewhere – was used as a main source of the SynChron. Both proems share the idea of providing a concise chronicle ("σύντομον χρονογραφίαν" (Theoph., 3.13), "σύνοψις χρονικὴ" (SynChron, 4.19)) and employ similar expressions in their proems in order to describe the objective in writing the chronicle (Theoph., 3.13-23, 4.15-8); nevertheless, there are no further similarities of ideas, so a connection between the two proems seems unlikely.

An additional theme of the proem of the SynChron is the modesty of the author, a frequent topos in Byzantine texts100 and especially proems.101 As a result it is difficult to isolate a particular source, if there is one. The following passages resemble the expression used in the SynChron ("μὴ φιλοτιμία τὴν διήγησιν ταύτην ποιήσασθαι"

99 A parallel reference to the convenience of the intended reader can also be found in Psellus, Theologica, 1, 51.99-104, however there is no other evidence which could suggest the author of the SynChron has used the passage as a model: "Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐξήγησις αὕτη. ἐγὼ δὲ αὐτὰ ἐγγυὸν ὅτι ἐκ περιττοῦ πολλὰ τοῖς θεολογικοῖς ἐπεισυγκεκριμένων, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς ἐλλείποντας μέρεσιν, ἡμέρας ἐκ τοῖς βιβλίοις μὴ ἐντυγχάνετε, τούτους ἐνταῦθα γινόμενοι οὕτως τέ εἰς τούτου βουλομαι γὰρ τέλεσθαι τοὺς κακουπάτους ἔλλειποντας μέρεσιν."

100 See Kazhdan, et al., ODB, 1387.

101 Cf. Alexakis, "The Modesty Topos", 521-30, who discusses the presentation of the topos of modesty in the proem of the second sermon of John of Damascus, which presents parallels to the proem of the SynChron.
(SynChron, 3.7-8)), however they confirm the use of the theme by different authors rather than reveal the actual source of the SynChron: "Οὐχὶ φιλοτιμίας ἕνεκεν διηγοῦντο" (Catena, In Act., 77.32), "οὐ φιλοτιμίας χρώμενος, ἀλλ’ ὀφελεῖας ἀρχέτυπον προτιθείς" (Theodoret, Interpt. in Psalm., 1940.30-1), "Διηγήσατο δὲ οὐ φιλοτιμούμενος" (Theodoret, Hist. Reg., 21.19.3-4).

Finally, we conclude the comparison with an example of a proem from hagiography with remarkable similarities to the proem of the SynChron. The introduction of the life of John of Cyprus – written by Leontios of Neapolis – has a similar structure of arguments (that is, hypothetical accusations against the author in regard to the necessity of his task, subsequently overturned by Leontios), which concludes with a statement concerning the justification of the conscious choice of the style that is going to be used:

διότι σοφοὶ καὶ δυνατοὶ ὄντες ἐν λόγῳ οἱ φιλοϊστορεῖς οὗτοι σοφῶς καὶ ἀνωτέρως [καὶ] τὴν ὑπόθεσιν διεζωγράφησαν· ὅπερ μᾶλλον καὶ πλείω διηγείρετο ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν παρούσαν σπουδήν, ἵνα τῷ ἐνυπάρχοντι ἡμῖν πεζῷ καὶ ἀκαλλωπίστῳ καὶ χαμηλῷ χαρακτῆρι διηγησώμεθα ἵνα δύνασθαι καὶ τὸν ἰδιώτην καὶ ἀγράμματον ἐκ τῶν λεγομένων ὑφεληθήναι: (Leontios, 344.64-9)

Needless to say, this does not suggest that the respective idea of the SynChron was drawn from the text of Leontios. It shows, however, that the author of the SynChron would be willing to use concepts and schemes that were common in hagiographical texts, a tendency that also appears elsewhere in the chronicle.102

**First part (4.19-19.16)**

**Adam – Moses (4.19-8.19)**

**Introduction – Title (4.19-24)**

We were not able to identify a source for the passage, which describes the subject of the chronicle and provides the title that we use for it ("Σύνοψις χρονική"). Nevertheless, it can also be found in the Vind. Gr. 99, under the name of (the non-

---

102 See pp. 284ff.
existent) writer John Sikeliotes. Its presence there suggests that it was part of an earlier text and not compiled by the author of the SynChron. This is confirmed by the fact that it can also be found in the Synopsis Lambros, which – however – does not include the proem.

In addition to that, the similarities with the introductions to certain parts of the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae of Athanasios and John Chrysostom cannot be a coincidence:

᾿Επιτομή πράξεων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰσραήλ. Ἀρχήν δὲ τῶν πάντων πράξεων τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ τῶν τῆς Σαμαρείας, τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τὰς πράξεις, καὶ τά τῆς ἑκάστου βασιλείας ἔτη καὶ πρῶτον περὶ τῶν βασιλέων Ἰερουσαλήμ. (Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacr., 323.20-4)

῾Εστὶ δὲ τά ὀνόματα τῶν βασιλέων τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ὁποῖον τῆς ἑκάστου πράξεως τὸ τέλος, καὶ πόσα ἐτη ἑκάστος αὐτῶν ἐβασίλευσε, ὡς ἐν ἑπτάμων διαλαβεῖν (ἑστι) ἀπὸ τῶν προκειμένων δ’ βιβλίων, οὕτως. (Chrys., Syn. Scr. Sacr., 354.40-4)

As we show elsewhere, the above texts are part of the pool from which the archetype of the SynChron draws its material. The fact that the passage is also present in the Vind. Gr. 99 suggests that the author of the phrase could have used any of the above passages as the prototype for his introduction.

**Adam: Designation of the names of the animals (4.28-5.1)**

The passage of the SynChron can also be found in: Mal., 4.8-10, Io. Ant., 1.6-7, Eklog. Chron., 232.2-5, Georg. Monk, 6.5-7, Vind. Gr. 99, 9.4-6

**Lamech’s death (5.16-18)**

The initial source for the passage is probably Eusebius (Sync., 92.25). The phrase "θανάτῳ φυσικῷ" is probably a later addition which finds its way to the SynChron through the Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99.

---

103 It is also echoed in the “Ekloge Historion”: “Ἀρχήν δὲ τῆς ἑκάστου βασιλείας ἔτη τῆς ἱστορίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, οὕτως ὡς πέρι τῶν ἱστορικῶν ἀποτελέσματα αὐτῶν ἐλευθερίας, ὡς ἐν ἑπτάμων διαλαβεῖν (ἐστι) ἀπὸ τῶν προκειμένων δ’ βιβλίων, οὕτως. (Chrys., Syn. Scr. Sacr., 354.40-4)
Haran (5.18-20)

This is an instance where the SynChron diverges from the Chronikon Epitomon and the Vind. Gr. 99. Additionally, the Septuagint relates that Haran died before his father (Gen. 11.28), but does not include any references to idolatry; on the other hand, the Jubilees relate that Haran died trying to put down Abraham’s fire, which was destroying the idols (Jubil., g*), a tradition also present in later authors such as George Synkellos (Sync., 107.22-25, 111.13-7 (from Josephus), 112.7-9) and Leo the Grammarian (Leo Gramm., 19.15-22).

Omission of Cainan in the Bible (5.27-31)104

The passage comes to the SynChron from the tradition of the Chronikon Epitomon (Chron. Epit., 10.16-26) and refers to Gen. 11.11-2, Luke 3.36.


Cainan: Astronomy (6.1-4)

A common reference in various texts (Io. Ant., 2.29-31 (drawing from Josephus), Vind. Gr. 99, 10.27, Georg. Monk (PG), 52.41-5, Glyc., 243.1-4, Joel, 3.13-4.2), which, according to John of Antioch, originates from Josephus. It is noteworthy, however, that the additional phrase "ἥτις καὶ περίεστι" (SynChron, 6.4) can also be found only in the Vind. Gr. 99 and the Synopsis Lambros, which is indicative of the connections between the texts.

Peleg: Building of the tower (of Babel) – Eber (6.6-12)

Main source: The source of Vind. Gr. 99, 11.1-4

Serug: Hephaestus, king of Egyptians (6.15-6)


Terah: Cronus and Rhea, kings of Egyptians (6.16-7)
From the *Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99*. Parallel passages: Sync., 19.5 (from Manetho)

Abram: Zeus, king of Egyptians (6.18-9)
From the *Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99*. Parallel passages: Sync., 19.17 from Manetho

Abraham and his relatives (6.26-7.2)
The passage is common with the *Vind. Gr. 99* (11.22), however it is not present in the *Chronikon Epitomon*.105

Belus, first king of the Assyrians (7.3-7)
From the *Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99*. Other texts that mention that the duration of the kingdom was 1300 years: *Anon. Matr.*, 8.5-9, *Eklog. Histor.* (Wirth), 10.4-6

Aegialeus, first king of the Sicyonians (7.8-11)

The 'dynasty' of the Egyptians (7.12-6)
From the *Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99*. Parallel passage: *Anon. Matr.*, 10.1-4

Jacob's wives and children (7.17-24)
The passage is common with the *Vind. Gr. 99* (12.11), however it is not present in the *Chronikon Epitomon*

Inachos, first king of Argos – Mycenae (7.26-8.2)

Background of Moses (8.4-9)

The passage is common with the *Vind. Gr. 99* (12.21), however it is not present in the *Chronikon Epitomon*.

Exodus (8.9-12)

The passage is also present in the *Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99*, however it has more similarities with the latter.

Judges: Joshua – Samson (8.20-9.26)

Ogygos' cataclysm (8.20-5)


Joshua (8.26-30)

The passage is common with the *Vind. Gr. 99* (13.13), however it is not present in the *Chronikon Epitomon*.

Cecrops, first king of Athens - Cataclysm of Deucalion – Phaethon (9.3-9)


Sibylla (9.22-3)

From the *Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99*. Parallel passages: *Anon. Matr.*, 16.5-6

Samson (9.24-5)

The passage is common with the *Vind. Gr. 99* (14.17) and the Athan., *Syn. Scr. Sacr.*, 313.35-7, however it is not present in the *Chronikon Epitomon*. Other sources: Josephus (Joseph., *Ant. Iud.*, 5.300, Kedr., 1.123.3-5) or the Bible (Judg. 15.16), although the reference is present in numerous other texts (e.g. *Chron. Pasch.*, 153.8, Sync., 203.10, Georg. Monk, 151.20-152.1, Glyc., 308.19).
Eli – Samuel (9.27-10.6)

Duration of Eli’s tenure (9.27-8)


Eli: Trojan War – Homer (9.27-31)

From the Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99. Other sources: Exc. Barb., 247.12-6, Eus., Hier. Chron., 63a.14-7. The different passages between the texts, as they appear below, present an opportunity to examine the relationships between the texts, especially the SynChron and the Synopsis Lambros. An additional parallel passage, which does not add to the current discussion, is Sync., 206.24-5, 206.27, 207.9.

In diebus autem Heli sacredotis solis exterminatio facta est ab Acheis, in quibus memorantur Agamemnon et Menelaus et Achilleus et quanti alii Danei, de quo historiam posuit Omirus litterator et scriba. (Exc. Barb., 247.12-6)

Ἡλεὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς ἔτη μ´ κατὰ τὸ ἑβραϊκόν, κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ο´ ἐτη κ´. Κατὰ τούτους δὲ τοὺς χρόνους ὁ πρὸς τοὺς Τρῶας πόλεμος συνέστη τοῖς Ἐλληνι καὶ ἤ Ἰλιος έάλων. Ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ Ἡλεὶ καὶ ἤ κιβωτὸς παρελθήθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ, ὅπερ μαθὼν ὁ Ἡλεὶ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης πληγήν μὴ ἐνεγκὼν ἔπεσε παραυτίκα καὶ αφῆκε τὴν ψυχήν. Μετὰ ταύτα αναρχία κατεῖχε τοὺς Ἐβραίους εἰς τῆς λύπης πληγῆς ἐνεγκὼν. Εἰς τούτου τοῦ Ἠλεὶ καὶ ἡ κιβωτὸς παρελήφθη ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ, ὅπερ μαθὼν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης ἐπεσε παραυτίκα καὶ αφῆκε τὴν ψυχήν. Ἐπὶ τούτου καὶ Ὅμηρος. (Vind. Gr. 99)

Ἠλεὶ ὁ κριτὴς ἔτη μ´. [...] τῷ εἰκοστῷ ὃν ἔτει τῆς ἀναρχίας, καθ´ ὃν καιρὸν ἤρθεν Ἑμεγαρ καὶ Ἡλεὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς, συνέβη τῷ Ἰσραήλ ἐλαῦσιν ἐτοὺς διαγενομένου ἀπὸ Αδάμ ὁ, ὅτι καὶ εἰρήνης τῆς πρὸς ἀλλοφύλους ἐτη λ´. Ὅμηρος ὁ ποιητής ἐγνωρίζετο εἰς εἰκοστῷ ἔτει τῆς εἰρήνης ταύτης. (Anon. Matr., 16.10, 17.7-18.20)

Ἠλὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς κατὰ μὲν τοῖς ἐτη μ´. Ἐπὶ τούτου καὶ ἤ κιβωτὸς παρὰ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων παρελθήθη ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ, ὅπερ μαθὼν ὁ Ἡλεὶ καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης πληγήν μὴ ἐνεγκὼν ἔπεσε παραυτίκα καὶ αφῆκε τὴν ψυχήν. Ἐπὶ τούτου καὶ Ὅμηρος. Διήγε τὸ Ἰσραήλ μετὰ τὸν Ἡλὶ ἀνάρχως πρὸ τῆς ἡλικίας Σαμουὴλ ἔτη λ´. (SynChron, 9.27-31)


107 The respective passage of the chronicle in Vat. Gr. 433 (f. 246v.12-8) is the same as the Chronikon Epitomon.
Ἡλεὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς κατὰ μὲν ἑβραϊκὸν ἔτη μʹ, κατὰ δὲ τοὺς Ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτη κʹ. Ἐπὶ τούτου συνέστη ὁ τρωικὸς πόλεμος καὶ ἡ Ἰλιος ἑάλω. Ἐπὶ τούτου ἦν Ὅμηρος. Διήγε δὲ ὁ Ισραήλ μετὰ τὸν Ἡλεὶ ἀνάρχως πρὸ τῆς ἡλικίας Σαμουὴλ ἔτη Λʹ. Ἔπειτα μὲν τοῖς Σαμψὼν ἔως Ἡλεὶ τοῦ ἱερέως ἀναρχία ἦν παρ᾿ αὐτοῖς ἔτη μʹ. (Syn. L., 146.21-147.5)

**Kings: Saul - Mattaniah (10.7-13.18)**

**David: Hesiod (10.16-7)**


**Solomon's proverb (10.18-25)**

The passage is not to be found neither in the *Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99/Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* nor in any of the other historiographical texts. Although it is not part of the *Sapientia Salomonis* either, it appears in other Byzantine texts: Chrys., *In Epist. Hebr.*, 136.61-2, Dam., *Sacr. par.*, 1221.3-6, 1521.44-7.

**Building of the temple (10.24-5)**

The passage is common with the *Vind. Gr. 99* (15.10) however the *Chronikon Epitomon*, the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* and the *Synopsis Lambros* do not include any references to the temple in this instance.

**Jhoas' death (11.17-8)**


**Amaziah (11.19-22)**

Common passage between the *SynChron*, the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* (324.2-9) and the *Vind. Gr. 99* (16.9); however, there are common passages between the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacra* and the *SynChron*, which are missing in the *Vind. Gr. 99*.

---

108 The *Synopsis Lambros* relates the building of the temple by Solomon in a later passage (*Synopsis Lambros*, 170.6-7), which is part of an extensive account of Solomon’s tenure, sourced from Glykas.
Azariah (11.24-6)

Passage present in the Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacr., 324.9-17 but not in the Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99.

Azariah: First Olympic Games (11.27-8)

Other source: Eus., Hier. Chron., 86a.6

Olympiads – Leap year (11.29-12.11)

The passage in Eusebius' chronicle (Eus., Hier. Chron., 86a.11-3) seems to be an initial version of the extensive explanation on the use of the Olympiads as a measure of time and the introduction of the leap year, which is unique in this place in the SynChron and the Synopsis Lambros (200.3-201.5). Parallel passages: Exc. Barb., 324.21-2, Horap., 1.5.1-7, Dam., Expos. fid., 21.177-9, Sync., 231.5-6, 377.7-17, Georg. Monk, 293.14, Kedr., 1.189.13-4, Glyc., 379.12, Joel, 24.10

Ahaz: Founding of Rome (12.13-7)

From the Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99 (16.15-20). The last part of the passage of the Chronikon Epitomon (16.18-20), part of which we find in the SynChron (12.15-7), is missing from the Vind. Gr. 99.
Parallel passage: Plut., Rom., 12.5-6.

The retrogression of the Sun (12.24-5)

The brief reference to the return of the sun by ten degrees is not part of either the Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99 or the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae. However, it is a rather common reference in other texts (such as Eus., Comm. in Isa., 2.14.49-66, Theodoret, Comm. in Isa., 11.426-8 (from Symmachus), Zon., 1.167.21-4, Glyc., 361.10-362.10), whose indirect source is the Bible (Isa. 38.8).

109 See Gelzer, Africanus, II, 374.
110 In fact, the Vind. Gr. 99 and the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae share another passage, an additional sign of the connection between them.
Manasseh (12.26-13.1)

Although there are parallels with the Vind. Gr. 99 (in the content), the similarities with the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae (324.29-39) are stronger and verify the suggestion that the SynChron draws its material from a text between the Vind. Gr. 99 and the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae.

Manasseh: Founding of Byzantium (13.1-2)

From the Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99 (17.1-2).

Josiah (13.4-9)

The passage is missing in the Chronikon Epitomon but can be found in the Vind. Gr. 99 (17.4-5) and the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae (324.45-55).

Capture of Mattaniah (13.16-8)

The passage is present in the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae (325.4-7) and the Vind. Gr. 99 (17.9) but not in the Chronikon Epitomon.

Under Babylonian rule (13.18-15.2)

The capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (13.18-14.16)

For the first part of the narrative (13.18-14.5), the source of the SynChron is a text from the family of the Epitome. Although we are not able to identify a main source for the first lines (13.18-23), its content is similar to the respective passages of Leo Gramm., 43.20-44.1 and Kedr., 1.200.7-17 (parallel: Sync., 260.11-5, 264.7-31). As far as the SynChron, 13.23-14.5 is concerned, the text is almost the same as Leo Gramm., 44.1-15, which confirms that a text of its family was used.

The next intermitted sentence (SynChron, 14.6-8) describing the duration of the capture of the Jews is identical with Chron. Epit., 17.19-22, an introduction to the following passage (SynChron, 14.8-16) that recaps the three captures of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. This also comes from the Epitome, as the strong similarities with Leo Gramm., 45.1-12 and Kedr., 1.202.16-203.2 suggest.

The prophecy of Daniel (14.18-27)

The prophecy of Daniel refers to the explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream by the prophet Daniel (Dan. 2.36-45), a common place in Byzantine chronicle writing.
However, we were not able to identify a text with close similarities to the respective passage of the *SynChron*, which suggests that the author (of the archetype of the *SynChron* and the *Synopsis Lambros*) either rendered the passage of the Bible himself or used a parallel passage from a non surviving text.

**Belshazzar's Feast and the Handwriting of God (14.28-15.2)**

Other sources: Dan. 5.1.1-5, 5.1.24-30, although it seems that the *SynChron* used Mal., 117.18-118.40 (or a text based on Malalas). The account of the *SynChron* is less extensive, but both texts have a similar short rendering of the writing "MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN" on the wall.

**Under Persian rule (15.3-17.26)**

**The end of the Babylonian kingdom (15.3-6)**

Other sources: Joseph., *Ant. Iud.*, 10.248-9 (due to similar content and structure), although the information could have also come from the Bible (Dan. 6).

**The war between Cyrus and Croesus (15.10-16.18)**

Sources: Mal., 119.64-122.60, John Nik., LI.1-16, Georg. Monk, 18.11-20.19, Kedr., 1.239.15-242.20

**Release of the Jews – Rebuilding of the temple (16.23-17.5)**

Other sources: 1 Esd. 5.54-6, 2 Esd 1, 2 Esd. 2.64-7; however, the material of the *SynChron* comes from the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* (Athan., *Syn. Scr. Sacr.*, 329.41-9, Chrys., *Syn. Scr. Sacr.*, 358.18-27).

---

111 The *Synopsis Lambros* also includes the passage (221.14-222.7), with the addition of information from Glykas.
Xerxes – Ezra – Nehemiah (17.7-13)


Under Macedonian rule (17.27-19.16)

The source for the section is clearly the family of the Chronikon Epitomon, as the strong similarities in structure, content, language and chronology suggest. However, there are some minor differences between the Chronikon Epitomon and the SynChron, such as the ones in the chronology of the Ptolemies. There are also minor linguistic differences as well as passages present in the Chronikon Epitomon but missing from the SynChron and vice versa, which suggest that the SynChron used an earlier version of the Chronikon Epitomon. In the following we note the main differences between them and the potential sources of the SynChron.

Alexander (17.27-18.1)

The following passages are part of the tradition that was the source of the family of the Chronikon Epitomon, and we discuss their relationship to the SynChron in the respective sections.

ἔζησεν δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀλέξανδρος ἔτη λϚʹ, ἐβασίλευσε δὲ ὑποτάξας τὰ πάντα ἐτη ιζʹ, ὁ δὲ πόλεμος αὐτοῦ ἐκφάτησεν ἐτη θʹ, ὑπέταξε δὲ βαρβάρων ἐβασίλευσε δὲ οὕτως ἐπολέμησε δὲ ἔτη ιβʹ, πολεμῶν δὲ ἐνίκησεν ὑπέταξε δὲ βαρβάρων ἐδεικνύοντο ὑπέταξε δὲ ἔθνη κβʹ Ἑλλήνων φυλὰς ιδʹ, ἔκτισε δὲ ἐπὶ ᾗ Ὀλενῆς ιβʹ, καὶ ἔκτισε πόλεις ιβʹ·

 Aristaeus, Magn. (rec. d), 6-9) Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδὼν μετὰ τὸ ἀνελεῖν τὸν Δαρεῖον τοῦτον καὶ καθελεῖν τὴν Περσῶν αρχὴν τελείως, ἐτι οἰκτῷ, καὶ πρὸ τοῦτον ἐτι τέσσαρα. ὑπαγόμενος τὴν Ασίαν, ὑποτάξας καὶ δουλοσάμενος Ἑλλήνων μὲν φυλὰς δεκατρεῖς, καὶ βαρβάρων...
ἐθνη κβ'. ἐπελεύσθη δὲ κατὰ τὴν Βαβυλώνια ἐν ἔτει ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου ἑξ'.

(Synchron, 17.27-18.1)

Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδών μετὰ τὸ ἀνελεῖν τὸν Δαρείον τοῦτον καὶ καθελεῖν τελείως τὴν αρχήν τῶν Περσῶν ἐβασιλεύσεν ἐτήςγε'· Καὶ πρὸ τοῦτο γὰρ ἤν βασιλεύον καὶ υπαγόμενος τὴν Ασίαν ἔτη δ', ὡς ὅμοι τὰ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐτήςγε'. Εν οἷς ἐρίθασεν ὑποτάξεις καὶ δουλωσάμενος Ἐλλήνων μὲν φυλὰς ἑν', βαββάρων δὲ ἐθνη κβ'. Καὶ ἄπλως συμπάσης Ασίας καὶ Αἰγύπτου διὰ βραχέων ἔκρατης πολέμιον νόμω γενόμενος ἐπελεύσθη δὲ ἐν Περσίδι κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν Βαβυλώνια ἐν ἔτει ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου ἑξ'. (Chron. Epit., 19.31-20.3)

Τοῦτον ἀνελὼν ᾿Αλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδών καὶ καθελὼν τὴν τῶν Περσῶν αρχήν ἐβασιλεύσεν ἐτής Ζ', πρὸ τοῦ καθελεῖν τὸν Δαρείον βασιλεύσας, ὡς τινὲς γὰρ, ἐτήςγε', ἐπελεύσθη δὲ ἐν Βαβυλώνι ἐτῶν λέων ι', [ως δέ άλλο εἰπών ΛΩΣ]. ἐβασιλεύσεν οὖν ἐτὴς ι'· Ἐπέταξε δὲ βαββάρων ἐθνη κβ' καὶ φυλὰς Ἐλλήνων ἑν', [καὶ ἐπελεύσθην ἐν Περσίδι βασιλεύσαν]. Ὁμοίο τὰ πάντα ἀπὸ ᾿Αδὰ μὲ ἄλλοις ἐτὴς τελευτῆς ᾿Αλεξάνδρου ἐτῆς ἑξ'ζ'. (Niceph., Chron. Synt., 89.20-90.6)

Τοῦτον ἀνελὼν ᾿Αλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδών καὶ καταλύσας τὴν τῶν Περσῶν αρχήν ἐβασιλεύσεν ἐτής γε' καὶ ἐπελεύσθην ἐν Βαβυλώνι ἐτῶν λέων ι'· ὑπέταξε βαββάρων ἐθνη κβ' καὶ φυλὰς Ἐλλήνων ιγ'· Ὁμοίο ἃπὸ τοῦ ᾿Αδὰ μὲ ἄλλοις ἐτῆς τελευτῆς ᾿Αλεξάνδρου ἐτῆς ερξζ'. (Symeon, Chron. Brev., 1280.28-33)

Ptolemy Philopator against the Jews (18.14-9)
The source of the passage should be a text of the Epitome family (Georg. Monk, 435.14-436.2, Leo Gramm., 50.21-51.8, Kedr., 1.290.15-23, 340.3-14).

Hyrkanus – Aristobulus (18.26-19.4)
Similarly to the passage on Ptolemy Philopator, this segment was obtained from a text of the Epitome family (as the similarities to Leo Gramm., 51.9-52.5, Kedr., 1.291.1-20 seem to suggests), the original source probably being Eus., Hier. Chron., 153.12-23.

Second Part (19.17-173.8)

Introduction (19.17-9)
Parallel passages: Zon., 2.84.18-85.5, (Manass., 1471-4)

Aeneas (19.19-27)
Other source: Mal., 129.72-130.88112


**Ascanius (19.27-31)**

Other source: Mal., 130.89-93

**Silvius – Procas (20.1-5)**

**Amulius (20.5-21.2)**

Other sources: Appian., *Basil.*, 1.5-6, 1a.5-9, Plut., *Rom.*, 6-8, Cas. Dio, *Hist. Rom.*, 6.7-7.16, Zon., 2.887.6-90.2, Manass., 1564-1616

It seems that there are two versions of the story of Amulius and Numitur, and the origin of Romulus and Remus, which is reflected in the 'other sources' and 'parallel passages' above. The *SynChron* does not follow Malalas but draws its material from a different source that reflects earlier texts. The same applies to the accounts of Manasses and Zonaras (whose version is the most extensive). However, although there are similarities between the three texts, we cannot suggest conclusively that they follow the same source, as the story was not only part of the oral tradition of the Roman Empire, but was also included in other texts, even at a later age. For example, Appian's passage comes via Photius' *Bibliotheca* (Phot., *Bibl.*, cod. 57, 16b.34-17a.15).

**Numitur – Romulus & Remus (21.3-22.28)**

**Founding of Rome (1) (21.3-17)**

Other source: John Nik., LVI.2-4
Parallel passages: *FGrh*, 3c.839.73-6, Mal., 132.3-8, *Chron. Pasch.*, 204.4-7
Romulus designates the name of the city (21.17-20)
Other sources: Lyd., De Mens., 4.73.1-9, Manass., 1632-3

Founding of Rome (2) (21.21-30)
Main sources: Mal., 132.8-12, Chron. Pasch., 204.8-12, Georg. Monk, 21.8-14, Manass., 1618-31
Other sources: Lyd., De Mens., 4.73.20-9, John Nik., LVI.4, Kedr., 1.257.21-2
Parallel passages: Suda, kappa 341.1-3, pi 49, Plut., Aetia, 271.4-13, Zon., 2.90.19-91.2, Glyc., 266.12-5

The murder of Remus and its aftermath (21.31-22.12)
Parallel passage: Glyc., 266.18-22

The Hippodrome (22.12-28)
Parallel passages: Lyd., De Mens., 1.12.30-41, Dam., Sacr. par., 372.37-373.9, Glyc., 266.16-7

Numa Pompilius – Coins (22.29-31)
Other sources: Lyd., De Mens., 1.17.25-7, Io. Ant., 62, 63 (Exc. Salm. II), Kedr., 1.260.2-5, 801.23-802.2
Parallel passages: Heron, De mens., 60.15.1-2, Epiph., De mens., 50-3

Ancus Hostilius – Servius Tullius (23.1-3)

Tarquinius Supervus (23.4-23.29)

Rape of Lucretia – Tarquinius' overthrow – Brutus (23.4-23.29)
Other sources: Liv., Ab urb. cond., I.57-60, Mal., 139.6-140.41, Io. Ant., 69, Zon., 2.117.20-120.3
Parallel passages: Dion. Hal., *Antiq. Rom.*, 4.69.3.5-4.7, Eutrop., *Breviarium*, 1.8, Sync., 284.5-9, Kedr., 1.262.6-263.2, Manass., 1683-92, 1736-51

**The Roman Republic (23.29-24.13)**

**Changes in the administration and government (23.29-24.11)**

Main sources: Lyd., *De magistr.*, 50.21-7, 52.22-54.8, 54.24-56.2, 56.23-58.5
Parallel passages: Zon., 2.130.12-22, 139.10-21, 143.10-23

**Subversion of the Republic by Julius Caesar (24.12-4)**

Other sources: Eus., *Hier. Chron.*, 106.24, 156.2-4, Mal., 161.1-2

**Julius Caesar (24.15-23)**

Parallel passage: Sync., 366.3-4.

Most of the information of the passage can be found in Eutropius' *Breviarium ab urbe condita*, which also shares the positive attitude towards Julius Caesar of the *SynChron*. Also, some of the information may have been drawn from the *Chronicon Paschale*, which was also the source for the preceding passage.

**Augustus Octavius (24.24-25.27)**

**Augustus – Antonius – Lepidus – Cleopatra (24.24-25.10)**

Other sources: Cas. Dio, *Hist. Rom.*, 43.49.1, 46.42-45, 48.28.3ff, Lyd., *De magistr.*, 84.29-30, 86.12-8, Zon., 375.6-434.21

---

113 Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 30.
114 The text was translated into Greek early and was used as a source by John of Antioch; see Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur*, I, 327. Karpozelos, *Vyzantinoi Historikoi*, II, 575.
115 See pp. 291ff.
Delphic oracle (25.11-20)
Main source: Leo Gramm., 57.1-7
Other source: Mal., 176.82-96

Dying words of Augustus (25.20-2)\textsuperscript{116}
Parallel passages: Zon., 2.454.19-21, Manass., 1915-8, Glyc., 383.4-5

Birth of Jesus Christ (25.23-27)
Main sources: Eklogai, 87.16-7, Leo Gramm., 57.8-11, Glyc., 383.10-12.

Maccabees – Herodian dynasty (25.28-27.18)\textsuperscript{118}
Sack of Jerusalem by Antiochus – Mattathias' revolt (25.27-26.7)
Other sources: 1 Macc. 2, Joseph., Ant. lud., XII.5, Eus., Hier. Chron., 141.2-8
Parallel passages: Sync., 336.23-338.14, 347.11-24, De virtut. et vit., 1.78.30-79.19

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{116} The verb 'καταλιμπάνω', which is common in wills, appears only in the SynChron.
\item \textsuperscript{117} Hippolytus also puts the birth of Jesus Christ in 5500.
\item \textsuperscript{118} See Fishman-Duker, "Second Temple period", 126-56 for a discussion of the treatment of the period in the Byzantine chronicles (or its absence), and especially in Malalas, George the Monk and Zonaras. However, Fishman-Duker does not make any references to the SynChron, notwithstanding its extensive account of the events of the period.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Mattathias' sons (26.7-14)

Other sources: 1 Macc. 3-16, 2 Macc 8.10.8, Hippol., *Fragm.* 452.20-5, Joseph., *Ant. Iud.*, XII.6, XIII.1, XIII.6, Eus., *Hier. Chron.*, 141 (Iud.), 142 (Iud), 144 (Iud.)


Other sources: Joseph., *Ant. Iud.*, XIII.8, XIV.1, XIV.4, Eus., *Hier. Chron.*, 145 (Iud.), 148 (Iud.)

Herod Antipater – Herod Agrippa II (26.25-27.18)


A main source of *SynChron*, 25.28-27.18 are the books of the Maccabees of the *Septuagint*, Josephus' *Antiquities* and possibly the *De Bello Judaico* for the information concerning the family of Herod. Although some of the information can also be found in the *Chronicon Paschale*, the additional material of the *SynChron* reject the possibility that the *Chronicon Paschale* was the source of this section. On the other hand, there are similarities with Zonaras (not linguistic but in content). However, the fact that Zonaras' account of the events is more extensive (1.324-1.402, 2.1-2.24), and the differences in language suggest that there is no direct connection between the *SynChron* and Zonaras in this case.

---

119 This is the entry of the *Bibliotheca* on Josephus' *Antiquities*, which provides a summary of the text that could have been used by later authors.
Tiberius (27.19-28.12)

Jesus Christ: Teachings – Death – Resurrection – Assumption (27.19-27)
Main sources: Luk 3.1, 3.23, Chron. Epit., 22.32-23.5
Other sources: Eus., Hier. Chron., 10.6-7, 173.18-9, Eusebius in Sync., 394.1-2

Flies' proverb (27.28-28.1)
Main source: Leo Gramm., 53.3-8

Tiberius on Jesus Christ (28.1-3)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 58.20-2, Kedr., 345.10-3
Other sources: Alex., Invent., 4037.25-33, Tert., Apol., 5.2, Eus., HE, 2.2.1.7-6.10 (esp. 2.2.6.1-6), Zon., 3.11.22-12.1

Death of Pilate (28.3-9)
Main source: Kedr., 1.343.5-12

---

120 Cf. Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 28, who uses this passage and its similarities to Leo the Grammarian's text to suggest that one of the sources of the SynChron is the Epitome.
121 See p. 285.
122 See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, "Pontios Pilatos", 77-107 for a more extensive discussion of the presentation of the matter by the Byzantine sources.
Tiberius on contradicting laws (28.10-2)
Main source: Kedr., 1.336.11-4, 344.9-10
Parallel passage: Joel, 26.13-6

Gaius (28.13-18)
Main sources: Mal., 186.74-6, Chron. Pasch., 432.19-21, (De Ins., 157.5-8), Zon., 3.12.24-5

Claudius (28.18-22)

Kedrenos and Zonaras agree both in language and in content with the SynChron, as they all seem to draw the material from the family of the Epitome; the SynChron has the same account as Leo the Grammarian, with the exception of the claim for Agrippina's role in Claudius' death, which is missing from Leo, who relates that Claudius ate a "μύκητα πεφαρμαγμένον".

124 The Synopsis Lambros (265.5-13) follows the extensive account of Glykas (435.20-436.4), instead of the phrase "οἱ ἐγκλήσεως Μαρίας τῆς Μαγδαληνῆς" that we find in the SynChron (28.4).
125 Malalas' excerpts.
Nero (28.23-29.8)

Nero's murders and other actions (28.23-6)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 62.4, 62.7-8, Kedr., 1.377.19-22
Other sources: Eus., Hier. Chron., 182.16-7, Eus., Chron., 100.33-6, Eus., HE, 2.25.2-3

Persecution (28.26-8)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 62.8-9, Chron. Epit., 23.8-11
Other sources: Eus., Hier. Chron., 185.6-10, Eus., Chron., 100.36-40, Eus., HE, 2.25.5

Nero's death (28.29-29.3)
Parallel passages: Manass., 2031-3, Glyc., 441.22-442.2, Xanth., HE, 145.852D

Galbius on Nero (29.3-8)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 62.17-21, Kedr., 1.378.7-12
Parallel passage: De Sent.. 250.20-3

The form of the name Galbius is different between the texts: Γάλβιος (in the SynChron), Βάλβιος (in Kedrenos) and Ἀβλάβιος (in Leo the Grammarian).¹²⁶

¹²⁶ The writing in Constantine Porphyrogenitus' De sententiis is Φλάβιος Σούβριος.
Galba (29.9-12)

Burial of the apostles Peter and Paul (29.9-11)
Main sources: Mal., 195.44-9, Chron. Pasch., 46.8-10

Galba's death (29.11-2)
Other source: Io. Ant., 175.4
Parallel passage: Sync., 416.10-1

Otho (29.13-5)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 63.20, 64.1, Kedr., 1.379.16, 1.379.19

Although the texts of Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos contain the information that we find in the SynChron, the latter includes an additional sentence, for which we cannot identify a direct source. The information could have been drawn from the source of the respective extensive account of Zonaras (3.44-6), or the text from which the SynChron drew the material of John of Antioch in the previous passage.

Vitellius (29.16-9)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 64.7-12, Kedr., 1.379.21-380.3

Vespasian (29.20-30.2)

Vespasian proclaimed emperor –First actions (29.20-7)
Main sources: Kedr., 1.374.13-5, 380.4-9 (?), Manass., 2039-45 (?)
Other sources: Alex., Invent., 4041.25-35, Eus., Hier. Chron., 186.22-5, Eus., HE, 3.5.1.3-2.1

**Sack of Jerusalem (29.27-30)**

Other source: Joseph., *De bello Jud.*, 1.28-29


**Herakleia – Perinthos (29.30-30.1)**

Unknown source.\(^{127}\)

**Vespasian's death (30.1-2)**


**Titus (30.3-8)\(^{128}\)**

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 65.5-9, Kedr., 1.380.15-22, Glyc., 445.2-5


**Domitian (30.9-16)**

**Domitian "παγχάλεπος" (30.10-12)**

Main source: Leo Gramm., 65.11-14


Parallel passages: *Suda*, delta 1752.21, Sync., 419.5, Kedr., 429.15-430.2

---

\(^{127}\) See p. 292.

Eusebius and Synkellos write "μετέστησε", Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos "ἀνῄρει", and the SynChron "ανείλε"; the variations seem indicative of the different traditions.

**Persecution – St John exiled to Patmos (30.12-4)**

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 65.14-6, Chron. Epit., 23.24-9
Other sources: Eus., Hier. Chron., 192.1-5, Eus., HE, 3.17.1.7

**Apollonius Tyaneus (30.14-6)**

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 65.16-7, Chron. Epit., 23.23-4
Other source: Eus., Hier. Chron., 192.9-10

**Domitian's death (30.16)**

Main source: Kedr., 1.429.14-5
Parallel passages: Georg. Monk, 443.18-444.1, De Ins., 178.12-5, Joel, 29.3-5, Xanth., HE, 145.920B

**Nerva (30.17-22)**

**Nerva – St John released from Patmos (30.17-9)**

Main sources: Mal., 203.53-4, Chron. Pasch., 469.5-9, Kedr., 1.434.3-6
Other sources: Papias, 12.1-4, Eus., HE, 3.20.8.1-9.3

---

129 According to Papias, Nerva's reign was one year, as in the SynChron.
Banning of gladiatorial shows - Introduction of hunting (30.19-21)

Main sources: Mal., 203.56-8, Chron. Pasch., 469.12-3
Parallel passages: Sozom., HE, 1.8.6.1-2, Zon., 3.64.10-1

Nerva's death (30.21-2)

Main sources: Mal., 203.59, Chron. Pasch., 469.14-5
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 28.22-4, Zon., 3.64.23-65.2

Trajan (30.23-31.2)

Trajan's saying (1) (30.23-5)

Other source: Eutrop., Breviarium, 8.5.3-4

Trajan's attitude towards his friends (30.25-9)


The passage in Ignatios' text is not a parallel passage per se; however it is interesting that we find echoes of Trajan's saying in this passage from the dialogue between the patriarch Nikephoros and the emperor Leo V. On the other hand, the texts of Blemmydes and Galesiotes refer directly to Trajan when mentioning the saying, which indicates that it was part of the tradition of 'Regiae statuae', probably transferred to chronicles at a later stage.

Trajan's saying (2) (30.29-31.1)

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 67.13-6, Kedr., 436.18-21
Other sources: Cas. Dio, Hist. Rom.(Xiph.), 325.8-10, Cas. Dio, Hist. Rom.(Salm.), 765.41-3
Parallel passages: Suda, tau 902.2-5, Georg. Monk, 450.8-11, Manass., 2151-3, Glyc., 446.18-20, Joel, 29.22-30.1, Ephr., Chron., 77-81

130 Sozomenos, however, attributes the act to Constantine.

131 Galesiotes uses similar words with the SynChron (SynChron: "χρῆναι γὰρ ἐλεγε τὸν βασιλέα μιμεῖσθαι θεόν, τὰς ἐξ ἀπάντων φέροντα λοιδορίας"; Gales., Metaphr.: "ἀρμόζει τῷ βασιλεῖ μιμεῖσθαι Θεόν καὶ τῶν πταισμάτων τῶν δούλων ἀνέχεσθαι"), which could indicate the use of the same tradition.
**Ignatios' martyrdom (31.1-2)**

Main source: *Chron. Epit.*, 23.31-2


**Hadrian Aelius (31.3-14)**

**The character of the emperor (31.3-4)**

Other sources: Leo Gramm., 68.14, Kedr., 1.437.14-5

**Destruction of Jerusalem (31.4-9)**


**Hadrian - Old debts (31.9-12)**


---


133 The idea that the destruction of the Temple was a punishment of the Jews for the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ (originating in Eusebius and John Chrysostom) had a significant influence on later authors and the Church (see Fishman-Duker, "Second Temple period", 134-5); such anti-Jewish sentiments, however, are not present in the *SynChron*, neither in this passage, not in any other references to the Jews.

134 It is not clear whether Synkellos or Zonaras was the main source of the *SynChron* in this instance; Synkellos' account is more extensive, but includes the information about the Jews being exiled to Libya, whereas Zonaras' account refers to the Greeks occupying the city.
Plutarch (31.12)
Main source: *Chron. Epit.*, 23.34-24.1\(^{136}\)
Other source: Eus., *Hier. Chron.*, 198.1-3
Parallel passages: Sync., 426.22-3, Georg. Monk (PG), 528.23-4; cf. *Suda*, pi 793

Persecution – St Eustathios (31.12-4)
Parallel passage: Xanth., *HE*, 145.953D-956A

Hadrian's death (31.14)
Main source: Mal., 211.29-30
Other source: Eus., *Hier. Chron.*, 201.25-6

Antoninus Pius (31.15-22)

Presentation of Antoninus (31.15-8)
Other sources: Cas. Dio, *Hist. Rom.*, 70.3.1(?), Eutrop., *Breviarium*, 8.8.1-11(?)\(^{137}\)

Antoninus' inheritance legislation (31.18-22)
Main sources: Mal., 212.54-213.60, Zon., 3.80.12-20

Marcus Aurelius (31.23-32.17)

General presentation of the emperor (31.23-6)
Other source: Glyc., 449.17-8

\(^{135}\) *The Chronicon Paschale* conveys that the burning of the old debts took place during the reign of Antoninus Pius.

\(^{136}\) The entry of the *Chronikon Epitomon* reads: "Ἐπί τούτου Πλούταρχος φιλόσοφος ἐγνωρίζετο καὶ Φλέγων ὁ χρονογράφος", an indication that the *SynChron* did not use the *Chronikon Epitomon* itself, but another text from the same tradition.

\(^{137}\) It is not clear if Cassius Dio or Eutropius are sources of the *SynChron* or mere ‘parallel passages’; Eutropius includes a positive presentation of the character and actions of Antoninus, whose contents are closer to the passage of the *SynChron* than the one of Cassius Dio. However, a comparison of the language of the texts does not offer a conclusive answer. John of Antioch also includes a detailed positive portrait of the emperor, although its content is not as close to the spirit of the passage in the *SynChron*.
Parallel passage: Manass., 2175-9

**Raising money for war (31.26-32.6)**

Other sources: Io. Ant., 200 (Exc. Salm. II)

**Inheritance legislation (32.6-9)**

Main sources: Mal., 213.67-9, Zon., 3.79.30-80.2
Other source: *Chron. Pasch.*, 489.6-8

**Rain miracle (32.9-15)**

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 70.12-7, Kedr., 1.439.13-22
Other sources: Eus., *Hier. Chron.*, 206.23-207.10, Eus., *HE*, 5.5.1-7

**Justin – Oppianus – Sextus (32.15-7)**

Main source: *Chron. Epit.*, 24.5-8
Other source: Eus., *HE*, 4.16.1.1-3
Parallel passages: Sync., 432.4, Niceph., *Chron. Synt.*, 94.4, *Eklog. Histor.* (Wirth), 16.3-4, Zon., 3.86.3-4

**Commodus (32.18-23)**

**Judgment on Commodus (32.18-9)**

Unknown source.

**Commodus' assassination (32.19-23)**

Main sources: Mal., 219.31-3, *Chron. Pasch.*, 492.14-5, Leo Gramm., 71.7-8, Kedr., 1.441.13-4

---

138 See p. 292.

The description of Commodus' death provides a good opportunity to study the relationships between the various texts. The initial sources, Herodian and Cassius Dio, refer to the events that took place in the theatre and describe Commodus' performance as a gladiator, without mentioning him being injured. Afterwards, they refer to the conspiracy, with the participation of Commodus' mistress Marcia, the poisoning of the emperor and his eventual strangling by Narcissus. It is interesting to investigate how these events were channelled in later texts.

Malalas, who probably used a different source, mentions that the assassination took place in the home of a Phaustinus, and that Commodus died from haemorrhage. The *Chronicon Paschale* seems to combine the information and includes another version about the owner of the home, which is clearly based on the one mentioned by Malalas (Βεστιανοῦ), but also mentions that the emperor was strangled. The fragment of John of Antioch also describes the emperor being strangled by Narcissus, whose name was omitted in both Malalas and the *Chronicon Paschale*. The strangling of Commodus by Narcissus is the information picked up by the Epitome, whereas Psellus omits the strangling and only refers to the poisoning of the emperor (by Narcissus). Finally, Synkellos seems to draw from yet another source, putting the death in the palace and characterising Narcissus as "ἵπποδαμαστή", while Zonaras bases his account on the information of Dio or Herodian, mentioning the conspiracy, the poisoning and the strangling by Narcissus.

139 ἀπελθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φαυστίνου, συγγενοῦς αὐτοῦ, ἀπὸ σιμάλητον χυμοῦ ἀθρόως ἐτελεύτησε. Malalas seems to be the only source of George the Monk; "ὑπὸ ἀναγωγῆς αἰματος καὶ χολῆς ἄθροος ἀπέθανεν".

140 ἐτελεύτησεν ἀποπνιγεὶς ἐν οἰκίᾳ Βεστιανοῦ συγγενοῦς αὐτοῦ.

141 Leo Gramm.: "Νάρκισσος δέ τε τῶν οἰκεών αὐτοῦ ἀπέπνιξεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ λουτρῷ"; Kedr.: "τούτου Νάρκισσος τις τῶν οἰκεών αὐτοῦ ἐν λουτρῷ ἀπέπνιξεν".

142 "Νάρκισσος δέ τε τῶν δορυφόρων ἀναιρεῖ φασμάκον".
The *SynChron*\(^{143}\) is the only later text that refers to a conspiracy, and indeed includes the name of Marcia as one of the participants; this points to the use of a text that was based on either Cassius Dio or Herodian. However, in the *SynChron*, Narcissus does not strangle Commodus, but injures him fatally in the arena. The fact that we only have a fragment of John of Antioch does not allow us to decide if it could have been the (indirect) source for the *SynChron*. However, if we are to take into account the similarities of the fragment with Zonaras, we can assume that the author of the *SynChron* used a different tradition for his text. At the same time, the supplementary use of Malalas is evident, with the reference of the name of the owner of the house, in which the assassination took place. The *SynChron*, however, transcribes "Φεστιανοῦ", a version different from either the one in Malalas or in the *Chronicon Paschale*, nevertheless clearly related to them.

**Pertinax (32.24-6)**

Main sources: Mal., 219.36-7, Leo Gramm., 71.13-5, Kedr., 1.441.15-7, 441.21-2

Malalas (who is also the source of the *Chronicon Paschale*) is the source for the age of the emperor, and the tradition of the Epitome is the source for the rest of the passage.

**Didius (32.27-9)\(^{144}\)**


\(^{143}\) The passage is also present in the *Synopsis Lambros*, with minor differences.


Septimius Severus (32.30-33.13)

General on his actions (32.31-33.1)
Unknown source.¹⁴⁶

Albinus and Niger revolt (33.1-2)
Main source: Zosim., 1.8
Parallel passages: Suda, sigma 181.2-3 (Niger), Mal., 220.57-221.61 (Albinus), 222.86-7, Sync., 434.22-435.3 (Niger), Zon., 3.99.17-24 (Niger)

Building activity in Byzantium (33.2-10)

Hippodrome – ‘Zeuxippon’
Main source: Mal., 221.63-4, 222.2
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 72.14-6, Kedr., 1.442.15-7

Renovation of the walls
Main source: Io. Ant., 209.3 (Exc. Salm. II)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 72.7-14, Kedr., 1.442.8-15

The accounts of Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos present strong similarities to the SynChron, but they structure the events differently: the renovation and description of the walls are followed by the other buildings, whereas in the SynChron the Hippodrome and the Zeuxippon are mentioned first.

Synchronisations (33.10-13)

Gregory – Origen

¹⁴⁶ See p. 292.
¹⁴⁷ However, the two texts attribute the system to the time of Byzas.
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 72.16-8 (Origen), Chron. Epit., 24.13 (Gregory), Kedr., 1.442.21 (Origen)
Other sources: Niceph., Chron. Synt., 94.11 (Gregory), Anon. Matr., 51.14-5 (Gregory)

Leonides's death
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 72.18-9, Chron. Epit., 24.11-2

Hippolytus
Main source: Chron. Epit., 24.13
Parallel passage: Eus., HE, 6.22.1

Africanus
Main source: Chron. Epit., 24.14
Other source: Sync., 434.15
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 34.85-6, Leo Gramm., 15.17-8, Kedr., 1.441.20, Xanth., HE, 1109C

Antoninus Caracalla – Antoninus Geta (33.13-20)

Caracalla's actions (Geta's murder) (33.15-8)
Main source: Kedr., 1.448.20-2

All the parallel passages include only the synchronisation concerning Origen.
However, in Leo's text, Africanus is supposed to have lived during the reign of Maximinus, whereas Kedrenos and Psellos put him in the time of Pertinax; also, see Chron. Pasch., 499.6-7. Cf. Gelzer, Africanus, I, 5-6.
Caracalla's death (33.18-20)
Main source: Chron. Pasch., 498.7-9
Other source: Eus., Hier. Chron., 213.21-2

Macrinus (33.21-8)
Main source: Zosim., 1.10
Other sources: Io. Ant., 216.53-7, Kedr., 1.449.11-6

Antoninus Elegabalus (33.29-34.31)
General presentation of Elegabalus (33.29-34.2)150
Main source: Mal., 225.IIIb (?)151

Elegabalus' financial measures (34.2-19)
Main source: Mal., 225.IIIb (?)152

Elegabalus' relationship with Alexander (34.19-29)
Other sources: Herodian, 5.7.1-8.10, Zon., 3.119.6-19

Elegabalus' death (34.29-31)
Main source: Mal., 225.IIIc (?)153
Other source: Chron. Pasch., 499.9-10

150 The positive presentation of Elegabalus is also present in the Chronica (Vat. Gr. 1889, 20r).
151 The passage is missing from the manuscript of Malalas and the text is the suggestion of the editors, based mainly on the assumption that the SynChron follows Malalas' text and conveys his original text; as a result, we could not establish any connections between the two texts on the basis of this passage.
152 See note 151.
153 See note 151.
Alexander (35.1-18)

General presentation of Alexander (35.2-4)
Other source: Eus., Hier. Chron., 215.25-6
Parallel passages: Suda, alpha 1124.4-5, Zosim., 1.11, Phot., Bibl., Cod.99, 85b.5-6, Ephr., Chron., 164-5

Administration and Mamaea (35.4-8)
Other source: Zon., 3.120.3-9

The Persian and German war (35.8-12)
Main sources Mal., IVb (?)
Other sources: Io. Ant., 219, Leo Gramm., 74.14-5, Zon., 3.122.7-10, 122.16-22

Maximinus' revolt – Death of Alexander and Mamaea (35.12-16)
Main source: Mal., IVb (?)
Other source: Zon., 3.122.23-123.6

Mamaea and Christianity – Origen (35.16-8)
Main sources: Mal., IVb (?), Paris. Gr. 1712, f. 80v.
Other sources: Eus., HE, 6.21.3, Leo Gramm., 74.15-8, Zon., 3.123.7-13, Zonaras is another author who mentions Eusebius as a source for the passage, however his phrase is different; "ὡς ὁ Εὐσέβιος ἱστορεῖ καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ τινες τῶν συγγραφέων φασίν."
Maximinus (35.19-36.11)

Presentation of Maximinus – Reaction of the people (35.19-25)
Other source: Zon., 3.124.20-9
Parallel passage: Kedr., 450.15

Gordian proclaimed emperor (35.25-9)
Main sources: Zosim., 1.14, Zon., 3.125.8-20

Persecution (35.29-31)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 75.7-9, Kedr., 1.450.16-8
Other sources: Eus., Hier. Chron., 216.14-5, Sync., 442.9
Parallel passage: Eus., HE, 6.28.1

Revolt against Maximinus (35.31-36.9)
Main sources: Zosim., 1.14-5, Zon., 3.125.28-126.17
Other sources: Herodian, 7.10.3, Hist. Aug., Maximini Duo.20
Sync., 442.11, Georg. Monk, 460.21-2, 461.2-3, Eklog. Histor. (Wirth), 16.18

The usurpers Maximus and Balbinus (36.9-11)
Main source: Zosim., 1.16.
Other sources: Mal., 226.VIb, Zon., 3.126.23-127.11
Parallel passages: Chron. Pasch., 501.4-5, Leo Gramm., 75.11

Pupienus (36.12)
Main sources: Mal., 226.VIIb (?), Zon., 3.126.23-127.11
Parallel passage: Zon., 3.127.12-7

Balbinus (36.13-4)
Main sources: Mal., 226.VIa, VIIa, VIIIa (?), Zon., 3.127.19-24

159 See note 151.
160 There is no reference to Pupienus neither in the text of Leo the Grammarian or the Chronikon Epitomon.
161 See note 151.
162 See note 151.
Parallel passage: *Chron. Pasch.*, 501.3-5\textsuperscript{163}

**Gordian I (36.14-6)**

Main sources: Mal., 226.VIIId (?),\textsuperscript{164} Zon., 3.127.24-32  
Parallel passage: *Chron. Pasch.*, 502.3-4

**Gordian II (36.16-9)**

Main sources: Mal., 226.IXb, IXf (?),\textsuperscript{165} Zon., 3.128.8-17  

**Gordian III (36.20-31)**

**Timesitheus**\textsuperscript{166} appointed pretorian prefect (36.20-5)

Main sources: Zosim., 1.17, Mal., 227.Xb (?),\textsuperscript{167} Zon., 3.129.28-130.2  
Parallel passages: Psell., *Hist. Synt.*, 42.74, Leo Gramm., 75.20-76.1

**Revolt against Gordian and his death (36.25-31)**

Main sources: Zosim., 1.18-9, Mal., 227.Xc,\textsuperscript{168} Zon., 3.130.2-12  

**Marcus (36.31-37.2)**

Main sources: Mal., 227.XIb (?),\textsuperscript{169} Zon., 3.130.13-8  
Other source: Kedr., 1.451.16  
Parallel passage: Georg. Monk, 465.2

\textsuperscript{163} The *Chronicon Paschale* mentions a Puplius and Balbinus as two separate emperors, whereas the *SynChron* attributes both names to one person.

\textsuperscript{164} See note 151.

\textsuperscript{165} See note 151.

\textsuperscript{166} The writing of the *SynChron* is Τιμισικλής (Zosimos: Τιμησικλής, Zonaras: Τιμησικλής, Synopsis Lambros: Τιμισικλής).

\textsuperscript{167} See note 151.

\textsuperscript{168} See note 151.

\textsuperscript{169} See note 151.
Severus Hostilianus (37.2-4)
Main sources: Mal., 227.XIIa (?), Zon., 3.130.18-21
Other source: Kedr., 1.451.17-9

Philip and Decius (37.5-10)
Main sources: Mal., 227.XIIIb (?), (De Ins., 159.22-8)
Other source: Mal., 227.XIIIc (?)
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 43.85-6, Io. Ant., 226.5-23, Anon. Matr., 53.7-9, Zon., 3.132.7-10

Marius (37.10-1)
Main source: Mal., 227.XVIa (?)

Philip – Christians (37.12-3)
Other source: Zon., 3.131.4-11
Parallel passages: Eus., HE, 6.34.1.3-12, Leo Gramm., 76.4-5

Philip – Eugenia (37.13-16)
Main source: Zon., 3.131.11-8
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 43.78-9, Leo Gramm., 75.15-6, Georg. Monk (PG), 545.14-5

Millenium of Rome (37.17-9)
Other source: Eutrop., Breviarium, 9.3.2-5

Decius (37.19-30)

Decius' victory against the barbarians (37.19-21)
Main source: Zon., 3.136.5-13

---

170 See note 151.
171 See note 151.
172 See note 151.
173 See note 151.
Persecution of Christians (37.23-5)

Other source: *Chron. Epit.*, 24.27-30

The *Chronikon Epitomon* and Zonaras\(^\text{174}\) place the martyrdom of Babylas and Kyprianos in the reign of Decius. The *SynChron* omits the passage and mentions that Babylas' martyrdom took place in the reign of Numerianus. We also find the name of Kyprianos in the texts of Leo the Grammarian (76.14-5, Kedrenos (1.453.6-7), Synkellos (445.15-8) and Psellus (44.95), and Babylas in Eusebius (Eus., *Hier. Chron.*, 218.19-9), Synkellos (444.21-2, 445.11-2, although in 471.18-22 he is mentioned in Numerianus' reign), *Eklog. Histor.* (Wirth), 16.26-7, and Nikephoros (Niceph., *Chron. Synt.*, 94.23-4).

The Seven Sleepers of Ephesus (37.25-6)\(^\text{175}\)


Gallus' conspiracy and Decius' death (37.26-30)
Main sources: Zon., 3.136.13-20

**Gallus** [and]** Volusianus** (37.31-38.8)

Decius' children assassinated (37.31-38.1)
Main source: Zosim., 1.25

Aemilianus' revolt (38.1-8)
Main source: Zosim., 1.28
Other source: Zon., 3.137.22-138.9
Parallel passages: Io. Ant., 229, Leo Gramm., 77.15-7

\(^{174}\) Zon., 3.132.19-133.7.

\(^{175}\) See p. 107.

\(^{176}\) The *SynChron* attributes both names to a single person: "Γάλλος ὁ Λουσιανός" (37.31).
**Aemilianus (38.9-14)**
Main sources: Zosim., 1.29, Zon., 3.138.15-139.3
Parallel passage: Psell., *Hist. Synt.*, 46.21-3

**Valerian (38.15-9)**
Main sources: Zosim., 1.29-30, 36, Zon., 3.139.25-140.19
*Pasch.*, 508.1-3, Sync., 466.1-12, Leo Gramm., 78.4-8, Kedr., 1.454.3-6, Xanth., *HE*, 145.1156B

**Gallienus (38.20-9)**

**Aureolus' revolt (38.20-3)**
Main source: Zosim., 1.38
Parallel passage: Zon., 3.147.4-5

**Heraclianus' conspiracy (38.23-9)**
Main sources: Zosim., 1.40, Zon., 3.148.25-149.5
Other source: Io. Ant., 232
Parallel passage: Sync., 467.26-7

**Claudius (II) (38.30-39.3)**

**Aureolus' death (38.30-1)**
Main sources: Zosim., 1.41, Io. Ant., 233, Zon., 3.149.24-7

**Claudius' reign (38.31-39.3)**
Main source: Zosim., 1.46
Other source: Mal., 230.28-30
Parallel passages: *Chron. Pasch.*, 508.8, Niceph., *Chron. Synt.*, 95.6, Zon., 3.151.9-10

---

177 Zosimos is the source for the positive portrait of the emperor, which is not present in other later texts.
Quintillus (39.3-8)

Quintillus elected emperor (39.3-6)
Main source: Zon., 3.151.14-20
Other sources: Georg. Monk, 467.17, Kedr., 1.454.19
Parallel passage: Leo Gramm., 455.2-3

Quintillus' suicide (39.6-8)
Main sources: Zosim., 1.47, Zon., 3.151.20-1
Other source: Glyc., 455.9-12178

Aurelian (39.9-17)

Renovation of the walls of Rome (39.9-10)
Main source: Zosim., 1.49

Military successes of Aurelian (39.10-1)
No direct source could be found for the reference to his military successes; it is possible, however, that the passage is an abridgment of the relevant extensive account of Zosimos (1.18.61).

Aurelian's assassination (39.12-6)
Other sources: Eus., Hier. Chron., 223.9-11, Io. Ant., 238.1-10
Parallel passages: Georg. Monk, 467.20, Joel, 34.1

Synchronisation: St Chariton (39.16-7)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 79.16-7, Kedr., 1.455.8-9, Eklog. Histor. (Wirth), 17.1-2
Other source: Joel, 34.1-2

Parallel passage: Niceph., *Chron. Synt.*, 95.8

**Tacitus (39.18-20)**

Other source: Zon., 3.153.28-9, 154.13-5
Parallel passages: Zosim., 1.63, Io. Ant., 239.8-9

**Probus (39.21-40.5)**

**Florian (39.21-7)**

Main sources: Zosim., 1.64, Zon., 3.154.16-26
Other source: Mal., 232.81-2

**General presentation of Probus (39.26-7)**

Main source: Zon., 3.154.26-8
Parallel passage: Ephr., *Chron.*, 234

**The rain miracle (39.29-40.3)**

Main sources: Zosim., 1.67, Zon., 3.155.15-24

**Probus' death (40.4-5)**

Main source: Zon., 3.156.5-6
Other source: Zosim., 1.71 (?)
Parallel passages: Psell., *Hist. Synt.*, 52.94-5, Mal., 233.92-4

**Carus (40.6-8)**

**Campaign against the Persians (40.6-7)**

Main source: Zon., 3.156.12-21

---

179 Nikephoros places Chariton's martyrdom in Tacitus' reign.
Carus' death (40.8)
Main source: Mal., 233.7-9
Other source: Zon., 3.156.26-8

Numerianus (40.9-13)
Persecution – Martyrdom of Babylas (40.9-11)
Other sources: Mal., 234.12-5, Leo Gramm., 81.10-2, Kedr., 1.464.11-2

Zonaras (3.132.29-33) follows a different tradition that originates in Eusebius (Eus., Hier. Chron., 218.18-9), which places the martyrdom of Babylas in Decius' reign.

Numerianus' death (40.11-3)
Main sources: Mal., 234.24-30, Zon., 3.157.5-11
Other source: Ephr., Chron., 240-1
Parallel passages: Chron. Pasch., 510.10-1 (?), Georg. Monk, 477.5-7, Joel, 35.11-2

Carinus (40.14-26)
Martyrdom of Cosmas and Damian (40.14-26)
Main source: Mal., 234.16-235.71

Carinus' death (40.26)
Main source: Io. Ant., 246.15-6

---

182 Zonaras also relates a second version for Carus' death, in which his tent was hit by a thunderbolt (3.156.8-157.2).
**Diocletian (40.27-41.14)**

**Persecution by Diocletian and Maximianus Herculius (40.27-41.1)**


**Galerius Maximianus and Constantius Chlorus (41.1-8)**

Main sources: Theoph., 7.1-6, Zon., 3.160.7-18
Other sources: Eutrop., *Breviarium*, 9.22.5-13, 10.5-7, Eus., *Hier. Chron.*, 225.21-6

**Abdication and death of Diocletian and Herculius (41.8-13)**

Main source: Zon., 3.163.1-16

**Constantius (I) Chlorus (41.15-26)**

**Constantius and Galerius (41.15-9)**

Parallel passage: *Chron. Pasch.*, 517.8-10

**Constantius' death (41.20-3)**

Parallel passages: *Chron. Pasch.*, 517.6-8, Zon., 3.160.35-7, Glyc., 457.6-8, Ephr., *Chron.*, 296-8
Constantius' sons (41.23-6)\(^{183}\)
Parallel passages: Philost., *HE (Phot.)*, 16a.8-12, Xanth., *HE*, 145.1241B

**Constantine (I) (41.26-54.9)**

Maxentius proclaimed emperor (41.26-8)
Other sources: Eus., *Hier. Chron.*, 229.4-6, Kedr., 1.473.13-4
Parallel passages: *Chron. Pasch.*, 517.10-1, Xanth., *HE*, 1249A

The five emperors (41.28-42.4)
Main sources: Theoph., 12.10-2, Kedr., 1.474.3-5
Other source: Eutrop., *Breviarium*, 10.2.10-2
Parallel passages: Zosim., 2.11.1, Gelas., *HE*, 1.8.1, *Chron. Pasch.*, 517.11-7, Georg. Monk, 481.21-482.5

War between Constantine and Maxentius (42.4-25)

**Beginning of the war (42.4-7)**
Main source: Kedr., 1.474.6-11
Other sources: *Vit. Const. (Patmos)*, 5.6-9, Georg. Monk, 487.21-3, Zon., 3.172.27-31

As far as the structure is concerned, George the Monk relates the account of the war against Maxentius after the baptism of Constantine. However, similarities in the content and language indicate a relationship between the two texts (Joel follows George the Monk). On the other hand, we include Zonaras in the 'other sources' because his text relates the events in the same order as in the *SynChron*.

**The first vision of the cross (42.7-15)**

---

\(^{183}\) Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, *Michael Glykas*, 435 used the similarities in the duration of the reign (4 years) and the form of the name of Constantius ("Κώνστας") to suggest that Glykas is connected with the Epitome B through the archetype of the *SynChron*. 
Main sources: Vit. Const. (Patmos), 5.14-28, Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 4.7-10, 5.1-4

The battle of the Milvian Bridge (42.15-9)
Main sources: Theoph., 14.7-9, Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 5.4-10, Kedr., 1.474.19-22
Other sources: Vit. Const. (Patmos), 5.29-37, Socr. Schol., HE, 1.2.46-9, Zon., 3.173.12-9, Xanth., HE, 145.1273A

Constantine becomes the sole ruler (42.19-25)
Main sources: Vit. Const. (Guidi), 324.4-7, Theoph., 14.11-5, Kedr., 1.474.22-475.2
Other source: Zon., 3.173.19-21
Parallel passage: Joel, 37.3-6

Recap: Creation – Constantine (42.26-43.3)
The passage, which is also present in the Synopsis Lambros, is reminiscent of the recap in the Chronicon Paschale (526.7-527.5), but the latter is more detailed and finishes the calculation with the twentieth year of Constantine's reign.

Duration of Constantine's reign and life (43.5-11)
Other source: Georg. Monk, 525.11-3

The second vision of the cross (44.1-22)
Other sources: Mal., 243.10-9, Glyc., 460.2-8
Parallel passage: Vit. Const. (Angel. 22), 545.9-18

---

184 There are no linguistic similarities between Socrates Scholastikos and the SynChron, but the two texts share the same structure, which leads in both to a brief description of the defeat of Maxentius.

185 The name of the bridge is not actually mentioned in the SynChron.
Fausta becomes idolater (44.22-6)
Parallel passages: Zon., 3.172.18-9, Glyc., 460.8-9

Constantine becomes Christian (44.26-46.8)

Constantine's sickness (44.26-45.10)
Main sources: Vit. Silvestr., 4.5-28, Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 6.1-14, Kedr., 1.475.3-17, Ephr., Chron., 350-60

"ὢ χριστομιμήτου φωνῆς" (SynChron, 45.6): Two texts are using the same words in a similar context: Euthymios Tornikes in a panegyric speech to Alexios ("Ω χριστομιμήτου βασιλέως ἐπιβατήρια" (Tornik., 1.8.6)) and one of the Ptochoprodromika poems, referring to Manuel ("Ω τῆς χριστομιμήτου σου σοφῆς μακροθυμίας" (Ptochopr., 4.353)). Needless to say, it is not necessary that the phrase in the SynChron derives from any of these texts; however, the use of the form indicates that the author that interpolated the expression in the chronicle would be familiar with such rhetorical elements.

Baptism by Sylvester (45.10-23)
Parallel passage: Psell., Hist. Synt., 55.29-31

Glykas is included in the 'other sources' because his text presents similarities in the structure of the narration of Constantine's conversion, although we can find various differences in the language.

Constantine's proclamations on Christianity (45.23-46.4)
Main sources: Vit. Silvestr., 4.88-93, Vit. Const. (Guidi), 328.26-8, Xanth., HE, 145.1284C
Parallel passages: Vit. Const. (Guidi), 333.2-4, Glyc., 461.4-9

Baptism of Constantine's relatives (46.4-8)
Main source: Mal., 242.24-7
Other source: Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 6.24-6

Change of the names of the days of the week (46.8-11)
Other source: Glyc., 461.9-11 187

Helen and Judaism – Sylvester (46.12-20)
Other source: Xanth., HE, 145.1289A, 1289C
Parallel passages: Zon., 3.177.16-28, 178.28-30, Xanth., HE, 146.15D

Foundation of Constantinople (46.21-31) 188
Main sources: Vit. Const. (Patmos), 8, Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 10.1-17, Kedr., 1.495.22-496.15
Other sources: Glyc., 462.6-11, 189 Manass., 2308-20
Parallel passages: Zosim., 2.30.1-2, 5, Anagn., HE, 1.27.1-4, Chron. Pasch., 517.21-3, Theoph., 23.26-7, Leo Gramm., 89.8-12, Zon., 3. 179.29-180.18

Campaign against the Persians (46.31-47.27)

187 The account of the SynChron on the subject is more extensive than Glykas; also see Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 314.
188 For a brief overview of the handling of the foundation of Constantinople by the sources, see Karpzelos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, I, 168-73.
189 Cf. Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 374-5.
Buildings in Constantinople (47.27-48.9)

Main source: *Eklogai*, 92.33-93.1

Other sources: Theoph., 23.30-24.1, Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 12.1-6


*Eklogai* are a 'main source' for the passage of the *SynChron* that refers particularly to building of churches (48.4-8), and not the whole passage.

Fausta and Crispus – Her sons (48.10-6)

Main source: Zon., 3.179.7-23

Other sources: Philost., *HE (Pass. Artem.)*, 2.4b.20-7, Glyc., 461.12-4 190


Zonaras presents the same information about the event, using similar vocabulary to the *SynChron*. Nevertheless, the order of the events is different (Zonaras puts first the names of the sons by Fausta and then her affair with Crispus) and there is more information concerning her punishment. Glykas and Philostorgius' texts are included in the section of the 'other sources' than in the 'parallel texts', because the relevant passages relate that the emperor punishes Fausta when he learns the truth, which is missing from the other parallel texts.

190 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 130.
List of the bishops of Byzantium (48.16-49.27)

Other source: Ephr., Catal. Patriarch., 9563-9616

First Ecumenical Council (49.28-51.2)

Main subject of the Council (48.29-50.6)

Main sources: Georg. Monk, 509.9-10, Glyc., 502.14-8
Other source: Chron. Epit., 26.21-9

Presidents of the Council (50.6-12)

Main sources: Georg. Monk, 509.5-8, Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 10.54-60, Kedr., 1.499.21-500.3, Glyc., 502.10-4
Other source: Vit. Metr. et Alex., 12.4-7

Constantine's edict on cleric's offences (50.15-22)

Main source: Glyc., 467.15-21
Other sources: Vit. Const. (Guidi), 641.7-12, Theoph., 23.2-4, Georg. Monk, 508.4-16, Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 10.101-3, Kedr., 1.504.10-21, Zon., 3.186.11-6
Parallel passages: Sozom., HE, 1.17.3-5, Gelas., HE, 2.8.1-4, Anagn., HE, 1.12

318 attendants of the Council (50.23-51.2)

---

191 See pp. 295ff.
192 The Chronikon Epitomon puts the Council in the twentieth year of Constantine's reign. Another similarity with the SynChron is the reference of the Chronikon Epitomon to the Creed; the SynChron uses passages from the Nicean Creed to describe the decisions of the Council. However, the similarities between the two texts are not as strong as in other instances, and it is not definite that a text related to the Chronikon Epitomon was used in this case.
193 Cf. Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 304-5, who distinguishes three versions; the one transmitted by George the Monk and Kedrenos, the second by Theophanes and Zonaras and the third by Glykas and the SynChron.

**Metrophanes' succession (51.3-52.10)**

Parallel passage: Gelas., *HE*, 2.5.4

**Alexander patriarch of Constantinople (52.11-6)**

Other sources: *Vit. Metr. (Menolog.)*, 15.5-13, *Vit. Metr. et Alex.*, 20.28-21.4

**Free bread to the population of the City (52.17-8)**


**Helen and the Holy Cross – Her death (52.19-31)**

Main source: Zon., 3.186.24-8 (Death of Helen)

**Two edicts about the church (53.1-7)**\(^{195}\)


---

\(^{194}\) "ἦσαν δὲ ἐπισκοποὶ ὑπὲρ ἀμφι τριακόσιοι εἴκοσι".

\(^{195}\) See p. 295.
Senators and nobles of Rome moved to Constantinople (53.8-14)

Main source: Schreiner, 14.1a
Other sources: Glyc., 463.11-464.4, Patr. Const., 146.5-148.11
Parallel passages: Vit. Const. (Guidi), 337.2-6, Vit. Const. (Patmos), 12, Sozom., HE, 2.3.4.4-5.1, Anagn., HE, 1.27.5-6, Theoph., 23.27-30, Georg. Monk, 499.18-500.3, Leo Gramm., 89.12-5

Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou discusses extensively the passage\(^{196}\) and suggests that Glykas and the SynChron draw from the same archetype.\(^{197}\) We add to her suggestions the chronicle 14 from the Kleinchroniken, which presents stronger similarities with the SynChron and also includes the subsequent phrase about the home of Euphratas.

Euphratas' home (53.14-7)

Main source: Schreiner, 14.1a.8-11
Other source: Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 16.1-5

The successors of Constantine (53.18-23)


Civil war between the successors of Constantine (53.24-54.6)

Other source: Psell., Hist. Synt., 55.41-9

\(^{196}\) See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 429-33.

\(^{197}\) Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 433. Also see Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 51.
Constantine's death and burial (54.6-9)\textsuperscript{198}

Other sources: Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 15.1-2, Kedr., 1.519.19-21

\textbf{Constantius (II) (54.10-56.23)}

\textbf{Constantius Arian (54.10-5)}

Other sources: Psell., Hist. Synt., 56.62-4, Leo Gramm., 91.18-9, Joel, 37.18-21
Parallel passages: Philost., HE (Pass. Artem.), 3.2a.1-6, Sozom., HE, 2.29.2.1-3.4, Mal., 250.79-80, Kedr., 1.518.22-4

\textbf{Reaction of patriarch Alexander – Arius' death\textsuperscript{199} (54.15-55.2)}

Main sources: Georg. Monk, 534.3-535.1, Zon., 3.208.8-20 (Arius' death)
Parallel passages: Socr. Schol., HE, 1.38.20-6, Sozom., HE, 2.29.3.4-4.4, Anagn., HE, 1.50.6-10, Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 14.9-18,\textsuperscript{202} Theoph., 32.12-27, Kedr., 1.518.24-519.7, Xanth., HE, 146.205C-D, Patr. Const., 173.7-13

\textbf{Patriarchs Alexander – Paul (55.3-8)}

Main source: Zon., 3.208.20-4

\textsuperscript{198} Cf. Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 448-50.
\textsuperscript{199} For a brief overview of the subject, see Leroy-Molinghen, “La mort d'Arius”. Also see Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 411-6, who discusses the connections of the texts.
\textsuperscript{200} Photios' entry draws from the Vita of Metrophanes and Alexander: "Ἀνεγνώσθη ἐκ τοῦ λόγου ὃς ἐπιγέγραπται Πολιτεία τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡ ἡ Μητροφάνους καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὁ βίος Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ βασιλέως" (256.496b.13-5).
\textsuperscript{201} Copied from Athanasios' epistle.
\textsuperscript{202} In Pseudo-Symeon, the incident takes place during the reign of Constantine.

**The Arian patriarchs Eusebius and Makedonios (55.8-17)**

Main source: Zon., 3.208.24-209.1
Other sources: Theoph., 37.34-38.2, 42.19-25, Leo Gramm., 91.21-92.2, Kedr., 1.523.1-4, 528.11-529.1
Parallel passages: Xanth., *HE*, 146.232B-237B, 240C

**Patriarch Makedonios moves the body of Constantine - Eudoxios becomes patriarch (55.17-24)**

Main source: Zon., 3.209.1-10
Other sources: Philost., *HE (Phot.)*, 5.1, Theoph., 46.1-8, Kedr., 1.530.7-13

**Athanasios – Eustathios - Eudoxios (55.25-31)**

Other source: Georg. Monk, 516.9-10
Parallel passages: Anagn., *HE*, 1.47.3-9, Xanth., *HE*, 146.245D, 360B

**Relics of St Andrew and St Luke the Evangelist (56.1-5)**

Main source: Zon., 3.209.11-6
Parallel passages: *Chron. Pasch.*, 533.15-8, Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 13.5-7203, Xanth., *HE*, 146.472B

**Gallus sent to France – Julian becomes Caesar (56.5-11)**


---

203 Pseudo-Symeon attributes the transfer of the relics to Constantine.

**Julian's coup – Constantius' death and burial (56.11-22)**

Parallel passages: Eutrop., *Breviarium*, 15.4-8, Socr. Schol., *HE*, 2.47-1-10, Mal., 250.93-5, Manass., 2353-60a, Ephr., *Chron.*, 438-43

**Julian (56.23-57.8)**

**Julian's Christian background (56.23-9)**

Other sources: Anagn., *HE*, 3.122, Theoph., 46.17-20, Leo Gramm., 94.6, Kedr., 1.532.2-3, Georg. Monk (PG), 664.25-6, Glyc., 470.3-9, 204 Manass., 2356
Parallel passages: Socr. Schol., *HE*, 3.1.39-40, Leo Gramm., 92.20, Zon., 3.211.4-11

**Persecution of the Christians (56.29-57.4)**

Main source: *Chron. Epit.*, 27.6-9
Other sources: *Chron. Pasch.*, 549.12-6, Theoph., 52.30, Kedr., 1.537.4-7
Parallel passages: Philost., *HE (Phot.)*, 7.1.1-5, Zon., 3.211.11-3, Joel, 38.2-3, Xanth., *HE*, 146.472B

**Julian's death**205 and burial**206 (57.4-8)**


---

206 Also see Downey, "Tombs", 45.
Jovian (57.9-28)

Jovian proclaimed emperor (57.9-16)
Main sources: Mal., 258.66-73, Chron. Pasch., 552.17-553.1

Jovian's actions (Persians, Christians, Athanasios) (57.16-22)
Main source: Chron. Pasch., 553.1-3

Jovian's wife (57.22)
Main source: Zon., 3.218.22-5
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 95.20-1, Kedr., 1.540.21-2
Parallel passage: Niceph., Chron. Synt., 104.14

Jovian's death and burial (57.22-8)
Main source: Leo Gramm., 95.9-13
Parallel passages: Zosim., 3.35.3

---

207 Zosimos makes no reference to a cause of death. Kedrenos and Zonaras provide two versions, one identical with the one mentioned in the SynChron. Most of the other sources relate the alternative version (the emperor dying from asphyxia). Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras II", 326-32, discusses more extensively the different versions followed by the sources (in relation to Zonaras).

208 Also see Downey, "Tombs", 45, 46.
Valentinian (57.29-60.6)

Valentinian becomes emperor (57.29-58.11)


Other sources: Anagn., HE, 3.158.2-3, 4, Theoph., 54.19-23, Leo Gramm., 96.2-4, Zon., 3.218.2-13, 219.3-4, Xanth., HE, 146.585A


Valentinian investigates Sallustius (58.11-5)


Other source: Zosim., 4.2.3

Parallel passage: Suda, sigma 64

Valens named co-emperor (58.15-8)

Main sources: Theoph., 54.24-6, Zon., 3.219.10-3


Parallel passages: Zosim., 4.3.1, Philost., HE (Pass. Artem.), 8.8a.5-6, Theodoret, HE, 217.15-20, Socr. Schol., HE, 4.1.13-5, Anagn., HE, 3.158.3-5, Chron. Pasch., 556.6-8, Joel, 38.15-7, Xanth., HE, 588C-D

The family of Valentinian (58.18-22)

Main sources: Theoph., 56.23-8, Zon., 3.219.13-20

Other sources: Philost., HE (Phot.), 8.8.35-6, Anagn., HE, 3.212.1-6, Leo Gramm., 96.7-10,211 Manass., 2386-7

Parallel passages: Socr. Schol., HE, 4.10.1-6, Anagn., HE, 3.165.1-3, Mal., 264.8-9, Chron. Pasch., 556.18-9, 557.7-9, Theoph., 55.1-3, Kedr., 1.541.18-9, Xanth., HE, 146.588D

211 Cf. Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 51.
Construction of the aqueduct (58.23-4)
Main source: Glyc., 473.13-4
Other sources: Psell., Hist. Synt., 59.60, Kedr., 1.544.4-5

Different authors attribute the aqueduct to different emperors. Leo the Grammarian attributes it to Valens (98.1-3), a story followed by Zonaras (3.223.21-6). Theodore Anagnostes and Theophanes attribute it to Valens, and provide its name as "Οὐαλεντινιακὸν". Leo the Grammarian, Zonaras and the Patria do not mention any name for it. Based on the connection between Leo the Grammarian and Zonaras, Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, who does not take into account the entry in the Patria, suggests that this is an instance where Zonaras and the SynChron are not connected. This seems to be true, although we are not able to identify the main source of the SynChron, which is also the source for Glykas.

Death of Eudoxios – Patriarch Demophilos (58.24-8)
Other source: Zon., 3.219.20-4

Valentinian moves to Milan – Ambrose (58.28-31)
Parallel passages: Eus., Hier. Chron., 247e, Leo Gramm., 98.11-2

Valentinian advises Valens to reject Arianism (59.1-6)
Main source: Zon., 3.219.26-31
Other source: Theoph., 55.3-5
Parallel passage: Kedr., 1.546.20-3

212 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 305-6.
Rodanos' incident (59.6-28)\(^{213}\)

Main sources: Mal., 262.72-263.91, (De virtut. et vit., 1.161.5-21), Chron. Pasch., 558.6-22, Zon., 2.219.31-220.18


Parallel passages: Suda, sigma 64, Glyc., 473.15-6\(^{214}\)

The fairness of the emperor (59.28-60.1)

Main sources: Mal., 263.91-4, Chron. Pasch., 559.1-425


Death and burial of Valentinian (60.1-6)

Other sources: Theoph., 61.25-6, 62.1-2, Leo Gramm., 96.10-2, Zon., 3.220.19-23


Valens (60.7-61.14)

Valens' family (60.7-10)

Other sources: Anagn., HE, 3. 193, Theoph., 57.1-4\(^{215}\)


St Gregory's teachings (60.10-4)

Main source: Zon., 3.229.21-9

Parallel passages: Socr. Schol., HE, 5.7.7.5-8, Anagn., HE, 4.228.1-6, Theoph., 67.12-5, Kedr., 1.551.17-21

With the exception of Zonaras and the SynChron, all the other texts relate that Gregory was teaching in the church of St Anastasia during the reign of the emperor

\(^{213}\) Cf. Patzig, “Quellen des Zonaras I”, 51, who also discusses the sources of the passage (but omits the passage of the Chronicon Paschale).

\(^{214}\) Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou suggests that Glykas' sources are a text from the Epitome, Zonaras, and the archetype of the SynChron. Although this is possible, the short entry of Glykas does not allow a final conclusion.

\(^{215}\) Theophanes provides two versions for Valens' conversion to Arianism; the SynChron and Zonaras follow the first version.
Anastasios. Zonaras includes the relevant passage in his entry of the reign of Theodosius.

**Burning of the ship with the clerics (60.14-18)**

Main sources: Theoph., 58.28-32, Kedr., 1.544.16-9, Zon., 3.220.27-221.1


Parallel passages: Xanth., *HE*, 146.617B

**Persecution of orthodox bishops (60.18-20)**

Main source: Zon., 3.221.3-5

Other source: Georg. Monk, 550.19-551.2

Parallel passages: Mal., 265.24-6, Joel, 38.17-9

**Valens and St Basil (60.20-6)**

Other sources: Theoph., 63.20-4, Leo Gramm., 99.14-8, Zon., 3.221.5-11


**Valens' death – Incident with Isaakios (60.27-61.14)**


Patzig divides the sources for the passage into three groups, using as a main criterion the description of the building in which Valens died, and he argues that Zonaras

---


217 For a general discussion of Valens' war against the Goths and the treatment of Valens' death by the ecclesiastical historians, see Karpozelos, *Vyzantinoi Historikoi*, I, 184-9, esp. 186-7.

218 Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras II", 337-41.
and the SynChron are not linked in this instance.\textsuperscript{219} On the other hand, Mauromate-
Katsougiannopoulou suggests that the texts are connected, both drawing from
Sozomenos.\textsuperscript{220} Her arguments are sound and confirm the connection between the
texts. We include Theophanes as an additional main source of the SynChron; although
neither Patzig nor Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou\textsuperscript{221} included Theophanes in the
same group of sources, similarities in the language of the texts indicate that it belongs
to the same family of sources that describe similarly the death of Valens, which was
also the source of Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos.

**Gratian (61.15-62.24)**

**Gratian emperor (61.15-6)**


**Gratian's orthodox faith (61.16-21)**

Main source: Zon., 3.225.8-14

Parallel passages: Socr. Schol., \textit{HE}, 5.2.1-2, Glyc., 473.5-8,\textsuperscript{222} Xanth., \textit{HE}, 146.749B

**Theodosius' appointed general in Thrace (61.21-8)**

Main source: Zon., 3.225.14-22


100.2-6, Joel, 39.6-8, Xanth., \textit{HE}, 146.737Cff, 749B

**Theodosius' victory (61.28-62.2)**

Main source: Zon., 3.225.22-7

146.749C-D

---

\textsuperscript{219} Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras II", 340.
\textsuperscript{220} Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, \textit{Michael Glykas}, 425-7.
\textsuperscript{221} Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, \textit{Michael Glykas}, 417-8.
\textsuperscript{222} Glykas does not attribute the incident to Gratian but to Valens' brother, Valentinian.
Accusations against Theodosius (62.2-9)

Theodosius' vision (62.9-14)

Theodosius appointed emperor (62.14-22)
Main source: Zon., 3.226.5-15
Parallel passages: Theoph., 66.16-20, Manass., 2393-2406

Gratian's family (62.22-3)
Parallel passage: Zosim., 5.39.4.2

Proverb: Gratian's arrows (62.23-4)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 100.16-7, Kedr., 1.551.10-2, Georg. Monk (PG), 689.17-9, Manass., 2414-5, Glyc., 474.10-2

Theodosius the Great (62.25-67.13)

Theodosius against the Arians – Gregory patriarch (62.25-63.5)
Main sources: Anagn., *HE*, 229.1-8, Theoph., 68.7-13, Leo Gramm., 103.5-11, Kedr., 1.552.18-553.2
Other sources: Sozom., *HE*, 7.5.5-7, Georg. Monk (PG), 704.52.705.4

Theodosius' baptism (63.5-7)
Main sources: Anagn., *HE*, 227.1-2, Theoph., 68.4-5, Kedr., 1.552.15-7

Theodosius' orthodox legislation – Closing of the pagan temples (63.7-11)
Main sources: Anagn., HE, 227.3-4, Theoph., 68.5-6, Kedr., 1.555.17-8
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 102.8-10, Kedr., 1.573.18-20
Parallel passages: Soc. Schol., HE, 5.16, Mal., 266.61-2, Chron. Pasch., 561.6-9

Second Ecumenical Council: Presidents and Macedonian bishops (63.13-19)
Main sources: Theoph., 68.21-8, Kedr., 1.554.16-20

Time of the Ecumenical Council (63.19-21)
Parallel passages: Peter Alexandr., 16, Leo Gramm., 101.18-20, Kedr., 1.553.15-6

Decisions of the Ecumenical Council (63.21-6)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 101.16-7, Chron. Epit., 27.16-9, Kedr., 1.553.11-2, 1.554.20-3, 555.7-8, Zon., 3.230.7-10, Glyc., 503.4-5
Parallel passage: Ephr., Chron., 650-3

Addition to the Creed concerning the Holy Spirit (63.26-31)

Condemnation of the heresy of Apollinarius (63.31-64.9)
Main sources: Theoph., 69.19-23 (?), Kedr., 1.553.11-5 (?)
Other sources: Georg. Monk, 575.19-21, Leo Gramm., 101.17-8, Kedr., 1.553.12-3, 555.9-11, Georg. Monk (PG), 557.30-9, Glyc., 503.5-6
Parallel passage: Theodoret, HE, 294.22-5
Resignation of Gregory – Patriarch Nektarios (64.10-7)

Main source: Theoph., 69.4-13

Incident with bishop Amphilochios (64.18-65.4)

Parallel passages: Sozom., HE, 7.6.4-7, Xanth., HE, 146.772A-D

Translation of the relics of St John Prodrom and St Paul (65.5-10)

Main source: Anagn., HE, 239.1-3
Other sources: Chron. Pasch., 564.13-8, Theoph., 69.30-2, Kedr., 1.554.2-4

Elevation of the status of the Patriarchate of Constantinople (65.11-4)

Other sources: Socr. Schol., HE, 5.8.32-6, Theoph., 69.15-6, Zon., 3.230.23-6

The references from the records of the Ecumenical Councils come from the Fourth Ecumenical Council;\textsuperscript{224} however the language of the passage is similar to the SynChron, which indicates that the author of the SynChron refers to this decision.

\textsuperscript{224} The passages of Evagrius and Anna Komnene refer to the Fourth Ecumenical Council as well.
Incident in the hippodrome of Thessaloniki (65.15-22)\textsuperscript{225}

Main sources: Mal., 268.22-7, Theoph., 72.20-27
Other source: Zon., 3.227.6-15

Ambrose - Theodosius' penance (65.22-31)

Other sources: Mal., 268.27-269.3, Theoph., 72.27-73.6, Zon., 3.227.15-27

Gratian's murder (66.1-2)

Main sources: Anagn., \textit{HE}, 244.1-2, Theoph., 67.30-1
Other source: Zon., 226.14-6
Parallel passages: Psell., \textit{Hist. Synt.}, 62.16-7, Philost., \textit{HE (Phot.)}, 10.5.2-4, Sozom., \textit{HE}, 7.13.1, 8, Georg. Monk, 564.4-6, Leo Gramm., 100.11-5, Kedr., 1.551.8-11, Joel, 39.8-10, Xanth., \textit{HE}, 146.804B, 805C

Justina and her appeal to Theodosius (66.2-9)

Other sources: Zon., 3.226.18-26, Xanth., \textit{HE}, 146.804C

Theodosius' revenge of the murder of Gratian (66.9-13)

Other sources: Philost., \textit{HE (Phot.)}, 10.7, Manass., 2416-20

\textsuperscript{225} See Karpozelos, \textit{Vyzantinoi Historikoi}, I, 190-6.

Eugenios' tyranny – Valentinian's suicide – Honorius emperor (66.14-20)

Other sources: Theoph., 70.31-3, 71.1-7, Manass., 2421-31

Placilla (66.21-30)

Main source: Kedr., 599.18-9
Other sources: Theodoret, HE, 313.21-314.21, Anagn., HE, 272.1-2
Parallel passage: Xanth., HE, 146.900B-D

Honorius, Arkadios and St Arsenios (66.30-67.4)

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 102.1-7, Kedr., 1.573.11-7

Placilla's death and burial (67.4-6)

Parallel passages: Theoph., 72.8-10, Kedr., 1.570.18-20

Obelisk in the hippodrome (67.7-9)

Parallel passage: Patr. Const., 183.16-9

Placidia (67.10)

Parallel passages: Philost., HE (Phot.), 10.7.4-5, Socr. Schol., HE, 4.31.52-3, Anagn., HE, 212.7-8, Theoph., 56.27-8, Xanth., HE, 146.689C

Theodosius' death and burial (67.11-3)

Other sources: Anagn., HE, 279.1-8, Theoph., 74.12-9, Leo Gramm., 104.13-5, Kedr., 1.573.20-574.4

227 The SynChron seems to follow the tradition of the Epitome and does not mention the rift between Arsenios and the emperor, which was the reason why Arsenios had to leave, whereas Zonaras has a more detailed account of the event, which accords with the information in the "Vita sancti Arsenii".

**Arkadios (67.14-68.10)**

**Arkadios' wife and children (67.14-7)**
Other source: *Chron. Pasch.*, 566.9-11
Parallel passages: Zosim., 5.3, Philost., *HE (Phot.*)*, 11.6.1-10, Kedr., 1.585.10

**Death of Nektarios – Patriarch John (67.18-21)**
Other sources: Georg. Monk, 593.2-6, Leo Gramm., 105.18-9, Zon., 3.232.32-233.3

**Dispute between the patriarch John and Eudoxia (67.21-29)**
Other sources: Chrys., *In decoll.*, 485.14ff, Theoph., 78.16-23, 79.12-8, Zon., 3.233.3-26

The *SynChron* uses the attribute "ἁπλοϊκός" (67.29) to characterise the emperor, which is not used by any other author.

**Death of John – Patriarch Arsakios (67.29-68.2)**

**Death of Arsakios – Patriarch Attikos (68.2-3)**
Main source: Leo Gramm., 109.17-8
Other source: Zon., 3.234.13-3
Building of the columns of Xerolophos and Pittakia - Foundation of Arkadioupolis (68.4-7)
Main source: Leo Gramm., 104.20-105.2
Other source: Zon., 2.232.28-32, 234.18-9
Parallel passages: Theoph., 77.24-5, 79.4-6, Georg. Monk, 592.22-593.1, Glyc., 478.18-20, Joel, 40.8-10, Ephr., Chron., 685.8, Patr. Const., 67.3

Death and burial of Arkadios and Eudoxia (68.7-10)
Main source: Leo Gramm., 105.13-8
Other sources: Theoph., 80.35-81.4, Zon., 3.234.13-8

Honorius (68.11-69.7)

Honorius – Maria (68.11-3)
Main source: Zon., 3.234.25-235.1
Other source: Zosim., 5.4
Parallel passages: Eunap., Fragm., 254.19-21, Philost., HE (Phot.), 11.3.2, Phot., Bibl., cod.80, 56b.30-3228

Honorius – Thermantia (68.13-7)
Main source: Zon., 3.235.1-5
Other source: Zosim., 5.28
Parallel passages: Chron. Pasch., 572.5-6, Phot., Bibl., cod.80, 56b.33-6

Honorius in Ravenna, calls Alaric (68.17-21)
Main sources: Mal., 271.82-5, Zon., 3.235.3-10
Other source: Theoph., 76.20-5
Parallel passages: Xanth., HE, 146.1068D-1069A

Alaric in Rome (68.21-5)
Main source: Mal., 271.85-90

228 Photios' abstract comes from Olympiodorus.
Other sources: Theoph., 76.25-30, Zon., 3.235.10-4
Parallel passages: Zosim., 5.37.1-4, 5.39.1, 5.42.1-2, Phot., Bibl., Cod.80.58b.42-57a.7, Manass., 2435-9, Xanth., HE, 146.1069A

Constantius (68.25-69.1)
Main source: Mal., 271.90-5
Other sources: Theoph., 76.30-77-4, Zon., 3.235.14-22

John usurps power in Rome – Death of Honorius (69.2-3)
Main source: Mal., 271.8-11
Other source: Zon., 3.236.8-10

Placidia returns to Constantinople (69.3-5)
Parallel passages: Philost., HE (Phot.), 12.31, Phot., Bibl., Cod.80.63b.26-31, Manass., 2440-4

Death and burial of Arkadios (69.6-7)
Repetition of the information that had already been related more extensively in SynChron, 68.7-10.

Theodosius the Younger (69.8-79.5)

Theodosius and Pulcheria (69.8-13)
Other sources: Theoph., 81.4-12, Glyc., 484.1-3

229 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 295.
Churches commissioned by Pulcheria (69.14-5)\textsuperscript{230}

Other sources: Glyc., 484.3,\textsuperscript{231} Xanth., \textit{HE}, 1061A-B

Theodosius' marriage to Eudokia (69.16-70.15)

Main sources: Mal., 273.39-275.98, Manass., 2545-97, Glyc., 484.4-14
Other sources: Georg. Monk, 608.10-609.6, Leo Gramm., 106.13-6, Kedr., 1.590.8-18, Zon., 3.236.24-237.29

Miracle by the patriarch Attikos (70.16-8)

Main sources: Theoph., 81.17-9, Kedr., 1.587.16-8, Zon., 3.237.29-238.1
Parallel passages: Anagn., \textit{HE}, 303, Georg. Monk, 605.6-9, Ephr., \textit{Chron.}, 729-33, Glyc., 483.11-2\textsuperscript{232}, Xanth., \textit{HE}, 146.1093B-D

John Chrysostom's name inserted in the diptychs (70.18-9)

Main source: Zon., 3.238.1-3
Other sources: Theoph., 83.35-84.2, Kedr., 1.590.18-9
Parallel passage: Anagn., \textit{HE}, 321.1-3

Death of Attikos – Patriarch Sisinios (70.19-21)

Other source: Zon., 3.238.4-6
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 109.20-1, Kedr., 1.590.18-9, Xanth., \textit{HE}, 1152C

Death of Sisinios – Patriarch Nestorios (70.22-4)

Other source: Zon., 3.238.7-10

\textsuperscript{230} In addition to the reference here, the \textit{SynChron} also mentions the building of the church of Blachernae in the beginning of the reign of Marcian (80.23-4), an indication of use of two different sources for the respective reigns.

\textsuperscript{231} Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, \textit{Michael Glykas}, 295. We should add to Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou's comments that Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos also attributes the building of the church of Blachernae to Pulcheria in a similar position (the beginning of the reign of Theodosius) as Glykas and the \textit{SynChron}.

\textsuperscript{232} In Glykas' text, the miracle is performed by the patriarch Proklos.

**Time of the Third Ecumenical Council (70.24-6)**
Main source: Kedr., 1.594.9-12
Parallel passages: *Chron. Pasch.*, 581.11-4, Peter Alexandr., 195.20-1, Joel, 40.20-1

**Presidents of the Council (70.26-9)**
Main source: Kedr., 1.594.12-3
Other source: Georg. Monk, 605.11-16
Parallel passages: Blastares, proem.13.4-8, Mal., 287.97-8, Leo Gramm., 108.1-3, Glyc., 503.8-10

**Nestorios' dogma (70.29-71.9)**
Other sources: Georg. Monk, 605.16-606.8, Zon., 3.238.10-18

**Exchange of epistles between the patriarchs (71.9-26)**
Main source: Theoph., 88.34-89.20
Other source: Kedr., 1.593.22-594.5

**Cyril's letters to Theodosius and Pulcheria (71.2-30)**
Main source: Kedr., 1.594.5-9
Other source: Zon., 3.238.18-24

**Theodosius's invitation to the Council (71.31-72.5)**
Main source: Theoph., 89.20-7
Parallel passages: Mal., 287.93-7, Xanth., *HE*, 146.1168D-69A

**John of Antioch does not respond (72.6-8)**
Main source: Theoph., 89.29-90.2
Parallel passages: Xanth., HE, 146.1169B-C

**Opening of the Council – Nestorios' speech (72.8-19)**

Main source: Theoph., 90.2-11
Other source: Glyc., 72.14-9

Parallel passage: Xanth., HE, 146.1169D

**Deconsecrating of Nestorios (72.19-25)**

Main source: Theoph., 90.11-9
Other source: Xanth., HE, 146.1172A-B
Parallel passage: Leo Gramm., 108.5-6

**Dogmatic decisions of the Council (72.25-8)**

Main source: Kedr., 1.594.24-595.2

**The twelve propositions of Cyril (73.3-8)**

Other source: Zon., 3.239.1-7

**Appearance of John of Antioch and his followers - Discussions on the twelve propositions (73.8-20)**

Main source: Theoph., 90.19-28
Other sources: Georg. Monk, 606.8-17, Kedr., 1.595.3-12, Zon., 3.239.7-22, Xanth., HE, 146.1173A-C

**Final decisions of the Council (73.21-9)**

Main source: Theoph., 90.29-91.9
Other sources: Georg. Monk, 606.17-22, Kedr., 1.595.12-6, Zon., 2.239.22-240.4
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 329.1-2, Xanth., HE, 146.1173D

**John of Antioch and Cyril (73.29-74.6)**

Main source: Theoph., 91.19-26
Other source: Xanth., HE, 146.1176A-B

---

233 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 311.

**Maximianos consecrated patriarch (74.6-8)**

Main source: Theoph., 91.9-11
Other source: Zon., 3.240.4-5

**Eudoxia married to Valentinian – their children (74.9-12)**

Main source: Mal., 275.7-276.12

**Theodosius against usurper John (74.12-5)**

Main source: Mal., 275.4-7
Parallel passages: Philost., *HE (Phot.),* 12.13.26-8, Anagn., *HE*, 320.1-5, Procop., *De bell.*, 3.3.8

**Geiseric sacks Rome (74.16-26)**

Main source: Mal., 287.4-288.19

**The Seven Sleepers of Ephesus**

Other source: Manass., 2696-2705

---

234 Cf. *SynChron*, 83.27-84.12, where the same event is related.
235 The myth is of Syrian origin, also present in Qur'an (18:8-26) and well known in the West, through Gregory of Tours (*Story of Martyrs* 1:95).
Death of Maximianos – Patriarch Proklos (75.8-15)

Other sources: Theoph., 87.18-23, Leo Gramm., 109.21-2,\textsuperscript{236} Kedr., 1.599.14-6, Zon., 3.240.6-11, Glyc., 483.12-4\textsuperscript{237}

John Chrysostom's body – Miracles under Proklos (75.15-20)

Other sources: Theoph., 92.37-93.1, Leo Gramm., 109.22-5, Kedr., 1.599.16-20, Zon., 3.240.11-8
Parallel passages: Psell., \textit{Hist. Synt.}, 64.54-5, Socr. Schol., \textit{HE}, 7.45.3-9, Anagn., \textit{HE}, 331.1-2, Joel, 40.18-9, Ephr., \textit{Chron.}, 753-4

Trisagios hymn – Miracle with the boy snatched up into the air (75.21-31)


Prefect Cyrus (76.1-10)\textsuperscript{238}

Main source: Mal., 281.15-282.27\textsuperscript{239}

Death of Proklos – Patriarch Flavian (76.11-3)

Parallel passages: Theoph., 97.26-9, Xanth., \textit{HE}, 146.1221B

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{236} Maximianus does not appear in the order of the patriarchs in the text of Leo the Grammarian. However, the similarities of the following passage with the \textit{SynChron} (on the translation of the body of John the Chrysostom) suggest that the texts are part of the same tradition.
\item \textsuperscript{237} Mauromate-Katsougianopoulos, \textit{Michael Glykas}, 410-1.
\item \textsuperscript{238} See Constantelos, "Kyros Panopolites", 459-60.
\item \textsuperscript{239} See p. 223.
\end{itemize}}
Chrysaphios manages to remove Pulcheria from court (76.13-6)
Other sources: Zon., 3.242.10-6, Ephr., Chron., 782-6
Parallel passage: Theoph., 99.12-7

Flavian – Chrysaphius – Eutuchius – "Robber" Synod (76.17-77.27)
Main source: Zon., 3.240.30-242.3
Other sources: Evagr., HE, 17.3-16, Theoph., 99.28-101.5, Xanth., HE, 146.1221B, 1224C-D, 1225B-1228A
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 376-7, Chron. Pasch., 587.3-6, Anon. Matr., 60.12-4, Kedr., 1.60.111-4, Ephr., Chron., 762-70

The 'apple incident' (77.27-78.9)
Main sources: Mal., 276.15-277.33, Chron. Pasch., 584.8-585.3, Leo Gramm., 106.16-107.6, Kedr., 1.590.21-591.15
Other sources: Theoph., 99.16-28, Georg. Monk, 609.6-610.6, Zon., 3.243.12-29

Eudokia withdraws to Jerusalem – Her death (78.9-14)
Main sources: Mal., 277.33-40, Leo Gramm., 107.6-10, Kedr., 591.16-23
Other sources: Chron. Pasch., 585.4-9, 16-21, Zon., 3.243.29-244.2

Dioskoros and Anatolios' ascension to the patriarchal throne (78.15-24)
Other source: Zon., 3.242.4-10

Theodosius punishes Chrysaphios and recalls Pulcheria (78.25-79.1)
Other source: Zon., 3.242.16-24
Death and burial of the emperor Theodosius (79.1-2)
Other source: Zon., 3.244.9-11
Parallel passages: Mal., 288.32-3, Chron. Pasch., 590.4-5, Xanth., HE, 146.1273C

Translation of the relics of St Flavian (79.2-5)
Main source: Theoph., 102.8-10
Other source: Kedr., 1.602.4-5
Parallel passages: Acta Concil. Oecum., 2.1.1.9.5-11, Anagn., HE, 357.1-2, Xanth., HE, 146.1232A-B, D

Marcian (79.6-84.20)

The arrangement between Marcian and Pulcheria (79.6-14)
Main sources: Theoph., 103.8-16, Georg. Monk, 610.8-18, Kedr., 1.602.18-603.3, Joel, 41.3-12, Ephr., Chron., 794-810
Other sources: Manass., 2725-33, Glyc., 486.17-487.3
Parallel passages: Mal., 289.34-9, Chron. Pasch., 590.10-11, Leo Gramm., 111.10-2, Zon., 3.245.1-10

Recall from exile – Murder of Chrysaphios (79.15-6)
Main source: Kedr., 1.603.7-10
Other source: Theoph., 103.27-33
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 353.5, Chron. Pasch., 590.6-7, Leo Gramm., 110.14-6, Manass., 2734

Marcian's background: The 'eagle' sign (79.17-80.19)
Main sources: Theoph., 103.34-105.4, Kedr., 1.603.11-604.6, 9-13, Zon., 3.245.11-246.13
Other sources: Procop., De bell., 3.4.4.3-11.3, Evagr., HE, 37.20-38.7, Leo Gramm., 112.5-21, Manass., 2735-2808
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 65.3-5, Glyc., 487.3-19, Ephr., Chron., 811-20, Xanth., HE, 147.9A, 12B-13A

Appointments of Tatian and Julius (80.19-22)
Main sources: Theoph., 105.9-13, Kedr., 1.604.6-9, Zon., 3.246.14-7
Parallel passage: Xanth., *HE*, 147.13A

**Building of the church of Blachernae (80.23-4)**

Main sources: Theoph., 105.13-6, Kedr., 1.604.13-5, Zon., 3.246.18-20

**Fourth Ecumenical Council (80.24-83.20)**

*Pope Leo and the patriarch Anatolios ask for an Ecumenical Council (80.24-7)*

Main source: Theoph., 105.16-9
Other sources: Zon., 246.20-5, Ephr., *Chron.*, 825-30
Parallel passage: Xanth., *HE*, 147.13C-D

**Time of the Council (80.27-81.2)**


**Presidents of the Council (81.1-4)**


**Dioskoros' and Eutuches' dogma (81.4-9)**

Main source: Leo Gramm., 111.15-9

**Decisions of the Council (81.9-25)**

Main sources: *Acta Concil. Oecum.*, 2.1.2.102.35-41, 129.24-130.3, Evagr., *HE*, 49.29-50.8

---

240 See our comments on SynChron., 69.14-5, in p. 104.
Dioskoros' response (81.25-31)
Main source: Theoph., 105.26-106.4
Parallel passage: Xanth., HE, 147.20B-C

On Theodoret and Ibas (82.1-3)
Main source: Zon., 3.247.6-8
Parallel passages: Evagr., HE, 50.22-6, Xanth., HE, 147.28A

The emperor Marcian on the decisions of the Council (82.3-10)
Main sources: Theoph., 106.8-14, Zon., 3.247.25-248.2
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 362.1-3, Evagr., HE, 50.20-23, 50.29-51.1, Kedr., 1.605.3-4

Conflict with the followers of Dioskoros – Resolution given with the use of the body of St Euphemia (82.11-83.20)\textsuperscript{241}
Main source: Zon., 3.248.2-249.7
Other sources: BHG\textsuperscript{3} 624m, 3.1-14, BHG\textsuperscript{3} 621, 9.1-27
Parallel passages: Glyc., 488.19-489.7, Ephr., Chron., 849-62, Xanth., HE, 147.21B-24A

Death of Pulcheria (83.21-3)
Main source: Theoph., 106.25-9
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 112.1, Georg. Monk (PG), 756.15-6, Xanth., HE, 147.48A

\textsuperscript{241} See p. 285.
Valentinian murdered by Maximianus\(^{242}\) (83.24-7)

Main source: Theoph., 108.22-6

Sack of Rome by Geiseric (83.27-84.12)\(^{243}\)

Main sources: Theoph., 108.27-109.9, Kedr., 1.606.2-17, Zon., 3.249.25-250.11\(^{244}\)
Other source: Mal., 287.4-288.19

Death and burial of the emperor Marcian (84.13-4)

Main source: Kedr., 1.607.6-7
Other source: \textit{Chron. Pasch.}, 592.16-7

Aspar and Leo the Great (84.15-26)

Other sources: Theoph., 116.6-8, Georg. Monk (PG), 756.25-9
Parallel passages: Procop., \textit{De bell.}, 3.5.7, Leo Gramm., 113.3-5, Zon., 3.250.27-30, Manass., 2810-8

Leo the Great (84.21-87.6)

Leo's edict on Sundays (84.21-6)

Main sources: Mal., 293.13-6,\(^{245}\) \textit{Chron. Pasch.}, 596.13-6, Glyc., 489.19-490.1\(^{246}\)
Parallel passages: \textit{Eklogai}, 103.15-6, Anagn., \textit{HE}, 377.1-2, Xanth., \textit{HE}, 145.1320B\(^{247}\)

Isokasios (84.27-85.6)

Main sources: Mal., 292.81-8, 293.95-12, \textit{Chron. Pasch.}, 595.6-7, 596.3-12, Zon., 3.21.31-252.10,\(^{248}\) Manass., 2821-49

---

\(^{242}\) The other texts use the form 'Maximus'.


\(^{244}\) Also see Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras II", 346.

\(^{245}\) Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 30.


\(^{247}\) Xanthopoulos attributes the legislation to Constantine I.
Parallel passages: Theoph., 115.9-18, Leo Gramm., 115.5-12, Kedr., 1.612.21-613.7

Leo and the sons of Aspar (85.7-20)
Main source: Zon., 3.251.9-31
Other sources: Mal., 294.17-22, Manass., 2850-9
Parallel passages: Chron. Pasch., 596.17-21, Theoph., 117.25-6, Leo Gramm., 113.4-9, Ephr., Chron., 895-900, Xanth., HE, 147.48B

Persecution against the Arians (85.21-2)
Main source: Mal., 295.31-3

Anatolios' death – Patriarch Gennadios (85.23-5)
Other source: Zon., 3.254.17-9

Marcian oikonomos of the Great Church (85.25-8)
Main source: Anagn., HE, 376.2-6
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 114.15-6, Georg. Monk (PG), 757.12-3

The family of Leo (85.29-86.2)
Main sources: Zon., 3.252.10-5, Ephr., Chron., 907-14
Other source: Mal., 299.5-9
Parallel passages: Theoph., 111.20-1, Leo Gramm., 115.17-9, Manass., 2895-7, Xanth., HE, 147.81A

Basiliscos sent to fight Geiseric (86.3-14)
Main sources: Mal., 29.45-57, Theoph., 115.21-116.6, Manass., 2860-7, 2883-7
Other sources: Prisc., Fragm., 42, Procop., De bell., 3.6.1-2, 10, 13-4, 19-20, 26

Birth and coronation of Leo (86.15-6)
Main source: Zon., 3.253.31-254.2
Other sources: Mal., 299.9-10, Manass., 2898-902
Parallel passages: Theoph., 119.11-3, Kedr., 1.614.1-3

Death of Gennadios – Patriarch Akakios (86.17-9)
Other source: Zon., 3.254.19-21
Parallel passage: Ephr., Chron., 946-50

Eudoxia's return to Constantinople (86.20-2)
Main source: Zon., 3.250.11-4
Parallel passages: Eklogai, 104.17-9, Anagn., HE, 393.1-2

Eudokia to Constantinople and Jerusalem (86.22-30)
Main sources: Theoph., 118.19-25, Zon., 3.250.14-21
Parallel passage: Xanth., HE, 147.40B

Death and burial of Leo (86.31-87.2)
Other source: Leo Gramm., 115.19-21
Parallel passage: Malch., Fragm., 2d.6-8

Translation of the "holy robe" of Theotokos and the relics of St Anastasia to Constantinople (87.3-6)
Main source: Leo Gramm., 114.4-7 (?)
Other source: Zon., 3.254.12-6

---

250 See Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras II", 346.
251 See Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras II", 346.
252 The text of Leo the Grammarian does not mention the church, in which the robe was placed. However, the additional information of the SynChron does not necessarily suggest the use of another text of the tradition of the Epitome (although it cannot be entirely rejected), since the information is present in various other texts, and it was probably part of a familiar tradition.
**Last emperors of the West (Maximianus – Romulus) (87.7-15)**

**Series of the last emperors (87.7-13)**


**The 'Romulus' tradition (87.13-5)**

Parallel passages: LeoGramm., 115.13-6, Kedr., 1.614.8-13, Xanth., *HE*, 147.37D

**Leo (II) (87.16-7)**

Other sources: Peter Alexandr., 195.29-30, LeoGramm., 116.2-4, Kedr., 1.615.4-7, Zon., 3.254.29-255.1, Xanth., *HE*, 147.84C

**Zeno (87.18-89.8)**

**Duration of Zeno's reign (87.18-9)**


All the above texts mention that the two years of Basiliscos' reign are included in the calculation of the duration of Zeno's reign. The *SynChron* uses the same verb as the *Chronicon Paschale* and Theophanes, however it is not clear if it processes the material from either of the two texts or copies another text, especially since the phrase of the *SynChron* "συναριθμοῦνται γάρ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ δύο κέρατα τῆς ἀρχῆς" refers to the two parts of the reign of Zeno.

---

Basiliscos’ coup (87.19-23)
Main sources: Theoph., 120.26-9, Kedr., 1.615.16-9
Other sources: Anagn., HE, 401, Leo Gramm., 116.12-7
Parallel passages: Mal., 301.9-17, Evagr., HE, 100.14-24, Chron. Pasch., 600.12-6,
Georg. Monk, 617.18-618.2, Zon., 3.255.9-13, Manass., 2917-23, Glyc., 490.11-5,
Joel, 43.15-9, Xanth., HE, 147.117D-120A

Basiliscos’ tenure (87.23-9)
Main sources: Theoph., 121.1-4, Kedr., 1.615.21-616.2
Other source: Anagn., HE, 402
Parallel passages: Mal., 302.25-6, Evagr., HE, 100.24-7, Chron. Pasch., 600.17-8,
Xanth., HE, 147.129D

Return of Zeno – (87.30-88.4)
Main source: Theoph., 124.15-8, 21-6
Other source: Mal., 302.31-2, 35-6, 40-4
Parallel passages: Chron. Pasch., 600.20-601.1, 5-8, 14-5, Kedr., 616.20-4, Manass.,
2934-7, Xanth., HE, 147.129D-132A

Basiliscos’ punishment (88.4-8)
Other sources: Mal., 303.53-6, 63-9, Chron. Pasch., 601.15-9, 601.22-602.10,
Theoph., 124.26-125.123.1, Manass., 2938-46255
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 413.2-414.2, Georg. Monk, 618.6-9, Kedr., 616.24-617.4, Glyc., 490.15-9, Joel, 43.19-23, Ephr., Chron., 1002-6, Xanth., HE, 147.132A-B

Armadur and his son – Verina exiled (88.8-12)

255 Cf. Patzig, “Quellen des Zonaras I”, 31-2; one of the examples used by Patzig to point the relationship between Manasses and the SynChron; suggesting that the information of their common source comes from material from Malalas.

**Verina exiled (88.11-2)**
Parallel passages: Mal., 310.82-9, Io. Ant., 303.30-4, Xanth., HE, 147.157D

**The Henotikon (88.13-8)**
Main source: Theoph., 130.13-8

**Ecclesiastical reactions to the Henoticon – Appeal to the pope (88.18-26)**
Main sources: Theoph., 132.18-20, 31-2, Kedr., 1.619.15-22
Other source: Zon., 3.259.1-9

**Death of Akakios – Patriarch Fravitas - Patriarch Euphemios (88.26-9)**
Other sources: Theoph., 133.13-6, Zon., 3.258.23-30
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 440.1-3, Evagr., HE, 120.32-121.1, 121.5-7

**Removal of the name of Peter Mongus from the diptychs (88.31-89.2)**
Main source: Theoph., 133.16-8
Other source: Zon., 3.258.30-2
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 440.4-5, Georg. Monk (PG), 623.14-9

**Execution of senators by Zeno (89.3-8)**
Other sources: Mal., 317.76-80, Chron. Pasch., 606.4-12, Theoph., 134.25-135.2, Leo Gramm., 117.8-12, Glyc., 491.3-7, Xanth., HE, 147.160C
Parallel passage: Manass., 2954-9

The exact sources of the passage are not easily identified. On the one hand, the author of the SynChron seems to know the details that are present in the account of Malalas, Chronicon Paschale and Theophanes. On the other hand, the SynChron and Leo the Grammarian provide the name Μαριανὸς, whereas the other texts relate Μαυριανός; hence, we can assume that it drew its material from the pool of the Epitome. Furthermore, the hypothesis is further supported by the similarities to Glykas;
although the other texts refer to a murder of a specific person, Glykas and the SynChron refer more generally to murders of numerous senators. A similar reference can be found in Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, at the end of the relevant entry, although for the rest of the account Xanthopoulos follows the story of Malalas and Theophanes. As a result, we can assume that the SynChron and Glykas draw their material from the Epitome (a tradition also known to Kallistos Xanthopoulos), but not from Leo the Grammarian, who omits significant parts of the incident.

Death and burial of the emperor Zeno (89.7-8)

Other sources: Mal., 318.92-4, Chron. Pasch., 607.3-4
Parallel passage: Patr. Const. - De Sepulcris Imperator., 203.10

Anastasios (89.9-93.18)

Origin of Anastasios (89.9-10)

Main source: Evagr., HE, 125.23-6
Other source: Xanth., HE, 147.161C
Parallel passages: Lyd., De magistr., 8.12-4, Mal., 319.4-5, 344.63-345.66, Chron. Pasch., 606.5-6, Glyc., 491.10

Anastasios and the heresy of the Manichees – His ascension to the throne (89.10-7)

Other sources: Anagn., HE, 446-7, Kedr., 1.625.20-626.11, Zon., 3.258.20-3, 259.7-14, 260.10-1
Parallel passages: Evagr., HE, 130.10-2, Anon. Matr., 61.6-7, Manass., 2969-73

Deposition of Euphemios – Patriarch Makedonios (89.17-20)

Other sources: Leo Gramm., 121.2-8, Kedr., 1.627.20-628.1, Zon., 3.260.8-12
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 455.1-5, Mal., 327.62-5, Evagr., HE, 130.3-10, Theoph., 140.7-12

Makedonios – Henoticon - Chalcedon (89.20-5)

Other source: Kedr., 1.628.1-6
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 456.1, 459.1-2, Theoph., 140.15-6, 154.25-155.1
Meeting between Euphemios and Makedonios (89.25-30)
Main source: Theoph., 140.19-26
Other sources: Anagn., HE, 457.1-6, Georg. Monk, 625.15-626.1
Parallel passage: Mal., 327.63

Makedonios (89.31-90.2)
Main source: Theoph., 150.8-11

Dispute between Anastasios and Makedonios (90.2-90.10)
Other source: Anagn., HE, 489

Deposition and death of Makedonios (90.10-5)
Other sources: Anagn., HE, 515.1-3, Theoph., 155.22-4, 161.33-162.3
Parallel passages: Mal., 327.65, Leo Gramm., 121.8-10, Kedr., 1.631.3-5, Georg. Monk (PG), 772.39-43, Zon., 3.260.13-4

Patriarch Timotheos – Persecution of the orthodox (90.16-8)
Other sources: Kedr., 1.631.4-9, Zon., 3.260.14-5

Change in the trisagios hymn – Reactions (90.18-26, 90.30-1)\textsuperscript{256}
Main source: Kedr., 1.631.9-15, 20-1
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 69.43-6, Anagn., HE, 483, 508.1-3, Theoph., 159.5-19, Glyc., 491.17-492.3

\textsuperscript{256} See Karpozelos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, I, 226-9 for a general discussion of the incident and the links between the texts of Malalas, Evagrius and Anagnostes.
As we discuss in our analysis of the position of the Epitome in the tradition of the *SynChron*, the passage offers an example of Kedrenos’ text being closer to the *SynChron* than Leo the Grammarian:

Τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως βουληθέντος προσθεῖναι εἰς τὸν τρισάγιον τὸ ἴππος ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δὲ ἡμᾶς ελέησον ἡμᾶς, (Leo Gramm., 119.4-5)

βουληθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἀναστάσιος προσθεῖναι εἰς τὸ τρισάγιον τὸ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι’ ἡμᾶς, (Kedr., 1.631.9-10)

Βουλήθη λεπτομορφος τοῦ ἐν τῷ τρισάγιο αὐτοῦ βασιλέως προσθεῖναι εἰς τὸ τρισάγιον τὸ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι’ ἡμᾶς, (SynChron, 90.18-9)

The same phrase is rendered as follows in the other texts that convey the same tradition:

ὡς βουληθεὶς τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως προσθεῖναι εἰς τὸ τρισάγιον τὸ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι’ ἡμᾶς, ἔλεησον ἡμᾶς” (Mal., 333.13-5)

προσθήκην τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς τῷ τρισάγιῳ βουλθε瑚τὸς ποιήσασθαι τὸ "Ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι’ ἡμᾶς”, (Evagr., HE, 146.3-5)

ὡς βουληθεὶς τοῦ βασιλέως προσθεῖναι εἰς τὸ τρισάγιον τὸ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι’ ἡμᾶς (Georg. Monk, 620.4-5)

ἐβουλήθη προσθεῖναι εἰς τῷ τρισάγιῳ τὸ "Ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι’ ἡμᾶς.” (Zon., 3.261.28-30)

προσθήκην τῆς δυσσεβείας τὸν ἰὸν ὑμνῳ τῷ τρισάγιῳ, (Manass., 2983-4)

Ὅτι Ἀναστασίου βουληθεὶς τοῦ τρισάγιῳ τὸ, "Ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι’ ἡμᾶς,” (Xanth., HE, 147.215B)

Interestingly, Theophanes and Anagnostes, who were the main sources for the information concerning the reigns of Zeno and Anastasios, are not used in this instance in the *SynChron*.

**Cistern Mokesia built by Anastasios (90.26-7)**

Main source: Georg. Monk, 620.20-621.1 (?)  
Other sources: Zon., 3.262.12-4, Glyc., 492.8

---

257 See pp. 250ff.

**Erection of the Long Walls (90.27-9)**

Other source: Zon., 3.265.16-8

**Death of Timotheos – Patriarch John (91.1-3)**


**Anastasios' vision about his death (91.3-8)**

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 120.8-14, Glyc., 492.4-7
Parallel passages: Theoph., 163.31-164.2, Psell., *Chron.*, 69.50-2, Joel, 43.14-20, Ephr., *Chron.*, 1106-11

**Burial of the emperor Anastasios (91.8-9)**

Main source: Leo Gramm., 120.14-7
Other source: Kedr., 1.636.13-5

**Dialogue between Anastasios and a bishop (91.10-27)**

Main source: Kedr., 1.633.21-634.16
Parallel passages: Eccl. 4.13(?)

**Anastasios buried alive (91.28-92.8)**

Main source: Leo Gramm., 120.19-121.2
Other sources: Kedr., 1.622.12-21, Georg. Monk (PG), 765.44-51, Manass., 3005-23, Joel, 43.20-44.4
Parallel passages: Zon., 3.258.6-10, Glyc., 492.9-13

---

260 In Zonaras' text (and also in Kedrenos) the story is attributed to the emperor Zeno, but its account does not hold similarities to the other texts, hence its placement in the 'parallel passages'.

122
Abolition of the chrysargyron tax by Anastasios (92.8-93.17)
Main source: Evagr., HE, 136.32-139.5
Other sources: Manass., 3024-51, Xanth., HE, 147.204A-205B

Justin (93.19-94.18)

Justin's ascension to the throne (93.19-24)
Parallel passage: Leo Gramm., 123.5-10

The religious attitude of Justin (93.24-8)
Main source: Zon., 3.266.17-21
Other source: Mal., 338.36-8
Parallel passages: Cyril, Vit. Sabae, 162.11-4, Anagn., HE, 524.3, Theoph., 164.31-165.2, 165.15-6, Kedr., 1.637.17-9, Joel, 44.6-7

Justin's wife (93.28-9)
Main source: Zon., 3.266.21-3
Other source: Theoph., 165.2-3
Parallel passages: Anagn., HE, 524.5-6, Kedr., 1.637.1-2

Death of John – Patriarch Epiphanios (93.30-94.1)
Other source: Zon., 3.267.12-5

Persecution of Anastasios' followers and heretical bishops (94.1-5)
Other sources: Mal., 337.19-21, Evagr., HE, 154.4-5, Chron. Pasch., 611.19-612.1, 612.7-9, Theoph., 166.1-3, Zon., 3.266.5-6, 1-3, Xanth., HE, 147.221B-C

261 See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 409-10.
Synchronisation: Martyr Arethas / War against the Ethiopians (94.5-7)
Main sources: Theoph., 169.13-6, Leo Gramm., 123.12-4, Kedr., 1.639.7-10, Georg. Monk (PG), 773.28-31
Other source: Joel, 44.7-9
Parallel passages: Zon., 3.268.15-6, Xanth., HE, 147.232C-235A

Removal of heretics from the diptychs by Pope John (94.8-12)
No source was found for the passage.

Persecution of heretics (94.13-6)
Parallel passages: Theoph., 171.2-3, Kedr., 1.639.18-9, Manass., 3066-8

Justinian appointed emperor – Justin's death (94.16-8)

Justinian (94.19-101.6)

Persecution against pagans and heretics (94.20-2)
Other sources: Theoph., 176.17-9, 180.11-3, Leo Gramm., 125.18-21

Legislation concerning the properties of the bishops (94.22-7)
Main source: Mal., 359.23-30
Other sources: Theoph., 176.20-4, Leo Gramm., 125.15-8, Kedr., 1.645.9-14

The Nika revolt (94.27-95.6)\(^{262}\)
Other sources: Theoph., 181.24-31, Leo Gramm., 126.6-15, Kedr., 1.647.11-22, Manass., 3157-69, 31

\(^{262}\) See Karpozilos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, I, 402-5.
Building of St Sophia (95.7-15)

Other source: Leo Gramm., 126.15-23

Death of Epiphanius – Patriarch Anthimos (95.16-9)

Other sources: Theoph., 217.1-4, Zon., 3.275.1-4

Deposition of Anthimos by Pope Agapetos – Patriarch Menas (95.19-23)

Other sources: Theoph., 217.7-11, Zon., 3.279.25-280.3, 280.15-20
Parallel passages: *Eklogai*, 112.28-31, Mal., 404.53-4, 55-6, Kedr., 1.651.4-7, Ephr., *Catal. Patriarch.*, 9776-9

Council under Pope Agapetos and Patriarch Menas (95.23-96.8)

Other sources: Theoph., 217.4-7, Zon., 3.280.23-9

Death of Pope Agapetos in Constantinople (96.8-9)

Other sources: Theoph., 217.8-9, Zon., 3.280.29-30
Parallel passages: Mal., 404.54-5, Kedr., 1.651.7-9

Vandal wars (96.10-98.18)

Cause of the war (96.10-26)

Main source: Theoph., 187.20-188.13
Other source: Procop., *De bell.*, 3.9.9
Parallel passages: Mal., 386.34-45, Manass., 3078-89

The army in Africa – Belisarius' speech (96.26-97.22)

Main source: Theoph., 190.20-191.21
Other source: Procop., *De bell.*, 3.16.1-7
Byzantine victories – Capture of Gelimer (97.22-98.11)

Other sources: Procop., *De bell.*, 3.20.1, 4.3.25-8, Theoph., 193.15-5, 196.23-197.2, Manass., 3094-7, 3136-9
Parallel passages: Theoph., 198.5-6, Kedr., 1.649.15-9, Zon., 3.277.11-8

Belisarius' triumph in Constantinople (98.11-8)

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 129.11-9, Kedr., 1.649.19-24\(^{263}\)
Other sources: Procop., *De bell.*, 4.9.1, 4.9.10-11, Georg. Monk (PG), 808.18-25, Manass., 3140-4
Parallel passages: Mal., 403.46-8, Theoph., 199.10-1, 15-25, Zon., 3.278.11-21

Belisarius' wars in Italy, Asia, Thrace (98.19-31)

Parallel passages: Mal., 405.72-6, Theoph., 205.24-7, Leo Gramm., 131.15-21, Zon., 3.279.21-4, Manass., 3150-6, Xanth., *HE*, 147.253A

Allegations against Belisarius - His death (98.31-99.3)

Main source: Zon., 3.284.13-9
Parallel passages: Theoph., 238.9-11, 16-8

Death of Menas – Patriarch Eutychios (99.4-6)

Other source: Zon., 3.280.30-281.3
Parallel passages: Mal., 415.4-6, Theoph., 228.14-6

Fifth Ecumenical Council (99.7-100.17)

Other sources: Georg. Monk, 629.1-630.5, Leo Gramm., 127.1-15, Kedr., 1.659.18-660.18, Zon., 3.280.30-281.18, Glyc., 502.3-8, 504.4-15\(^{264}\)
Parallel passages: *Chron. Pasch.*, 635.9-17, Theoph., 228.28-229.3, Joel, 44.17-23, Xanth., *HE*, 147.284B-288A, 289B

\(^{263}\) Although the Epitome was not the source for the rest of the description of the Vandal wars, the author of the *SynChron* uses the passage (present in Leo the Grammarian, Kedrenos and George the Monk (PG), and also alluded in Manasses) concerning the production of a coin with the representation of Belisarius as an addition to the account.

The structure and choice of content of the account of the event in the Synopsis Lambros (394.7-395.9) is very similar to Zonaras, however the language is closer to the SynChron, and also has information from the SynChron that is not to be found in Zonaras:

ἐφ' οὖ καὶ ἡ πέμπτη συνήθροιστο σύνοδος τῶν ἑκατὸν ἑξήκοντα καὶ πέντε ἁγίων πατέρων, ὅπε ἡγίατος Βεγίλιος πάπας Ῥώμης καὶ ὁ εὐφημένος Εὐτύχιος καὶ ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας Ἀπολινάριος. ἐφ' οὖ καὶ ἡ πέμπτη συνήθροιστο σύνοδος τῶν ἑκατὸν ἑξήκοντα καὶ πέντε ἁγίων πατέρων, ὅπε ἡγίατος Βεγίλιος πάπας Ῥώμης καὶ ὁ εὐφημένος Εὐτύχιος καὶ ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας Ἀπολινάριος. ἐφ' οὖ καὶ ἡ πέμπτη συνήθροιστο σύνοδος τῶν ἑκατὸν ἑξήκοντα καὶ πέντε ἁγίων πατέρων, ὅπε ἡγίατος Βεγίλιος πάπας Ῥώμης καὶ ὁ εὐφημένος Εὐτύχιος καὶ ὁ Ἀλεξανδρείας Ἀπολινάριος.

The heresy of Corruptibility and Incorruptibility - Deposition of Eutychios – Patriarch John (100.22-101.3)
Main source: Glyc., 505.17-22

Building of the church of the Pege of Theotokos and other churches
(100.18-21)
Main source: Leo Gramm., 130.13-5
Other source: Zon., 3.275.9-12

See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 299.
Other sources: *Eklogai*, 111.15-7, Mal., 432.70-2, Theoph., 240.31-241.2, Kedr., 1.680.2-6, Georg. Monk (PG), 808.9-11, Zon., 3.284.19-27

A letter of Daphnopates (Daphnop., *Epist.*, 8) which discusses the issue of Corruptibility and Incorruptibility presents similar arguments and uses expressions similar to the ones found in the *SynChron*; e.g. "ὅτι φαγεῖν λέγεται μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν" (109), "Αἱ δὲ τῶν Ἧλων τρήσεις καὶ ἡ τῆς πλευρᾶς τρῶσις" (139-40). This is not to suggest that Daphnopates' letter is the source of the *SynChron*, but to show that its author used a similar text in his explanation of the doctrine and not a historiographical text, especially since we cannot identify another text with such a treatise on the subject.

**Death of Theodora – Death and burial of Justinian (101.4-6)**

Other source: Leo Gramm., 130.17-21
Parallel passages: Kedr., 1.680.6-9, Zon., 3.284.27-8

**Justin (II) (101.7-104.17)**

**Sophia – Cancellation of debts (101.7-13)**

Main source: Theoph., 242.22-7
Other sources: Zon., 3.285.23-8, Glyc., 506.2-6

**Buildings by Justin (101.14-24)**

Main source: Theoph., 132.5-9, 132.17-133.4
Other sources: Joel, 45.1-6, Xanth., *HE*, 147.325C

---

266 See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, *Michael Glykas*, 299-301, who suggests that the source of the *SynChron* drew its material from Theophanes, and then Glykas used that as his source. According to Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Glykas could not have used Theophanes directly due to the linguistic similarities between the *SynChron* and Glykas.
Instances of injustice and the incident with the appointed prefect (101.24-103.18)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 133.11-134.23, Kedr., 1.680.21-683.6

Restoration of the aqueduct – Other buildings (103.19-20)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 136.11-2, 136.15-6, Kedr., 1.685.9-10, 685.15-6

Death of John – Patriarch Eutychios (103.20-3)
Other sources: Theoph., 248.9-11, Leo Gramm., 136.18-9, Kedr., 1.685.17-9

The coronation of Tiberius by Justin (103.24-104.17)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 135.8-136.10, Kedr., 1.685.5-8, 1.685.19-686.22
Other sources: Simoc., Hist., 3.11.4-13, Theoph., 247.28-31, 248.14-249.10

Tiberius (104.18-105.4)

Tiberius' family (104.18-22)
Other source: Zon., 3.288.15-9, 290.15-9
Parallel passages: Theoph., 250.3-5, 252.1-4, 252.10-1, Leo Gramm., 137.2-7, Kedr., 1.689.1-2, 690.20-691.1

Sophia confined to the "Sophia's" palaces (104.23-5)
Other sources: Zon., 3.288.19-22
Parallel passages: Theoph., 250.9-13, Leo Gramm., 167.15-9, Kedr., 1.688.16-8, Joel, 45.10-4
Popular actions and buildings of the emperor (104.25-8)
Main source: Leo Gramm., 137.20-138.1
Other source: Zon., 3.289.19-23
Parallel passage: Manass., 3428-32

Death of Eutychios – Patriarch John (104.29-31)
Other source: Zon., 3.289.23-80
Parallel passages: Theoph., 251.22-4, Kedr., 1.690.10-2

Maurice proclaimed emperor – Death of Tiberius (105.1-3)

Building of the church of the Forty Martyrs (105.3-4)

Maurice (105.5-106.31)

Maurice and his family (105.5-10)
Other source: Kedr., 1.691.12-3, 692.10-2

Kedrenos is the only other text that attributes the epithet Καππαδόκης to Maurice in this context. Other texts ascribe it to the next emperor, Phokas (Georg. Monk, 662.10, Glyc., 458.23, 510.3-4, Joel, 46.5).

General Philippikos (105.11-4)
Other sources: Kedr., 1.692.12-5, Zon., 3.291.24-6, 296.5-8

---

267 Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras II", 354 mentions that the description is also found in Paris. Gr. 1712. Manasses also mentions the origin of the emperor (3437), but in regard to his marriage, and not in the initial presentation.

**Church of the Forty Martyrs (105.14-5)**
Other sources: Kedr., 1.695.18-20, Zon., 3.295.12-4

**Establishment of the procession of the Virgin of Blachernae (105.15-8)**
Main sources: Kedr., 1.694.21-3, Glyc., 508.10-1
Other source: Leo Gramm., 138.18-21

**Death of John – Patriarch Kyriakos (105.19-23)**
Main source: Zon., 3.296.9-14
Parallel passages: Chron. Pasch., 692.9-10, Kedr., 1.699.8-10, Xanth., HE, 147.396B

**Building of the church of the Virgin of Areobindos (105.23-4)**
Main source: Zon., 3.296.14-7
Parallel passages: Theoph., 277.14-6, Kedr., 1.699.7-8, Patr. Const., 237.12-4

**Defeat by the Avars – Byzantine prisoners (105.25-106.7)**
Other sources: Megas Chronogr., 13.6-18, Leo Gramm., 139.5-7, 140.2-17, Kedr., 1.700.1-11, Manass., 3470-96

**Phokas' coup - Death and burial of Maurice - Inscription on Maurice's tomb (106.7-31)**
Other sources: Anthol. Palat., 732, Leo Gramm., 142.11-143.1, 144.8-145.10, Kedr., 1.705.18-708.2, 711.12-5, Zon., 299.5-18, 300.6-10, 300.14-301.9, Xanth., HE, 147.403C, 408C-409A, 412B-C

268 See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 310.
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 74.2-6, Chron. Pasch., 693.9-18, 694.3-6, Theoph., 288.21-4, 289.30-290.3, Georg. Monk, 661.16-662.8, 662.15-20, 664.2-6, Anon. Matr., 62.17-9, Glyc., 510.3-10, Joel, 45.18-46.3-34, 56a, Ephr., Chron., 1292-1305

**Phokas (107.1-26)**

**Phokas' family (107.1-4)**

Parallel passages: Theoph., 294.11-2, Leo Gramm., 143.11, Zon., 3.302.26-30

**Negative actions of the emperor (107.4-7)**

Other source: Zon., 3.301.27-8

**Execution of Narses (107.7-9)**

Other source: Zon., 3.301.16-18
Parallel passages: Theoph., 292.29-293.2, Kedr., 1.710.18-711.2, Manass., 3567-74

**Buildings commissioned by Narses (107.9-11)**

Main source: Zon., 3.301.18-20
Other source: Leo Gramm., 133.7-10
Parallel passage: Patr. Const., 249.6-7

**Death of Kyriakos – Patriarch Thomas (107.12-4)**

Other source: Zon., 3.301.28-31
Parallel passages: Chron. Pasch., 697.5-6, 697.11-4, Theoph., 293.26-8, Kedr., 1.711.29-31, Xanth., HE, 147.417B-C

**Priscus' letter to Heraclius (107.15-20)**

Main sources: Theoph., 295.27-296.1, Kedr., 1.711.19-712.2
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 75.13-7, Io. Ant., 319.4-7, Leo Gramm., 146.5, Zon., 3.302.32-303.15, Manass., 3582-93, Joel, 46.6-9

---

269 In contrast to the other related texts, the passage of Leo the Grammarian is placed in the reign of Phokas.

270 See Kaegi, "New Evidence", 311-2, who notes the unique information related in the SynChron.
Death of Thomas – Patriarch Sergios (107.21-3)

Phokas defeated and killed by Heraclius (107.24-4)

**Heraclius (107.27-110.8)**

Heraclius and his family (107.27-108.3)
Other source: Manass., 3608-9, 3612-6

Persian wars – Recapture of the Holly Cross (108.4-15)
Other sources: Theoph., 303.3-6, Leo Gramm., 148.12-8, 150.21-151.2, 151.12-4, 152.10-4

The 'Avar' siege – Akathist Hymn (108.16-109.9)

The Monophysite issue and the emperor (109.10-26)
Main sources: Theoph., 329.22-330.7, Kedr., 3.736.4-737.1, Zon., 3.110.10-311.9

---

271 The SynChron attributes the attack to the Scythians and Russians.
Death of Sergios – Patriarch Pyrros (109.27-9)
Other source: Zon., 3.311.12-6

Heraclius' edict on the monophysite issue (109.29-110.3)
Main sources: Theoph., 330.19-23, Kedr., 3.737.1-4
Other source: Zon., 3.311.9-12
Parallel passages: Anast. Sin., Sermo III, 1.66-72

Death of Heraclius (110.3-4)\(^272\)
Other sources: Georg. Monk, 673.12-3, Leo Gramm., 155.6-8, Kedr., 1.752.18
Parallel passages: Niceph., Brev. Hist., 27.17-9, Zon., 3.312.23-4, Glyc., 515.18-20, Joel, 47.3

Census of land (110.5-7)
No sources identified.\(^273\)

Constantine (III) (110.8-12)

Constantine's reign and family (110.8-10)

Death of Constantine (110.10-2)
Main source: Manass., 3744-6
Other sources: Theoph., 341.14-6, Kedr., 1.753.11-3
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 77.90-1, Theoph., 3.331.1-2, Georg. Monk, 673.21, Leo Gramm., 155.18-9, Zon., 3.313.2-4, Glyc., 513.3-5, Joel, 47.5-6

\(^{272}\) See p. 300.
\(^{273}\) See p. 301.
Heraklonas and Martina (110.13-17)

Revolt against Heraklonas and Martina (110.13-6)
Main sources: Manass., 3752-5, Glyc., 513.8-11
Other sources: Theoph., 331.2-4, 341.24-6, Leo Gramm., 156.14-7, Kedr., 1.753.22-754.1, Georg. Monk (PG), 860.51-861.2, Zon., 3.313.10-8, Joel, 47.7-10
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 78.7-10, Ephr., Chron., 1420-5

Deposition of Patriarch Pyrros (110.17)
Other sources: Theoph., 341.28, Leo Gramm., 156., Zon., 3.313.18-20

Constans (II) (110.17-113.12)

Constans emperor (110.17-9)
Other sources: Theoph., 331.4-5, 341.26-7, Kedr., 1.754.2-4, Georg. Monk (PG), 861.3-4, Zon., 3.313.21-3

Patriarch Paul (110.19-21)
Other sources: Theoph., 331.5-6, 342.1-3, Zon., 3.313.23-5
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 157.3, Kedr., 1.754.6-8

Constans monothelite (110.22-4)
Other source: Ephr., Chron., 1429-31
Parallel passages: Georg. Monk, 717.18-20, Kedr., 1.754.9-11, Joel, 47.16-7, Chron. Brev. (Monac.), 9-10

Pyrros and the Pope (110.24-111.2)
Main source: Theoph., 331.11-28
Other source: Zon., 3.315.12-21
Parallel passage: Prov 26.11

Martyrdom of Maximos (111.2-11)
Main source: Theoph., 351.19-24

Note the common reference of Manasses, Glykas and the SynChron to 'divine justice' in relation to the fate of Heraklonas and Martina.
Death of Paul – Patriarch Pyrros (111.12-3)
Other source: Zon., 3.315.7-12

Death of Pyrros – Patriarch Peter (111.14-6)
Other sources: Theoph., 345.6, Zon., 3.315.21-25
Parallel passage: Ephr., Catal. Patriarch., 9833-7

Pope Martinos exiled to Cherson (111.16-9)
Main source: Theoph., 332.2-4
Other source: Kedr., 1.761.23-762.2

Murder of Theodosius - Constans moves to Sicily (111.19-23)
Main source: Theoph., 347.25, 348.4-9, 351.25-8
Other sources: Georg. Monk, 717.11-3, 20-3, Kedr., 1.762.8-9, 14-6, Zon., 3.315.27-316.3, Manass., 3773-8
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 79.16-8, Leo Gramm., 158.15-6, 158.22-159.1, Glyc., 516.13-4, Ephr., Chron., 1437-9

Death of Peter – Patriarch Thomas (111.24-6)
Other source: Zon., 3.315.25-7

Death of Thomas – Patriarch John (111.26-8)
Other source: Zon., 3.313.27-8

Constantine emperor in Constantinople (111.29-30)
A sentence repeating the information related earlier, in SynChron, 111.22.
Incident between Mauias, Sergios and Andrew (111.30-113.8)
Main source: Theoph., 348.29-350.18, 350.23-6
Parallel passage: Mich. Syr., 2.451-4

Constantine (IV) Pogonatos (111.13-114.30)\textsuperscript{275}

Constantine avenges the murder of Constans (111.13-19)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 159.7-12, Zon., 3.316.18-29
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 80.39-41, Theoph., 352.4-7, Georg. Monk, 718.4-7, Kedr., 1.763.19-21, 764.2-5, Manass., 3790-5, Glyc., 517.5-7, Joel, 47.23-48.1

Origin of the nickname 'Pogonatos' (111.19-20)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 159.12-4, Zon., 3.316.29-32
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 80.41-3, Glyc., 517.5-7,\textsuperscript{276} Manass., 3795-800, Joel, 48.1-3

Constantine's orthodoxy (111.20-1)
Parallel passage: Zon., 3.319.4-5 (?)\textsuperscript{277}

Revolt and punishment of Tiberius and Heraclius (111.21-2)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 159.15-7, Georg. Monk (PG), 884.32-5

\textsuperscript{275} The structure “Revenge – ‘Pogonatos’ – Punishment of Heraclius and Tiberius” seems to be based on the Epitome source that was used by the SynChron, as the similarities with Leo the Grammarian indicate. In addition to the two short additions of the SynChron (the reference to Constantine's orthodoxy and the reference to Constantine's wife and son), it is interesting that the whole entry of the SynChron for Constantine Pogonatos is extensive, especially in comparison to Glykas and Manasses who provide a concise account of his reign.

\textsuperscript{276} See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 301.

\textsuperscript{277} See p. 301.
Constantine's wife and son (113.22-3)
Parallel passages: Theoph., 367.19-20, Leo Gramm., 162.9-10, Joel, 48.5-6

Death of John – Patriarch Constantine (113.24-6)
Other source: Zon., 3.318.32-319.2

Death of the patriarch Constantine – Patriarch Theodore (113.26-8)
Other source: Zon., 3.319.2-3

Expulsion of Theodore – Patriarch George (113.28-31)
Other source: Zon., 3.319.4

Sixth Ecumenical Council (114.1-26)
Main sources: Georg. Monk, 725.14-726.21, Kedr., 1.766.16-767.14
Other sources: Pseudo-Anast Sin., De Haeres., 17, Zon., 3.319.5-23, Joel, 48.6-14

Death of George – Patriarch Theodore (114.27-9)

Death of the emperor Constantine (114.29-30)

Justinian (II) (A) (114.31-115.20)

Building of the triklinon palace (114.31-115.2)

Characterisation of Justinian (115.2)
Parallel passages: Manass., 3814-8, Glyc., 115.12-3

Death of Theodore – Patriarch Paul (115.3-5)
Parallel passage: Synod. Vet., 142.2-3

The Quinisext Council (115.5-12)
Parallel passage: Synod. Vet., 143

Death of Paul – Patriarch Kallinikos (115.13-5)

Leontios' revolt – Justinian banished (115.15-20)
Other source: Manass., 3821-30

Leontios (115.21-116.8)

The Byzantines defeated by the Arabs (115.21-8)
Other sources: Zon., 3.324.8-26, Manass., 3834-47

Mutiny of the fleet – Apsimaros named emperor - Leontios banished (115.28-116.5)
Other sources: Zon., 3.324.26-325.15, Manass., 3850-64
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 82.92-2, 82.6-10, Theoph., 370.20-371.9, Niceph., Brev. Hist., 39.26-40.16, Georg. Monk, 733.2-8, Leo Gramm., 166.8-12,

278 Manasses' language and description does not seem similar to the SynChron; however, the structure of the two texts is parallel and Manasses' characterisation of Justinian is similar to the SynChron, which could suggest that they use the same source, and hence it is possible that Manasses could be placed in the 'other sources'.
166.18-21, Kedr., 1.776.17-777.5, Glyc., 517.19-518.2, Joel, 48.23-49.6, Ephr.,
Chron., 1521-26

**Apsimaros (116.8-117.18)**

**Philippikos exiled (116.8-10)**

Other sources: Theoph., 372.7-11, Leo Gramm., 167.4-8, Kedr., 1.778.2-5, Georg. Monk (PG), 904.38-41

**The return of Justinian to power (116.11-117.18)**


**Justinian (II) Rhinotmetos (B) (117.19-119.24)**

**Justinian's vengeance (Apsimaros, Leontios, patriarch Kallinikos et al.) (117.19-26)**

Other sources: Theoph., 375.6-7, 375.12-4, 375.16-21, Georg. Monk, 732.21-733.2, 733.5-7, Leo Gramm., 16-21, Kedr., 1.780.18-781.4, 781.6-8, Zon., 3.327.20-8, 327.30-328.1, Joel, 49.18-21, 50.1-3
Parallel passages: Synod. Vet., 144.3-5, Psell., Hist. Synt., 84.38-40, 84.43, Niceph., Brev. Hist., 42.11-9, 42.25-7, 42.29-43.6, Anon. Matr., 65.2-11, Manass., 3913-23, Glyc., 518.12-6, Ephr., Chron., 1535-6

**Return of Theodora and Tiberius (117.26-7)**


---

Patriarch Cyrus (117.28-118.3)

Other sources: Theoph., 375.14-6, Georg. Monk, 733.2-5, Zon., 3.327.28-30, Joel, 50.3-5

Parallel passages: Niceph., Brev. Hist., 42.28-30, Glyc., 518.16-8, Synod. Vet., 5-7

The structure of the events in the SynChron is unique in comparison to the above texts; only the SynChron intermits the return of Justinian's wife and son between the expulsion of the patriarch Kallinikos and the ascension of Cyrus to the patriarchal throne. As a result, it is not possible to decide with certainty if the author of the SynChron used any of the above texts as his main source and changed the order himself, hence their placement in the 'other sources'.

Justinian's invasion to Cherson – Philippikos' revolt (118.4-119.11)


Other sources: Niceph., Brev. Hist., 44.14-47.15, Leo Gramm., 11-9, Glyc., 519.5-520.1

Parallel passages: Georg. Monk, 733.12-19, Manass., 3935-48, 3958-68, 3979-4006, Joel, 80.5-12, Ephr., Chron., 1539-70

Death of Justinian and Tiberius (119.12-24)


Other sources: Niceph., Brev. Hist., 47.15-30, Leo Gramm., 169.19-23


Philippikos or Bardanes (119.25-31)

Expulsion of Cyrus – Patriarch John (119.25-8)

Other source: Zon., 3.330.32-331.3

---

280 Joel writes Kyriakos; nevertheless the rest of the passage is very similar to the other texts and its language very close to the SynChron.

281 Glykas also writes Kyriakos.
Parallel passages: Synod. Vet., 145.4-6, Theoph., 381.30-2, Leo Gramm., 170.21-2, Kedr., 1.784.18-20

Anathematisation of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (119.28-30)

Other sources: Zon., 3.330.13-6, 330.23.4

Philippikos' fall from power (119.30-1)

Other source: Zon., 3.331.13-5
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 85.56-4, Theoph., 381.22-3, Georg. Monk, 734.3-5, Leo Gramm., 170.17-9, Joel, 50.18-20

Artemios or Anastasios (II) (120.1-25)

Appointment of Anastasios (120.1-3)

Other sources: Zon., 3.331.16-20, Manass., 4046-50

The description of the appointment of the emperor in the above texts is as follows: "σωρευθέντος τοῦ λαοῦ" (Theoph., 383.17-8), also "ἀθροισθεὶς ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἅπας δήμος" (Niceph., Brev. Hist., 49.17-8), "ἐπισυναχθέντος τοῦ λαοῦ" (Leo Gramm., 170.19), "ἀθροισθεὶσαι οἱ τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς" (Zon., 3.331.17-8), "συναχθέντος τοῦ λαοῦ" (Kedr., 1.785.16-7), "ἡ σύγκλητος ἀθροισθεῖσα" (SynChron, 120.1-2), "ἡ σύγκλητος Αρτέμιον ἰστησιν Αὐσονάρχην" (Manass., 4046), "συναχθέντος τοῦ λαοῦ" (Joel, 50.21-2). The verb is the same or similar in all the cases, but Zonaras, the SynChron and Manasses agree that it is the senate that made the appointments (the other texts refer to the people), which points to the use of a common source, which draws from the tradition of the Epitome.

General comments on Anastasios (120.3-4)

Parallel passages: Kedr., 785.20, Zon., 3.331.21-2, Manass., 4052-3, Ephr., Chron., 1601-4
Punishment of the culprits of Philippikos' blinding (120.4-5)
Parallel passages: Theoph., 383.19-21, Niceph., Brev. Hist., 49.21-3, Georg. Monk, 735.8-9, Leo Gramm., 171.5-6, Kedr., 785.23-786.1

Eviction of John – Patriarch Germanos (120.6-9)

Mutiny of the fleet against Artemios – Emperor Theodosius (120.10-5)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 171.21-172.16, Kedr., 1.756.12-787.1
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 86.81-8, Georg. Monk, 735.9-14, Manass., 4054-76, 4081, 4087-92, Ephr., Chron., 1610-41

Theodosius (120.26-121.4)

Artemios removed to Thessaloniki (120.26-8)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 172.18-20, Kedr., 1.787.4-6
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 86.93-4, Georg. Monk, 734.16-8

Leo's coup (120.29-121.2)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 172.21-4, Kedr., 1.787.6-10, Georg. Monk (PG), 913.2-6, Manass., 4099-106, Glyc., 520.11-6, Joel, 51.11-3
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 86.94-2, Zon., 3.333.8-12

Theodosius' resignation (121.2-4)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 173.13-5, Manass., 4109-13
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 87.18-20, Kedr., 735.9-11, Zon., 3.333.16-9, Joel, 52.17-9
Leo (III) Isauros (121.5-123.22)

Artabasdos becomes *curopalates* (121.5-7)

Other source: Zon., 3.336.1-3
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 182.4-5, Georg. Monk (PG), 933.30, Kedr., 2.4.7-8

Birth of Constantine *Kopronymos* (121.7-9)


Revolt and death of Artemios (121.9-12)

Other sources: Theoph., 400.18-29, Kedr., 1.792.14-21, Zon., 3.338.11-23

Beginning of iconoclasm (121.13-8)


Expulsion of Germanos – Patriarch Anastasios (121.19-23)

Main source: Zon., 3.339.6-11

Origin of Leo's iconoclasm (121.24-122.11)

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 173.19-175.4, 175.10-20, Zon., 3.339.11-340.26
Other sources: Dam., *Epist.*, 356.36-357.28, 357.44-360.11, 360.19-26, Kedr., 1.788.11-8, 789.4-9, 793.18-794.1, Georg. Monk (PG), 735.15-737.7, 737.20-738.9, Manass., 4141-67
Parallel passages: Theoph., 401.29-402.9, Glyc., 521.6-12, Ephr., *Chron.*, 1671-93

Constantine named emperor (122.22-3)


---

282 Zonaras' entry is closer to the material of Leo the Grammarian than the *SynChron*, which presents a slightly abridged version.
Pope Gregory on the issue of the icons (122.24-8)
Main source: Glyc., 522.1-5

Constantine's marriage to Irene (122.29-31)
Main sources: Theoph., 409.30-410.1, Leo Gramm., 179.22-180.122, Kedr., 1.800.7-9, Georg. Monk (PG), 928.9-12, Zon., 3.343.7-13
Parallel passage: Niceph., Brev. Hist., 58.28-59.2

Burning of the school by the Great Cistern (123.1-17)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 177.7-17, Manass., 4191-98, 4204-5, 4216-32

Burning of the copies of the Iliad and the Odyssey (123.17-9)
Other source: Kedr., 1.616.8-10, Zon., 3.256.28-257.1, Manass., 4232-6, Ephr., Chron., 1008-19

Death of the emperor Leo (123.20-2)
Other sources: Theoph., 413.2-4

The similar reference to a "ψυχικὸν θάνατον" suggests a close connection between Theophanes and the SynChron.
Constantine (V) Kopronymos (123.23-126.18)

Characterisation of Constantine (123.23-29)
Parallel passages: Suda, kappa 2285.1-7, Psell., Hist. Synt., 89.33-5, Georg. Monk, 750.15-751.2, Leo Gramm., 181.4-7, Joel, 52.4-8, Ephr., Chron., 1725-35

Artabasdos' revolt and government (123.30-124.5)

Constantine's counter-attack - Punishment of Artabasdos and his sons (124.6-12)
Other source: Kedr., 2.6.3-17 (?)

The reference of Kedrenos to Constantine's entrance to the city ("διὰ τῆς Ἀβύδου, καὶ χερσαίῳ τείχει τῆς πόλεως" (Kedr., 2.6.3-4)) is the only clue that it could have been used as the source of the SynChron, since the account of the latter seems to be an abridged relation of the events, without a clear indication of the source of its material.

Punishment of the patriarch Anastasios (124.12-6)
Other source: Kedr., 2.6.21-7.4
Parallel passages: Theoph., 420.28-421.2, Leo Gramm., 184.2-4, Zon., 3.346.13-17, 346.22-4

Death of Anastasios – Patriarch Constantine (124.16-9)
Other source: Theoph., 427.25-6
Iconoclastic council – Persecution of the dissenters (124.20-5)

Other sources: Kedr., 2.10.13-5, 11.2-3, Zon., 3.347.17-9, 347.28-348.1, Ephr., Chron., 1775-95

Parallel passages: Theoph., 427.28-32, Niceph., Brev. Hist., 65.26-30, 66.4-6, Leo Gramm., 185.8-10, 186.15-8, Chron. Epit., 29.35-30.8

Persecution of St Stephen (124.25-6)

Other source: Ephr., Chron., 1805-7


Anathematisation of iconophile bishops (124.27-31)

Other sources: Kedr., 2.11.3-6, Zon., 3.348.2-7, Ephr., Chron., 1796-1804

Parallel passages: Theoph., 428.6-12, Niceph., Brev. Hist., 66.7-10, Leo Gramm., 179.20-2, Georg. Monk (PG), 928.6-8

Wives and children of Constantine (125.1-6)

Other sources: Theoph., 426.14-6, 443.28-444.6, Leo Gramm., 185.6-8, 188.12-4, Zon., 3.347.6-9, 3.353.1-4

Parallel passages: Theoph., 426.26-9, Niceph., Brev. Hist., 77.1-5, Kedr., 2.16.21-17.4, Georg. Monk (PG), 948.3-5

Expulsion and torture of the patriarch Constantine (125.7-13)

Other sources: Theoph., 441.5-8, 441.19-25, 442.8, Zon., 3.352.20-4, 352.29-30


Patriarch Niketas (125.13-31)

Main source: Glyc., 527.14-528.1

Other source: Zon., 3.352.6-10

Parallel passage: Theoph., 440.11-3

285 Also see Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 314, Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 51.
This is the only case in the reign of Constantine Kopronymos that Glykas and the *SynChron* convey a parallel incident (which is also present in the *Synopsis Lambros*). Correspondingly, Zonaras' comment "οὐδ' ἀναγνώναι δυνάμενον" (3.352.9-10) seems to allude to the same incident.

In addition to the above, the following two expressions of the passage present further interest:

"ἄτων ἄρρητων σου κριμάτων φιλάνθρωπε κύριε" (125.13-4)

"ἰχθύων ἀφωνότερος" (125.17-8)
A common expression in the literature, attributed by texts of the Epitome (Leo Gramm., 208.12, Pseudo-Symeon, 609.13, Georg. Monk (PG), 777.13) to the patriarch Theodotos.

**Constantine's measures against icons, relics, monks and the status of Saints and the Virgin (126.1-11)**

Other sources: Manass., 4591-2, Zon., 3.350.14-351.2

**The degradation of the relics of St Euphemia (126.11-6)**

Main source: Zon., 3.355.5-11
Parallel passages: Theoph., 439.26-8, Manass., 4321-4

**Death of the emperor Constantine (126.16-8)**

Other sources: Leo Gramm., 190.1, Manass., 4324

---

286 See p. 275.
**Leo (IV) (126.19-25)**

*Leo's family (126.19-21)*

Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.19.6-7, Zon., 3.356.18-20

**Death of Niketas – Patriarch Paul (126.21-4)**


**Death of the emperor Leo (126.24-5)**

**Irene and Constantine (VI) (127.1-128.15)**

*Constantine's marriage and daughters (127.2-6)*

Other source: Zon., 3.357.6-9, 358.9-14

Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.23.19-24, Georg. Monk (PG), 957.35-8, Patr. Const., 207.22-208.1

**Resignation of Paul – Patriarch Tarasios (127.6-9)**


**Seventh Ecumenical Council (127.9-128.15)**

*Time and presidents of the Council (127.9-20)*

Other source: Georg. Monk, 769.10-9


*Subject and decisions of the Council (127.20-128.6)*

Other source: Theoph., 463.8-9

Parallel passages: Synod. Vet., 152.8-10, Theoph., 462.29-463.8, Chron. Epit., 30.15-9, Kedr., 2.23.10-8, Zon., 3.360.21-361.2, Glyc., 505.3-8, Joel, 53.6-10, Ephr., Chron., 1883-4
Change of the venue of the Council (128.6-15)\textsuperscript{287}

Parallel passages: Synod. Vet., 151.3-6, Theoph., 461.16-26, Leo Gramm., 195.14-196.1, Kedr., 2.23.1-3

Constantine (VI) (128.16-129.4)

Irene removed from power (128.16-9)

Other source: Manass., 4343-8

Irene re-instated (128.19-24)

Other source: Manass., 4349-53

Maria – Theodote (128.24-7)


Blinding of the sons of Constantine Kopronymos (128.27-9)


Irene's coup – Blinding of Constantine (128.29-129.4)

Other sources: Glyc., 529.17-9,\textsuperscript{288} Manass., 4375-80

\textsuperscript{287} The passage starts with "Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο ἰστέον" (128.6), which seems to introduce an addition from a different source than the one used for the rest of the entry for the Council.

\textsuperscript{288} Cf. Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 316.
Irene (129.5-8)
Other source: Manass., 4454-9

Nikephoros (129.9-130.12)
Character and general comments (129.9-12)
Other source: Zon., 3.369.6-11
Parallel passages: Manass., 4476-8, Glyc., 530.6-7

Bardanios proclaimed emperor by the army (129.13-15)
Main source: Manass., 4501-6
Other source: Kedr., 2.32.21-4
Parallel passages: Theoph., 479.15-7, Georg. Monk, 772.7-9, Zon., 3.369.13-7, Glyc., 530.12-3, 531.3-6

The predictions of the monk in Philomelion (129.15-130.1)
Main source: Manass., 4507-34
Parallel passage: Glyc., 531.6-8

The story is in the same place as in the SynChron, namely in Nikephoros' reign, in the texts of Theophanes Continuatus, Kedrenos and Manasses, but in a different position in Skylitzes, Zonaras, Glykas (who place it in Michael's reign), and Genesios (who puts in the reign of Leo). As the story is related to all of the above emperors, it is not odd that different authors decided to include it in different places in their narrative. Nevertheless, the similarities with Manasses suggest that the inclusion of the event in the reign of Nikephoros was not the choice of the author of the SynChron (or the author of the archetype of the SynChron, since the passage is also the same in the Synopsis Lambros) but of their common source.
**Bardanios' failed coup (130.1-6)**


**Death of Tarasios – Patriarch Nikephoros (130.7-9)**

Parallel passages: Theoph., 481.15-6, 20, Leo Gramm., 204.11-3, Kedr., 2.34.3-8, Georg. Monk (PG), 976.3-5, Zon., 3.370.4-8, Joel, 53.14-5

**Staurakios proclaimed emperor (130.10-1)**

Parallel passages: Theoph., 480.11-2, Leo Gramm., 204.10-1, Kedr., 2.33.17-8, Georg. Monk (PG), 976.1-2, Zon., 3.370.1-2, Joel, 53.14

**Nikephoros' defeat by the Bulgarians and his death (130.11-2)**


**Staurakios (130.13-6)**


**Michael (130.17-131.4)**

**Michael's family (130.17-20)**


**Character and generosity of the emperor (130.20-4)**

Other sources: Script. Inc., 335.8-336.5, Theoph., 494.9-11(?)

Parallel passages: Schreiner, 14.42, Leo Gramm., 206.4, Joel, 53.19

**Defeat by the Bulgarians – Coup of Leo the Armenian (130.24-7)**

Michael's family (130.30-131.4)

Leo the Armenian (131.5-132.4)

Leo's family (131.5-7)
Parallel passage: *Synod. Vet.*, 154.18-20

Resumption of iconoclasm – Persecutions (131.7-14)

Expulsion of Nikephoros – Patriarch Theodotos (131.15-8)

Michael imprisoned (131.19-25)
Other sources: Manass., 4607-13, Glyc., 534.5-10

Michael’s escape and revolt (131.15-132.4)
Other sources: Manass., 4618-29, Glyc., 534.12-535.2

---

289 Genesios (2.14), Theophanes Cont. (48.8-12), Skylitzes (28.82-9) and Ephraem (2219-24) attribute the imprisonment of Euthymios (and later of Methodios) to Michael.
The SynChron finishes its account of Leo's reign with: "Καὶ κρατεῖ τῆς βασιλείας ὁ Μιχαὴλ ὁ Ἀμορραῖος καὶ Τραυλὸς ἔτη η' καὶ μήνας θ'" (132.5-6), which has the form of the usual introductions to the imperial reigns. On the other hand, in the Synopsis Lambros, the conclusion of Leo's reign is "Καὶ κρατεῖ τῆς βασιλείας ὁ Μιχαὴλ" (472.21-2) and the introduction is "Καὶ κρατεῖ τῆς βασιλείας ὁ Μιχαὴλ ὁ Ἀμορραῖος καὶ Τραυλὸς ἔτη η' καὶ μήνας θ'" (473.1-2), the same as in the SynChron. However, this is probably a case where the Synopsis Lambros preserves the archetype, since the form of the conclusion and the introduction is consistent with the presentation of the reigns of the emperors, whereas the author of the SynChron altered his source and combined the conclusion of Leo with the introduction to Michael.

Michael (II) the Amorian (132.5-24)

Leo's wife and sons (132.7-8)
Parallel passages: Skylitz., 24.69-73, Zon., 3.389.32-390.6

Michael's family (132.8-9)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 211.17-8 (?), George Monk Cont., 783.12-3 (?)

Michael's second marriage (132.9-13)
Other source: Zon., 3.398.13-4, 398.29-399.1
Parallel passages: Genes., 2.14.1-5, Pseudo-Symeon, 620.9-11, Theoph. Cont., 79.5-12, Kedr., 2.95.13-9, Skylitz., 44.90-6

Michael's neutral position on the issue of the icons (132.14-6)
Other source: Manass., 4632-4
Parallel passages: Theoph. Cont., 47.20-48.1, Skylitz., 27.77-9

Death of Theodotos – Patriarch Anthony (132.17-8)
Parallel passages: Synod. Vet., 155.1-5, Zon., 3.399.4-8

Thomas's failed revolt (132.19-23)

Death of Michael (132.23-4)
Parallel passage: Zon., 3.400.13-7

Theophilos (132.25-136.24)

Theophilos' wife (132.25-6)
Other source: Psell., Hist. Synt., 97.44-5 (?)
Parallel passages: Zon., 3.402.10-3, Manass., 4677-80, Glyc., 536.5-6

Iconoclasm - Torture of Saints Theodore and Theophanes (132.26-31)
Other sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 641.3-18 (?), Zon., 3.409.1-9

The text of Pseudo-Symeon is placed in the 'other sources' due to the similarities of the following passage, which relates the exchange of letters between the two saints and Methodios.

Epigram (133.1-12)
Other sources: Anthol. Palat., 308, Pseudo-Symeon, 641.19-642.8, Zon., 3.410.10-21
Punishment of Leo's murderers (133.13-4)

Other source: Zon., 3.400.25-8
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 214.17-9, George Monk Cont., 791.8-11, Georg. Monk (PG), 1008.45-8

Euphroisyne sent to monastery (133.14-7)


Building of the Pentapyrgion – Restoration of the walls (133.18-23)

Main sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 627.10-17, George Monk Cont., 793.7-14
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 215.12-9, Glyc., 537.1-6

Theophilos' justice - The incident with Petronas (133.24-134.3)

Main sources: Leo Gramm., 215.20-216.11, Pseudo-Symeon, 627.17-628.7, Manass., 4715, 4760-76

The burning of the ship of the empress (134.4-10)

Other sources: Genes., 3.20, Pseudo-Symeon, 628.3-7

290 Manasses has the same structure as the SynChron and concludes the account of the event at the same point, omitting the transfer of the building to the complaining woman.
Theophilos' daughters (134.11-2)
Parallel passages: Pseudo-Symeon, 628.12-3, Theoph. Cont., 90.5-7, Kedr., 2.103.17-8, Skylitz., 52.75-7, Zon., 3.404.19-21

Theodora iconophile (134.13-4)

Birth and coronation of Michael (134.15-6)

Death of Anthony – Patriarch John (134.17-20)

St Methodios secluded in a tomb (134.21-7)
Other sources: Manass., 4811-24, Glyc., 537.16-21

Letters between Sts Theodore and Theophanes and St Methodios (134.28-135.10)
Main source: Zon., 3.414.25-415.6
Other sources: Anthol. Palat., 309, 310, Pseudo-Symeon, 642.9-643.7, Manass., 4825-40, Glyc., 537.21-538.10
Parallel passage: Kedr., 2.116.15-117.6

Interestingly, Glykas refers to the two brothers as "οἱ κεντηθέντες" (537.21), which suggests that the author was aware of the nature of their torture, but did not include the relevant incident in his account (although it is not possible to deduce whether it was present in his source).
Release of St Methodios (135.11-136.7)
Main sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 644.7-645.10, Manass., 4842-44, 4856-80 (?)
Other sources: Zon., 3.415.7-13, Glyc., 538.11-6

Restoration of the hospice (136.8-23)
Main sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 645.16-46.8, George Monk Cont., 809.3-21, Georg. Monk (PG), 1028.37-1029.6
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 227.13-4, Theoph. Cont., 95.2-7, Skylitz., 55.73-6, Zon., 3.408.4-6, Ephr., Chron., 2380-85, Patr. Const., 185.15-20

Theodora and Michael (III) (136.24-141.15)

Iconophile actions by Theodora – Eviction of John – Patriarch Methodios (136.25-137.2)
Other sources: Skylitz., 84.84-92, Zon., 4.1.5-9, 2.5-9
Parallel passages: Georg. Monk, 802.13-8, 802.21-3, Genes., 4.4, Leo Gramm., 228.12-229.1, Pseudo-Symeon, 647.5-15, George Monk Cont., 811.5-13, Kedr., 2.143.21-144.8, Glyc., 539.1-4, Joel, 55.1-6, Ephr., Chron., 2423-31

Theodora and the forgiveness of Theophilos' actions (137.2-10)
Other sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 650.21-651.13, Zon., 4.2.9-26, Manass., 4909-13
Parallel passages: Genes., 4.2.33-9, Theoph. Cont., 152.1-154.1, Ephr., Chron., 2435-44

Council – Restoration of the icons (137.11-21)

Theodora's meal with the bishops (137.22-138.8)

291 Manasses' account is more detailed and with more similarities to the SynChron than Zonaras and Glykas; in this instance, the poetic form of Manasses' text does not allow us to decide with certainty if they copy the same text or not. Nevertheless the similarities in the content and the structure suggest the former.
Other sources: Glyc., 539.15-24, Manass., 4914-41

**Death of Methodios – Patriarch Ignatios (138.9-11)**


**Background of Ignatios (138.12-9)**


Other sources: Kedr., 2.172.2-6, Skylitz., 106.18-22

**Representation of St Methodios (138.19-26)**

Parallel passage: Glyc., 538.15-21

**Michael's wedding to Eudokia (138.27-8)**

Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 230.2-3, Pseudo-Symeon, 655.4-5, George Monk Cont., 816.8-12

**The corrupt life of Michael (138.28-139.11)**

Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 98.60-2, Leo Gramm., 229.18-20, Pseudo-Symeon, 655.1-2, George Monk Cont., 816.4-6, Kedr., 2.201.11-8, Zon., 4.11.21-6

Both Glykas (541.19-542.20) and Manasses (4946-87) present a similarly negative image of Michael; however, since there are no significant similarities between the texts, or with the earlier texts mentioned in the parallel passages, we can assume that the author of the *SynChron* drew from the material and composed his own critical picture of Michael (a theme that is revisited later in the text (143.25-145.8)), perhaps echoing the pro-Macedonian views of his contemporaries and his sources. The suggestion that the author is composing his own text and not just copying or collating

---

292 Cf. Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 231, who suggests that the *SynChron* is more closely connected to Glykas and Manasses; however, due to the similarities in the language, we suggest that the *SynChron* belongs together with the texts of Pseudo-Symeon, Skylitzes, Theophanes Continuatus and Kedrenos (whose text is not mentioned in Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou).

293 See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 316-7.

294 Or better, the author of the archetype of the *SynChron* and the *Synopsis Lambros*, as the two texts coincide.

295 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 77, suggests a similar conduct on behalf of Glykas.
earlier text is supported further by the distinctive structure of the events (Basil in the stables – Basil's background – the taming of the horse), which are put within the timeframe of Michael's reign, a hypothesis further supported by the use of the word "ἑταιρειώτην" (the other sources convey "ἑταιριάρχην" or "ἑταιρειάρχην").

**Basil hired in the imperial stables (139.11-19)**

Other source: Leo Gramm., 230.12-22
Parallel passage: Georg. Monk (PG), 1040.1-2

**Basil's background - His arrival in Constantinople (139.19-140.26)**

Main sources: George Monk Cont., 817.10-6, 819.13-820.24
Parallel passages: Genes., 4.24.1-11, 4.25, Skylitz., 119.84-121.34, Glyc., 546.14-547.7

**The incident with the taming of the horse (140.26-141.8)**

Other sources: Leo Gramm., 230.6-22, Pseudo-Symeon, 655.7-18, Theoph. Cont., 230.16-231.15, George Monk Cont., 816.15-817.9, Kedr., 2.194.16-195.19, Skylitz., 124.32-54

**Theodora on Basil (141.9-11)**

Parallel passages: Genes., 4.26.31-6, Manass., 5103-10

**Theodora removed from power (141.11-15)**

Other sources: Leo Gramm., 237.8-11, Pseudo-Symeon, 658.10-3, George Monk Cont., 823.10-15, Manass., 5016-22

---

296 Skylitzes (126.67-8) (whose text is followed by Kedrenos (2.196.5-8)) attributes a similar quote to Bardas.
Parallel passages: Genes., 4.11.1-4, Theoph. Cont., 174.2-7, Zon., 2.9.7-12, Glyc., 543.16-20

**Micheal (III) (141.16-143.12)**

**Basil and Bardas (141.16-21)**

Other sources: Leo Gramm., 242.3-5, Pseudo-Symeon, 675.9-12, Zon., 4.20.13-5, 20.25-8

**Bardas' dispute with the patriarch Ignatios - Expulsion of Ignatios – Patriarch Photios - Torture and exile of Ignatios (141.21-142.23)**

Main sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 667.6-19, 668.2-14, Manass., 5032-43, 5055-76, Glyc., 543.18-544.10
Parallel passage: Joel, 55.6-9

**Persecution of bishops (142.23-5)**

Main source: Pseudo-Symeon, 668.14-5
Parallel passage: Skylitz., 106.32-4

**Bardas murdered by Basil (142.25-8)**

Parallel passages: Peter Alexandr., 197.31-2, George Monk Cont., 831.5-8, Zon., 4.21.18-29, Manass., 5080-1

**Basil named co-emperor – His marriage to Eudokia (142.28-31)**

Parallel passages: Genes., 4.27.12-3, Leo Gramm., 247.1-3, Pseudo-Symeon, 675.13-5, 655.1-6, Theoph. Cont., 235.8-9, 240.1-2, George Monk Cont., 828.3-4, 833.5-6, Kedr., 2.198.6-10, 200.8-9, Skylitz., 113.21, 127.17-20
Michael murdered by Basil (143.1-12)\textsuperscript{297}

Other source: Manass., 5086-101

Basil (143.13-145.31)

Basil's wife and children (143.13-6)

Expulsion of Photios – Patriarch Ignatios (143.17-9)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 255.3-5, George Monk Cont., 841.3-6, Kedr., 205.3-8, Skylitz., 133.70-134.74, Zon., 4.24.13-4, 24.19-20, Manass., 5174-5, Glyc., 547.9-11, Joel, 55.11-4

Building of the monastery of Anatellontos (143.19-21)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 255.20-2, Pseudo-Symeon, 690.14-6, Theoph. Cont., 20.19-21, George Monk Cont., 842.21-842.2

Michael's excessive spending (143.22-144.2)
Parallel passage: Ephr., Chron., 2501-13

Michael and the destruction of the warning system (144.3-145.2)
Main source: Pseudo-Symeon, 681.19-682.18

\textsuperscript{297} For an overview of the treatment of Michael by the sources, and especially the relation of his murder, see Karpozelos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, II, 367-88.

\textsuperscript{298} Cf. Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 442-3.
General comments on Michael's reign (145.2-8)\textsuperscript{299}

Churches and buildings commissioned by Basil (145.9-13)
Parallel passages: Theoph. Cont., 325.2-5, George Monk Cont., 843.3-4, 843.15-7, Kedr., 2.240.2-17, Skylitz., 163.65-164.73, 164.81-2, Ephr., Chron., 2482-8

Leo's marriage to Theophano (145.14-6)

Stephen (145.16)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 262.15-6, Pseudo-Symeon, 700.8, Theoph. Cont., 353.8-9, Kedr., 2.206.2-3, Skylitz., 134.89-90, Zon., 4.24.26-8, Joel, 55.22-3

Death of Ignatios – Patriarch Photios (145.17-20)

Santabarenos – The row between Basil and Leo (145.21-8)\textsuperscript{300}

\textsuperscript{299} See p. 303.
\textsuperscript{300} See p. 303.
Death of Basil (145.29-31)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 262.10-1, Pseudo-Symeon, 700.4-5, George Monk Cont., 848.16

Leo (VI) the Wise (146.1-147.9)

Expulsion of Photios – Patriarch Stephen (146.1-4)

Death of Stephen – Patriarch Anthony (146.4-7)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 266.15-7, Pseudo-Symeon, 702.5-6, George Monk Cont., 852.20-2, Kedr., 2.253.22-254.1, Skylitz., 175.72-4, Zon., 4.39.31-40.1, Joel, 56.2-4

Death of Anthony – Patriarch Nicholas (146.7-9)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 273.22-274.1, Pseudo-Symeon, 703.15-6, George Monk Cont., 860.1-2, Kedr., 2.259.22-2, Skylitz., 180.7-8, Zon., 4.42.17-20

Leo and Zoe - Death of Theophano (146.10-4)

Building of the church of Holy Apostles in Theophano's honour (146.14-7)
Other sources: Patr. Const., 280.17-281.6 (?)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 274.9-11, Pseudo-Symeon, 703.8-10, Theoph. Cont., 364.20-2, George Monk Cont., 860.12-4, Kedr., 2.260.4-6, Skylitz., 180.14-6, Zon., 4.42.24-7

301 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 312 suggests that the SynChron and Glykas are connected on this passage; however, there is not enough evidence to substantiate her claim, hence the position of Glykas in the 'parallel passages'.
While other texts relate the building of the church of Holy Apostles and the church of Lazaros in a single passage (Leo the Grammian, Theoph. Cont., George the Monk Cont., Kedrenos, Skylitez, Zonaras), the SynChron includes the information in two separate passages, a possible indication of use of a different source. Additionally, the SynChron and the Synopsis Lambros state that the church of Holy Apostles was later dedicated to the Hagioi Pantes, a detail that is not mentioned in any other historiographical text; the only other source that identifies the church of the Holy Apostles with the church of Hagioi Pantes is the Patria.

Leo's second marriage; Zoe (146.18-9)
Other source: Zon., 4.41.15-21 (?)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 270.18-9, Pseudo-Symeon, 702.22-703.1, 701.21, Theoph. Cont., 361.18-9, George Monk Cont., 856.18-9, 852.17-8, Kedr., 2.258.2-3, 253.16, Skylitz., 179.67-8, Joel, 56.5-6

Leo's third marriage; Eudokia (146.19-21)
Other source: Zon., 4.41.31-42.4 (?)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 274.5-8, Pseudo-Symeon, 703.21-704.2, Theoph. Cont., 364.16-9, George Monk Cont., 860.8-11, Kedr., 2.260.1-4, Skylitz., 180.10-3

Leo's fourth marriage; Zoe – Birth of Constantine (146.22-6)
Other source: Zon., 4.42.11-7 (?)302

Nicholas' objections - Expulsion of Nicholas – Patriarch Euthymios (146.26-147.5)
Other sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 709.5-6, 709.12-9, Manass., 5307-23,303 Joel, 56.8-11

302 Zonaras is only a possible 'other source' due to non-conclusive similarities in the structure.

Building of the church of St Lazaros – Translation of relics (147.6-9)

Other source: Glyc., 554.1-4


Alexander (147.10-25)

Criticism of Alexander's life (147.10-4)


Expulsion of Euthymios – Patriarch Nicholas (147.14-8)


Persecution and death of Euthymios (147.18-25)


304 Cf. Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 315, whose suggestion for a link to the respective passage of Glykas (556.1-2) is not necessarily beyond question, as the passage is too short to allow us to establish a connection between Glykas and the SynChron, at least in this instance.
Constantine (VII) Porphyrogenitus (A) (147.26-149.22)

Overview and duration of Constantine's reign (147.26-30)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 288.9-16, Pseudo-Symeon, 718.6-9, George Monk Cont., 874.9-13
Other sources: Theoph. Cont., 381.3-9, Joel, 57.1-4
Parallel passages: Skylitz., 247.78-81, Zon., 4.71.18-24

Revolt and death of Constantine Doukas (147.31-148.4)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 288.19-289.2, 289.21-290.1, 290.9-13, Pseudo-Symeon, 718.14-8, 719.16-8, 720.2-6, Theoph. Cont., 381.14-9, 383.2-3, 383.11-8, George Monk Cont., 874.18-5.1, 875.19-21, 876.6-11, Zon., 4.50.16-22, 51.8-9, 51.16-21
Parallel passages: Kedr., 278.10-17, 280.1-2, 280.9-16, Skylitz., 197.25-32, 198.63, 198.70-199.76, Manass., 5373-82

Leo Phokas' insurgency – Lekapenos' rise to power (148.5-22)
Other sources: Kedr., 2.320.17-321.8 (?)

Leo Phokas in Chrysopolis (148.22-30)
Parallel passages: Zon., 4.57.27-8, Manass., 5406-13

Constantine Porphyrogenitus' letter (148.30-149.11)
Main sources (same text): Leo Gramm., 302.7-21, Pseudo-Symeon, 729.22-730.12, Theoph. Cont., 396.3-16, George Monk Cont., 888.14-889.6
Other sources: Kedr., 2.294.14-295.6, Skylitz., 201.88-7
Parallel passage: Manass., 5463-8
End of the revolt (149.12-4)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 302.21-303.7, Pseudo-Symeon, 730.12-9, Theoph. Cont., 396.16-397.1, George Monk Cont., 889.889.6-12
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.295.6-19, Skylitz., 210.7-211.20, Zon., 4.57.28-32, Manass., 5469-72

Lekapenos becomes emperor – Marriage between Constantine and Helen (149.14-7)

Lekapenos' sons named emperors (149.18-21)

Coins (149.21-2)
Unknown source.306

Romanos Lekapenos (149.23-152.17)

The emperors and their families (149.23-9)307
Parallel passage: Chron. Epit., 31.7-9

Death of Nicholas – Patriarch Stephen (149.30-150.3)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.307.1-4, Zon., 4.60.18-22

---

305 As the content of the passage is similar to numerous other texts, with which it is not necessarily connected, we only mention passages with the same context and structure as the SynChron.
306 See p. 303.
307 See p. 304.
Theophylaktos becomes cleric (150.4-6)
Other source: Zon., 4.60.14-8
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 314.6-10, Pseudo-Symeon, 739.10-2, Theoph. Cont., 409.22-410.3, George Monk Cont., 902.9-12, Kedr., 2.306.20-3, Skylitz., 221.13-6

Death of Stephen – Patriarch Tryphon (150.6-10)

Resignation of Tryphon – No patriarch appointed (150.10-13)
Other sources: Leo Gramm., 321.10-4, Pseudo-Symeon, 744.23-745.3, Theoph. Cont., 421.1-6, George Monk Cont., 911.22-912.5

Patriarch Theophylaktos (150.13-5)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 322.8-9, Pseudo-Symeon, 745.15-17, Theoph. Cont., 422.3-4, George Monk Cont., 913.1-2, Kedr., 2.315.3-5, Skylitz., 227.58-62, Joel, 57.12-3

Building of the monastery of Roufinianai (150.15-6)
Parallel passages: Glyc., 563.10-1, Patr. Const., 216.13-4

Union of the separated episcopates – Edict on marriages (150.17-26)309

Lekapenos and the monastic habit (150.27-151.4)
Other sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 744.3-8, George Monk Cont., 910.1-15
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 319.20-320.8, Theoph. Cont., 418.11-419.8

308 See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 315-6.
309 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 315, suggests that the SynChron and Glykas are linked in this passage through their common source; Glykas' phrase (556.2-3), however, is part of the reign of Leo VI, and is too short to allow any persuasive suggestions.
Lekapenos and the monk Sergios (151.4-17)
Main sources: Leo Gramm., 327.9-16, Pseudo-Symeon, 750.1-11, George Monk Cont., 919.17-920.11
Other source: Theoph. Cont., 433.12-5, 434.2-14
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.320.8-11, Skylitz., 282.79-81

Sergios and Polyeuktos (151.17-152.7)
Main source: Pseudo-Symeon, 751.10-752.8

The coup of Lekapenos' sons – Constantine assumes power (152.8-12)
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 328.4-14, Pseudo-Symeon, 752.10-20, Theoph. Cont., 435.11-21, George Monk Cont., 921.921.5-11, Kedr., 2.320.13-5, 323.21-324.1, Skylitz., 262.83-5, Zon., 4.65.20-8, Manass., 5532-7, Joel, 57.15-20, 57.24-58.3

The reaction of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (152.12-7)

Constantine (VII) Porphyrogenitus (B) (152.18-153.16)

Appointments by Constantine (152.19-23, 25-8)
Other sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 753.2-5, 754.18-22, 755.15-9, Manass., 5547-54
Parallel passages: Leo Gramm., 328.17-21, Theoph. Cont., 436.5-8, 436.9-10, 442.18-22, 459.13-8, George Monk Cont., 921.12-6, Kedr., 2.327.2-12, Skylitz., 238.36-41, Zon., 4.66.19-67.4, Glyc., 561.10-3 (?)310

Building of St Basil's church (152.23-5)311
Parallel passage: Psell., Chron., 1.20.11-22 (?)

310 Cf. Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 315-6, who suggests a strong connection between the SynChron and Glykas on this point (the origin of Basil parakoimomenos). However, she does not take into account Pseudo-Symeon's passage on Basil, which could have been (or, most probably, points to) a common source.

311 Preger has a note on Basil parakoimomenos in his index (Preger, Patria, 333) referring to this passage of the SynChron, and identifying him with a certain Basil mentioned in the Patria, but no other information or references are forthcoming; Ross, ”Basil the Proedros”, 271-5, does not contain any references to this church either.
Death of Theophylactos – Patriarch Polyeuktos (152.29-153.2)

Parallel passages: Pseudo-Symeon, 755.1-4, Theoph. Cont., 444.14-20, Kedr., 2.332.4-7, 334.3-5, Skylitz., 242.47-51, 244.89-93, Zon., 4.69.1-3, 69.26-8, Glyc., 562.14-6, 563.9-12, Joel, 58.3-7

Translation of the relics of St Gregory (153.3-12)

Other sources: Greg. Naz., Orat 42, 489.26-7, BHG 728, 171

Parallel passages: Pseudo-Symeon, 755.5-10, Joel, 58.7-9

The passage refers to the translation of the relics of St Gregory, which is described in detail in the panegyric (BHG 728\textsuperscript{312}); however, there is no indication that the author of the SynChron was familiar with that text. Other sources that refer to the event are the text of Pseudo-Symeon, who relates that part of the relics of St Gregory were put in the church of the Holy Apostles, and part in the church of St Anastasia, and Joel, who only includes a general comment on the translation of the relics, with no details on the place they were laid. Since the SynChron is more detailed than Pseudo-Symeon, we can assume that the source of the SynChron is not the text of the latter but another parallel text of the Epitome, closely related to Pseudo-Symeon, which was (additionally) not used by any of the other later authors, with the exception of Joel (who could have used either, since he does not provide any details, or a related intermediary source).

On a different note, the final comment of the author of the SynChron ("Καὶ ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥήθην ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ὅτε τῆς Πόλεως ἐξήρχετο ἐν τῷ συντακτημόνῳ προφητικὸν λόγιον: χαίρετε, Ἀπόστολοι, ἡ καλὴ μετοικεσία") (SynChron, 153.10-2)) presents an additional conundrum, since it is not present in any of the other texts. Its original source is the statement "χαίρετε ἀπόστολοι, ἡ καλὴ μετοικία" (Greg. Naz., Orat 42, 489.26-7) from the conclusion of the oration 42 of Gregory of Nazianzus, delivered on the occasion of the Second Ecumenical Council. The statement is echoed in BHG 728, 171,\textsuperscript{313} but since the language of the SynChron is

\textsuperscript{312} First edited in the Acta Sanctorum Maii II: "Εγκομιον εις τον επανοδον του τιμου λειπανου του εν θεολογια ηπειρεπτησαντο πατρος ημον Γρηγοριου".

\textsuperscript{313} Flusin, "Le Panégyrique de Constantin VII Porphyrogénète pour la translation des reliques de Grégoire le Théologien (BHG 728)", 18.
closer to the speech of Gregory than the later panegyric, we can assume that that was
the original source (albeit an indirect one). Finally, it is noteworthy that the passage is
missing from the Synopsis Lambros (we find only the first part of the passage in a
marginal note in the manuscript), which suggests that it was an addition of the author
of the SynChron to their common archetype.

Birth of Basil (153.13-5)
Parallel passages: Pseudo-Symeon, 755.20-2, Manass., 5559-61

Death of the emperor Constantine (153.15-6)
Cont., 468.23-469.4, Manass., 5562-3

Romanos (II) (153.17-154.17)

Romanos' family (153.18-21)
The SynChron and the Synopsis Lambros (511.17-8) are the only texts which relate
that Zoe, Theodora, Agathe, Theophano and Anna were the daughters of Romanos II
(in fact, they were the daughters of Constantine Porphyrogenitus).314

Nikephoros Phokas in Crete (153.22-5)
Parallel passages: Pseudo-Symeon, 758.11-4, 759.9-11, Theoph. Cont., 473.18-20,
Leo Deac., 7.10-5, Kedr., 2.340.1-6, Skylitz., 249.24-9, Zon., 4.72.22-5, Manass.,
5568-79, Glyc., 565.6-12, Ephr., Chron., 2762-8

Successes of John Tzimiskes (153.26-30)
No other text mentions Tzimiskes in the same context, in Romanos' reign.

Parakoimomenos Joseph – Romanos' leisure activities (153.31-154.4)
Other sources: Pseudo-Symeon, 757.8-11, 758.2-3, Theoph. Cont., 469.17-470.1,
472.7-8, Skylitz., 248.5-9
564.15-7, Ephr., Chron., 2755-61

Nikephoros' triumph (154.5-13)
Parallel passages: Pseudo-Symeon, 759.20-3, 760.1-2, 760.6-8, Leo Deac., 28.12-5, Manass., 5580-1, Glyc., 566.17-21

In other authors (Kedr., 2.345.15-20, Skylitz., 254.48ff, Zon., 4.74.23ff), Nikephoros' triumph takes place after Romanos' death, during Theophano's reign.

Death of Romanos (154.14-7)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.345.1, 345.4-6, Zon., 4.14.17-23, Manass., 5591-4, Glyc., 567.2-5

Theophano (154.18-155.13)

Nikephoros becomes General of the East (154.18-24)
Other source: Manass., 5595-600

Joseph's letter to Tzimiskes (154.25-155.2)
Other source: Manass., 5604-14
Parallel passages: Leo Deac., 37.23-38.20, Kedr., 2.347.12-348.4, Skylitz., 256.86-5, Zon., 4.75.24-76.9, Glyc., 567.21-568.1

Tzimiskes and Nikephoros in Chalcedon – Nikephoros proclaimed emperor (155.2-12)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.348.8-11, Skylitz., 256.8-10, Zon., 4.476.13-4, Glyc., 568.1-5, Ephr., Chron., 2771-3

Nikephoros (II) Phokas (155.14-156.19)

Nikephoros' father and brother honoured (155.13-7)

Nikephoros and Theophano (155.16-7)
Campaigns and successes of Nikephoros (155.17-24)
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 105.90-5, Leo Deac., 75.1-6, Skylitz., 271.64-70, Manass., 5674-82, Glyc., 569.17-8, 570.1-7, Ephr., Chron., 2774-7

Tzimiskes' confinement – His coup and the murder of Nikephoros (155.25-156.15)
Other sources: Manass., 5736-52, 5767-73, 5779-81
Parallel passages: Psell., Hist. Synt., 105.36-72, Kedr., 2.375.7-376.14, Skylitz., 279.87-280.18, Zon., 4.89.21-8, 90.62-9, Glyc., 572.14-573.9, Joel, 59.2-4, Ephr., Chron., 2812-23

Chronological summary (156.16-9)
Parallel passages: Schreiner, 15.3-4, Leo Deac., 93.4-8, Kedr., 2.348.8-11, 351.5-6, Skylitz., 279.95-6, Eklog. Histor. (Wirth), 22.10-5.

The SynChron puts the ascension of John Tzimiskes to the imperial throne in the month January, 13th indiction, year 6478. In Schreiner, 15.4, Skylitz., 279.95-6, Eklog. Histor. (Wirth), 22.13-5, the chronological information is the same, with the exception of the month: they relate that it took place in December.  

John Tzimiskes (156.20-157.15)

Confinement of Theophano (156.20-4)
Parallel passages: Leo Deac., 99.4-6, Kedr., 2.380.17-9, Skylitz., 285.34-5, Zon., 4.92.18-20, 92.24-6, Joel, 59.10-2

Death of Polyeuktos – Patriarch Basil (156.25-7)
Parallel passages: Leo Deac., 101.10-6, 102.14-21, Kedr., 2.382.10-3, Skylitz., 286.64-287.69, Zon., 4.93.4-9, Joel, 59.13-7

315 Similar confusion concerns the reference to the coronation of Nikephoros Phokas, however it can be explained by the fact that Nikephoros was proclaimed emperor in July (as mentioned in the SynChron and Kedrenos), but crowned in St Sophia in August.
Basil exiled – Patriarch Anthony (156.27-9)
Parallel passages: Leo Deac., 164.6-8, Kedr., 2.414.3-6, Skylitz., 311.81-3, Zon., 4.102.26-30, Joel, 59.16-7

John Tzimiskes' character and actions (156.30-157.12)
Parallel passages: Manass., 5618-33, 5811-22, Ephr., Chron., 2828-35

Building of the Church of the Saviour (157.13)
Parallel passages: Leo Deac., 128.4-129.2, 178.15-6, Kedr., 2.413.20-3, Skylitz., 311.74-5, Zon., 4.102.25-6, Glyc., 574.11-2, Ephr., Chron., 2877-8, Patr. Const., 282.11-4

Death of the emperor Tzimiskes (157.13-5)

Basil (II) and Constantine (VIII) (157.16-159.9)

The military way of life of Basil (157.18-31)

Failed revolts (158.1-18)
Parallel passage: Manass., 5857-63, 5875-6

Total defeat of the Bulgarians (158.19-23)

Death of Anthony – Patriarch Nicholas (158.24-6)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.434.15-8, Skylitz., 328.53-6, Zon., 4.110.8-13

---

316 Manasses' first description of Tzimiskes (5618-33) is found within Theophano's reign, however the treatment is similar to the passage of the SynChron, hence its position in the parallel passages.
Building of the monastery Smilakia in Olympos (158.26-7)

Although the sequence of the patriarchs is also present in the Synopsis Lambros, the reference to the monastery is omitted (or was not present in the archetype). We were not able to identify any other references to this monastery.

Death of Nicholas – Patriarch Sisinios (158.27-9)

Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.448.21-3, Skylitz., 340.4-341.8, Zon., 4.117.31-118.3, Joel, 60.3-6

Death of Sisinios – Patriarch Sergios (158.29-159.1)

Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.449.2-5, Skylitz., 341.10-2, Zon., 4.118.3-6, Joel, 60.6-10

Death of Sergios – Patriarch Eustathios (159.1-3)

Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.475.22-476.3, Skylitz., 365.3-7, Zon., 4.124.4-8, Joel, 60.10-2

Death of Eustathios – Patriarch Alexios (159.3-5)

Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.11-480.1, Skylitz., 368.84-7, 368.11-369.12, Zon., 4.124.32-125.7, Glyc., 579.13-4, Joel, 60.15-8

Death and burial of Basil (159.6-9)\textsuperscript{317}

Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.480.4-8, Skylitz., 369.15-9, Glyc., 579.11-3, Joel, 60.18-9

Constantine (VIII) (159.10-8)

Constantine's family (159.10-2)

On Constantine's character and actions (159.12-5)

Other source: Psell., Chron., 2.2.2-16 (?)\textsuperscript{318}


\textsuperscript{317} Stephenson, The legend of Basil, 50 n.4.

\textsuperscript{318} See p. 263.
Romanos appointed emperor (159.15-8)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 484.15-8, 484.22-485.3, 485.15-20, Skylitz., 373.15-8, 374.22-6, 374.38-41, Zon., 4.127.13-29, 128.9-13, Manass., 5963-70, Glyc., 580.5-9, 580.18-9, Joel, 60.23-61.1, Ephr., Chron., 2948-54

Romanos (III) Argyropoulos (159.19-29)

Romanos and the monks: Holy Anthony (159.21-6)
Other source: Manass., 5972-3 (?)319

Building of the monastery of Peribleptos (159.26-8)

Death and burial of Romanos (159.28-9)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.505.24-506.1, Skylitz., 392.10-1, Glyc., 585.19-20, Joel, 61.22-3

Michael (IV) Paphlagon – Zoe – Theodora (159.30-161.15)

Michael's accession to the throne (160.1-7)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.504.2-505.1, Skylitz., 390.79-82, Zon., 4.134.12-4, 136.13-5, Manass., 5976-90, Glyc., 584.18-585.4, Joel, 61.15-6, Ephr., Chron., 3007-21

Michael's character (160.7-9)
Parallel passage: Manass., 6001-9

Michael's sickness (160.10-2)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.507.25-508.4, Psell., Chron., 4.18, Zon., 1.137.30-138.2

Michael's beneficial actions towards churches and monasteries (160.12-26)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 4.513.3-7, Skylitz., 397.64-8, Psell., Chron., 4.31.1-5, Zon., 4.143.32-144.1, Glyc., 587.15-7, Ephr., Chron., 3056-63

319 Manasses is a possible parallel source for SynChron, 159.22, since he uses the same adjectives as the SynChron to describe Romanos (σοφὸς, θεοσεβῆ), but without any references to monks.
John Orphanotrophos (160.27-161.3)

Other benefactions of Michael (161.3-6)
Parallel passage: Psell., Chron., 4.36.1-8

John arranges Michael's succession (161.6-10)
Parallel passages: Psell., Chron., 5.1-2, Zon., 4.144.3-17, Manass., 6045-50

The deterioration of Michael's health – His tonsure and death (161.11-5)

Michael (V) Kalaphates (161.16-162.19)

Overview of Michael's reign (161.16-20)
Parallel passage: Manass., 6069-73

John Orphanotrophos removed from power (161.20-2)

Theodora and Zoe removed from power and exiled (161.22-6)

Revolt against the emperor (161.26-162.13)
Constantine Monomachos recalled from exile (162.14-20)
Other source: Manass., 6132-42, 6152-3
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.542.2-8, Skylitz., 423.33-8, Psell., Chron., 6.18, Attal., 18.4-8, Zon., 4.156.7-11, 20-4, Glyc., 593.6-8, Joel, 63.2-6, Ephr., Chron., 3101-3

Constantine (IX) Monomachos (162.20-163.10)

General comments on Constantine (162.20-3)320
Parallel passages: Attal., 18.11-3, Glyc., 593.18-20

Building of the Mangana monastery (162.24-5)

Death of Alexios – Patriarch Michael (162.26-9)
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.550.6-9, Skylitz., 429.18-21, Zon., 4.162.22-5, Glyc., 595.3-5, Joel, 63.7-10

Constantine's sickness (162.30-163.1)
Parallel passages: Attal., 35.5-8, Zon., 4.179.22-7, Manass., 6186-9, Glyc., 594.13-5

Failed revolts (163.1-2)
Parallel passage: Psell., Chron., 6.166.1-3

Death and burial of Zoe (163.3-5)

320 The comment of the SynChron concerning Constantine's generosity towards the comedians presents remarkable similarities with a comment of the historian Nicolaos on the Roman General Sulla:

Νικόλαος δ' ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ καὶ ἑκατοστῇ τῶν ἱστοριῶν (FHG III 416) Σύλλαν φησὶ τὸν Ῥωμαίων στρατηγὸν οὕτω χαίρειν μίμοις καὶ γελωτοποιοῖς φιλόγελων γενόμενον, ὡς καὶ πολλὰ γῆς μέτρα αὐτοῖς χαρίζεσθαι τῆς δημοσίας. (Athenaeus, Deipnios., 6.78.12-6)
We could not find a source for the place of burial of Zoe (the church of Antiphonites); the passage is also missing from the Synopsis Lambros, a possible indication that the latter did not use the source of the SynChron in this case.

**Constantine's benefactions (163.6-8)**

**Death and burial of Constantine (163.8-10)**
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.610.17-20, Skylitz., 478.92-3, Zon., 4.181.13-8, Glyc., 599.9-10

**Theodora (163.11-8)**

**Theodora's reign (163.11-4)**
Other source: Attal., 51.21-52.7
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.611.1-2, Skylitz., 479.4-5, Zon., 4.179.19-25

**Michael appointed emperor (163.14-7)**
Other source: Attal., 52.11-4, 52.19-20
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.612.3-4, Skylitz., 480.31-3, Zon., 4.182.9-17, 182.24-5, Manass., 63.18-20, Glyc., 599.20-2, Ephr., Chron., 3221-4

**The burial place of Theodora (163.17-8)**
Similarly to the previous notes on place of burials, we could not find a text that refers to the place of burial of Theodora (the monastery Oikoproasteia), missing from the Synopsis Lambros, which, however, mentions that she was buried in the monastery built by her, without mentioning its name (Syn. L., 534.2-4).

**Michael (VI) Geron (163.19-164.18)**

**Administration during Michael's reign (163.19-23)**
Parallel passages: Kedr., 2.612.10-3, Skylitz., 480.37-40, Manass., 6247-52

**Isaakios Komnenos’ coup (163.24-164.6)**
Parallel passage: Zon., 4.187.4-7
Civil war (164.7-17)
Other sources: Zon., 4.188.3-6 (?), Manass., 6277-85, 6286-92

Issakios’ entry to Constantinople (164.17-8)
Parallel passage: Psell., Chron., 7.40.1-6

Issaakios Komnenos (164.19-165.12)

Issaakios' family and actions (164.19-22)
Parallel passages: Joel, 64.1-2

Dispute between Issaakios and the patriarch Michael - Expulsion of Michael – Patriarch Constantine (164.23-165.5)
Parallel passages: Psell., Chron., 7.65.1-7, Skylitz. Cont., 644.5-11, 644.18-23, Attal., 63.15-8, 66.12-6, Zon., 4.193.15-32, 194.15-9, Glyc., 601.8-10, 601.16-8, 602.4-6, Joel, 64.2-3321

Michael's death and burial (165.5-8)
Parallel passage: Skylitz. Cont., 644.12-4

Death and burial of Isaakios – Constantine appointed emperor (165.9-13)
Parallel passages: Psell., Chron., 7.9, 7.13 (Issaakios), Skylitz. Cont., 647.8-648.10, Attal., 69.3-14, Zon., 4.196.26-32, Bryenn., Hist., 83.11-7, Glyc., 603.7-11, Joel, 64.6-9, 64.15-6, Ephr., Chron., 3287-93

Constantine (X) Doukas (165.13-166.29)

Constantine's family (165.13-7)
Parallel passages: Skylitz. Cont., 659.10-4, Zon., 4.201.25-31, Glyc., 606.21-607.2, Joel, 64.22-65.1

---

321 We were not able to identify a source or a parallel passage for the phrase “ἐφ’ ὁ καὶ εγκώμιον καὶ ψόγον ὁ Ψελλὸς συνέθετο” (134.24-5). The passage is missing from the Synopsis Lambros (whose account on Isaakios' Komnenos is mainly the same as the SynChron), which suggests that it was not part of the common archetype, but was inserted by the author of the SynChron.
Death of Constantine –Patriarch John Xiphilinos – Background of Xiphilinos (165.18-166.7)

Decorations and buildings commissioned by Xiphilinos (166.7-21)

Xiphilinos and the poor (166.21-6)
Parallel passage: Psell., Chron., 452.13-6

Death and burial of Constantine (166.27-9)
Other sources: Attal., 92.4-10 (?), Glyc., 606.18-20 (?), Joel, 64.20-4 (?)
Parallel passages: Zon., 4.201.21-5

Eudokia (166.30-167.14)

Caesar John excluded from power (166.30-167.3)

Romanos Diogenes' coup (167.3-9)
Other source: Georg. Monk (PG), 1240.19-23 (?)
Parallel passages: Skylitz. Cont., 664.1-17, Zon., 4.204.3-9, Glyc., 607.12-5

Eudokia proclaims Romanos emperor (167.9-14)
Other source: Georg. Monk (PG), 1240.23-30
Parallel passages: Skylitz. Cont., 665.10-3, 666.11-8, Zon., 4.204.20-9, 205.24-32, Manass., 6376-84, Glyc., 608.10-2, Joel, 65.11-2, Ephr., Chron., 3364-7

Romanos (IV) Diogenes (167.15-168.17)

Romanos and co-emperors (167.15-9)
Main source: Chron. Epit., 32.9-13
Battles and defeats by the Turks (167.20-6)

Romanos' sons – Andronikos named co-emperor (167.27-30)

Romanos' attitudes (167.30-168.1)
Other source: Georg. Monk (PG), 1241.10-5
Parallel passage: Zon., 4.206.1-3, 206.8-10

Romanos' capture and his fall from power (168.1-8)

Michael's coup (168.9-17)
Parallel passages: Attal., 168.20-169.9, Georg. Monk (PG), 1245.28-43, Zon., 4.217.4-12, Bryenn., Hist., 125.6-11, Manass., 6515-20, Komn., Alex., 9.6.1.9-13, Glyc., 611.16-20

The title of the place of exile of Eudokia could indicate an indirect link between the Alexias and the SynChron: Anna writes "εἶς τὴν μονὴν τοῦ Κυπερούδη", and so does the SynChron ("Κυπερούδη"), whereas Attaleiates writes "Πιπερούδη" and Skylitzes Continuatus "Πιπερούς" (Tsolakis: "Πιπερούδιον" (152.19)).

Michael (VII) (168.18-170.30)

Michael's family (168.18-21)

Capture and blinding of Romanos Diogenes (168.22-6)

Death of John – Patriarch Kosmas (168.27-31)
Parallel passages: Skylitz. Cont., 731.12-8, Zon., 4.226.10-6, Joel, 65.17-20

Defeats in the east (169.1-7)
Parallel passage: Georg. Monk (PG), 1248.18-22
Nikephoros Botaneiates (169.7-28)

Botaneiates' letter (169.28-170.14)
Parallel passages: Georg. Monk (PG), 1248.38-42, Manass., 6561-4

The Syn Chron cites the contents of the letter of Botaneiates (in the first person); we were not able to find any texts that carry the letter, which is also missing from the Synopsis Lambros.

Michael's abdication – Botaneiates proclaimed emperor (170.15-30)

Nikephoros (III) Botaneiates (170.31-173.8)

First actions of Botaneiates; Maria and Michael (170.31-171.4)

Offices given unreservedly (171.4-172.9)
Parallel passages: Attal., 274.8-22, 275.22-276.15, Georg. Monk (PG), 1252.36-48, Manass., 6595-605, Glyc., 618.3-5

Botaneiates' idle life (172.10-25)
Parallel passages: Georg. Monk (PG), 1252.18-20, 1252.25-34, Zon., 4.231.6-17, Manass., 6574-85, Glyc., 618.5-9, Ephr., Chron., 3447-51

Isaakios and Alexios' coup (172.25-173.6)
Parallel passages: Zon., 4.232.13-27, 232.31-233.3, Glyc., 618.9-12, Georg. Monk (PG), 1257.22-34, 1257.41-6, Ephr., Chron., 3470-7

322 Mauromate-Katsouiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 308-9 hypothesises that Glykas used the archetype of the Syn Chron as his source for this part. However, although there are some similarities in the passage that relates the entrance of the insurgents to Constantinople, we do not think that there is sufficient evidence to confirm the suggestion.
Botaneiates' tonsure and death (173.2-8)

Chapter Four: The sources – Analysis

The Synopsis Lambros

We have already had a preliminary discussion on the connection between the SynChron and the chronicle in Ath. 3758, when addressing the issue of the authorship of the SynChron. In this section, we shall examine the texts themselves and compare their similarities and differences, in order to try to define the relationship between them and their respective place in the Byzantine chronicle tradition.

Ath. 3758 carries the text in two different places. Between folios 610r and 611v, there is a short chronicle covering the events and the lives of the biblical patriarchs from Adam up to Rehoboam, which is the same as the first few pages of the SynChron (3.1-10.31), with a few minor differences. If we were to reach a conclusion based only on this passage, it would be natural to assume that it is a mere copy of the first pages of the SynChron. However, at the end of the text, the scribe notes: "Τυρησε ὅπισθεν εἰς τὸν χρονογράφο καὶ ἰδὲς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς χρονογραφίας", pointing the reader to the text that lies on folios 543v -607v of the manuscript, which is an extended chronicle covering the same period as the SynChron (creation of the world – recapture of Constantinople by the Byzantines in 1261). The above sentence suggests that the scribe considers the extended version to be the same as the abridged text (Syn. L., a-r). Indeed, the short chronicle is the spine of the extended version, albeit with numerous and prolonged additions, and the same applies to the SynChron; that is to say, the SynChron and the Synopsis Lambros have striking similarities and share numerous common sections and passages. On the other hand, there are a great number of differences between them, which raise the question whether the Synopsis Lambros is a different text, by a different author.
The majority of the few scholars who were familiar with the text and its characteristics accepted the statement of the scribe that they are two distinct texts. In addition to Lambros, who prepared a separate critical edition, J.B. Bury shared his opinion that an edition of the chronicle in *Ath. 3758* was necessary, notwithstanding its close relationship to the text of the *SynChron*, and agreed to include the text in the collection of Byzantine authors published by Methuen; this is confirmed by several notes and letters in the relevant folder in the Lambros Archive. On the other hand, Heisenberg based his arguments about the authorship of the *SynChron* on a note of *Ath. 3758*, which identified Theodore of Kyzikos as the author of the text. As a result, we can assume that he considered the texts of *Vat. Gr. 407* and of *Ath. 3758* as one and the same chronicle. However, his assumption is solely based on Lambros' catalogue of the manuscripts of Mount Athos and there is no indication or reference that would suggest that Heisenberg had consulted the actual chronicle of the Athonite manuscript. Kazhdan does not seem to be aware of the differences of the two texts and focuses his criticism on the unreliability of the scribe of the Athonite manuscript. Finally, Krumbacher distinguishes between the two texts and provides separate entries for each one; however, he seems intrigued by their similarities and poses the question if the *Synopsis Lambros* is a mere adaptation of the *SynChron*. Ultimately, these opinions were not based on a comprehensive study of the similarities and differences of the two texts and unfortunately Lambros, the only scholar who studied both texts comprehensively, does not seem to have left an introduction to his critical edition, in which we would expect a more thorough discussion of the issue. As a result, we will attempt an initial approach to the

323 The unpublished edition (along with the relevant correspondence with the editors) is now in the *Lambros Archive*, in the library of the Department of History of the University of Athens; see Euaggelatou-Notara, "Katalographesis", 267.

324 Charitakis, "Spyridonos P. Lambrou - Ta meta thanaton eurethenta", 205.


326 See pp. 24ff, where we discuss the issue of the authorship of the text.


329 Kazhdan, "Excerpty Skilicy", 530.

330 Krumbacher and Soteriades, *Historia*, 788-92. Also see Runciman, *Romanus Lecapenus*, 3 n.1, who distinguishes between the similar texts but does not discuss the matter any further.

331 Krumbacher and Soteriades, *Historia*, 791.
relationship between the SynChron and the Synopsis Lambros; a more extensive analysis should be part of a new edition of the text(s).

The main similarity between the two texts is that they share the same structure. They both start from Adam and follow the sequence of the biblical patriarchs, judges and kings up to Cleopatra and Julius Caesar; then they both turn back to Aeneas and his successors, followed by the series of the Roman emperors, which concludes with Michael Palaiologos and the recapture of Constantinople by the Byzantines in 1261. It is noteworthy that in the vast majority of the cases, the passages that advance the narrative (usually the reference of the name of the ruler along with the duration of the reign) are common in both texts. Additionally, there are numerous common passages between the two texts, which show their close relationship. It would be impossible to cite them all, however we provide below some examples, and a table that outlines the point; more common passages are discussed in the analysis of other parts of the text.

A passage that demonstrates that they are closely linked can be found in SynChron, 5.24 / Syn. L., 9.21, where both texts write that the time between the creation of the world and the flood was 2042 years. The SynChron and the Synopsis Lambros are the only sources that convey this number, probably following an earlier mistake by a scribe (since in other instances they transcribe 2242 years, the number that is commonly accepted by the Byzantine chroniclers). However, they both carry the inaccurate number, which suggests that either the one was based on the other, or that they both derive from the same source. The passage on the building of the church of Holy Apostles in honour of Theophano under Leo VI and its identification with the church of Hagioi Pantes, which is unique to the two texts (SynChron, 146.14-7 / Syn. L., 499.10-6), has the same effect, and so does the passage with the erroneous information about the family of Romanos II (SynChron, 153.18-21).

The passages that deal with the reign of Diocletian are a good example to show that although there are strong similarities between the two texts, it would not be possible to regard them as mere variations of the same text. Immediately after the introduction

332 With the exception of the Patria, however our focus here is on historiographical texts. See p. 164.
333 See p. 172.
of the passage with the name of the emperor, the Synopsis Lambros includes the following:

"ὅς Δαλμάτης ἦν τὸ γένος ἐκ γονέων ἀσήμων· τινὲς δὲ ἀπελεύθερον αὐτὸν φασίν Ἀνουλίνου συγκλητικοῦ· εἷς εὐτελῶν στρατιωτῶν δοὺς Μυσίας ἐγένετο. Ἀλλοι δὲ κόμητα αὐτὸν φασιν δομεστικοὺς δὲ τίνες τοὺς ἵππεας νομίζουσι. (Syn. L., 306.6-13)

Then, both accounts are the same, up to "χριστιανῶν" (SynChron, 41.1), after which the Synopsis Lambros adds:

"τῶν πρὶν γεγονότων ἀπάντων σφοδρότερον καὶ χαλεπώτερον καὶ ἀγριώτερον· ἐκθύμως γὰρ ἢ μᾶλλον περίμανός τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐσπεύδεν ἐκ πάσης γῆς ἐξαλείψαι σωτήριον ὄνομα, ὅτε κατὰ πᾶσαν πάλιν καὶ χάοςαν τοσοῦτοι μάρτυρες ἐγένοντο, ὡς ἤδη μοι εἴρηται, καὶ αὐτὸς τούτῳ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα Θεοδώραν κατεγγυήσας. (Syn. L., 306.18-307.5)

This is followed by this passage, in the place of the subsequent passage of the SynChron:

"Οὗτοι καίσαρας ἐχειροτόνησαν τοὺς ἑαυτῶν κηδεστὰς, ὁ μὲν Διοκλητιανὸς Μαξαμῖνον τὸν Γαλλέριον, τὴν οἰκείαν θυγατέρα συζεύξας αὐτῷ Βαλλερίαν, ὁ δὲ Ἑρκούλιος Μαξιμιανὸς Κώνσταντα, ὃς διὰ ὠχρότητα ἐπεκλήθη Χλωρὸς, θυγατριδοῦν ὄντα Κλαυδίου τοῦ πρὸ μιαροῦ βασιλεύσαντος, ὡς ἤδη μοι εἴρηται, καὶ αὐτὸς τούτῳ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα Θεοδώραν κατεγγυήσας. (Syn. L., 307.5-17)

"Οὗτοι ἀποδεικνύουσι καίσαρας ἄλλους πάλιν δύο, Διοκλητιανὸς μὲν Μαξιμιανόν τὸν Γαλλέριον, δοὺς αὐτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα Βαλλερίαν, ὁ δὲ Ἑρκούλιος δὲ Μαξιμιανὸν Κώνσταντα τὸν Χλωρὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τής θυγατρὸς τοῦ προβεβασιλευκότος Κλαυδίου, ποιήσας αὐτὸν καὶ γαμβρὸν ἐπὶ τῇ ἰδίᾳ θυγατρὶ Θεοδώρᾳ. (SynChron, 41.1-6)

Likewise, the passage SynChron, 41.6-13 is the same in both texts; however the Synopsis Lambros omits the passage "ἐπὶ πλέον ... κατέστρεψαν"(SynChron, 41.13-4) but concludes the reign with an extensive passage of additional information (308.6-310.8), which is not part of the account in the SynChron.

In much the same way, the following passages from the end of the reign of Constantine demonstrate that they are two independent texts, but with a strong yet complex connection. They share common passages and expressions; however the
description of the actual connection between them proves to be a problematical task, which we attempt to resolve below.

Finally, the parts up to the reign of Constantine (SynChron, 3.1-53.17, Syn. L., a-r, 1.1-333.10)\(^3\) provide an overview of the differences between the two texts, mainly their respective additions and omissions. In the following table we outline the common passages (we note both in the same line), the additional passages (we note the passage without a corresponding passage from the other text) and the passages that convey the same content with different form and language (in parentheses).

\(^3\) Thereafter, the comparison could not have been as straightforward as in this part, especially as far as additional information is concerned, because it is more common for the two texts to relate the events in a different manner. We include examples of different accounts in other parts of our analysis.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.18-22</td>
<td>266.9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.23</td>
<td>266.11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.24-6</td>
<td>266.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266.20-268.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.26-29.1</td>
<td>269.1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29.1-3)</td>
<td>269.5-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.3-8</td>
<td>(269.12-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.9-29</td>
<td>269.15-273.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.29-30.7</td>
<td>273.6-274.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>274.15-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.7-14</td>
<td>274.19-275.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>275.11-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.14-31.2</td>
<td>275.18-276.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>276.7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.3-9</td>
<td>276.9-277.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>277.19-278.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.9-12</td>
<td>278.14-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.12-4</td>
<td>278.25-280.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.14-32.15</td>
<td>280.2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.15-7</td>
<td>280.9-282.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.18-23</td>
<td>282.19-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283.1-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283.4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283.14-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.24-33.2</td>
<td>283.14-284.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284.8-285.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.2-10</td>
<td>286.1-287.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.10-33.29</td>
<td>287.10-289.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.29-34.31</td>
<td>289.6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.31</td>
<td>289.8-290.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1-4 &amp; 35.8-18</td>
<td>290.8-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.6-8</td>
<td>35.25-36.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.19-25</td>
<td>290.20-291.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.10-37.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.22-25</td>
<td>291.12-294.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.17-22</td>
<td>294.2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.23-30</td>
<td>294.6-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>294.19-297.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.31-38.8</td>
<td>297.16-298.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>298.6-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.9-14</td>
<td>298.18-299.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299.7-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above tables, it becomes evident that there are more additional passages in the *Synopsis Lambros* than in the *SynChron*, which can suggest that the author of the former used the *SynChron* as his prototype and added extra material from other texts. However, this is not definitely the case, as the type of the additions suggest. More specifically, some of the above additions are synchronisations or additional information added at the end of the description of the reign or tenure, concerning famous people that lived during that time or significant contemporary events. For example: "Ἐπὶ μὲντι Δεβώρας καὶ Βαρὰχ Προμηθεὺς καὶ Ὀρφεὺς ὁ Θρᾴς ἐγνωρίζοντο οἱ παρ' Ἑλλησοφῶτατοι, καὶ Ἀσκληπιός ὁ ἱατρὸς καὶ Λυκοῦργος ὁ νομοθέτης." (*Syn. L.*, 124.9-13), "Ἐν τούτοις Ὀρφεὺς ἐγνωρίζετο." (*Syn. L.*, 126.4-6), "Τότε καὶ Κλήμης ὁ Στρωματεύς ἐγνωρίζετο." (*Syn. L.*, 283.14-15), "Ἐπὶ τοῦτοι καὶ Φίλων ὁ σοφὸς καὶ Ἰωσηπὸς ἤκμαζον." (*Syn. L.*, 266.9-10). This practice is also used frequently in the *SynChron*, and in many of these cases, the information is present in both texts. For example: "Κατὰ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους ἡ Σιβύλλα ἐν Δελφοῖς ἐχρησμολογεῖ." (*SynChron*, 9.22-3 / *Syn. L.*, 126.18-20), the
Trojan war and Homer "Ἐπὶ τούτου συνέστη ὁ τρωικὸς πόλεμος καὶ ἡ Ἰλίως ἔδιω. [...] Ἐπὶ τούτου ἦν Ὡμήρος. (SynChron, 9.28-9, 9.31 / Syn. L., 146.21-3), "Ἐπὶ τούτου λόγος ἀκμάσαι καὶ Πυθαγόρας τὸν Σάμιον" (SynChron, 16.21-2 / Syn. L., 230.23-231.1), "Ἐπὶ τούτου Δημόκριτος ὁ Αὐθηναῖος καὶ Σωκράτης ὁ Ἀθηναῖος, καὶ Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἠκμαύε καὶ Ξενοφῶν" (SynChron, 17.17-8 / Syn. L., 232.10-3) "Ἐπὶ τούτου Πιλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἠκμαύε καὶ Ξενοφῶν" (SynChron, 17.20 / Syn. L., 233.15-7). Hence, we put forward the suggestion that the two texts followed a common archetype and the author of the *Synopsis Lambros* did not add the extra information, but the author of the *SynChron* chose to omit them from the text. In order to test this assumption, we should also examine the information that is present in the *SynChron* but missing from the *Synopsis Lambros*, as well as the cases where the two texts render common events in a different manner.

First, the hypothesis that the *Synopsis Lambros* (or an earlier version) was the prototype of the *SynChron* is contradicted by various passages of the two texts. A clear example can be found in the section that concludes the reign of the Ptolemies and begins the reign of Julius Caesar. More specifically, although the phrase "τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας αὐτῆς κατελύθη ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἡ ὑπατεία, καὶ γέγονεν αὐθενσιος μοναρχία, Γαίου Ἰουλίου Καίσαρος πρῶτον τὴν ἀρχὴν περιθεμένου [...]." (SynChron, 19.8-11) is also present in the *Synopsis Lambros*, it is divided into two parts. After μοναρχία, the author of the *Synopsis Lambros* chooses to insert a long passage relating events of the reigns of the Antiochi (Syn. L., 243.21-245.7), drawn from Glykas, and then he uses the second part of the sentence (Syn. L., 245.7-10), although there is no verb for the main sentence of his phrase. As a result, we can safely assume that the passage of the *Synopsis Lambros* could not have been the source of the *SynChron*. A similar example can be found in the account of the reign of Michael IV. The *SynChron* has a brief passage referring to John the Orphanotrophos (SynChron, 160.31-161.6), which is omitted in the *Synopsis Lambros*. The latter, however, continues with a phrase that starts with οὗτος (referring to Orphanotrophos) (Syn. L., 534.22-535.7 / SynChron, 161.6-10). The whole passage could have been part of a common source of the two texts, but its absence from the *Synopsis Lambros* makes it impossible for it to be the source of the *SynChron*. 
We cite elsewhere the sources and parallel passages concerning judge Eli and the events that took place during his tenure, which illustrate the connection between the Synopsis Lambros and the SynChron, in relation to the rest of the tradition. It is significant for the current discussion that the Synopsis Lambros does not carry SynChron's reference to the capture of the ark, which is present in the common indirect sources, and the same applies to the passage referring to the recapture of the ark in the following entry. Hence, the Synopsis Lambros could not have been the source of the SynChron; it is more plausible that its author omitted the two references in order to incorporate a longer passage on the subject, which he duly did in 147.7-150.13, drawing from Glyc., 321.18-323.17. In Figure 1 we show our suggestion for the relationships between the texts, based on the passages in the table.

In a passage on the reign of Cambyses, we read the sentence "Οὗτος καὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον προσελάβετο πονηρός δὲ ὄν ἀπείργει τοὺς Ἑβραίους τῆς οἰκοδομῆς, ὅτε καὶ τὰ κατὰ Ιουδίθ καὶ Ὀλοφέρνην ἐγένετο" (SynChron, 16.20-1). The passage is also included in the Synopsis Lambros, with the last part of the sentence ("ὁτε … ἐγένετο") missing. Since the phrase is also present in the original source of the two texts (Chron. Epit., 18.34-5, and also in Anon. Matr., 30.6-7, and Georg. Monk, 276.6-7), the hypothesis that the Synopsis Lambros could have been the prototype of the SynChron does not seem to stand.

Later in the relation of the same reign, after the word λευίται (SynChron, 16.29) the Synopsis Lambros adds χιλιάδες, probably because the author thought that his source forgot to include it. However, if we go to the original source, the Synopsis Scripturae Sacra, the text reads "καὶ οἱ Λευίται πάντες ὁμοῦ τὸν ἀριθμὸν μυριάδες τέσσαρες καὶ δισχίλιοι καὶ τριακόσιοι καὶ ἑξήκοντα" (Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacr., 28.329.44-6). It seems that the author of the SynChron omitted the word μυριάδες in order to avoid repetition. Consequently, we can deduce that it would not have been possible for the

335 P. 42.
336 Additionally, the SynChron is the only text that uses the form Ἡλὶ whereas the rest of the texts, the Synopsis Lambros included, write Ἡλει. However, this cannot be a conclusive clue, since it may have been a mistake by a scribe.
337 All the figures can be found at the end of the thesis.
Synopsis Lambros to be the source of the SynChron, although the opposite seems a plausible possibility. However, as we show in the following section, the study of various passages suggests that this cannot be the case either.

To start with, there are various passages of the SynChron which are not to be found in the Synopsis Lambros. Using them as a criterion in order to prove that the one is not the source of the other presents by itself an interesting methodological issue. Regardless of the number of the omissions identified, there is always the possibility that the omitted passages were excluded consciously by the compiler of the Synopsis Lambros. Nevertheless, as we show below, certain missing passages seem to present a particular pattern, which suggest that they were additions of the author of the SynChron to a previous text (the common archetype of the SynChron and Synopsis Lambros that we suggest) and not omissions made by the author of the Synopsis Lambros from the SynChron. More specifically, many of the missing passages derive consistently from the same text, or constantly refer to the same subject; as we show below, this suggests that they come from a text, to which the author of the Synopsis Lambros did not have access.

A recurring theme of the SynChron is the commissioning of churches and public buildings by emperors or other members of the imperial family, and the patriarchs. It is noteworthy, however, that a great number of those references are missing from the text of the Synopsis Lambros. It is unlikely that the author of the Synopsis Lambros is indifferent to this type of information, because such references are not always missing. For example, the Synopsis Lambros includes the commission of the Churches of the Virgin by Pulcheria (SynChron, 69.14-5 / Syn. L., 362.15-9). In this case, the difference from the absent passages that we are discussing below is that this does not seem to come from the same pool as the other entries, but from the common source with Glykas. Similarly, in the later part of the text, when the original source of the texts is different, the author of the Synopsis Lambros seems to include more such passages (for example, the building of the monastery of Peribleptos (Syn. L., 530.3-6) or the building of the monastery of Mangana (Syn. L., 540.3-7)). On the other hand, there are omissions of buildings which are not of any significant use to us

338 See our comments on the sources of 69.14-5.
on this issue; for example, the passages on the buildings and churches that were commissioned by the emperor Justin (SynChron, 101.14-24, 103.19-20) are absent from the Synopsis Lambros, however the whole reign of Justin in the latter is mainly based on Glykas, and as a result the omission of passages is to be expected.

Consequently, since the author of the Synopsis Lambros is not indifferent to this type of information, it would be plausible to assume that the following passages are missing from his account because he did not have access to the source material with the respective references. Before we examine further this hypothesis, the absent passages are the passages on the building activity in Byzantium during the time of Septimius Severus (SynChron, 33.2-10), the commissioning of numerous churches (amongst which the church of the Theotokos of the Pege) by Justinian (SynChron, 100.18-21), the buildings and decorations ordered by Tiberius (SynChron, 104.25-8), the beginning of the building of the church of the Forty Martyrs (SynChron, 105.3-4), the building of the triklinon palace by Justinian (SynChron, 114.31-115.2), the commissioning of the church of St Basil by parakoimomenos Basil (SynChron, 152.23-5), and the building of the monastery Smilakia on Olympos by the patriarch Nicholas (SynChron, 158.26-7). As the presentation of the sources of the above passages in the previous chapter shows, the 'building passages' are consistently parallel to passages from texts of the tradition of the Epitome. A plausible explanation for their absence from the Synopsis Lambros is that they derive from a text of the Epitome that has not survived, from which the author of the SynChron drew the relevant information that he inserted into his text.

The existence of such a text is supported further by the consistent absence of more passages that seem to originate from the Epitome. The Synopsis Lambros seem to lack the information about the burial places of the early Byzantine emperors. As we show elsewhere, these fragments - which are not common to other Byzantine chronicles - seem to derive from a different text from the family of the Epitome. The consistent absence of passages from a single text in the Synopsis Lambros offers further support to our assumption that they were not part of the common archetype.

339 See p. 258.
As far as information on burial places is concerned, we see a similar occurrence in the later part of the texts. More specifically, the burial place of the patriarch Alexios (a monastery built by him in Pera) (SynChron, 162.268) is missing from the Synopsis Lambros and the same applies to the places of burial of the empress Zoe (the church of Antiphonetes) (SynChron, 163.3-5), the empress Theodora (the monastery Oikoproasteia) (SynChron, 163.17-8), the patriarch Keroularios ("ὁ τοῦ πατρικίου ἤτοι τοῦ συγκέλλου λέγεται Θεοδοσίου") (SynChron, 165.7-8), and the emperor Constantine Monomachos (the monastery of Molivotos) (SynChron, 166.28-9).

However, as we mention in the relevant sections of chapter three, we are not able to identify a specific source for these passages, and, as a result, we cannot base our argument about the existence of an archetype solely on these passages. Having said that, the pattern of these omissions is similar to the rest of the omissions that we discuss here, which supports further the suggestion that the passages were not omitted by the author of the Synopsis Lambros; they were not part of his source.

The structure of the concluding passage of the reign of the Ptolemies that we discussed earlier suggests not only that the SynChron could not have derived from the Synopsis Lambros but also that the two texts originate from a separate archetype. The suggestion is based on the fact that the passages of the Synopsis Lambros containing additional information are integrated in the text in such a way that they can only be explained by the existence of a common archetype.

At the end of the reign of the emperor Valerian, the SynChron writes "Οὐαλεριανὸς δὲ ἀπατηθεὶς ὑπὸ Περσῶν, αἰχμάλωτος ἀπήχθη." (SynChron, 38.18-9). The sentence of the Synopsis Lambros is "Οὐαλεριανὸς δὲ ἀπατηθεὶς ὑπὸ Περσῶν, αἰχμάλωτος ἀπήχθη πρὸς Σαπώρην βασιλέα Περσῶν." (Syn. L., 299.19-20). It could be argued that the addition could have come from Zonaras (3.140.16-7); however both texts and Zonaras share the same source, which suggests that the 'Zonaras-common-source' was actually used by the author of the common archetype. Additionally, the fact that the addition actually concludes the sentence of the SynChron strengthens the idea that the passage was part of an original source and that

---

340 In Theodora’s case, the Synopsis Lambros mentions (534.2-4) that she was buried in the monastery built by her, but does not mention its name.
the addition was not carried into the account of the SynChron, especially since there are similar cases that point in the same direction. In the relation of the reign of Constantius Chlorus, we read the following sentence: "Κώνστας δὲ πολλὰ τρόπαια κατὰ Αλαμανῶν ἐνδείξαμενος καὶ ἄλλων ἑδινῶν, ἡσυχός τε ὢν καὶ πάντας εὐεργετῶν, θνήσκει, τὸν ἐξ Ἑλένης τῆς προτέρας αὐτοῦ γυναικὸς Κωνσταντίνον βασιλέα καταστημάμενος" (SynChron, 41.21-3). After θνήσκει the Synopsis Lambros writes: "ἐν Βρεττανίαις, πένθος ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν καταλελοιπῶς διὰ τὴν χρηστότητα, πρότερον τὸν πρεσβύτερον υἱὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς καταστήσας διάδοχον, τὸν μέγα δήλα δὴ Κωνσταντίνον, ὃν ἐκ τῆς προτέρας αὐτοῦ ἐγείνατο γαμετῆς, τῆς θείας Ἑλένης." (310.21-311.7), from Zonaras (3.167.8-14). The additional fragments of the Synopsis Lambros confirm that its source was not the SynChron but an earlier archetype. The similarities with Zonaras substantiate the connection between Zonaras and the archetype.

Another case which strongly substantiates the hypothesis for a common archetype is a passage from the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The case in point is the sentence "... Ρωμανός τις, ὃ Λεκαπηνὸς τὸ ἐπώνυμον, δρουγγάριος ὡν τῶν πλωίων τιμᾶται καίσαρ, εἶτα καὶ βασιλεὺς ἀναγορεύεται, καὶ τοὺς τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐκτελεῖ γάμους, συζεύξας αὐτὴν τῷ βασιλεῖ Κωνσταντίνῳ· μεθ’ ἥς τίκτει υἱόν, ὃν ὠνόμασας Ρωμανόν." (Syn. L., 503.13-20), which is also present in the SynChron; in that case, however, it is divided into two parts (SynChron, 148.7-9, 149.15), between which the author of the SynChron inserts a long passage with the information about the background of Romanos Lekapenos and the circumstances that led to his ascension to the imperial throne (SynChron, 148.9-149.15). This could not have been possible if the SynChron was the source of the Synopsis Lambros; since we have already rejected the possibility that the Synopsis Lambros is the source of the SynChron, the only credible possibility is the existence of a common archetype.

An additional argument for the distinction between the two texts comes from the later part of the text, namely from the additions to the text of George Akropolites. This part does not fall within the subject of this study, and so we will not discuss it at length. Nevertheless, the fact that the Synopsis Lambros includes some of the additions to Akropolites' text and omits others seems to support further the case for the existence
of a common archetype. For example, in the narrative relating the election of the patriarch Arsenios, the Synopsis Lambros includes the events of his election but omits the information of his background and the first reactions (SynChron, 510.10-12, 15-6, 16-8, 22-3, 29). Similarly, after the death of the emperor Theodore II Laskaris, the SynChron inserts a eulogy in honour of the emperor (535.5-536.12), only part of which is present in the Synopsis Lambros (SynChron, 535.5-17, Syn. L., 735.2-736.1). The missing passage SynChron, 535.20-536.12 starts with "Ἐγὼ δὲ ..." and goes to praise the literary and scholarly interests of the emperor, which may suggest that the passage is missing from the Synopsis Lambros because it is an addition of the author of the SynChron to the text of the archetype. Needless to say, these two examples are only used here as an indication of the connection of the two texts in the last part of the narrated history, and can only produce conclusive suppositions when studied as a whole. Nevertheless, as far as the subject of the inclusion or omission of first-person passages of the SynChron in the Synopsis Lambros is concerned, it should be noted that the proem and conclusion of the SynChron, which both include personal comments of the author, are also missing from the Synopsis Lambros. The possibility that they were omitted by the author of the Synopsis Lambros due to their personal nature can be discarded, because in other cases, both texts share first-person passages, which are additions to Akropolites. In any case, the relationship between the SynChron and the Synopsis Lambros needs to be investigated further, especially as far as the authorship of the additions to Akropolites is concerned; the above passages, however, suggest that at least some of the Akropolites' passages that are missing from the Synopsis Lambros were not part of the archetype, and hence substantiate further the distinction between the SynChron and the Synopsis Lambros.

**Conclusion**

Although the Synopsis Lambros has been regarded as another version of the SynChron, it appears to be a separate text; it does have strong similarities to the SynChron, but a close study of the connections (and differences) of the two texts suggests that they are not linked directly between themselves, but derive from an earlier common archetype.
We can be reasonably certain that the Byzantine author was familiar with the text of the *Septuagint*, which was the source of some of the events described in the chronicle. Nevertheless, it is difficult to define whether it is a case of direct or indirect use of the material of the Bible. The author of the *SynChron* was aware of the distinction between the Greek and Hebrew text of the Bible, as the passages "οὗτος δὲ ὁ Καῖναν οὐδόλως εὑρίσκεται ἐν τῷ Ἐβραϊκῷ" (*SynChron*, 5.27-8) \(^{341}\) and "Ἡλι ὁ ἱερεὺς κατὰ μὲν τὸ Ἐβραϊκὸν ἐτη μ’, κατὰ δὲ τούς ο´ ἐτη κ’." (*SynChron*, 9.27-8) \(^{342}\) seem to suggest. Furthermore, in other passages, such as the sections on prophecy of Daniel (*SynChron*, 14.18-27), Belshazzar’s Feast and the Handwriting of God (*SynChron*, 14.28-15.2), the end of the Babylonian kingdom (*SynChron*, 15.3-6) or the story of the Maccabees (*SynChron*, 25.28-26.14), the account of the *SynChron* is closer to the Bible than to any other source.

On the other hand, the juxtaposition of the chronological data of the two texts does not seem to demonstrate that the *Septuagint* was certainly used in the composition of the *SynChron*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SynChron</th>
<th>Septuag.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Birth of Cain</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam †</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Enos</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth †</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Cainan</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos †</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Mahalaleel</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainan †</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Jared</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleleel †</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Enoch</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared †</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Mathouselah</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Metathesis</em> Enoch</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Lamech</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{341}\) The passage originates from Synkellos (89.29-90.1); see Synkellos, *The Chronography*, xxxvii-xxxviii.

\(^{342}\) See p. 42 for a presentation and discussion of the sources of the passage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathouselah †</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Noah</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamech †</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Shem, Ham, Japheth</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah †</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Arphaxad</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem †</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Kainan</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Salah</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Eber</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Peleg</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Reu</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Serug</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Nahor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Terah</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Abram</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise to Abraham</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus from Egypt</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Isaac</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of [Esau and ]Jacob</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of the sons of Jacob</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Kohath</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Amram</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Moses</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses †</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua's son of Nun reign</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finees and the Presbyterians over Israel</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chushanrishathaim</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othniel judges Israel</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglon the king of Moab</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehud and Shamgar</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah and Barak</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreib, Zeb and Zevee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abimelech the son of Gideon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tola the son of Puah</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jair the Gileadite</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children of Ammon</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibzan (Esevon)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon the Zebulonite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdon (Labdan the Pirathonite)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli the priest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the chronologies of the two texts agree to a great extent, the existence of a small number of differences can only suggest that the chronological information of the SynChron could not have come directly from the Septuagint. This is supported further by the fact that the spine of the SynChron is based throughout on chronological references, which are provided in a straightforward sequence; the Septuagint, on the other hand, does not have such a sequence after the initial narrative of the Patriarchs, and the chronologies do not hold such a prominent position in the narrative. It is more likely that the author of the SynChron used other historiographical texts as the basis of the chronicle and drew material from the Bible only on certain occasions, as the above passages seem to suggest, and even then their use could have been based more on the memory of the author than the direct use of the text itself.

**Africanus**

A reference to Africanus’ name in the SynChron does not refer to his text but to a synchronisation with the reign of Septimius Severus (SynChron, 33.12-3). This would suggest that the author of the SynChron was aware of his fame, but it is no surprise
that there are no traces of the early text in the *SynChron*: A couple of references could be traced back to Africanus' work (*SynChron*, 8.20-5, 11.27-8, 25.23-7 (?)), but the absence of any other indications suggests that they were transmitted to the *SynChron* indirectly – probably through more than one intermediaries.

**Josephus**

Apart from a few parallel passages (*SynChron*, 6.1-4, 9.24-5, 15.3-6, 16.23-17.5, 29.27-30), the use of Josephus' works in the composition of the *SynChron* is minimal. His influence, however, is apparent in the extensive section that relate the story of the Maccabees and the Herodian dynasty (*SynChron*, 25.28-27.18), for which we are not able to indicate a direct source.

**Hippolytus**

The lost chronicle of Hippolytus was used as a source by numerous Byzantine authors, amongst which some of the sources of the *SynChron*, such as the *Chronographia Syntomos*, the *Excerpta Barbari*, the *Chronicon Paschale* and George Synkellos. Its effect on the *SynChron* can be seen in the chronological structure and in the reference–synchronisations between the biblical Kings and Judges, and the respective prophets (e.g. Hippol., *Chron.*, 92.22-94.9, *SynChron*, 11.3-9). As we can see in the example, the information probably reached the *SynChron* through other intermediary texts; in this case, as in numerous others, either through the *Excerpta Barbari* (251.7-14) or the *Chronikon Epitomon* (16.1-3)/*Vind. Gr.* 99 (15.13).

**Latin texts**

The *SynChron* seems to carry various influences from Latin texts, which cannot always be easily explained by the use of known intermediary sources. The most notable example is the history of Cassius Dio, which is referenced various times (e.g. *SynChron*, 20.5-21-2, 24.24-25.10, 31.9-12, 31.15-8), without however being possible to establish a direct connection between the two texts. In addition to the use of Cassius Dio, other Latin texts are also echoed in the *SynChron*, albeit in a more

---

343 Hippolytus, *Chronik*, XIV.

344 Also see the section on Eutropius below, p. 209.

345 For example, in the description of Commodus' assassination (*SynChron*, 32.19-23) we note the place of Herodian and Cassius Dio amongst the 'other sources' of the passages, but the reference of the *SynChron* actually originates from the specified 'main sources'. See p. 63.
limited scale, such as Appian (*SynChron*, 20.5-21.2), Herodian (*SynChron*, 34.19-29, 35.31-36.9) and certain sections of the *Historia Augusta* (*SynChron*, 32.27-9, 35.31-36.9).

Although the *SynChron* is in various cases the only text that transmits unique information for the early Roman emperors,\(^3^4^6^\) the direct use of the texts does not seem very likely. A more plausible explanation is the use of a (translated) compendium of Roman history. We know that such compendia were in circulation in Byzantium at the time, and it has been suggested that Synkellos and other Byzantine chroniclers, especially John Zonaras, had made use of such texts.\(^3^4^7^\) Although Zonaras and the *SynChron* have commonly drawn material from the same texts, probably a common intermediary one, the respective differences between Zonaras and the *SynChron* prohibit the possibility that both authors shared the same compendium. Regardless, the use of such a compendium in the composition of the *SynChron* makes sense and explains the resemblances and connections between the *SynChron* and the above Latin texts. The hypothesis is further supported by our discussion of the description of the reign of the emperor Didius in the *SynChron*,\(^3^4^8^\) which suggests that the unique connection between the *SynChron* and the *Vita Didii Iuliani* of the *Historia Augusta* indicates the use of an intermediary text, most probably a compendium of Roman history. The same seems to apply to the section of the *SynChron* on the emperor Elegabalus (33.29-34.31), which we discuss elsewhere;\(^3^4^9^\) notably, neither of the two Roman sources (Herodian and Dio) appear positive towards Elegabalus, but the fact that Herodian seems less biased against him than Dio seems to point at the direction of a compendium, whose translation was later used in the compilation of the *SynChron*.

**The chronicle of Eusebius**

The chronicle of Eusebius, written at the beginning of the fourth century, was a great influence of later chroniclers, both in terms of structure and content, but especially for its display of universal theory and comparative chronology in a synchronistic

\(^3^4^6^\) See Zafeiris, "Portraits", 3 - Abstracts of Communications, 170.
\(^3^4^7^\) Alföldi, "Die Hauptereignisse", 41-68, Alföldi, "Die römische Münzprägung", 47-92.
\(^3^4^8^\) Zafeiris, "Portraits", 3 - Abstracts of Communications, 170.
\(^3^4^9^\) See p. 293.
Unfortunately, the original Greek text is now lost, and is accessed through Jerome's Latin translation of the second part, excerpts from later Byzantine authors (mainly Synkellos), an Armenian translation and Syriac epitomes. As a result, it would be difficult, indeed impossible, to identify with certainty the passages of later texts that descend from it – in our case, of the SynChron, for which the chronicle of Eusebius appears to be a recurrent source, albeit indirect. In the previous chapter we tried to indicate the passages where Eusebius' chronicle was the source of the SynChron. Here, we are concerned with the manner with which the information from Eusebius is used in the SynChron, and, if possible, the identification of the texts through which the Eusebian material was transferred.

As far as the use of the material is concerned, the most prominent instances can be seen in the numerous synchronisations that are provided in the SynChron, usually at the ends of the reigns of the emperors (SynChron, 9.3-9 (Cecrops, first king of Athens - Cataclysm of Deucalion – Phaethon), 11.27-8 (first Olympics), 30.14-6 (Apollonius Tyaneus), 31.1-2 (Ignatios’ martyrdom), 31.12 (Plutarch), 33.11-2 (Leonides’s death), 37.17-9 (millennium of the city of Rome)). However, the (indirect) use of Eusebius is not limited to such instances, but extends to more comprehensive events. The reference to the destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian (SynChron, 31.4-9), which seems to originate from Eusebius' chronicle (Eus., Hier. Chron., 201.8-14, 201.18-21), is a typical example, but not the only one. As for the intermediary texts, from which the material was retrieved by the compiler of the SynChron: on the one hand, the synchronisations were most probably copied from the text of the family of the Chronikon Epitomon that was used by the archetype of the SynChron; on the other hand, the more general passages do not seem to present a consistent pattern. Numerous passages were drawn from the tradition of the Epitome (e.g. SynChron, 18.26-19.4, 32.9-15, 57.4-8) as well as from Theophanes (e.g. SynChron, 40.27-41.1, 41.20), but also from Zosimos (SynChron, 39.9-10) and Malalas (SynChron, 24.12-4). Other passages may have come from the common source with Zonaras (e.g. 31.4-9),

---


351 For other similar examples, see our notes on the sources of the following passages: SynChron, 11.29-12.11, 31.9-12, 32.9-15, 39.9-10, 40.27-41.1, 41.20-9, 57.4-8.
and the use of an additional source should not be discarded, as the unique place of the passage of the Olympiads in the *SynChron* (11.29-12.11) seems to suggest.

**Eutropius**

Eutropius' *Breviarium historiae Romanae* (translated into Greek by Paeanius and Capito of Lycia) was another text that was used by later Byzantine authors, mainly through intermediary texts such as John of Antioch.\(^{352}\) His influence also appears in the *SynChron* (e.g. *SynChron*, 24.15-23, 37.17-9, 41.1-8, 41.28-42.4, 56.5-11), and in some cases there are no apparent parallels to other later texts (*SynChron*, 30.23-5, 31.15-8), which raises the issue of their link. Malalas is a possibility, Eutropius probably being one of his sources,\(^{353}\) but since there are no significant connections between the *Synopsis* and Malalas in the relevant cases, this does not seem to be the case. John of Antioch (or better, the text through which the *SynChron* accessed the text of John of Antioch) is a more plausible possibility; his text is present in most of the cases, in which Eutropius is mentioned as related to the *SynChron*, and is also associated with the *SynChron* in further cases.\(^{354}\) The possibility is further supported by Patzig, who uses the passage *SynChron*, 30.23-9 to suggest that the *SynChron* draws its Eutropius information from a source that was also used by Manasses, and which was originally based on the text of John of Antioch.\(^{355}\)

**Excerpta Barbari**

As we see in the passages relating the synchronisation between Eli and the Trojan war (*SynChron*, 9.27-31),\(^{356}\) the text of the *Excerpta Barbari* (or *Barbarus Scaligeri*) must have been an indirect source for later texts that are connected to the *SynChron*, such as the *Chronikon Epitomon* or the *Anon. Matr*. Karpozelos suggests that *Chronographicon Syntomon* of the patriarch Nikephoros, the *Anon. Matr.*, the *Chronikon Epitomon* and the *Ekloge Historion* (Wirth) are all adaptations of a chronicle that was written in ‘the circles of Alexandria at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries’, and are not connected to the *Chronographeion*

---

\(^{352}\) Jeffreys, et al., *Studies*, 181.

\(^{353}\) Jeffreys, et al., *Studies*, 181.

\(^{354}\) See pp. 226ff.

\(^{355}\) Patzig, “Quellen des Zonaras I”, 30-1.

\(^{356}\) See p. 42.
Syntomon and the chronicle of Peter of Alexandria (who both drew their material from the Excerpta Barbari). However, the above passages suggest that the Excerpta Barbari could have also been the source of the Anon. Matr. and the Chronikon Epitomon (and henceforth, of the SynChron). Since the original text does not survive, it is not possible to draw absolute conclusions; nevertheless, the similarities in their chronology bear out its ongoing influence, which reaches indirectly the SynChron. In the following table, we present the chronologies of the two texts, in regard to the first part of the SynChron.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SynChron</th>
<th>Excerpta Barbari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Adam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Seth</td>
<td>Birth of Seth 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam †</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Enos</td>
<td>Birth of Enos 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth †</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Cainan</td>
<td>905 Birth of Cainan 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos †</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Mahaleel</td>
<td>170 Birth of Mahaleel 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainan †</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Jared</td>
<td>165 Birth of Jared 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleelel †</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Enoch</td>
<td>162 Birth of Enoch 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared †</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Mathouselah</td>
<td>165 Birth of Mathouselah 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metathesis Enoch</td>
<td>365 Metathesis Enoch 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Lamech</td>
<td>165 Birth of Lamech 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathouselah †</td>
<td>953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Noah</td>
<td>188 Birth of Noah 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamech †</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Shem, Ham, Japheth</td>
<td>500 Birth of Shem, Ham, Japheth 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>2242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah †</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Arphaxad</td>
<td>101 Birth of Arphaxad 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem †</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Kainan</td>
<td>135 Birth of Kainan 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Salah</td>
<td>39 Birth of Salah 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Eber</td>
<td>130 Birth of Eber 130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

357 Karpozelos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, II, 537.

358 The Excerpta Barbari was also a source of Malalas (see Jeffreys, et al., Studies, 33, 198-99 and Weitzmann, "Illustrations", 132-3); as a result, it is possible that some of its material found their way to the SynChron through Malalas.

359 The Excerpta Barbari does not carry an indication to Noah's death, or to any subsequent Patriarchs; interestingly, the last such reference of the SynChron is Shem, Noah's son.
Birth of Peleg 134
Birth of Reu 135
Birth of Serug 132
Birth of Nahor 135
Birth of Terah 79
Birth of Abram 70
Promise to Abraham 70
Exodus from Egypt 430
Birth of Isaac 100
Birth of Esau and Jacob (sons of Isaac) 60
Birth of the sons of Jacob 85
Birth of Kohath 45
Birth of Amram 60
Birth of Moses 72
Exodus 80
Moses † 120
Joshua's son of Nun reign 27
Finees and the Presbyterians over Israel 30
Chushanrishathaim 50
Othniel judges Israel 40
Eglon the king of Moab 18
Ehud and Shamgar 80
Jabin 20
Deborah and Barak 80
Oreib, Zeb and Zevee 7
Gideon 40
Abimelech the son of Gideon 3
Tola the son of Puah 23
Jair the Gileadite 22
The children of Ammon 18
Jephthah 46
Ibzan (Esevon) 47
Elon the Zebulonite 410
Esval Bethleemite -
Abdon (Labdan the Pirathonite) 8
Philistines 40
Samson 20
Anarchia and peace -
Eli the priest 20/40
Anarchia 30
Samuel 20
Saul, first king of Israel 40
David the prophet 40
Solomon 40
Rehoboam 17
Abijam 3
Asa 41
Jehoshaphat 25
Jehoram 8
Ahaziah 1
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gotholia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhoas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah (Uzziah)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>4.3 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliakim (Jehoiakim)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim (Jehoiachin)</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>3 y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattaniah (Zedekiah)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building of the Temple in Jerusalem</td>
<td>424.5</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merodach</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltshazzar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambyses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Nothos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Hystaspos</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerxes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes 'Makroheir'</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xerxes</td>
<td>2 m</td>
<td>5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sogdianus</td>
<td>7 m</td>
<td>7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Mnemon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Nothos</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes and Parysatidos 'Mnemon'</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes Ochos</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Arsakes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander the Macedonian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Philip</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Alexander</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Lagos</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Philadelphos</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Euergetes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Philopator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Epiphanes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Philometor</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Euergetes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Soter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Phouskon</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Alexander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy (his brother)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Dionysus</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zosimos

The New History of Zosimos is a consistent main source of the SynChron, as already noted by Patzig.\textsuperscript{360} It is the sole main source of various passages (SynChron, 33.1-2, 33.21-8, 37.31-38.8, 38.20-3, 38.31-39.3, 39.9-10), and it is the main source of numerous other passages as well (e.g. SynChron, 36.15-31, 39.12-6, 57.29-58.11), although it is not possible to identify the exact source of such sections, since other texts present such similarities with the SynChron that they could also have been its source.

The above show – in addition to the central place Zosimos holds amongst the sources of the SynChron – that the SynChron accessed Zosimos' text either directly or through an intermediary text that was not used by any other authors (with the possible exception of Zonaras, as we discuss below). The direct use of Zosimos seems unlikely, as the differences between the two texts attest; in the passage relating the revolt of Albinus and Niger against the emperor Septimius Severus, the texts write the name of Albinus in a different manner: Zosimos (and Malalas) write "Ἀλβίνος" (Zosim., 1.8.5, Mal., 220.57), whilst the SynChron writes "Σαλβῖνος" (SynChron, 33.1). The account of the reign of the emperor Macrinus (SynChron, 33.21-8) originates from Zosimos (1.10), but small differences (for example, Zosimos writes "Ἐμισηνὸν", the SynChron writes "Ἡλιογάβαλον") suggest that it was not the only source of the SynChron. Similarly, in the passage on the assassination of the children of the emperor Decius, Zosimos refers to one child (Zosim., 1.25.26-8), whereas the SynChron uses plural: "τοὺς παῖδας" (SynChron, 37.31-38.1). In addition to such differences, there are cases of passages of the SynChron that either contain supplementary information or diverge from Zosimos in such a way as to suggest the additional use of another source. For example, in the account of Aurelian's assassination (SynChron, 39.12-6), the similarities between Zosimos (1.62), Zonaras (3.153.11-25) and the SynChron and the fact that the name of the secretary of the emperor is only found in these three texts suggest that Zosimos was a source of the passage. However, the similarities in the language of the SynChron to the texts of Leo the Grammarian (79.9-16) or Kedrenos (1.455.1-8) indicate that a text from the

\textsuperscript{360} Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 33.
tradition of the Epitome was also used as a source. Similarly, in the presentation of the usurpers Maximus and Balbinus (*SynChron*, 36.9-11), the account of Zosimos (1.16) presents various differences with the *SynChron*, but the similarities in the language indicate that the two texts are connected. However, additional information in the *SynChron* suggests the use of an additional source, possibly a text from the family of the Epitome.

The use of an additional text notwithstanding, the possibility that the *SynChron* used directly the text of Zosimos cannot be excluded with certainty just yet, and the study of the connection between Zosimos, Zonaras and the *SynChron* may throw further light on their relationship. There are numerous passages that show that the three texts have a particular relationship, sharing common passages that are hardly found in other texts (e.g. *SynChron*, 35.25-9, 35.31-36.9, 36.15-31, 38.1-19, 39.6-8, 39.29-40.3). The similarities, which indicate that either the material of Zosimos was part of their common source, or that they both copied independently from the history of Zosimos itself, can be seen in the following passages:

> ἐν τούτῳ δὴ πρὸς γάμον ἀνέγαμος Γορδιανὸς Τιμισοκλέους θυγατέρα, τῶν ἐπὶ παιδεύσει διαβοήτων ἀνδρός, ὁν ὑπάρχον τῆς αὐλῆς αναδείξας ἔδοξεν τὸ διὰ τὸ νέον τῆς ἡλικίας τῇ κηδεμονίᾳ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐλλεῖπον ἀναπληροῦν. (*Zosim.*, 1.17.2)

> οὗτος ἤσυχος ὢν καὶ ἐλλόγιμος, ἱλιγγάσας πρὸς τὴν ἀρχήν, Τιμισκλέα τὸν ἐαυτοῦ πενθερὸν ὑπάρχον τῆς αὐλῆς δι᾽ οἰκείαν ἀσφάλειαν προίστα, ἀνδρά παιδεύσει παντοία περιβόητον· καὶ ἐώς οὗτος ἐν τοῖς Ἄριστο ἔν, ἐν ὑμνήματι καὶ ἀσφαλεία τὰ τῶν πραγμάτων εἰς καὶ καλῶς διωκότα. (*SynChron*, 35.21-5)

> οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Γορδιανὸς ἄρξας ἐπαρχον τὸν οἰκείον προεχειρίσατο πενθερὸν Τιμιςκελία καλούμενον, μέχρι μὲν οὖν περιήν ἐκείνος, καλῶς εἰς τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας τῷ αὐτοκράτορι καὶ κατὰ ὅμοι ἐφεστο ὁ τὰ πράγματα, […] (*Zon.*, 3.129.28-130.2)

The connection between the three texts is evident, but the question of its nature remains open. Patzig uses the subsequent passage to study the relationship between Zosimos, Zonaras and the *SynChron*, juxtaposing it to the material from Leo the

---

361 For example, "ἐστειλαν ἐν Ῥώμῃ πρέσβεις" (*Zosim.*, 1.14.7), "καὶ πρέσβεις ἐν Ῥώμῃ στέλλοντος" (*SynChron*, 35.27); "Τῶν δὲ βίω χειμῶνος ἐν τῷ πλεῖν ἀπολομένων" (*Zosim.*, 1.16.4), "ἐτὶ δὲ τῇ τῶν χειμῶνος βίω τῶν βασιλέων βραδυνάντων" (*SynChron.*, 36.9-10).
Grammarian and Kedrenos, and suggests that Zonaras only used the text of Leo the Grammarian and the *SynChron* – but not Zosimos: 362


363 For example, in the account of the revolt of Aemilianus, a common phrase of Zosimos ("Αἰμιλιανὸς Παιονικῶν ἡγούμενος τάξεων" (1.28.6)) and the *SynChron* ("Αἰμιλιανὸς δὲ τις Παιόνων ἡγούμενος" (38.1)) is not found in Zonaras, who writes "ἄρχων τοῦ ἐν Μυσίᾳ στρατεύματος" (3.137.23), probably due to the use of a different source (perhaps John of Antioch: "ὁ τῆς Μυσίας ἔπαρχος" (229.1)).

The assumption of Patzig seems to be correct. The passage of Zonaras is closer to the passage of the *SynChron* than Zosimos' history, and could not have come independently from it. If we also take into account that Zonaras does not always agree with the common accounts of Zosimos and the *SynChron*, 363 the situation becomes...
clearer. The material of Zosimos comes to the SynChron through an intermediary text that followed Zosimos' history closely. The close connection between Zonaras and the SynChron corroborate that they both used the intermediary text, their common source, along with the use of additional material from other texts by both authors, especially by Zonaras.\footnote{Zonaras declares clearly that he uses more than one source, hence the phrase "οἱ δὲ φάσιν" in the above mentioned example on prefect Philip.}

**Procopius**

Procopius' historiographical work was a major source of the events of the late fifth and early sixth centuries.\footnote{Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur*, I, 291.} As we would expect, it appears invariably as a 'parallel text' to the SynChron (e.g. SynChron, 74.12-5, 84.15-26, 87.7-13, 87.16-7), as well as an indirect source of incidents that are commonly reported by various other sources: the 'eagle sign' in the description of Marcian's background (SynChron, 79.17-80.22), Basiliskos' ill-fated campaign against Geiseric (SynChron, 86.3-14), the triumph of Belisarius in Constantinople (SynChron, 98.11-8) and the allegations against him as well as his death (SynChron, 98.31-99.3). Its presence as a source (albeit indirect) is more notable in the account of the SynChron of the Vandal wars. Here, the SynChron seems to be the only other source to follow Theophanes to such an extent as to relate at length the background of the war, the beginning of the campaign and Belisarius' speech to the troops in Libya (SynChron, 96.10-97.22), all of which derive directly from Procopius' *De Bellis*.

**Ecclesiastical Histories**

Since the SynChron focuses consistently on ecclesiastical events, and relates meticulously the sequence of patriarchs of Constantinople, it is no surprise that there were numerous parallel passages between itself and the various Ecclesiastical Histories. Although in most cases the Ecclesiastical Histories are identified either as 'other sources' or 'parallel passages', in addition to the description of their position in the sources of the SynChron, their inclusion in the current discussion promotes the understanding of their transmission in the later historiographical tradition.
Eusebius

The SynChron seems to include material from Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History through other intermediary texts on a small number of occasions, such as Tiberius' reaction to Jesus Christ (SynChron, 28.1-3), the characterisation of Domitian and the persecution during his reign (SynChron, 30.10-4), and the passage on Mamaea and Origen (SynChron, 35.16-8), which is accompanied by the phrase "ὦς φησιν Εὐσέβιος". A special reference should be made on the passage concerning the synchronisation of Justin, Oppianus and Sextus during the reign of the emperor Marcus Aurelius (SynChron, 32.15-7); the references of three other texts only mention Justin (Niceph., Chron. Synt., 94.4, Eklog. Histor. (Wirth), 16.3-4, Zon., 3.86.3-4), whereas the SynChron reproduces Eusebius' synchronisation in the Ecclesiastical History (4.16.1.1-3), albeit through the Chronikon Epitomon (24.5-8).

Philostorgius

Philostorgius' Ecclesiastical History appears frequently in the 'other sources' of numerous passages of the SynChron (SynChron, 48.10-6, 53.18-23, 55.17-24, 56.1-11, 56.11-22, 58.15-22, 60.27-61.14, 61.21-8, 66.9-13), and in further numerous examples of 'parallel passages', but it is not clear if it could have been a direct source of the SynChron. For example, although Philostorgius' passage on the lands ruled by the successors of Constantine (Philost., HE (Pass. Artem.), 3.1a.1-14) is more extensive than the SynChron (53.18-23), its use of the words "αἱ ἄνω Γαλλίαι καὶ τὰ ἐπέκεινα Ἀλπέων" (1a.4-5) are similar to the phrase used in the SynChron ("ἐν ταις Γαλίαις καὶ ταις ἐπέκεινα Ἀλπεών") (53.21-2); in conjunction to the other parallels between the two texts, we could assume that a redaction of Philostorgius' history was part of the tradition of the SynChron. On the other hand, however, the connection of Philostorgius' Ecclesiastical History to the Epitome and to the Vita Constantini of Codex Angelicus 22, both sources of the SynChron, could suggest that the SynChron did not draw the material directly. Similarly, the consistent presence of Zonaras in all but one of the above examples (SynChron, 66.9-13) seems to suggest

366 The phrase was not written originally by the author of the SynChron but was drawn from the tradition of the Epitome; see p. 69.
367 Philostorgius, Kirchengeschichte, LXXVII-LXXXIV.
368 Philostorgius, Kirchengeschichte, LXXXVIII-XCVII.
that passages from Philostorgius were part of the source of Zonaras, which was also the source of the *SynChron*.

**Theodoret**

There are numerous common passages between Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History* and the *SynChron*; two of them (the events leading to the ascension of Valentinian to the throne (Theodoret, *HE*, 217.6-8, *SynChron*, 57.29-58.11) and the discourse between Theodosius I and Amphilochios (Theodoret, *HE*, 305.15-306.6, *SynChron*, 64.18-65.4)) present strong similarities and could be considered the main source of the respective sections of the *SynChron*. However, since Theodoret is not the only text that contains the above incidents, we cannot be certain that this was the case. On the other hand, we notice a pattern in the passages that carry the circumstances surrounding Theodosius' promotion to the position of general, and his subsequent ascension to the imperial throne (*SynChron*, 61.21-62.22): a connection between Theodoret, Zonaras, the *SynChron* and Kallistos Xanthopoulos' *Ecclesiastical History*. Although the connection is not that strong as to suggest that the later texts used directly the material of Theodoret, the common use of his material through an intermediary text is more than possible. Cases in point are the passage on the allegations against Theodosius, which is common to the four texts (*SynChron*, 62.2-9), or the description of Theodosius' vision (*SynChron*, 62.9-14). Although the last passage is missing from Zonaras' account, the similarities in the rest of the section suggest that the common source of Zonaras and the *SynChron* was using Theodoret's material; as far as Xanthopoulos is concerned, although it is probable that he was also using the same text, his linguistic differences to the *SynChron* and Zonaras show that it is more possible that he was drawing the material from a different text, which had also used Theodoret's history.

**Socrates Scholasticus**

Although various passages of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Socrates Scholasticus present considerable similarities to the respective passages of the *SynChron* (42.7-19, 52.19-31, 58.28-31, 60.14-8, 65.11-4), other texts with closer connections to the *Synopsis* seem to be their main sources. The influence of Socrates Scholasticus can mainly be detected in the section relating Constantine's first vision of the cross (*SynChron*, 42.7-15); although the language of Socrates Scholasticus' text (Socr.
Schol., *HE*, 1.2.34-45) presents considerable differences in comparison to the *SynChron*, it has the same structure, leading to a brief description of the defeat of Maxentius. However, this is probably due to the use of Socrates' *History* by the authors of the hagiographical texts that dealt with the life of Constantine, which found its way to the sources of the *SynChron* for Constantine.

**Sozomenos**

As with other *Ecclesiastical Histories*, Sozemenos' text appears frequently in the 'parallel passages' section; a few references present stronger similarities to the respective passages of the *SynChron* (52.19-31, 56.11-22, 57.9-16, 61.21-8, 62.25-63.5), but they do not appear to be part of the main body of the sources of the *SynChron*, with the exception of the passage that deals with the prophecy of the monk Isaakios and the ensuing death of the emperor Valens (*SynChron*, 60.27-61.14).\(^{369}\)

**Gelasius**

Although we note a small number of parallel passages between Gelasius' *Ecclesiastical History* and the *SynChron* (mainly in the section dealing with the reign of Constantine I), their similarities are not substantial enough to suggest that it could have been a source of the *SynChron*, with the exception of their potential link in the matter of the position of bishop Alexander in the First Ecumenical Council, which suggests the use of material from a common hagiographical tradition.

**Theodore Anagnostes**

Passages from the *Ecclesiastical History* of Theodore Anagnostes appear frequently amongst the sources of the *SynChron*. However, the examination of the other possible sources of the relevant passages indicates that the direct use of Anagnostes is not very likely. In the majority of the passages of the *SynChron*, of which Anagnostes' *Ecclesiastical History* is a 'main' or 'other source', Theophanes' text also appears consistently as a source (for example, *SynChron*, 60.7-10, 62.25-63.11, 65.5-10, 66.1-2, 83.21-3, 89.25-90.2). Since an epitome of Anagnostes' text was a main source of Theophanes' chronicle,\(^{370}\) which was used extensively in the composition of the

---

\(^{369}\) See p. 94.

SynChron, it seems more likely that the material of Anagnostes reached the SynChron through Theophanes. Having said that, in certain cases the SynChron is closer to the account of Anagnostes than Theophanes (e.g. SynChron, 65.5-10); such cases are more the exception than the rule, and could be attributed to the use of a different version of Theophanes or the use of other texts that have also drew material from Anagnostes, such as George the Monk (e.g. SynChron, 89.25-90.2) or the Epitome (e.g. SynChron, 87.23-9, 62.25-63.11). The use of the Epitome can also explain the passage on the emperor Marcian in SynChron, 85.25-8, whose only main source appears to be Anagnostes; its actual main source is a text of the tradition of the Epitome, which is corroborated by the inclusion of Leo the Grammarian and George the Monk (PG) in the 'parallel passages'.

Evagrius

The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius appears frequently in the 'other sources' (SynChron, 76.17-77.27, 79.17-80.22, 87.7-13, 87.13-5, 90.18-26, 90.30-1, 93.19-24, 94.1-5) and 'parallel passages' of the SynChron, along with other texts that are frequent sources of the SynChron, and, as a result, we cannot identify with certainty the exact source for each passage. It is noteworthy, however, that a few entire passages of Evagrius are included in the SynChron, especially since they do not commonly appear in other later chronicles, with the possibly exception of Manasses. A characteristic case is the passage of the SynChron referring to the decisions of the fourth Ecumenical Council (SynChron, 81.9-20), which derives from the respective passage of Evagrius:

ἐνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὕιὸν κύριον μονογενῆ ἐν δύο φύσεσιν ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως γνωριζόμενον, ὀυδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ανηρμηνέης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μάλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἐκατέρας φύσεως, καὶ εἰς ἐν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑποστάσιν συντρεχοῦσης· οὐχ ὡς εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ’ ἐνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὕιὸν μονογενῆ, θεὸν λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καθάπερ ἄνωθεν ὁ προφήται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐξεπαιδεύει, καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδείδωκε σύμβολον. (Evagr., HE, 49.29-50.8)

371 See pp. 246ff.
372 Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte, XXX.
373 Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte, XXXI.
Διὰ τούτου τούτους μὲν ἀναθεμάτισαν οἱ θεῖοι πατέρες, τοῖς δὲ γε τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐγγράφως παραδεδώκασιν ἐκ δύο καὶ ἐν δυσὶ φύσει, θεότητος τε καὶ ἀνθρωπότητος καὶ άχωρίστας γνωριζόμενον, οὔδαμον τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνηρημένης διὰ τὴν ἐνόσσην, σωστομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ιδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως, καὶ εἰς ἑν ἐνόσσων καὶ μάν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης, οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον ἤ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ’ ἑνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν υἱὸν μονογενῆ θεοῦ λόγον Κύριον ᾿Ιησοῦν Χριστὸν, καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ προεθέσπισαν, καὶ θεὸς δὲ ἡ μᾶς ᾿Ιησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσε, καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡ μῖν διετράνωσε σύμβολον. […] (SynChron, 81.9-20)

Evagrius' history is also the main source of the passage referring to the origin of the emperor Anastasios (Evagr., HE, 125.23-6, SynChron, 89.9-10), but the most striking case is the account of the SynChron to the abolition of chrysargyron tax by the same emperor (Evagr., HE, 136.32-139.5, SynChron, 92.8-93.17), already noted by Patzig. The extensive passage copies the passage of Evagrius with minor linguistic differences and omissions (such as the reference of Evagrius to Thucydides' style: "ἣν καὶ λεκτέον, τῆς Θουκυδίδου γλώσσης ἢ καὶ μείζονός τε καὶ κομψοτέρας ἐπιδεομένην" (Evagr., HE, 137.1-2), notwithstanding the fact that the 'Thucydidean' style of Evagrius' passage is also reproduced in the SynChron). The passage is also copied in Kallistos Xanthopoulos' Ecclesiastical History (Xanth., HE, 147.204A-205B ), whose account is closer to the original source than SynChron's. Evagrius was a frequent source of Kallistos Xanthopoulos, and the connection between Evagrius, Kallistos Xanthopoulos and the SynChron in the passages of the origin of Anastasios and the chrysargyron suggests that the two later authors were using a common source, whose source was Evagrius' history. Evagrius' passage on the chrysargyron was probably the indirect source of Manasses' account (Manass., 3024-51) as well, which presents a similar attitude to the SynChron, stating that although Anastasios' reign as a whole was not virtuous, the abolition of the chrysargyron was a commendable act on behalf of the emperor.

374 Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras II", 351.
375 Winkelmann and Gentz, Die Kirchengeschichte, 121 et passim.
376 The possibility that they were consulting Evagrius' text independently should probably be rejected, due to the fact that the two texts share the same sources in other instances as well (see pp. 282ff.), and that Evagrius' Ecclesiastical History does not seem to be particularly popular amongst later historians (Evagrius Scholasticus, The Ecclesiastical History, I:1); cf. Cernousov, "Des Euagrios", 29-34. On Evagrius' source for the subject, see Allen, Evagrius, 159.
John Lydus

The works of John Lydus appear to be amongst the 'other sources' or 'parallel passages' of the SynChron in regard to early Roman history (SynChron, 21.17-30, 22.29-31, 24.24-25.10), and in one instance we suggest the De Magistratibus as the sole main source of SynChron, 23.29-24.11. Nevertheless, the lack of any apparent connection between the passages seems to suggest that they were not used directly from Lydus' text but through intermediary texts, probably the 'other sources' that we note in the presentation of the sources of the passages in question. In both of the two cases of the use of the De Magistratibus (SynChron, 23.29-24.11, 24.24-25.10), we also note the presence of Zonaras as a parallel or other source, which probably indicates that the passages were present in the common source with Zonaras. As far as the passages from the De Mensibus are concerned, the connection with Manasses (SynChron, 21.17-20, 21.21-30) has already been noted, especially in the passage relating the designation of the name of the city of Rome (SynChron, 21.17-20).377 Additionally, the De Mensibus was also used by various other texts, such as the Patria, the Suda or Kedrenos,378 and as a result, the identification of the direct source of the above passages is not forthcoming.

Malalas

The central place of Malalas' Chronographia in the history of the sources of the SynChron has already been pointed out,379 and it is corroborated by the numerous pertinent references in the previous chapter. Malalas appears frequently as a 'main source' of the SynChron (e.g. SynChron, 14.28-15.2, 21.21-22.28, 29.9-11, 30.17-9, 31.18-22, 57.9-16, 69.16-70.15 etc.), and quite often is the only 'main source' that we could identify (e.g. SynChron, 31.14, 33.2-4, 40.8, 40.14-26, 46.4-8, 68.21-69.3, 74.9-26 etc.). In view of that, we shall try to address the issue of the position of Malalas' chronicle within the sources of the SynChron; that is to say, the version of Malalas' text that was used, and the texts through which it was transmitted to the SynChron.

378 Lydus, De Mensibus, LXXIII.
A good example of the close connection between Malalas and the SynChron is the passage on prefect Cyrus, during the reign of Theodosius the Younger (Mal., 281.15-282.27, SynChron, 76.1-10). Malalas and the SynChron are the only historiographical texts that relate that Cyrus retired to Kotyaion (Κοτυαεῖο), whereas most of the later texts say that he moved to Smyrna (Chron. Pasch., 588.16, Theoph., 97.8, Leo Gramm., 110.23, Kedr., 1.599.5, Zon., 3.240.29, Ephr., Chron., 781). The unique correspondence between the two texts seems to suggest that the SynChron drew the information from Malalas, although the possibility that a different source was used should also be investigated; the retirement to Kotyaion is also cited in the Suda (Suda, kappa 2776) and the life of Daniel Stylite (Vit. Daniel. Styl., 150.17-23), but there are no other indications that they could have been the source of the SynChron.

Additionally, further linguistic similarities with the text of Malalas suggest that the SynChron follows Malalas' tradition, although a few topographical details in the account of the SynChron could imply the use of an additional source (but they can also be an addition by the author, a resident of Constantinople). If the assumption is correct, then the author of the archetype of the SynChron had access to a version of Malalas that was not known to the other authors.

The passage on Valentinian's investigation of possible illegal acts (SynChron, 58.11-5) seems to point in the same direction, as the SynChron is the only later text that carries the information. The short entry on the emperor Tacitus advances a similar idea. Although we cannot discern with certainty a direct or main source, the fact that Malalas and the SynChron agree upon the duration of the reign and the age at death of the emperor, and that Malalas is the recurring source of the SynChron for the whole section, suggest that the passage probably came from a different version of Malalas.

The same is true for the passage on the release of St John from his exile in Patmos by the emperor Nerva (SynChron, 30.17-9), as well as the rest of the entry on the same emperor, as the similarities in the structure, content and language of the two texts

---

380 According to Karpozelos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, I, 569, Malalas copies the text of Eustathios of Epiphania, whose source was Priscus; also see Allen, "An Early Epitomator", 1-11.

381 Zonaras, who also gives seventy-five as Tacitus' age at death, provides two alternatives for Tacitus' reign: "οὔπω ἕβδομον μήνα παρὰ τῇ βασιλείᾳ ἀνύσαντα, κατὰ δέ τινας μή ὄλους δύο ἐνιαυτοὺς" (3.154.13-5).

suggest. However, it is noteworthy that the SynChron carries an additional phrase\textsuperscript{383} that cannot be traced in any other source,\textsuperscript{384} which can be explained if we are to accept that the above suggestion is valid. The editor of Malalas' most recent edition seems to follow the same spirit by reconstructing parts of Malalas' text from passages from the SynChron.\textsuperscript{385}

However, not all the material of Malalas that is found in the SynChron necessarily derives from this version; other such passages could have been drawn from other texts, such as the Chronicon Paschale (which we discuss below), the Epitome (e.g. SynChron, 15.10-16.18, 21.21-22.28, 32.19-23, 33.2-4, 35.16-8, 36.12, 40.9-11, 78.9-14), Theophanes (e.g. SynChron, 65.15-31, 83.27-84.12, 87.30-88.4, 94.22-7) or the common source with Zonaras (SynChron, 23.4-23.29, 36.9-11, 36.13-25, 36.31-37.4, 40.8, 59.6-28, 68.17-69.3, 84.27-85.6). If we are to give a characteristic example, the reference to the Delphic oracle (SynChron, 25.11-20) during the reign of Augustus Octavius demonstrates the potential relationships between Malalas, the Epitome and the SynChron. The passage originates from Malalas' text (176.82-96); nevertheless, the phrase "καὶ οὐκ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἀπόκρισις ἐκ τῆς Πυθίας. καὶ πάλιν ἐπηρώτησε τὴν Πυθίαν τὸ διὰ τι ὦν ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἀπόκρισις, ἀλλὰ σιγά τὸ μαντεῖον." (Mal., 176.15-18, also in Kedr., 1.320.18-9, Sphrantz., Chron., 464.15-6), is missing from the texts of Leo the Grammarian and the SynChron, which suggests that the passage came into the SynChron from Leo the Grammarian or a related text within the family of the Epitome. Another example is the narrative on the 'apple incident' during the reign of Theodosius the Younger (SynChron, 77.27-78.9), of which an identical account is carried by Malalas, the Chronicon Paschale, Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos; thus, we are not able to distinguish the main source of the SynChron.

\textsuperscript{383} “παρακληθεὶς ὑπὸ Φλαυίου συγκλητικοῦ καὶ συγγενοῦς” (30.17-18).

\textsuperscript{384} The Chronicon Paschale includes the name of Flavius Clemens as the consul serving along with Domitian (467.17-18), but there is no more information in the text that would enable the author of the SynChron to make the connection between the two Flavii.

\textsuperscript{385} See Malalas, Chronographia, 225-7.
Chronicon Paschale

On the other hand, there are numerous cases where the accounts of Malalas and the Chronicon Paschale coincide, and they are both possible main sources of the SynChron (e.g. SynChron, 21.30-22.28, 29.9-11, 30.17-22, 57.9-16, 58.11-5, 77.27-78.9, 84.21-85.6). A case in point is the narrative on the reign of the emperor Gaius (SynChron, 28.13-8), in which Malalas’ Chronographia and the Chronicon Paschale reproduce the same account for his death. Although the SynChron seems to draw from their tradition, it is not possible to identify with certainty its main source.

Καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἐσφάγῃ ὁ αὐτὸς Γάιος βασιλεὺς ἔσω ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἱδίων σπαθαρίων τῶν κουβικουλαρίων εὐνούχων κατὰ γνώμην τῆς συγκλήτου, ὄν ἐτῶν λθ’ (Mal., 186.74-6)

Επὶ τῶν προκειμένων ὑπάτων Γάιος Γάλλος ἐσφάγη ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ᾿Ρώμης ὑπὸ τῶν ἱδίων σπαθαρίων τῶν κουβικουλαρίων εὐνούχων κατὰ γνώμην τῆς συγκλήτου, ὄν ἐτῶν λθ’ (Chron. Pasch., 432.19-21)

[…] ὡς ἀσελγέστατος ὃν, ἐπιβουλευθεὶς παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ κατασφάττεται μετὰ τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ, ὃν ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἐννέα. (SynChron, 28.14-7)

Such similarities can be explained by the fact that the chronicle of Malalas was a main source of the Chronicon Paschale; however, there are other cases where the Chronicon Paschale alone appears to be the main source of the SynChron (with Malalas providing a different account –if any), such as the death of the emperor Caracalla (SynChron, 24.15-23), the various activities of the emperor Jovian (SynChron, 33.18-20), and possibly the information on the family of the emperor Arkadios (SynChron, 67.14-7). Such cases are not very common, although there are further examples where the Chronicon Paschale appears in the 'indirect sources' of the SynChron, whereas Malalas' text is not included (e.g. SynChron, 41.8-13, 56.29-57.4, 65.5-10, 84.13-4). As a result, there is not enough evidence to suggest that the SynChron had (direct or indirect) access to the Chronicon Paschale itself; it is more probable that the numerous common passages of the two texts arrived in the SynChron mainly through the version of Malalas that was used by the anonymous compiler, and secondarily through other texts that carried excerpts or references from the Chronicon Paschale.
**John of Nikiu**

The seventh-century chronicle of John of Nikiu is another related text that appears to be associated to the *SynChron*, usually in connection to Malalas' *Chronographia* (*SynChron, 15.10-16.18, 19.19-27, 21.21-22.12*). This is to be expected, since Malalas' text was a source of John of Nikiu. However, part of *SynChron's* passage on the founding of Rome (*SynChron, 21.4-17*), seems to have closer similarities to the John of Nikiu than the other parallel texts (*FGrH, 3c.839.73-6, Mal., 132.3-8, Chron. Pasch., 204.4-7*), although it could not be considered a direct or even a main source. Nevertheless, the differences with the other texts, and especially Malalas, suggest the use of early material by the author of the *SynChron*; it is rather possible that the differences are due to the different versions of Malalas – the one that we use now and the ones that were circulating amongst the Byzantine authors.

**John of Antioch**

The juxtaposition of the *SynChron* with the text of John of Antioch is inherently problematic; the author of the text is otherwise unknown, the text has only survived in abstracts, and their attribution to one person has not been without problems. Until recently, the abstracts were transmitted in various different versions and collections, and the different styles of the passages had led to doubts over the authenticity of the Salmasian excerpts, and the homogeneity of the text. The new edition of the text seems to put some order to the matter, by providing a more than adequate corpus of the existing excerpts of the text, and also by identifying an anonymous epitome of the work of John of Antioch, which was part of the Salmasian excerpts (*Excerpta Salmasiana II*), and was written sometime during the seventh to the twelfth centuries. However, the new editor did not realise the extent of the connection between John's *Historia Chronica* and the *SynChron*, which we examine below by looking at the characteristics of the common material of the two texts.

---


388 John of Antioch, *Fragmenta*, LXI-LXXIV, CLXXVIII. Roberto considers these passages integral part of the chronicle and incorporates them in the main text of the new critical edition.
The following passages are two examples which show notable similarities between the two texts, and the additional characteristic that they do not appear in any other sources. The first one refers to the murder of the emperor Galba and the second one to the murder of the emperor Carinus:

ἐπιβουλευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὄθωνος, ἀναιρεῖται κατὰ μέσην ἀγοράν. (Io. Ant., 175.4)

οὗτος ἐπιβουλευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὄθωνος κτείνεται [...]. (SynChron, 29.11-2)

αἰφνίδιον ἀναιρεῖται, τῶν χυλιάρχων ἐνός, οὐ τὴν γυναίκα διαφθείρας ἔτυχεν, ἀνελόντος αὐτὸν." (Io. Ant., 246.15-6)

Ἀναιρεῖται δὲ καὶ ὁ Καρῖνος ὑπὸ τινὸς χυλιάρχου. (SynChron, 40.26)

The fact that the thirteenth-century text conveys alone this piece of early information is remarkable by itself. In the case of the first example, other parallel texts provide different accounts, none of which is similar to the reference of the SynChron to Otho. For example, Malalas relates that Galba committed suicide (Mal., 195.49-50), and Leo the Grammarian includes a general allusion that "Γάλβας καὶ Ὄθων καὶ Βιτάλιος ἐν πολέμοις ἀνῃρέθησαν." (Leo Gramm., 64.2-3); later authors, such as Manasses (2034) and Glykas (456.13), do not carry any specific references either. As a result, it seems that the (archetype of the) SynChron had access to a text, whose main source was the chronicle of John the Antioch. The absence of the above passages from other related texts suggests that it was not used by other known authors. It may have been the text of the Epitome that was used by the author of the SynChron; in numerous cases, although not always, in which the text of John of Antioch is connected to the SynChron, there is also a connection with a text from the family of the Epitome (SynChron, 28.29-29.3, 29.16-9, 32.19-23, 33.21-8, 35.8-12, 54.10-5, 59.6-28). On that matter, it is possible that it was an early carrier of the Epitome family, as the passage on the renovation of the walls during the reign of Septimius Severus seems to suggest (SynChron, 33.4-10). The content of the passage of the SynChron is very similar to John of Antioch (127.13-20), and its structure deviates from that of Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos. Although this suggestion is only a hypothesis which needs further investigation, along with the relationship

---

389 Synkellos (416.10-1) seems to draw from John of Antioch as well, but is not the source of the SynChron.
between the John of Antioch and the various versions of the Epitome, the existence of an intermediary text between John of Antioch and the SynChron seems certain.

Following from that, we have to deal with the issue of the version of John of Antioch that was used by the unknown source; as we have already mentioned, Roberto has established the existence of a later epitome of the text, from which only the Salmasian excerpts have survived. However, although the SynChron includes passages that resemble the Salmasian excerpts (SynChron, 22.12-31, 28.18-22, 28.29-29.3, 29.16-9, 31.26-32.6, 33.4-10, 41.8-13, 59.6-28), some of which – for example, the passage on the renovation of the walls discussed above – are unique amongst later texts, the majority of the passages resemble the original text (mainly the passages from the De insidiis). As a result, and as the issue of the connection of other related texts (such as the Epitome and Zonaras) to John of Antioch is still open, we cannot provide a conclusive identification of the version of the Historia Chronica that was the indirect source of the SynChron, but only establish the existence of their relationship.

The family of the Chronikon Epitomon

The Chronikon Epitomon is a short chronicle, whose narrative stretches from the creation of Adam up to the reign of John Komnenos. The text is found in three manuscripts: Vind. Theol. Gr. 40, ff. 252r-258r, Vat. Gr. 433, ff. 244-259, Vind. Hist. Gr. 99, ff. 1-14. Although the edition of the Chronikon Epitomon by Pusch is based on Vind. Theol. Gr. 40, the text of Vat. Gr. 433 is the same chronicle, with minor differences. The chronicle of Vind. Hist. Gr. 99 is also a short chronicle, from the creation of Adam up to the reign of Theodore Laskaris, with an extensive passage on the Trojan War, which used to be attributed to the non-existent author John Sikeliotes. Its first part (Creation - Nebuchadnezzar) is another variant of the Chronikon Epitomon and can be found in the apparatus of Punch’s edition of the

---

390 Cf. John of Antioch, Fragmenta, CLX-CLXII, CLXIII-CLXVI.
391 John of Antioch, Fragmenta, CLXVII-CLXVIII.
394 Which, for the needs of this study, we have abbreviated as Vind. Gr. 99.
Chronikon Epitomon. The second part of the text does not present any significant similarities to the SynChron, hence it is of no particular interest to our study. The strong relationship between the Chronikon Epitomon and the SynChron has already been suggested by Krumbacher, but has not been studied in any detail.

In the following, we shall examine the similarities and differences of the texts and attempt to provide a description of their relationships.

In the following table, we give the chronological information of the SynChron and the two main versions of the Chronikon Epitomon, up to the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar during the reign of Zedekiah (which is where the first part of the Vind. Gr. 99 finishes). In comparison to other texts, the wide agreement in the numbers, especially as far as the Vind. Gr. 99 is concerned, is indicative of the relationship between the texts. The same applies to the sequence of the patriarchs and rulers, which is the same in all three texts (with the only exception of Gotholia, who is omitted in the SynChron) and the point in which they cease giving the age of death (Shem).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam Birth of Cain</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam †</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Enos</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth †</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>910 (?)(sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Cainan</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos †</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Mahalaleel</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>170(^{398})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainan †</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Jared</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleleel †</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Enoch</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared †</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Mathouselah</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metathesis Enoch</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

395 Wirth attempted a first analysis of the textual relationships of the Chronikon Epitomon ("Eklog. Histor. (Wirth)", 24-33), which was severely criticised in Krumbacher, "Review", 617-21.

396 Heinrich, ed., Johannes Sikeliota.

397 Krumbacher and Soteriades, Historia, 785, 788; also see "Eklog. Histor. (Wirth)", 26.

398 In the edition: "ἑκατὸν (?) ἑβδομήκοντα".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Lamech</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathouselah †</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Noah</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamech †</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Shem, Ham, Japheth</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah †</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Arphaxad</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem †</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Kainan</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Salah</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Eber</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Peleg</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Reu</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Serug</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Nahor</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Terah</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Abram</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood-Abraham</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation-Abraham</td>
<td>6030</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>3030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise to Abraham</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus from Egypt</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Isaac</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belos reigns first over the Assyrians</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the kingdom of the Assyrians</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegialeus reigns first over the Sicyonians</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of [Esau and Jacob]</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of the dynasty of the Egyptians</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the dynasty of the Egyptians</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of the sons of Jacob</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Kohath</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40 (?) (sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inachos reigns first over the Argeans</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Inachos' reign</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>5? (sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the reign of Mycenae - Descend of the Heraclids</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Amram</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Moses</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>2242</td>
<td>2242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood-Abraham</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham-Exodus</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation-Exodus</td>
<td>3835</td>
<td>3741 or 3335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses †</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua's son of Nun reign</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogygos' cataclysm</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekrops king of Athens</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finees and the Presbyterians over Israel</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chushanrishathaim</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othniel judges Israel</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekrops king of Athens</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Athens' kingdom</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deukalion's cataclysm in Thessaly</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaethon's burning in Ethiopia</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglon the king of Moab</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehud and Shamgar</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah and Barak</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreib, Zeb and Zevee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abimelech the son of Gideon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tola the son of Puah</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jair the Gileadite</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children of Ammon</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (!?) (sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibzan (Esevon)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon the Zebulonite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdon (Labdan the Pirathonite)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philitines</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli the priest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul, first king of Israel</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David the prophet</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahazania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotholia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhoas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah (Uzziah)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Olympics</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliakim (Jehoiakim)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the numerous similarities confirm the strong relationship between the SynChron and the texts of the family of the Chronikon Epitomon, the study of the few differences can demonstrate the particular connections between the texts. More specifically, the figures of the SynChron agree with the ones in the Vind. Gr. 99 but not with the Chronikon Epitomon in more than one case (birth of Mahalaleel, death of Mathouselah, birth of Noah, birth of Peleg, reigns of Chushanrishathaim, Deborah and Barak, Josiah, Eliakim, first Olympic Games). This suggests that the source of the SynChron could not have been the version of the Chronikon Epitomon but of the Vind. Gr. 99. This is confirmed by various passages that are present in the SynChron and the Vind. Gr. 99 but not in the Chronikon Epitomon, which we shall discuss below. As far as the chronology is concerned, the summary of the chronology after the exodus is indicative of the relationship between the texts:

Μωϋσῆς ἐτῶν π’ ἔξαγει τὸν λαὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, τέρασι καὶ σημείως, μετὰ υἱ’ ἐτή τῆς εἰς Αἰγύπτου τοῦ Ιακώβ μετοικήσεως, ἦν δὲ ο λαὸς μυρίαδες ἐξήκοντα. Συνάγονται οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδάμ ἐως τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ ἐτή βῆμβ’, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ ἐως τῆς γεννήσεως Αβραάμ ἐτή ἀπή’, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρῶτου ἐτους Αβρααμ ἐως τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν νυν Ἰσραηλ, ἤγουν τὸ ὁγυιοκοστὸ ἐτεὶ τῆς ἐως Μωσέως, ἐτή βε’, ὑσυμοι ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου ἐως τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐτή γωλε’. Ο’ δὲ Μωϋσῆς καθηγήσατο τοῦ Ἰσραηλ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα, καὶ θνήσκει ἐτῶν ρκ΄, μη ἔστελθαι εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. (SynChron, 8.10-9)

It is evident that the SynChron is closer to the Vind. Gr. 99 than the Chronikon Epitomon; nevertheless, they also present differences between themselves, both in content and chronology. As we see in the chronological table above, the two texts carry different numbers in the cases of Salah, Reu, Serug, Nahor, the promise to Abraham, Moses, the time between the creation and the exodus, the cataclysm of Ogygos. More significantly, there are instances when the SynChron and the Chronikon Epitomon agree between themselves, but disagree with the Vind. Gr. 99 (death of Seth, death of Enos, birth of Kohath, age of Moses at the time of the exodus) although it should be noted that in some of the above cases, the editor of the text attaches question marks to the relevant numbers indicating that their reading from the manuscript is not clear, which makes their use unsafe for drawing definite conclusions. They do show, however, that it is possible that the SynChron does not obtain its material directly from the Vind. Gr. 99 but from a different text of the Chronikon Epitomon family.

More reliable conclusions can be drawn from the study of the content of the texts. First, the differences in the content of the texts seem to confirm the suggestion drawn from the chronological data, that the SynChron has a stronger relationship with the Vind. Gr. 99 than the Chronikon Epitomon. More specifically, a number of passages of the Vind. Gr. 99 that are not present in the Chronikon Epitomon find their way to the SynChron: Abraham and his relatives (Vind. Gr. 99, 11.22, SynChron, 6.26-7.2), Jacob's wives and children (Vind. Gr. 99, 12.11, SynChron, 7.17-24), the background of Moses (Vind. Gr. 99, 12.21, SynChron, 8.4-9), the exodus (Vind. Gr. 99, 13.1, SynChron, 8.9-12), Joshua (Vind. Gr. 99, 13.13, SynChron, 8.26-30), the building of the Temple (Vind. Gr. 99, 15.10, SynChron, 10.24-5) and the capture of Mattaniah (Vind. Gr. 99, 17.9, SynChron, 13.16-8). It is noteworthy that the last passage is also present in the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae (325.4-7), which is indicative of its connection with the SynChron and the Vind. Gr. 99 (especially in relation to the Chronikon Epitomon). This is not the only case, and our conclusions in the following section, where we examine the additional examples, support further the suggestion

399 It is possible that this is a scribal mistake; the Vind. Gr. 99 does not carry the same number as the Chronikon Epitomon (135), as it was the case in the previous instances when the Vind. Gr. 99 and the SynChron had a different figure.
that the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon} could not have been the direct or main source of the \textit{SynChron}.

Having said that, the strong similarities between the \textit{SynChron} and the \textit{Vind. Gr. 99} do not necessarily signify that the latter is the direct source of the \textit{SynChron} either. As with the chronological information, there is at least one example that suggests that the text of the family of the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon} that was used as the main source of the \textit{SynChron} was not the \textit{Vind. Gr. 99}. The last phrase of the passage of the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon} on the foundation of Rome (\textit{Chron. Epit.}, 16.18-20), part of which we find in the \textit{SynChron} (12.15-7), is missing from the \textit{Vind. Gr. 99}. If this is not an oversight of a scribe, it strengthens the hypothesis that the \textit{SynChron} is not based directly on the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon} or the \textit{Vind. Gr. 99}, but a common earlier version.

As we mentioned earlier, the relevant narrative of the \textit{Vind. Gr. 99} finishes at the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Nevertheless, the remainders of the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon} and the \textit{SynChron} present significant similarities, which indicate that the text of the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon} family that was used by the author of the archetype of the \textit{SynChron} did not end at the same point as the \textit{Vind. Gr. 99}. In the following, we examine the similarities and differences between the \textit{SynChron} and the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon} in this later part, in order to describe the characteristics of the text of the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon} family that was the source of the \textit{SynChron}.

As far as the structure is concerned, it is substantially similar in both texts. Although the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon} is a short chronicle, and therefore does not contain as much information as the \textit{SynChron}, they both introduce the emperors in the same way, and they seem to share the majority of the chronological data. Having said that, their structure does not always coincide: for example, Sogdianus (\textit{SynChron}, 17.16), one of the Ptolemies (\textit{SynChron}, 19.6), Pupienus (\textit{SynChron}, 36.12), Marius (\textit{SynChron}, 37.10-1), Quintillus (\textit{SynChron}, 39.3-8) are all missing from the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon}, which suggest either that they were present in the variant of the \textit{Chronikon Epitomon}.

\footnote{It is noteworthy that Pupienus is also missing from the text of Leo the Grammarian, which could indicate a connection between the two texts.}
that was used by the author of the archetype of the *SynChron*, or that he also collected information from additional texts.

As far as the content is concerned, both texts seem to put emphasis on significant religious and ecclesiastical issues, such as persecutions or Ecumenical Councils, although the respective entries do not always match. The same applies to other events in the narratives of the reigns of the emperors; however, further common passages in the later part suggest that the *SynChron* and the *Chronikon Epitomon* (or another related text) share a strong relationship in their full length. For example:

**The recapture of Jerusalem by the Jews**

\[\text{Οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι χρόνοις ὑστεροῦ ἐβδομήκοντα ἐπὶ Δαρείου τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως ἀπολυθέντες, εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἠλθον, καὶ τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὸν ναὸν αὐθις ἀνενεώσαντο.} \quad \text{*SynChron*, 14.6-8}\]

\[\text{Οἱ μὲν οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι χρόνοις ὑστεροῦ ἐβδομήκοντα ἐπὶ Δαρείου τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως ἀπελύθησαν τῆς αἰχμαλώσιας καὶ ἀναχθέντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὸν ναὸν αὐθις ἀνενεώσαντο.} \quad \text{*Chron. Epit.*, 17.19-22}\]

**Alexander**

\[\text{Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδὼν μετὰ τὸ ἀνελεῖν τὸν Δαρείον τοῦτον καὶ καθελεῖν τὴν Περσῶν αρχὴν τελείως, ἀπὸ τούτου ἐπὶ τέσσαρα. ὑπαγόμενος τὴν Ἀσιαν, ὑποτάξας καὶ δουλωσάμενος Ἐλλήνων μὲν φύλας δεκατρεῖς, καὶ βαρβάρων ἐθνῶν ιγʹ \quad \text{ἐτελεύτησε} \quad \text{αὐτὴν τὴν Βαβυλῶνα ἐν ἔτει ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου ἐξδʹ.} \quad \text{*SynChron*, 17.27-18.1}\]

\[\text{Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακεδὼν μετὰ τὸ ἀνελεῖν τὸν Δαρείον τοῦτον καὶ καθελεῖν τελείως τὴν Περσῶν ἐβασίλευσεν ᾧ δέ καὶ τοὺς κορυφαίους ἀποστόλους Πέτρον καὶ Παῦλον ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἀθλήσαντες.} \quad \text{*Chron. Epit.*, 19.31-20.3}\]

**Nero's persecution**

\[\text{καὶ διωγμὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν κινήσας, ἐτιμωρήσατο μὲν καὶ ἄλλους πολλοὺς, ἀνείλε} \quad \text{καὶ τοὺς κορυφαίους τῶν Ἀποστόλων Πέτρον καὶ Παῦλον.} \quad \text{*SynChron*, 28.26-8}\]

\[\text{Ὅτιος διωγμὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀνεγείρας ἐτιμωρήσατο μὲν καὶ ἐτέρους ὅσον ὀλίγους, ἀνείλε} \quad \text{καὶ τοὺς κορυφαίους τῶν Ἀποστόλων Πέτρον καὶ Παῦλον ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἀθλήσαντες.} \quad \text{*Chron. Epit.*, 23.8-11}\]

\[401 \text{Cf. the other parallel passages in pp. 47ff.}\]
Synchronisation: Plutarch (Hadrian)

Plutarch Chaeroneus [...] philosophi insignes habentur. (Eus., Hier. Chron., 198.1)

Ἐπὶ τοῦτον Πλούταρχος ὁ σοφότατος ἦν. (SynChron, 31.12)

Ἐπὶ τοῦτον Πλούταρχος φιλόσοφος ὁ Χειρωνεὺς ἐγνωρίζετο [...]. (Chron. Epit., 23.34-24.1)

Ignatios' martyrdom

Ignatius quoque Antiochenae ecclesiae episcopus Romam perductus bestiis traditur
(Eus., Hier. Chron., 194.24-6)

Ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἅγιον Ἰγνάτιος ὁ θεοφόρος ἐν ῾Ρώμῃ ἐμαρτύρησε θηρίοις βορὰ παραδοθεὶς. (Anon. Matr., 50.1-3)

Ὑπὸ τοῦτον ὁ ἅγιος Ἰγνάτιος ὁ Θεοφόρος θηρίοις παραδοθεὶς, τὸ μαρτυρικὸν ἀνεδήσατο στέφος. (SynChron, 31.1-2)

Ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἅγιον Ἰγνάτιος ὁ θεοφόρος ἐπὶ ῾Ρώμης ἐμαρτύρησε, θηρίοις βορὰ παραδοθεὶς. (Chron. Epit., 23.31-2)

Synchronisation: Justin – Oppianus – Sextus (Marcus Aurelius)

Ἐπὶ τοῦτον Ἰουστῖνος ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐμαρτύρησεν, Ὀππιανός τε καὶ Σέξτος ἡκμαζον. (SynChron, 32.15-7)

Ἐπὶ τοῦτον Ἰουστῖνος ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐμαρτύρησεν. Κατὰ τούτους τοὺς καιρούς Ὀππιανός τε ὁ τὴν ἀλιευτικὴν ποίησιν συγγραψάμενος, καὶ Σέξτος ἡκμαζον. (Chron. Epit., 24.5-8)

Millennium of Rome (37.17-9)

Regnantibus Philippi millesimus annus Romanae urbis expletus est. Ob quam sollemnitatem innumerabiles bestiae in circo mango interfectae ludique in campo Martio thetrales tribus diebus ac noctibus populo peruirigilante celebrati. (Eus., Hier. Chron., 217.17-21)

Ἐπὶ τοῦτον ἕρωτάν ἔτος πληρωθὲν ἀπὸ ῾Ρωμὺλου καὶ κτίσεως ῾Ρώμης, ῾Ρωμαῖοι ἐώρτασαν μέγιστα θεάματα παρασκευεῖν. (Eklog. Histor. (Wirth), 16.22-4)

Τετάρτῳ δὲ ἔτει τῆς τούτου βασιλείας, πληρωθέντων ἐτῶν χιλίων ἀπὸ τῆς υπὸ τοῦ ῾Ρωμύλου, ἐώρτασαν οἱ ῾Ρωμαῖοι μεγίστην θεαμάτων παρασκευὴν. (SynChron, 37.17-9)

Τῷ δὲ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς τούτου βασιλείας πληρωθέντος ἔτους χιλιοστοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως ῾Ρώμης τὴν υπὸ τοῦ ῾Ρωμύλου, ἐώρτασαν οἱ ῾Ρωμαῖοι μεγίστην θεαμάτων παρασκευὴν. (Chron. Epit., 24.24-6)

Relics of St Andrew and St Luke the Evangelist (56.1-5)
Oὗτος ὁ Κωνστάντιος καὶ τὰ τῶν πανευφήμων ἀποστόλων ἁγίων λειψαν Ἀνδρέου τοῦ Πρωτοκλήτου καὶ Λουκᾶ τοῦ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ ἀπὸ Ἀχαίας διὰ τοῦ μεγαλομάρτυρος Ἀρτεμίου ἀνακομίζει καὶ ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἐντίμως κατατίθησιν. \(\text{(SynChron, 56.1-5)}\)

Ἐπὶ τούτου τὰ τίμια λειψαν τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων Ἀνδρέου, Λουκᾶ καὶ Τιμοθέου μετεκομίσθησαν εἰς Κωνσταντινούπολιν καὶ κατετέθησαν ἐν τῷ πανσέπτῳ ναῷ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων. \(\text{(Chron. Epit., 27.1-4)}\)

Romanos and co-emperors (167.15-9)

Ῥωμανὸς ὁ Διογένης, σὺν αὐτῇ τῇ βασιλίδι Εὐδοκία, καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου παισίν αὐτῆς, Μιχαὴλ, Ανδρονίκω καὶ Κωνσταντῖνῳ τοῖς βασιλεύσι, καὶ ἐτέροις πάλιν ἱδίους μετ’ αὐτῆς ὑιῶν Νικηφόρῳ καὶ Λέοντι, καὶ αὐτοῖς βασιλεύσων, ἐτή τρία, μήνας η’. \(\text{(SynChron, 167.15-9)}\)

Ῥωμανὸς ὁ Διογένης ὑπὸ Εὐδοκίας ἀναχθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλεῖαν καὶ τὴν ἐκείνης συμβίωσιν ἐβασίλευσε σὺν αὐτῇ καὶ τοῖς ρηθεῖσι παισίν αὐτῆς, τοῖς τοῦ Δουκίτζη ὑιοῖς Μιχαὴλ, Ανδρονίκω καὶ Κωνσταντῖνῳ, καὶ ἐτέροις πάλιν ἱδίους ἐκ τῆς Εὐδοκίας γεννηθεῖσιν αὐτῷ Νικηφόρῳ καὶ Λέοντι, ἐτή γ´ μήνας η´. \(\text{(Chron. Epit., 32.9-13)}\)

Conclusion

The basis for the structure of the SynChron was a text from the family of the Chronikon Epitomon. It could neither have been the Chronikon Epitomon itself or the Vind. Gr. 99, but a text that preceded them; its exact place in the tradition can be traced through the juxtaposition of the passages that are common with Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae, whose analysis follows. Its similarities with the Anon. Matr.\(^{402}\) and the Niceph., Chron. Synt.\(^{403}\) suggest a common source,\(^{404}\) whose information found its way into the SynChron. Additionally, much of the information from Eusebius' chronicle that we find in the SynChron seems to have also derived from the same text.\(^{405}\)

\(^{402}\) See p. 242.

\(^{403}\) See p. 244.

\(^{404}\) According to Karpozelos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, II, 537, who also includes the Eklog. Histor. (Wirth), they are all later adaptations of a chronicle that was written in the circles of Alexandria at the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th centuries.

\(^{405}\) Also see p. 207 or the above examples on the synchronisations of Plutarch and Ignatios, which derive originally from the chronicle of Eusebius. As far as its connection to Zonaras is concerned, the two texts do not seem to coincide often enough to suggest a direct connection. Furthermore, as we see elsewhere, the relationship between the SynChron and Zonaras does not seem to come from the Chronikon Epitomon tradition. Nevertheless, there is a case, in which the Chronikon Epitomon and Zonaras present closer similarities between themselves than to the SynChron; the martyrdom of Babylas and Kyprianos is placed in the reign of Decius by the Chronikon Epitomon (24.27-30) and Zonaras (3.156.8-157.2), whereas the SynChron puts the martyrdom of Babylas (only) in the reign of Numerianus (40.9-11). However, this is a unique occurrence and does not necessarily suggest a further connection between the texts.
The Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae

The Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae is a work of the early sixth century that is attributed to Athanasios, and – as its title suggests – is an abridgement of the books of the Bible. Another work with the same subject is a Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae, attributed to John Chrysostom; it shares various passages with Athanasios' text, and probably used it as one of its sources. The sections of the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae on the Judges (Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacr., 312.44-313.40) and on the Kings (Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacr., 321.24-325.21, Chrys., Syn. Scr. Sacr., 354.45-356.22) bear significant similarities to the respective sections of the Chronikon Epitomon/Vind. Gr. 99 and the SynChron, and – as we show below – it was used (either directly or through an intermediate text) as their main source. However, the exact nature of the connection between the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae, the different versions of the Chronikon Epitomon and the SynChron is not necessarily a straightforward one (namely, Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae → Chronikon Epitomon family → SynChron), and will be investigated below, starting with a comparison of their chronological structures. In the following table we provide the duration of the reigns, as given in the four texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chushanrishathaim</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othniel judges Israel</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekrops king of Athens</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Athens' kingdom</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deukalions' cataclysm in Thessaly</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaethons' burning in Ethiopia</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglon the king of Moab</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehud and Shamgar</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah and Barak</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreib, Zeb and Zevee</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abimelech the son of Gideon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tola the son of Puah</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jair the Gileadite</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

406 The section of John's Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae on the Judges is the same neither with Athanasios' text, nor with the Chronikon Epitomon or the SynChron. In addition to that, a prophet in Athanasios' text ("Σαμαίας" (321.38)), is missing from the text of John, but is present in the Vind. Gr. 99 (15.11) and the SynChron (10.30). As a result, we assume that the later texts used the synopsis of Athanasios as their source, and we focus our references on that.
The numbers of the above chronological tables confirm the existence of a close relationship between the texts, and provide some initial indications on the manner of their connection. In the cases of Barak and Josiah, the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* carries the same number with the *Chronikon Epitomon*, and not with the *Vind. Gr. 99* and the *SynChron*. This would indicate that the *Chronikon Epitomon* uses the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* as its source. However, the number given for the duration of the tenure of Eliakim (or Jehoiakim) suggests that this is not definitely the case; the number of the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* is the same as in the *Vind. Gr. 99* and the *SynChron*, and different to the number of the *Chronikon Epitomon*. Similarly, in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saul, first king of Israel</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David the prophet</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahazizah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotholia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhoas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah (Uzziah)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Olympics</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliakim (Jehoiakim)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim (Jehoiachin)</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattaniah (Zedekiah)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
case of Elon the Zebulonite, the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* is in agreement with the *SynChron*, but not with the *Chronikon Epitomon*, which provides a different number. As a result, we cannot use the chronological information alone in order to produce a conclusive answer on the connections between the texts. The juxtaposition of the respective content of the texts presents similar conundra, but can provide a better understanding of the connections between them.

First, the passage on Samson of the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* (Athan., *Syn. Scr. Sacr.*, 313.35-7) is also part of the *Vind. Gr. 99* (14.17) and the *SynChron* (9.24-5), but not the *Chronikon Epitomon*. Similarly, in the case of Manasseh's reign, the passages of the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* (324.29-39), the *SynChron* (12.26-13.1) and the *Vind. Gr. 99* (17.1) are closely related, whereas the *Chronikon Epitomon* does not contain such a passage; the same applies to the respective passages on Josiah (Athan., *Syn. Scr. Sacr.*, 324.45-55, *Vind. Gr. 99*, 17.4-5, *SynChron*, 13.4-9), and there are no cases where content of the *Chronikon Epitomon* is present in the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* but not in the *Vind. Gr. 99*. This would suggest that the *SynChron* draws the information of the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* from the *Vind. Gr. 99* and that the discrepancies in the chronology should be attributed to a careless scribe. This assumption is supported further by our conclusions on the relationship between the *Chronikon Epitomon* and the *Vind. Gr. 99*, and the *SynChron* in the relevant section.

However, in the last two cases that we mention above, the similarities between the *SynChron* with the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* are stronger; the style is similar and phrases of the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacra* and the *SynChron* are not present in the *Vind. Gr. 99*. This would suggest that the *SynChron* did not draw its material directly from the *Vind. Gr. 99* but from a text between that and the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae*; and indeed there are further examples that support this idea. In the case of Jhoas' death (*SynChron*, 10.17-8), the passage is missing from the *Vind. Gr. 99*, but it is present in Athan., *Syn. Scr. Sacr.*, 323.58-324.1, and the same applies to Azariah (Athan., *Syn. Scr. Sacr.*, 324.9-17, *SynChron*, 11.24-6) and the rebuilding of the

---

407 The respective number of the *Vind. Gr. 99* is missing from the manuscript.

408 See p. 237.
temple (Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacrae, 329.41-9, SynChron, 16.23-17.5). Similarly, in the passages on Amaziah's reign, although there are parallels between the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae and the Vind. Gr. 99, which confirm again that the former was used as a source for the latter, the SynChron has additional information, which are present in the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae but not the Vind. Gr. 99:

Ἀμεσίας νίος αὐτοῦ ἔτη κθʹ καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐν ἀρχῇ τὸ εὐθές, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς Δαβίδ· ἐτι γὰρ ὁ λαὸς ἐθυσίαζεν ἐν τοῖς υψηλοῖς, καὶ τὰ ἄλση οὐκ ἔξησεν. Καὶ ἐπὶ τούτου ἐπροφήτευσαν προφῆται· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγράφησαν τὰ νόματα αὐτῶν. Μετὰ ταύτα μέντοι, Ἀμεσίας, πατάξας τοὺς ἐν Σηεὶρ, ἑπήρθη, καὶ ἐλάτρευσε τοῖς εἰδώλοις τῶν Σηείρ, καὶ ἐπατάχθη παραδοθεὶς τοῖς ἐχθροῖς. (Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacrae, 324.2-9)

Μεσίας νίος αὐτοῦ ἔτη κθʹ· καὶ ἐποίησε ἐν ἀρχῇ τὸ εὐθές, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς Δαβίδ· ἔτι γὰρ ὁ λαὸς ἐθυσίαζεν ἐν τοῖς υψηλοῖς, ἑπατάξας τοὺς Σηεὶρ, ἐπήρθη καὶ ἐλάτρευσεν εἰδώλοις καὶ ἐπατάχθη ποτὲ ἐχθροῖς. (Vind. Gr. 99, 16.9)

Ἀμεσίας νίος αὐτοῦ ἔτη εἴκοσι εἴκοσι, καὶ ἐποίησε τοῖς υψηλοῖς, πλὴν τῶν εἰδώλων, καὶ τὰ ἄλση οὐκ ἔξησεν, εἶτα πατάξας τοὺς ἐν Σειὰρ, ἑπήρθη καὶ ἐλάτρευσεν εἰδώλοις καὶ ἐπατάχθη ποτὲ ἐχθροῖς. (SynChron, 11.19-22)

From the same passage, however, we can also discard the possibility that the SynChron gets the material directly from the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae and not from a text related to the Vind. Gr. 99; the phrase "ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς Δαβίδ· ἐτι γὰρ ὁ λαὸς ἐθυσίαζεν ἐν τοῖς υψηλοῖς" is only common to the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae and the Vind. Gr. 99, but missing from the SynChron. Similarly, the first part of the phrase "Καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ τελεία, ὡς Δαβίδ, ἀλλὰ ἐπορεύθη ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ." is only present in the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae (321.39) and the Vind. Gr. 99 (15.12), although the second part is present in all three texts (Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacrae, 321.10, Vind. Gr. 99, 15.12, SynChron, 11.12-3); the same applies in further cases, such as the movement of ten tribes to Samaria (Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacrae, 231.36-7, Vind. Gr. 99, 15.11), and the inclusion of Gotholia (Athan., Syn. Scr. Sacrae, 321.55, Vind. Gr. 99, 16.6).

In conclusion, our suggestion for the relationships between the texts can be found in Figure 2, generated from both our conclusions on the relationships between the texts of the Chronikon Epitomon family, and from the above comments on its connection to the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae.
**Chronographia Syntomos (Anon. Matr.)**

The anonymous text of the short chronicle *Chronographia Syntomos (Anon. Matr.)* appears frequently in the sources of the SynChron. As we see in chapter three, there are various similarities between the two texts, especially in the first part of the SynChron (SynChron, 6.15-6, 7.3-7, 7.8-11, 7.12-6, 7.26-8.2, 8.20-5, 9.3-9, 9.22-3, 10.16-7, Anon. Matr., 5.1-2, 8.5-9, 8.12-9.3, 10.1-4, 10.10-11.7, 11.16-12.6, 13.5-14.5, 16.5-6, 19.3-4), or the early sections of the second part (SynChron, 31.1-2, 33.10-2, Anon. Matr., 50.1-3, 51.14-5), most of them concerning synchronisations. However, all the common passages appear concurrently with corresponding passages from the Chronikon Epitomon; hence, it is more probable that the common information came through the Chronikon Epitomon family, especially since there is no evidence to suggest that the tradition of the SynChron used the Chronographia Syntomos directly.

**Ekloge Historion (Cramer)**

The anonymous *Ekloge Historion* of the ninth century appears to be a parallel text to the SynChron in such cases, which would imply a further connection with either the SynChron or one of its main sources. The latter assumption seems to have a valid basis; in some cases (e.g. SynChron, 5.27-31, 7.8-11, 8.20-5, 9.3-9) the Ekloge Historion is parallel to the Chronikon Epitomon, but this is probably due to the use of a common source (possibly Eusebius). In others the similarities can be attributed to the shared use of material from Malalas (e.g. Chron. Brev. (Paris.), 19.19-31, 22.12-28). However, since there are no strong similarities between the Ekloge Historion and the SynChron itself, the possibility of a direct connection between them should probably be discarded.

**Ekloge Historion (Wirth)**

The Ekloge Historion is a short chronicle that starts from Moses and concludes with Alexios I Komnenos. Although it shares the same title with the text edited by Cramer...
(Eklog. Histor. (Cram.)), the two texts do not convey the same text.\textsuperscript{412} There are numerous parallel passages between the Ekloge Historion (Wirth) and the SynChron, as seen in chapter three, but they do not seem to imply a direct connection between them; they are all distinct passages with no connection between them, and there are very few examples with identical content. It is more likely that they share the same sources; in the first part, the Chronikon Epitomon, with which the Ekloge Historion has further connections, and in the second part a text from the family of the Epitome, as suggested by the presence of an Epitome text in all the cases when we note a parallel passage between the Ekloge Historion (Wirth) and the SynChron.

\textbf{Other short chronicles}

\textbf{Peter of Alexandria}

There are a number of parallel passages between the chronicle of Peter of Alexandria and the SynChron, notably in the relation of the Ecumenical Councils, for which the SynChron may have consulted a separate text, or drew the material from a related chronicle. The parallels, however, are only minor and there are no other indications that the two texts had consulted the same source. As far as the similarities in the chronologies of the two texts are concerned, they can be attributed to their common indirect sources,\textsuperscript{413} rather than a connection between them.

\textbf{Chronographeion Syntomon}

There are certain similarities between the chronologies of the Chronographeion Syntomon and the SynChron, but there are no further signs of a connection between the two texts. If we take into account that there are only indirect connections, albeit consistent, between the SynChron and Eusebius's chronicle (Jerome), there is no reason to suggest that the material of the SynChron is linked to the Chronographeion Syntomon.

\textsuperscript{412} Karpozelos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, II, 599.

\textsuperscript{413} See Karpozelos, Vyzantinoi Historikoi, II, 558-60
Patriarch Nikephoros

Breviarium historicum

The Breviarium historicum, an account of the events that took place between the years 602-769, appears frequently in the parallel passages of the SynChron for the period. However, it does not appear to be part of its 'main sources', and it is one of its 'other sources' in only a few cases (SynChron, 110.8-10, 116.11-117.18, 117.26-119.24, 120.10-5, 120.26-8). Even then, it does not seem to be directly connected to the tradition of the SynChron, as other texts appear as the 'main' or 'other' sources of the SynChron (e.g. Justinian II’s invasion of Cherson and the subsequent revolt of Philippikos (SynChron, 118.4-119.11), where the material comes from Theophanes, or the mutiny of the fleet against the emperor Artemios (SynChron, 120.10-5), where the source is one of the texts of the Epitome. As a result, the similarities between the SynChron and the Breviarium historicum should be attributed to the use of common sources. 414

Chronographikon Syntomon

The similarities between the SynChron and the Chronographikon Syntomon do not appear to suggest a connection between the two texts. 415 Although there are similarities in their chronologies (especially in the cases of the Roman emperors), there are more divergences between them than between the SynChron and other texts. The small number of common synchronisations (e.g. SynChron, 33.10, 33.12) and the various parallel passages (such as the passage on Alexander (SynChron, 17.29-18.1)) might reflect the proximity to the Excerpta Barbari, the Anon. Matr., the Ekloge Historion (Wirth), and mainly the Chronikon Epitomon, 416 whose close relationship to the SynChron we discuss elsewhere. The only passage with a strong connection between the SynChron and the Chronographikon Syntomon is the section with the list of the bishops of Byzantium (SynChron, 48.16-49.27). The common source, which was also used by Kallistos Xanthopoulos, is a text that has not survived. Nevertheless,

415 Mango (in Nikephoros, Short history, 2-4) indicates the problems of de Boor’s edition, which does not take into account the Slavonic versions and the four oldest manuscripts, and suggests a new edition, which should also take into account the context of other similar contemporary texts; this could produce new evidence on the relationships between the texts, and possibly alter our views on its place within the tradition of the SynChron.
it does not change our earlier conclusions on the lack of connection between the *SynChron* and the *Chronographikon Syntomon*. The passage in question deals with a particular issue, and was not necessarily part of a common historiographical text; it was rather an independent text, one of the catalogues of bishops (and the patriarchs) that were in common circulation in Byzantium.417

**George Synkellos**

The chronicle of George Synkellos maintains a central position in the Byzantine chronicle tradition; this applies both to the transmission of its early (often non-surviving) authorities,418 and to the chronological presentation of the material it contains. The value of the latter is particularly high, because it demonstrates the Byzantine perception of chronology of the events of the Old Testament and the synchronisations with the corresponding secular events and pagan kings, as well as the chronology of the Roman rulers, kings and, later, emperors.419

Since the *SynChron* is based on some of the same texts and its structure on the same chronological background, the great number of parallel incidents between the two texts, narrated in similar fashion, does not come as a surprise; yet, they do not necessarily denote a connection between them – neither a direct nor an indirect one. This is best seen in the passages where Eusebius is the indirect source of the *SynChron* (e.g. *SynChron*, 9.27-8, 11.27-12.11, 31.4-9, 32.15-7, 35.29-31), to which Synkellos appears consistently as an indirect source or a parallel text. However, although Synkellos' text is valuable in allowing us to confirm that certain passages derive from Eusebius, they actually reach the *SynChron* through other intermediary texts. The same applies to other early authorities which are alluded in the *SynChron*, such as Ephorus (10.16-7), Manetho (*SynChron*, 6.15-9) or Josephus (*SynChron*, 5.18-20).

---

417 See pp. 295ff.
419 Karpozelos, *Vyzantinoi Historikoi*, II, 89.
**Theophanes**

The chronicle of Theophanes has a central place amongst the sources of the *SynChron*. It appears constantly as a 'main source' of numerous passages of the *SynChron*, and more often than not as the single main source of sections of the text (e.g. *SynChron*, 64.10-7, 65.15-31, 71.31-72.25, 73.29-74.6, 81.25-31, 83.24-7, 88.13-8, 89.25-90.2, 96.10-97.22, 111.19-23, 111.30-113.8). Interestingly, the author of the *SynChron* does not seem to have had into his disposal the exact same version of Theophanes that we do. As we have seen elsewhere, the *SynChron* incorporates material from Procopius and Theodore Anagnostes through Theophanes, but the similarities to the original texts are often stronger than to Theophanes' chronicle. As a result, we can assume that the source of the *SynChron* did not use Theophanes as we now know it, and either had 'corrected' certain parts in order to resemble the sources more faithfully, or had just used a manuscript with substantial differences to the current edition.

Furthermore, the frequent use of Theophanes' chronicle does not necessarily indicate that it was the sole source of the *SynChron* for the respective events or that it was used verbatim and with no further consultation of other texts. For example, although Theophanes' text was the main pool for the reigns of the emperors Zeno and Anastasios, the information for the passages relating the changes in the *Trisagios* hymn and the subsequent reactions (*SynChron*, 90.18-26, 90.30-1) do not come from Theophanes but from the tradition of the Epitome. Similarly, although Theophanes (Theoph., 351.19-24) is clearly the main source of the passage describing the martyrdom of Maximos (*SynChron*, 111.2-11), its linguistic similarities with Kedrenos (Kedr., 1.761.21-3) suggest that it was also influenced by an additional text, again from the tradition of the Epitome.

The connection between the chronicle of Theophanes, the Epitome and the *SynChron* is not restricted to only a small number of examples; it spans to a wide spectrum of

---


421 See p. 216 and p. 219.

422 Also see Mango's and Scott's remarks on the tradition of Theophanes and the defects of de Boor's edition, in Theophanes Confessor, *The Chronicle*, xcv- xcviii.
passages, which suggest a closer relationship between them (e.g. SynChron, 41.28-42.4, 42.15-25, 60.1-6, 63.13-9, 70.16-8, 71.9-26, 73.8-29, 79.6-80.24, 83.27-84.12, 87.19-23, 88.18-26, 94.5-7, 107.15-20, 108.4-15, 118.4-119.24). This can be due the use of a common source by both Theophanes and the tradition of the Epitome (e.g. Theodosius' actions against the Arians (SynChron, 62.25-63.5), which seems to originate from Anagnostes (Anagn., HE, 229.1-8). It could also suggest that parts of Theophanes' text were used as the source of the texts of the Epitome, and since the latter were also used as sources in the composition of the SynChron, we cannot distinguish with certainty the direct source of the Synopsis.

**Theophanes Continuatus**

Passages from the continuation of Theophanes start appearing as parallel to the SynChron from as early as the reference to the prediction of the monk in Philomelion (SynChron, 129.15-130.1), immediately after the last occurrence of Theophanes in the 'parallel passages', namely the attempted usurpation of Bardanios (SynChron, 129.13-5). However, although Theophanes has been a main source of the SynChron up to that point, the same does not apply to his continuation. In only two instances are passages of Theophanes Continuatus among the 'main sources' of the SynChron. One is the letter of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus during the revolt of Leo Phokas (SynChron, 148.30-149.11); however, in this case, the letter is conveyed verbatim by several texts (Leo Gramm., 302.7-21, Pseudo-Symeon, 729.22-730.12, Theoph. Cont., 396.3-16, George Monk Cont., 888.14-889.6), and there is no way to identify the precise source of the SynChron. The other passage is the account of Theodora's meal with the bishops (SynChron, 137.22-138.8, Theoph. Cont., 160.16-161.17); again, other texts that are frequently 'main sources' of the SynChron (such as Pseudo-Symeon, 653.3-654.5, Kedr., 2.149.19-150.19, Skylitz., 88.12-89.36) appear along Theophanes Continuatus, and they are indeed more likely to be its source in this case. However, all the above texts present substantial linguistic similarities and the idea that Theophanes Continuatus is part of the tradition consulted in the composition of the SynChron cannot be discarded. Additional support to this suggestion is given by the further similarities between the two texts, which are not scarce, since segments of Theophanes Continuatus are regularly present in the 'parallel passages', and often in the 'other sources' (particularly in the section dealing with Basil I) of the SynChron;
however, a closer connection between the two texts cannot be established based on such indications.

**George the Monk**

The text of George the Monk was one of the most popular and widespread Byzantine chronicles, with numerous manuscripts and different versions in circulation. It is no surprise, then, that parts of the *SynChron* resemble numerous passages of George the Monk; in fact, the relationship between the two texts is evident even from the first part of the *SynChron* (Adam – Julius Caesar), when the two texts transmit parallel passages in a similar manner (e.g. *SynChron*, 4.28-5.1, 9.24-5, 11.29-12.11, 15.10-16.18, 21.21-22.28). The same happens in numerous occasions in the second part of the chronicle (Aeneas – Byzantine emperors), but it remains to be seen if this is due to a direct connection between the two texts, or if they are only linked through the use of common sources.

An example that suggests a close link between George the Monk and the *SynChron* is the short passage on the duration of the life and reign of Constantine I (Georg. Monk, 525.11-3, *SynChron*, 43.5-11). Although it is not possible to suggest with certainty that the source of the *SynChron* was indeed the chronicle of George (the information was widely available and the resemblance could have been a mere coincidence; also, the passage of George the Monk is at a different point of the narrative, after the death of Constantine, whereas in the *SynChron* it is at the beginning of Constantine's reign), both texts share the division of the reign of Constantine between Rome and Constantinople; this is a unique parallel, especially as far as the other sources of the *SynChron* are concerned, and it could indicate a more direct connection between the two texts.

The issue of the exact character of the relationship between George the Monk and the *SynChron* is associated with their respective links to the texts of the Epitome; that is to say that in numerous cases, passages of the *SynChron* present significant similarities to both George the Monk and a text (or texts) from the family of the Epitome, and as result could originate from either (e.g. *SynChron*, 18.14-9, 42.4-5, 50.6-12, 63.26-31, 81.4-9, 114.1-26, 123.1-17). The situation becomes more complicated if we take into account that they often drew their information from the
same material, and that several redactions of the text of George the Monk (as well as the text of George the Monk Continuatus) were influenced by the various versions of the Epitome.

The hypothesis for a connection between George the Monk and the SynChron through a text of the Epitome is supported further by the study of the relationship between the SynChron and a specific redaction of George the Monk, the text that appears in the edition of Muralt in 1859. This is a different version of the text (with numerous editorial flaws), which extends until 1143, and incorporates parts of the continuation of George the Monk and the Epitome (which partly explains the further similarities with the SynChron). Numerous passages of the text of this redaction (Georg. Monk (PG)), which are not to be found in the text of George the Monk, are present in the SynChron (e.g. SynChron, 62.23-4, 81.1-4, 84.15-26, 91.3-8, 91.28-92.8, 98.11-8, 113.21-2, 116.11-117.18, 120.10-5); although some of them may originally derive from the Epitome, others suggest that the SynChron utilised a different version of George the Monk than the edition we have in our hands. In the passage that relates the presidents of the fourth Ecumenical Council (SynChron, 81.1-4), the SynChron and George the Monk (PG) (749.37-41) are the only historiographical texts that mention Maximos of Antioch. Both texts present strong similarities to Kedrenos (1.604.23-605.3), which would indicate the use of the Epitome tradition, but the reference to Maximos points to a direct connection between the SynChron and George the Monk (PG). Additional parallels in the last section of the first part of the SynChron (SynChron, 166.7-21, 167.3-14, 167.30-168.1, 169.1-7, 169.28-170.14, 173.2-8) support further the connection between the two texts; as we discuss elsewhere, there is no surviving source for the section 152.8-173.8, and the numerous connections between George the Monk (PG) and this part of the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{423}} \text{Cf. Gelzer, \textit{Africanus}, I, 110-1, II, 294-6.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{425}} \text{George the Monk, \textit{Chronicon}, reprinted in PG, 110, 41-1260, which we have used in our study.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{426}} \text{Krumbacher and Soteriades, \textit{Historia}, 723-4.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{427}} \text{The edition of de Boor does not carry the conclusive text of George the Monk, and a new edition is needed (see Hunger, \textit{Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur}, I, 350).}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{428}} \text{See pp. 304ff.}\]
*SynChron*\(^{429}\) strengthen the possibility that the *SynChron* drew its information from the same pool.

In addition to the use of a different version of George the Monk, we also notice that the version A of George the Monk Continuatus appears frequently among the sources of the *SynChron* (*SynChron*, 133.18-23, 136.8-23, 139.19-141.15, 145.14-6, 147.26-30, 150.27-151.17). Again, it usually appears along texts, such as Pseudo-Symeon, Leo the Grammarian or Kedrenos, which may suggest either the use of a common source from the tradition of the Epitome, or that the material of George the Monk Continuatus that we find in the *SynChron* came from the version of George the Monk that was used in the compilation of the *Synopsis*. Although the latter cannot be discarded, the use of the Epitome in the *SynChron* in the relation of other events close to the above narratives as well as the close connection between the version A of Continuatus with the different versions of the texts of Symeon Logothetes,\(^ {430}\) indicate that the former suggestion is the most plausible.

**Epitome – Symeon Logothetes**

As it has already indicated by Patzig,\(^ {431}\) and as we can also assume from the numerous relevant references in the previous chapter of this study, a large part of the material of the *SynChron* was drawn from a text or texts from the family of the Epitome. Unfortunately, it is not always straightforward to have a clear image of the relationship between the *SynChron* and the texts that derive from the Epitome, mainly due to the lack of final editions of the different texts and versions, and even conclusive ideas on the connections between the texts of the Epitome themselves; we often do not know the date of their compilation, and we have to deal with open issues concerning their authorship and their distinct place within the tradition. Nevertheless, in the following section we make an attempt to describe the similarities between the

\(^{429}\) For example, the passages in *SynChron*, 166.7-21, 167.3-14, 167.30-18.1, 169.1-7, 169.28-170.14, 173.2-8, present similarities only to the respective passages of George the Monk (PG) 1237.25-7, 1240.19-30, 1241.10-5, 1248.18-22, 1248.38-42, 1260.42-7.

\(^{430}\) Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur*, I, 349.

\(^{431}\) Patzig, *”Quellen des Zonaras I”*, 28-30.
SynChron and certain Epitome texts\textsuperscript{432} and to define the possible relationships between them.

The Epitome is a non-surviving chronicle, usually attributed to the patrikios Trajan, which initially concluded its narrative in the seventh century but was later continued to the ninth and tenth centuries.\textsuperscript{433} It was used as the basis for the chronicle of Symeon Logothetes, which presents further problems of its own. Symeon's chronicle does not survive in a single version, and there are various different texts attributed to Symeon Logothetes, which are mainly revisions and continuations of the Epitome, or compilations of parts of the Epitome in conjunction with other sources. Furthermore, they are often presented and perceived as different texts, attributed to different authors, who are frequently non-existent or mere copyists of manuscripts.\textsuperscript{434} Scholarship has yet to decide on the exact relationships between the different versions, or to agree on a final version for the chronicle of Symeon,\textsuperscript{435} but it is generally agreed that the different texts belong to two clusters, depending on which version of the Epitome they were following: the first group of texts conveys a short version of the chronicle of Symeon, which is often called Epitome A, and the second one follows an extended version of the text, called Epitome B.\textsuperscript{436} In addition to the two groupings, there is also the chronicle of Pseudo-Symeon, which is also related to the different versions of Symeon, but presents substantial differences; their relationship has been the object of unresolved debate.\textsuperscript{437}

\textsuperscript{432} We focus our attention on the texts that present the most and more consistent appearances in the previous chapter, namely the texts of Leo the Grammarian, Kedrenos and Pseudo-Symeon; nevertheless, when appropriate, we also take into account other versions of the Epitome/"Symeon Logothetes", such as the texts of Theodosius Melitenos, George the Monk Continuatus (for which, see p. 250) and "Symeon" (PG 110, 1261-85).
\textsuperscript{434} Wahlgren, "Symeon the Logothete", 251-262.
\textsuperscript{435} Unfortunately, we did not have the opportunity to consult the newly published edition by S. Wahlgren (Symeon Logothetes, \textit{Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon}).
\textsuperscript{437} Ostrogorski, "Slavjanskij", 33-6, suggests that Pseudo-Symeon was a different version of Symeon Logothetes, part of the texts of Epitome A. Kazhdan, "Chronika", 136, proposes that the source of Pseudo-Symeon was the original text of Symeon Logothetes. On the other hand, Markopoulos, \textit{PseudoSymeon}, 25, suggests that the chronicle is actually related to the texts of Epitome B. For a brief discussion of the subject and further bibliography, see Hunger, \textit{Vyzantine Logotechnia}, II, 163-7, Hunger, \textit{Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur}, I, 354-7, Karpozelos, \textit{Vyzantinoi Historikoi}, II, 401-10; also see Mavromate-Katsougiannopoulou, \textit{Michael Glykas}, 272-4, Snipes, "Notes", 141-61, and a criticism of Markopoulos' suggestions in Dieten, "Review", 258-64.
In any case, in the following section we study the relationship between the *SynChron* and the Epitome, focusing mainly on similarities between passages of the *SynChron* and texts of the Epitome. In some cases, the data indicate a clear connection between the *SynChron* and a specific text of the family of the Epitome, which may be helpful in identifying which text or version of the Epitome was the source of the *SynChron*. However, there are also numerous examples of passages with strong similarities to more than one text of the Epitome; in such cases, which are mainly due to the complex relationships between the texts of the Epitome, it is not possible to trace the origin of the passages of the *SynChron* to one text. Nevertheless, the similarities do confirm the relationship of the *SynChron* to the cycle of the Epitome.

The source of the passage describing the rage of Ptolemy Philopator against the Jews (*SynChron*, 18.14-9) should be attributed to the family of the Epitome, as the apparent similarities with Georg. Monk, 435.14-436.2, Leo Gramm., 50.21-51.8, Kedr., 1.290.15-23, 340.3-14 show, and the same applies to the subsequent passage on Hyrkanus and Aristobulus (*SynChron*, 18.26-19.4) and the biggest part of the section narrating the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (*SynChron*, 13.18-14.16). The connection between the *SynChron* and the Epitome is also evident in the passage that describes the death of Pontius Pilate (*SynChron*, 28.3-9); Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou has already noted that only the family of the Epitome and its followers place the death of Pilate in the time of Tiberius, whereas the majority of the other sources suggest that Pilate committed suicide during the reign of either Gaius or Nero (or was beheaded by Nero, in Malalas). We also observe several similar examples in other passages, such as references to the presidents of the fourth Ecumenical Council (*SynChron*, 81.1-4), the triumph of Belisarius in Constantinople (*SynChron*, 98.11-8), the allegations against him and his death (*SynChron*, 98.31-99.3), the revolt and punishment of Tiberius and Heraclius (*SynChron*, 113.21-2), the Sixth Ecumenical Council (*SynChron*, 114.1-26) or the appointment of the emperor Anastasios (*SynChron*, 120.1-3).

Such examples verify the connection between the *SynChron* and the different versions of the Epitome, but leave open the question of the exact relationship between them.

---

Hence, we shall focus our attention on the Epitome texts that present the more consistent similarities to the SynChron, in order to try to identify the branches of the Epitome that were used in the composition of the SynChron.

The text of Leo the Grammarian appears numerous times in the 'main sources', in several cases as the sole main source of the SynChron. A case in point is the conclusion of the reference to the delphic oracle (SynChron, 25.11-20) during the reign of Augustus Octavius. The phrase "καὶ οὐκ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἀπόκρισις ἐκ τῆς Πυθίας, καὶ πάλιν ἐποίησεν ἄλλην θυσίαν, καὶ ἐπηρώτησε τὴν Πυθίαν τὸ διὰ τί οὐκ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἀπόκρισις, ἀλλὰ σιγὰ τὸ μαντεῖον." (Mal., 176.15-18, also in Kedr., 1.320.18-9, Sphrantz., Chron., 464.15-6), is only omitted in the texts of Leo the Grammarian and the SynChron, suggesting that the latter is either using the version of Leo as its source, or a related text that also omits the sentence. A similar example of Leo the Grammarian as the sole main source is the section outlining the reign of the emperor Domitian (SynChron, 30.9-16), where, although there are no linguistic similarities with the text of Leo the Grammarian, the structure and the content of the two texts are the same. Similarly, in the passage on the Persian wars and the recapture of the Holy Cross (SynChron, 108.4-15), the similarities in the structure and language suggest that the entry in the SynChron is a paraphrase of the text of Leo the Grammarian. Additionally, there are numerous other cases where the text of Leo the Grammarian is the only main source of the SynChron (SynChron, 27.28-28.1, 57.22-8, 68.2-10, 81.4-9, 91.3-9, 91.28-92.8, 100.18-21, 104.25-8, 113.13-20, 121.24-122.11), which could confirm the existence of a strong link between the two texts.

However, although the above examples, and the numerous references to Leo the Grammarian in the previous chapter indicate that the SynChron could have been based directly on the text of Leo, other passages seem to raise doubts over the possibility of a direct connection. In the passage that describes the translation of the "holy robe" and the relics of St Anastasia to Constantinople (SynChron, 87.3-6), although Leo the Grammarian appears to be the source of the SynChron, he does not mention the church in which the robe was placed. The additional information found in the SynChron does not necessarily suggest the use of an additional text (the information is present in various other texts, and it was part of the relevant tradition); nevertheless, it
is more likely that the *SynChron* did not use Leo but a different text from the tradition of the Epitome with the additional information, which would explain the linguistic similarities to Leo. Similarly, in the later part of the text, various passages also suggest the use of different texts from the tradition of the Epitome instead of Leo the Grammarian; for example, the passage describing the building of the *Pentapyrgion* and the restoration of the walls by the emperor Theophilos (*SynChron*, 133.18-23) derives from either Pseudo-Symeon or the continuation of George the Monk, and not from Leo. Finally, the text of Leo the Grammarian does not include the emperor Pupienus (*SynChron*, 36.12) in his sequence of emperors, although he is included in the text of Kedrenos; the omission raises further doubts over the possibility that Leo the Grammarian is a direct source, and so do the juxtapositions of Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos with the *SynChron* that we provide below.

Strictly speaking, Kedrenos' history is not part of the family of the Epitome. However, his sources include Pseudo-Symeon (for the period from the Creation up to Leo the Armenian), George the Monk and the tradition of Epitome B,\(^{439}\) and as a result it may transcribe texts that were used in the compilation of the *SynChron*.\(^{440}\) In fact, we note Kedrenos as the single 'main source' of the *SynChron* on numerous occasions (for example, *SynChron*, 30.16, 33.15-8, 36.12, 42.4-7, 66.21-30, 70.24-9, 71.2-30, 72.25-8, 91.10-27, 105.5-10, 113.9-12), which seems to support such an assumption. It remains to be seen which aspects of Kedrenos are also present in the *SynChron*, and if they are sufficiently consistent to point towards a specific branch of the Epitome as its source.

The *SynChron* does not copy word for word the source of Kedrenos; although we see that they both contain often identical text (as in the examples above), there are cases when, although the connection is clear, the linguistic variations suggest the use of an Epitome source different from Kedrenos; in the passage on the emperor Tiberius' reaction towards any contradictory laws that he may had issued (*SynChron*, 28.10-2), the content of the two texts is the same, but they differ in language. In that case, no


\(^{440}\) It should be noted that the lack of a modern edition of the text does not allow for a full use of Kedrenos' passages (and their possible sources).
other texts appear to be the source of the *SynChron*, and the parallel passage in Joel (26.13-6), who also regularly extracted material from texts of the Epitome, seems to suggest that the passage of the *SynChron* is drawn from the Epitome, but not necessarily from the source of Kedrenos. Another example is the passage relating Gallus' mission to France while Julian became Caesar (*SynChron*, 56.5-11). We were not able to identify a 'main source' for the passage; it could be Zosimos, who provides a detailed description of the circumstances under which Constantius was convinced by Eusebia to name Julian Caesar. The *SynChron* seems to draw from the same tradition, but the relevant passage is shortened either by the *SynChron*, or by a previous source. Since Kedrenos' passage is very similar to the *SynChron*, it could point to the source of the *SynChron*, although it has Julian sent to France (Γαλλίας), not Italy (as in the *SynChron*). The minor difference (which could have also been a mistake of a scribe) suggests that although Kedrenos' source was not the direct source of the *SynChron*, it was closely related to it.

The central place of the Epitome in the sources of the *SynChron* is apparent from the numerous cases, in which the only main sources of the text are the texts of Leo the Grammarian and George Kedrenos, when they both have the same passage; for example, see our suggestions in the previous chapter for the sources of *SynChron*, 25.20-2, 28.1-3, 28.23-29.19, 30.3-8, 30.29-31.1, 32.9-15, 32.24-6, 35.29-31, 39.16-7, 62.23-4, 66.30-67.4, 98.11-8, 101.24-103.20, 103.24-104.17, 120.10-5, 120.26-8. However, it is in the cases when Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos differ that we can find clues on the aspects of the Epitome that was used in the compilation of the *SynChron*.

It is not always possible to decide whether the *SynChron* is closer to the version of Leo the Grammarian or Kedrenos. For example, Leo the Grammarian seems as the most probable source of the passage that contains the description of the injustices during the reign of Justin II (which includes the incident with the appointed prefect) (*SynChron*, 101.24-103.18). On the other hand, the *SynChron* includes in this instance some of the additional information that is present in the account of Kedrenos, which is more extensive than either Leo the Grammarian or the *SynChron*. Another example would be the passage on the reign of the emperor Nero (*SynChron*, 28.23-29.8), which
comes from the tradition of the Epitome, as the similarities to both Leo the
Grammarian and Kedrenos in language, content and structure suggest, although it
would not be possible to distinguish one text over the other as the source of the
*SynChron*.

In other cases, the indications suggest that the *SynChron* presents stronger similarities
to Leo the Grammarian than Kedrenos. Apart from the various references, where Leo
the Grammarian is the 'main source' when Kedrenos is either missing or is in the
'other sources' (for example, *SynChron*, 27.28-28.1, 28.26-8, 30.10-6, 68.4-10, 81.4-9,
100.18-21, 104.25-8), we mention above the passage with the oracle of Sibylla
(*SynChron*, 25.11-20), which connects Leo the Grammarian to the *SynChron* in
contrast to Kedrenos. In addition to that, the passage relating the incident of the
emperor Anastasios' burial while he was still alive (*SynChron*, 91.28-92.8) can also be
found in Kedrenos (1.622.12-21), albeit it is attributed with certainty to the emperor
Zeno; on the other hand, the linguistic similarities between Leo the Grammarian and
the *SynChron* are very strong and show a case where the account of the former could
have been the source of *SynChron*, in contrast to Kedrenos. Similarly, the section on
the reign of Domitian (*SynChron*, 30.9-16) is also based on the text of Leo the
Grammarian; Kedrenos' text has a more extensive account, with similar content, albeit
with great differences in the structure of the narrative, which begins at the death of the
emperor. A final indication (but not conclusive) that shows that the *SynChron* has
more similarities to Leo the Grammarian than Kedrenos is the references to the burial
places of the emperors. We discuss the subject in more detail below, but it would
suffice to say that the *SynChron* and Leo the Grammarian seem to contain more
common such references than any other texts.

Having said that, there are numerous passages of the *SynChron* that present more
similarities to Kedrenos' history than the text of Leo (e.g. *SynChron*, 28.3-9, 29.20-7,
30.16, 63.13-9, 70.26-9, 79.15-6, 80.23-4, 81.1-4, 107.15-20, 109.10-26), hence
suggesting a possible use of a common source. A good example of such an instance is
a phrase in the passage describing a change in the *trisagios* hymn ordered by the
emperor Anastasios:
Τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως βουληθέντος προσθείναι εἰς τὸν τρισάγιον τὸ ἁγιός ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς ελέησον ἡμᾶς, (Leo Gramm., 119.4-5)

βουληθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἀναστάσιος προσθείναι εἰς τὸ τρισάγιον τὸ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς, (Kedr., 1.631.9-10)

Βουληθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἀναστάσιος προσθείναι τῷ Τρισαγίῳ τὸ, ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς, (SynChron, 90.18-9)

All three chronicles convey the same text, but Kedrenos and the SynChron are almost identical. A similar example can be found in the establishment of the procession of the Virgin of Blachernae by the emperor Maurice (SynChron, 105.15-8). The accounts of Leo the Grammarian, Kedrenos and the SynChron (and Glykas) are closely connected, but the similarities between the SynChron and Kedrenos are stronger:

καὶ τὴν λιτὴν τὴν ἐν Βλαχέρναις τὴν καλουμένην πρεσβείαν, τὴν κατὰ παρασκευὴν τελουμένην, ὁ αὐτὸς τελείσθαι διετύπωσεν, ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν προέλευσιν τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου ἀπαρτίσας καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτάς δημόσιον λοετρόν. (Leo Gramm., 138.18-22)

tυποὶ δὲ καὶ τὴν λιτὴν καλουμένην πρεσβείαν κατὰ παρασκευὴν ἐν Βλαχέρναις τελείσθαι καὶ ἐν τοῖς Χαλκοπρατείοις πληροῦσθαι. (Kedr., 1.694.21-4)

Οὗτος ἐτύπωσε γίνεσθαι τὴν λιτανείαν τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου τῶν Βλαχερνῶν, καὶ τῇ παρασκευῇ ἐκάστης ἑβδομάδος προέρχεσθαι ταύτην εἰς τῶν Χαλκοπρατείων ναὸν. (SynChron, 105.15-8)

Before proceeding to the study of the text of Pseudo-Symeon, we should also consider the issue of the practice of the SynChron to conclude the narrative of each reign by mentioning the age of the emperors at their death – starting from Constantine I – and the place of their burial. The practice is not restricted to emperors, and extends to other members of the imperial family, and sometimes notable patriarchs. Often, the SynChron seems to reproduce information that is not present in other similar works or any of its sources, and the issue of its own source for the subject remains unclear. The text of Leo the Grammarian appears frequently to be the source of such passages, but the possibility of his use as the direct source should probably be rejected. In the case of the sarcophagus of the emperor Julian, the similarity between the two texts is unique: "ἐν τάφῳ πορφυρῷ κυλινδροειδεῖ" (SynChron, 57.8), "ἐν λάρνακι 441

441 For example, the SynChron is the only source that attests that the emperor Theodosius was buried along his wife, Placilla (SynChron, 67.12-3).
πορφυρῷ κυλινδρεῖδεί" (Leo Gramm., 94.1-2). The SynChron, however, does not transmit the tradition that the body of Julian was initially buried in Tarsos (found in Zosimos, Zonaras and Leo the Grammarians). Leo the Grammarian is also the only main source in other such instances, such as in the cases of the emperors Jovian (SynChron, 57.22-8), Arkadios and Eudoxia (SynChron, 68.7-10), Leo (SynChron, 86.31-87.2), Anastasios (SynChron, 91.8-9), Justinian (SynChron, 101.4-6) and Constantine Kopronymos (SynChron, 126.16-8). On the other hand, Kedrenos appears as the only main source of other such passages (e.g. the burial of the emperor Marcian (SynChron, 84.13-4); in other instances, passages of Leo the Grammarian or Kedrenos with similar content are not to be found in the SynChron, such as the passages on Justin I (Leo Gramm., 123.11-2), Justin II (Leo Gramm., 135.8-136.10, Kedr., 1.685.5-8, 1.685.19-686.22) or Michael II (Kedr., 2.99.15-6). Nevertheless, their absence does not necessarily rule out their use as the source of the SynChron, as they may have been omitted on purpose. Additionally, according to Markopoulos, the text of Pseudo-Symeon also provides detailed information on the imperial burials, and thus could have been the source of the SynChron, although the absence of a critical edition does not allow us to make a more detailed comparison. In any case, it is possible that, since the author of the SynChron tends to provide such information consistently, the burial information comes either from the unknown Epitome text employed as the source of the SynChron, or from a freestanding list of tombs, such as the "De sepulcris imperatorum quae sunt in templo sanctorum apostolorum" (Patr. Const. - De Sepulcris Imperator.).

As the juxtaposition with Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos does not seem to provide an answer to the relationship between the SynChron and the Epitome, the examination of the text of Pseudo-Symeon could provide some further insight.

---

442 In fact, in Zosimos there is no reference of the eventual transfer of the body of Julian to Constantinople.
443 Markopoulos, PseudoSymeon, 118-21.
444 Interestingly, the author of the Synopsis Lambros does not seem to have this source at his disposal. It does not provide the cause of death of the emperor Jovian; the phrase "ὦς φασι, μύκητα πεφαρμαγμένον φαγών" (57.24-5) is missing, and so does the passage of the SynChron (57.25-8) that refers to the burial of the emperor καὶ ἐτέθη ...Χαριτώ. The same applies to the unique information of the SynChron in regard to Theodosius' death and burial (67.11-3), in which case the Synopsis Lambros (355.24-356.11) uses a passage from Zonaras, and the death and burial of Arkadios and Eudoxia (68.7-10).
445 For a more detailed discussion of the subject of texts describing the tombs of the Byzantine emperors (with references to passages from the SynChron) see Downey, "Tombs", 27-51, esp. 45-6; also see Grierson, "Tombs", 1-60, Mango and Sevcenko, "Tombs", 61-2.
However, the study of the text of Pseudo-Symeon is hindered by the lack of a complete edition of the text, let alone a modern one. The part relating the events of the period 813-962 was edited by Combefis in 1685 and reprinted in the Bonn corpus by Bekker in 1838 [Pseudo-Symeon], and the section presenting the reign of Constantine I was published by Halkin [Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin)]. Additionally, as we mentioned earlier, parts of Pseudo-Symeon's text are included in Kedrenos' text, often verbatim, but there is no way of distinguishing Pseudo-Symeon's text except by consulting the Paris. Gr. 1712.

Even with such editorial impediments, the close resemblance between the SynChron and Pseudo-Symeon (or a closely related text) becomes easily apparent. Despite the small portion of Pseudo-Symeon that we have at our disposal, the passages that we designate as the 'main source' of the SynChron are not in short supply: SynChron, 28.3-9, 42.7-19, 44.26-45.23, 46.21-31, 50.6-12, 133.18-134.3, 134.21-7, 135.11-136.23, 137.22-138.8, 141.21-142.25, 144.3-145.2, 147.26-30, 148.30-149.11, 151.4-152.7. Additionally, the section of the SynChron that deals with the events after the death of Romanos Lekapenos, which is the date at which most of the manuscripts containing the chronicle of Symeon Logothetes conclude their narrative, and up to the end to the reign of Romanos II, appears to have consistent parallels to Pseudo-Symeon, although they are not always sufficiently close as to suggest a direct link between the two texts. In any case, the similarities in earlier passages can only be explained by a very close connection.

The passage on the death of Pontius Pilate, as analysed by Patzig who suggested with reservations the possibility that the SynChron draws directly from Paris. Gr. 1712, is but one example that demonstrates the close connection between the two texts. The same applies to the passage on Mamaea and Christianity (SynChron, 35.16-8); Mauromate mentions that only the texts of the Epitome provide the information that Mamaea was introduced to Christianity by Origen and, more specifically, she points out the relationship between the Vind. Hist. Gr. 40, the Paris. Gr. 1712 and the

---

446 Vasilievskij, "Khronika Logotheta", 97.
448 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 279-81.
SynChron, since they are the only texts that transmit the phrase "ὡς φησιν Εὐσέβιος".\(^{449}\) Similarly, as far as the passage on Michael and the destruction of the warning system (SynChron, 144.3-145.2) is concerned, the similarities in the selection of comments and in the structure between Pseudo-Symeon and the SynChron are indicative of the connection of the two texts. Another passage that can only be found in Pseudo-Symeon and the SynChron is the incident between Romanos Lekapenos, Sergios and Polyueuctos (SynChron, 151.17-152.7), a very strong indication of the relationship between the two texts; the relationship is also evident in a phrase regarding the seclusion of St Methodios in a tomb by the emperor Theophilos, which is similar to both texts: "ἰστε δὲ πάντως οία δυσῳδία καὶ σκωλήκων βρῶσις" (Pseudo-Symeon, 644.4), "πάντες ἂν συνοράτε ἔχοιτε" (SynChron, 134.27).

Having said that, the similarities between Pseudo-Symeon and the SynChron in the section on Constantine I should be treated with added caution. Although they are indeed strong, certain passages, namely the ones relating the first vision of the cross by Constantine (SynChron, 42.7-15), the foundation of Constantinople (SynChron, 46.21-31), the campaign against the Persians (SynChron, 46.31-47.27) and possibly the passage describing Constantine's conversion to Christianity by Pope Sylvester (SynChron, 44.62-46.8) seem to originate from a hagiographical source rather than Pseudo-Symeon, as we discuss elsewhere. The similarities between the three texts could be explained by the use of the same (or parallel) hagiographical source by Pseudo-Symeon.

In conclusion, our task is to define – if possible – which version of the Epitome / Symeon Logothetes was used in the composition of the SynChron, or – at least – describe its characteristics and its relationship to the other versions and text of the family of the Epitome. As we have seen in chapter three, the texts with the strongest resemblances to the SynChron are Leo the Grammarian, Kedrenos\(^{450}\) and Pseudo-Symeon,\(^{451}\) on which we focused our attention in this section. However, as we can see


\(^{450}\) To the extent that we can distinguish which parts are only a copy of Pseudo-Symeon, and which ones could derive from a different text of the Epitome.

\(^{451}\) In addition to the three texts, the connection to George the Monk should also be noted, since part of the text are also closely related to the Epitome, as we discuss elsewhere (pp. 248ff).
in our analysis, the *SynChron* presents significant similarities with each of the above versions, but also considerable differences, which prohibit the possibility that one of them could have been the direct, or the only source of the *Synopsis*. It is more possible that more than one of the texts were taken into account, or that another related text was used as the main source; it is also possible that both assumptions are correct.

There is sufficient evidence to confirm the use of a different text of the tradition of the Epitome that has not survived. We have already seen various examples of passages, whose origin cannot be explained by any of the surviving versions of the Epitome, but with similarities to them that confirm a link between the two, albeit not a direct one. A good example would be the long passage on the injustices perpetrated during the reign of Justin II (*SynChron*, 101.24-103.18), which presents both similarities and differences to both Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos; the majority of the above examples attest to the different connections between the two texts and the *SynChron*. However, the comparison cannot be limited to passages connected to Leo the Grammarian or Kedrenos. Most of the texts we mention in the 'other sources' or 'parallel passages' of the passage reporting the death of Heraclius seem to connect the death of the emperor to the monophysite heresy (Georg. Monk, 673.9-13, Leo Gramm., 155.4-8, Kedr., 1.752.15-9, Zon., 3.312.23-5, Glyc., 512.15-20, Joel, 46.24-47.3), the exceptions being Nikephoros and the *SynChron*. However, there are no further indications that Nikephoros is the source of the *SynChron*, and although it could be argued that there is an additional source for the passage (especially since there is no known source for the following passage, which refers to a census ordered by Heraclius), the linguistic similarities suggest that the sentence comes from the pool of the Epitome.

In such cases we should not reject the complementary use of additional texts, while the main source was still a version of the Epitome. In the passage that relates the assassination of Aurelian (*SynChron*, 39.12-6) we notice linguistic similarities with the texts of Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos. At the same time, however, linguistic similarities also exist between Zosimos, Zonaras and the *SynChron*; additionally, it is only these texts that mention the name of the secretary (Eros), which indicates a
relationship between them.\textsuperscript{452} Hence, it would be safe to assume that the SynChron
drew from both the tradition of the Epitome and Zosimos, who is another main source
of the text, at the same time.

Notwithstanding the use of complementary sources, most of the examples we mention
above derive mainly from the tradition of the Epitome, and indeed an additional text
of its tradition. An example in support of this hypothesis is the passage describing the
establishment of the procession of the Virgin of Blachernae by the emperor Maurice
(SynChron, 105.15-8). The passage has strong similarities to both Leo the
Grammarian and Kedrenos, but although the similarities confirm the derivation of the
passage from the Epitome, they do not favour the one text over the other. Moreover,
Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou rightly suggests that Glykas and the SynChron are
more closely related than Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos.\textsuperscript{453} The connection
between the SynChron and Glykas confirms that the two authors used a text with a
strong relationship to both Leo and Kedrenos (and as a result, part of the tradition of
the Epitome), but it is neither; hence, an Epitome text that has not survived. The same
applies to the reference to the proverb about Gratian's arrows (SynChron, 62.23-4); it
derives from the tradition of the Epitome (Leo Gramm., 100.16-7, Kedr., 1.551.10-2,
Georg. Monk (PG), 689.17-9, Glyc., 474.10-2) but the SynChron and Glykas have a
closer relationship than the other texts, \textsuperscript{454} thus establishing the use of another
Epitome text.

It seems that the remaining issue of the part of the family of the Epitome, to which
this unknown text belongs, will remain unresolved, especially as far as we do not have
any conclusive results of the connections between the texts of the Epitome itself. On
the one hand, the strong connections to Leo the Grammarian establish a relationship
with Epitome A. On the other, and as the place of Pseudo-Symeon within the Epitome
stem also remains to be confirmed, the proposal for a connection between the
SynChron and the Epitome B also seems to be valid, \textsuperscript{455} especially if Markopoulos'

\textsuperscript{452} Cf. Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 47, 48; also, see pp. 213ff above.
\textsuperscript{453} See Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 310.
\textsuperscript{454} Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 309-10.
\textsuperscript{455} Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 29-30.
suggestion for Pseudo-Symeon's link to the tradition of the Epitome B proves to be correct. As a result, the above suggestions – and the relevant passages of the *SynChron* – can be used in the definition of the relationships between the different versions of the Epitome and Symeon Logothetes; they may also be subject to alterations, in order to be adjust to any new developments and conclusions of scholarship in regard to the Epitome.

**Michael Psellos**

i. *Historia Syntomos*

The constant appearance of Psellos' *Historia Syntomos* in the entries containing the 'parallel passages' of the *SynChron* could be interpreted as an indication of a form of relationship between the two texts. Although such an assumption cannot be discarded outright, it does not seem that there is enough evidence to support it sufficiently. The text is not indicated as a 'main source' of the *SynChron* at all, and is in the 'other sources' section six times (*SynChron*, 53.24-54.6, 54.10-5, 57.22-8, 58.15-8, 58.23-4, 132.25-6). In the first case, the passage on the civil war between the successors of Constantine I (*SynChron*, 53.24-54.6), Psellos' text presents the same structure as the *SynChron*, but there is no additional linguistic evidence that could confirm a connection between the two texts. Similarly, the links in the rest of the passages are not so strong as to suggest a close relationship. It is more probable that the resemblances of the two texts are due to the similar structures adopted by their authors; the series of the Roman emperors, accompanied by brief comments or descriptions of particular events and actions. The most likely link between the *Historia Syntomos* and the *SynChron* is that the authors used the same or similar material, and possibly consulted the same sources.

ii. *Chronographia*

The *Chronographia* of Psellos also appears frequently in the 'parallel passages' of the last part of the section of the *SynChron* that we study, which would be expected, as the *Chronographia* is such a significant source for the period 976-1075. However, it is rarely part of the 'other sources' of the *SynChron*, and we could consider the possibility that the *Chronographia* is the source – albeit indirect – of the *SynChron* in only one instance, the short passage on the character and actions of Constantine VIII
Even then, although the structure and the comments of the two texts are similar, there are no further linguistic similarities between the *SynChron* and Psellus or any other text. This and the fact that there are no further such connections between the *SynChron* and Psellus’ *Chronographia*, make it more likely that the passage was either drawn from a different text that has not survived, or was composed by the author himself. On the whole, the place of the *Chronographia* in the sources of the *SynChron* should be considered within the issue of the possible sources of the last part of the text, as discussed later in this study.⁴⁵⁶

**Leo the Deacon**

The history of Leo the Deacon appears as a ‘parallel text’ to the *SynChron* in a small number of cases, namely in *SynChron*, 153.22-5, 154.5-13, 154.25-155.2, 155.13-24, 156.16-29, 157.13-5. Since, as we discuss elsewhere,⁴⁵⁷ there is not a single text that could be considered as the direct or the foremost source of this section of the *SynChron*, the issue we have to address is whether there are any indications – either in content, structure or language – that could suggest that Leo the Deacon was taken into account. However, this does not seem to be the case. The text of Leo the Deacon is an extensive history of the period 959-976, to which the *SynChron* devotes only a small part of its narrative (four pages of the Sathas edition); as a result, the parallel passages mainly refer to events discussed by both authors, and their similarities do not suggest any further connections between the two texts. The only example which may imply that the text of Leo the Deacon could have been an (indirect) source is the passage on the death of the emperor John Tzimiskes and his burial in the Church of the Saviour in Chalke, which was also built by him (*SynChron*, 157.13-4, Leo Deac., 178.14-6), as Leo is the only other historiographical text that refers to the church of the Saviour as the emperor's burial place. However, the lack of other indications in the same direction means that Leo cannot be regarded as an indirect source of the *SynChron* on the sole basis of this passage; additionally, a reference in the *Patria* (282.8-283.3) about the history of the Church, and especially about the tomb of Tzimiskes (*Patr. Const.*, 283.2-3), suggests that the information could have been drawn from a different, not necessarily historiographical, source.

⁴⁵⁶ See pp. 304ff.
⁴⁵⁷ See pp. 304ff.
John Skylitzes

The *Synopsis Historiarum* of John Skylitzes has been identified as a main source of the *SynChron* by Hunger;\(^\text{458}\) although the claim seems initially plausible, a further examination and comparison of the two texts does not seem to show such a close relationship. Skylitzes appears among the 'other sources' and 'parallel passages' of the *SynChron* as early as the events surrounding the emperor Michael I, which is also the beginning of his text. Furthermore, the text appears related to the *SynChron* in many cases in the earlier section, where there is no connection to the Epitome (e.g. *SynChron*, 132.14-6, 136.25-137.2, 138.12-9). However, these instances are not so common as to suggest that the text was consulted in addition to the Epitome; they could also be attributed to the use of the common source with Manasses (in the first example) or Zonaras (in the second and third ones). Nevertheless, Skylitzes appears consistently in the 'parallel passages' of the last section of the *SynChron* that we discuss. Although this could be expected, as the text of Skylitzes presents a more extensive overview of the period and was used as a source by various later authors,\(^\text{459}\) it remains to be seen whether it was used directly by the author of the *SynChron*, who then abridged the narrative of Skylitzes in order to fit it to the scope and purpose of his own text. Although such a suggestion cannot be discarded outright, there are differences between them that seem to argue against a direct relationship. In the passage on the resumption of iconoclasm in the reign of Leo the Armenian (*SynChron*, 131.7-14), Skylitzes is one of the texts that attribute the imprisonment of the bishop Euthymios to Michael, whereas in the narrative of the *SynChron* it happens in the reign of Leo. Similarly, in the description of Bardas' dispute with the patriarch Ignatios and the subsequent incident of the torture and exile of Ignatios (*SynChron*, 141.21-142.23), the *SynChron* (along with Manasses and Glykas) follow the same structure as Pseudo-Symeon (667.6-19, 668.2-14), whereas Skylitzes and Zonaras describe (in a similar way between them) the first part of Ignatios' torture before the appointment of Photios. Although all of them provide a similar account of the events, only the *SynChron* includes the more detailed version of Ignatios' torture, drawn from Pseudo-Symeon (668.2-14). Even in the later part, in the passage on Monomachos' recall from exile (*SynChron*, 162.14-20), the *SynChron* and Manasses seem to share

\(^{458}\) Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur*, I, 477.

\(^{459}\) Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur*, I, 392.
the same source, both following the same structure for the whole reign of Michael V and presenting similarly Zoe's reasons for recalling Constantine, with no reference to other possible candidates. In contrast, Skylitzes' text presents the events in a different light and with a different structure (Skylitz., 422.9-423.48), which excludes it from being the common source of the two texts. Similarly, in the narrative of the civil war between Michael VI and Isaakios Komnenos (SynChron, 164.7-17), the SynChron presents the emperor Michael as inclined to resign while his counsellors were uncompromising and brought the situation to an armed conflict. On the contrary, Skylitzes and Psellos focus their criticism on the emperor and attribute such an attitude to him personally (Skylitz., 486.10-487.15, 492.68-72, Psell., Chron., 7.3.1-18, also in Kedr., 2.619.23-620.4, 627.9-14, who copies Skylizes).

**Skylitzes Continuatus**

The relationship between Skylitzes Continuatus and the SynChron is analogous to the relationship between the SynChron and Skylitzes. Although there are numerous similarities in content and numerous sections of Skylitzes Continuatus appear often as 'parallel passages' to the SynChron (164.23-166.7, 167.3-14, 168.22-31, 170.15-171.4), there is no sufficient evidence to suggest a direct link between the two, an idea that is further supported by the lack of any substantial linguistic similarities between the two texts.

**Michael Attaleiates**

The *History* of Michael Attaleiates is an extensive account of the period 1034-1079/80; hence, it is to be expected that the two texts overlap in their narrative of the same events, although they are presented in a more abridged manner in the SynChron. As a result, we notice various parallels between them (SynChron, 161.11-5, 161.22-162.20, 162.20-5, 162.30-163.1, 163.11-7, 164.23-165.5, 165.9-13, 165.18-166.7, 168.9-17, 168.22-6, 170.15-172.9) which do not necessarily denote a special relationship. In a small number of cases, however, the SynChron presents considerable similarities to the text of Attaleiates, which need further investigation. The short description of Theodora's reign in the SynChron (163.11-4) seems to contain the same information and attitude towards the empress as the respective passage of Attaleiates (51.21-52.7), not to be found in other texts, and the same applies to the subsequent passage on the appointment of Michael VI (SynChron,
163.14-7, Attal., 52.11-4, 52.19-20). The two passages of the *SynChron* are followed by the reference to the death and burial of Theodora (*SynChron*, 163.17-8), for which we were not able to identify a source; this could be an indication that the *SynChron* was following an intermediary text, that used Attaleiates as one of its sources.

Another similar instance is the passage on the death and burial of Constantine X Doukas (*SynChron*, 166.27-9, Attal., 92.4-10); although Attaleiates names the church of St Nicholas as the place of burial of the emperor and not the monastery of *Molivotos*, as cited in the *SynChron*, it is possible that the two texts belong to the same tradition, since they both convey the same information about the exact location of the tomb in the church (that is, inside the golden gate), a detail that is not present in the accounts of Glykas (606.18-20) and Joel (64.20-4). However, the small number of such similarities does not allow any firm conclusion about the relationship between the two texts, and the possibility of their connection will remain a hypothesis to be tested in relation to the connections between the other texts and the *SynChron*, and any new research on Attaleiates, especially in connection to the new edition of the text.

**John Zonaras**

A detailed examination of the relationship between Zonaras and the *SynChron* was undertaken in two published studies of Patzig; in the following section, we attempt to present an overview of the relationship between the two texts, mainly from the point of view of the *SynChron*.

The *Epitome Historiarum* of Zonaras is an extensive chronicle, written in the first half of the twelfth century, which begins from the Creation of the world, and concludes with the accession of John II Komnenos. The author used a variety of sources, especially for the events of the Old Testament and early Roman history, some of which do not survive. The strong connection between Zonaras and the *SynChron* is easily apparent, established sufficiently by Patzig, and can also be inferred from the

---

great frequency that the *Epitome Historiarum* appears amongst the 'main' and 'other sources' of the *SynChron* in the previous chapter of this study.

Given that Zonaras wrote his chronicle a century or more before the *SynChron*, and the great similarities the two texts present, a question that emerges is if it would be possible to consider Zonaras' *Epitome* as the direct source of the *SynChron*. But, however plausible this hypothesis may seem, a thorough comparison of the two texts suggests that this cannot be the case. The accounts of the events surrounding the fifth Ecumenical Council (Zon., 3.280.30-281.18, *SynChron*, 99.7-100.17) offer an opportunity to determine the relationship between the two chronicles: although the narratives present similarities in content, structure and language that confirm the strong connection between the two texts, they also suggest that Zonaras could not have been the source for the *SynChron*, since the latter's account is more extensive.\(^{463}\)

Our task, then, is not to examine the issue of the direct relationship between Zonaras and the *SynChron*, but to study the similarities of the two texts in relation to the previous text (or texts) that appear to be their indirect sources. Having said that, in the course of the present chapter we have already discussed various texts with strong similarities to Zonaras, which establish various aspects of the common source of the *Epitome Historiarum* and the *SynChron*. In the following, we attempt to collect our earlier suggestions and conclusions, in order to define the relation of their common source to the rest of the chronicle and historiography tradition.

As far as early Roman history is concerned, the *SynChron* appears to present consistently accounts similar to Zonaras' text; on a few occasions (such as the foundation of the Roman republic, especially in regard to the establishment of the various bodies and honours of the government (*SynChron*, 23.29-24.13)), the only other sources that transmit parallel accounts that appear as 'main' or 'other' sources of the *SynChron* are John Lydus\(^{464}\) and Cassius Dio,\(^{465}\) an indication that the material

---

\(^{463}\) For more examples, and further discussion, see Patzig, “Quellen des Zonaras I”, 34-6.

\(^{464}\) See p. 222.

\(^{465}\) See pp. 206ff.
was part of the common source of the two texts. The same applies to the *New History of Zosimos*, which was part of the intermediary source that was consulted by Zonaras and the author of the *SynChron*, as we have discussed in further detail in the relevant section. Similarly, in the relation of the events of the early history of the Church, the common source of the two texts seems to have used Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History* and Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History*. The chronicle of Malalas is another text that appears to be present in the common source of Zonaras and the *SynChron*. In addition to the passages we mention elsewhere, there is also a pattern in the sources of the *SynChron* for early Roman history, according to which, whenever Malalas is the source, there are also similarities to Zonaras (and often, no other texts that contain the same material); cases in point are the passages relating the legislation of the emperor Antoninus Pius (31.18-22) and the inheritance laws of the emperor Marcus Aurelius (32.6-9).

The chronicle of Theophanes appears consistently as a common denominator for Zonaras and the *SynChron* as well. In numerous cases, Theophanes and Zonaras appear consistently together as 'main' or 'other sources' of the *SynChron*, and often no other texts appear relevant to the respective passages (e.g. *SynChron*, 41.1-8, 41.23-6, 58.15-22, 59.1-6, 67.21-9, 74.6-8, 105.16-9, 82.3-10, 86.22-30, 88.31-89.2, 93.28-9, 95.16-96.9, 101.7-13, 110.24-111.2, 125.7-13). It also seems that Theophanes was not an independent direct source for the two texts, but part of their common source. An indication for that, although not definite, are the two different versions of Theophanes for Valens' conversion to Arianism (Theoph., 57.3-14); both Zonaras (3.220.267) and the *SynChron* (60.89) convey only the first one, probably because it was the only one conveyed in their common source. More convincingly, the passages of Zonaras and the *SynChron* on the cancellation of the debts ordered by the empress Sophia have

---

466 Both of which are identified as sources of Zonaras in the studies mentioned in n. 461.

467 See pp. 213ff.

468 See p. 217.

469 See p. 218.

470 Also see Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 34-5.

471 Zonaras relates that the legislation was an act of the previous emperor, Antoninus Pius; however, as Patzig has already noticed (Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 34-5), there are strong linguistic similarities between the two passages, which suggest that both Zonaras and the *SynChron* draw from the same text.
more similarities between themselves than to Theophanes, which can only be explained by the existence of an intermediary source:

Τούτω τῷ ἐτει μεταστειλαμένη Σοφία, ἡ εὐσεβεστάτη αὐγούστα, τοὺς τε ἀργυροπράτας καὶ σημαδαρίους εκέλευσεν ἐνεχθῆναι τὰς ὁμολογίας τῶν χρεωστούσων καὶ τὰ σημάδια καὶ ἐντυχούσα αὐτοῖς ἔλαβε τὰ σημάδια παρασχομένη αὐτά τοῖς χρεωστούσι καὶ ἀπέδωκεναύτά τοῖς ἱδίοις δεσπόταις: (Theoph., 242.22-6)

αὕτη ἡ βασιλίς Σοφία ἀκριβωσαμένη πάντας τοὺς δανειστὰς καὶ ὅσα τινὲς αὐτοῖς ὠφελεν ἐπὶ δὲ ἐγγράφων ἢ καὶ δὲ ἐνεχύρων, κατέβαλε μὲν αὐτοῖς τὰ δάνεια ὁικοθεν, ἔλαβε δὲ τὰ ἐνέχυρα καὶ τὰ ἐγγράφα, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐνέχυρα τοῖς δεσπόταις ἀπέδωκε, τὰ δὲ ἐγγράφα ἐξηφάνισε. (Zon., 3.285.23-8)

Τούτω ἦν γαμετὴ βασίλισσα Σοφία, πάνω εὐσεβεστάτη. Ἡ τε ἐπισυναγογόνα διὰ βασιλικῆς κελεύσεως πᾶντα τὰ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐνεχθῆναι καὶ γραμματεία τῶν δανείων, οἰκοθεν ἀνελλιπῶς ἀπέδωκε τοῖς δανείσασι τὰ χρέη, καὶ τὰ ἐνέχυρα τοῖς ἱδίοις ἐκδώρησε δεσπόταις, διαφημίζεσα τὰ γραμμάτεια, ἀ συνήθως ἀποδείξεις καλούμεν. (SynChron, 101.7-13)

In contrast, the relationship between the common source and the Epitome is a more complicated matter, especially due to the lack of critical editions of the texts and conclusive studies on the Epitome family, and to our uncertainty over which text(s) of the Epitome were used in the composition of the SynChron. Patzig suggested that the source of the SynChron was a different version of Epitome B; however, as we have seen earlier, the situation in the stem of the texts of the Epitome is not so clear-cut as to enable us to be certain of the exact position of the source in the tradition – or, on that matter – if it is only one single source. Nevertheless, we have also established that although the material of the SynChron does not originate directly from any of the surviving Epitome texts, it bears great similarities to Leo the Grammarian, Pseudo-Symeon, Kedrenos and George the Monk (PG) – which signify that the Epitome source (or sources) used were related to those texts. As a result, the relevant similarities between Zonaras, the SynChron and the respective texts can provide an idea of the connection between the common source and the Epitome.

The information from the previous chapter of this study does not seem to indicate a closer connection to a particular Epitome text. Especially as far as Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos are concerned, the similarities seem to be divided, without

---

promoting the one text over the other. In most cases, common and similar passages of the *SynChron* and Zonaras that originate from the pool of the Epitome present similarities to both Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos (e.g. *SynChron*, 25.20-2, 28.1-3, 32.24-6, 33.11-2, 39.12-6, 57.22-8, 87.16-7, 98.31-99.3), whereas passages that present a stronger relation to either Leo the Grammarian (e.g *SynChron*, 68.4-7, 87.3-6, 104.25-8, 107.9-11, 113.13-9, 121.24-122.11) or Kedrenos (e.g. *SynChron*, 39.3-6, 63.26-31, 71.2-30, 82.1-3, 105.11-5, 124.27-31, 138.12-9) do not seem to suggest a link to a different source. As far as Pseudo-Symeon is concerned, and although the lack of a critical edition hinders any conclusive suggestions, there are only a few similarities (*SynChron*, 134.21-7, 134.28-136.7, 137.2-10), which may suggest that the text of Pseudo-Symeon was not part of the common source of the *SynChron*. However, since Pseudo-Symeon was a major source of Kedrenos, it is possible that some of the material that we identify to be from Kedrenos actually derives from Pseudo-Symeon; as a result, any suggestions will remain mere speculation until we have a critical edition of the chronicle in our hands. In any case, since Zonaras and the *SynChron* both seem to originate from the pool of the above texts, but show consistent mutual similarities not present in the original sources, Patzig's proposal of a single source for the Epitome seems to be upheld, although it is not possible to establish its exact position in the tradition of Symeon Logothetes.

Another interesting association between the *SynChron* and Zonaras appears in the passages on the successions of the patriarchs of Constantinople. The *SynChron* tends to mention exhaustively all the changes of the patriarchs in the appropriate chronological place within the reign of each emperor, whereas Zonaras only refers to the changes sporadically. However, in numerous occasions the relevant passages of the *SynChron* resemble the respective references of Zonaras (*SynChron*, 58.24-8, 68.2-3, 70.19-24, 76.17-77.27, 78.15-24, 85.23-5, 86.17-9, 88.26-9, 93.30-94.1, 99.4-6, 104.29-31, 105.19-23!, 107.12-4, 109.27-9, 111.12-6, 111.24-8, 113.26-31, 119.25-8, 121.19-23!), an indication that the same source was in use in this instance as well. The frequency and consistency of the similarities seem to confirm such an assumption, especially since there are no regular similarities with any of the other usual sources of the *SynChron*; hence, it is possible that it was not part of Zonaras’ plan to provide such an exhaustive presentation of the sequence of all the patriarchs.
It seems, though, that the common source did not incorporate the patriarchal changes in the main narrative, but in a different section focusing on ecclesiastical matters or solely on the patriarchs, such as the catalogue at the end of the chronicle of Ephraem (Ephr., Catal. Patriarch., 383-417), or the respective section of the patriarch Nikephoros' Chronographikon Syntomon (Niceph., Chron. Synt., 114.10-120.16). We can deduce that the SynChron drew its material from such a source from a few later references to patriarchal changes. In the passages 111.12-6, 146.1-9, 158.24-159.5, the SynChron does not follow the usual practice of integrating the information at the proper chronological point, but relates all the changes in a single passage. That the relevant passages of Zonaras originate from such a source as well is supported by the fact that they occur in the ‘other sources’ or ‘parallel passages’ to all of the above mentioned passages of the SynChron. Furthermore, in the case of the sequence of the patriarchs Anatolios, Gennadios and Akakios, Zonaras conveys the information concerning the succession of the patriarchs together (Zon., 3.254.17-21), at the end of the reign of Leo, thus following a more thematic approach, whereas the SynChron has the respective references at two different – and chronologically correct – points (SynChron, 85.23-5, 86.17-9). More significantly, the Synopsis Lambros provides the patriarchal succession in one paragraph at the end of the relation of the reign of the emperor (as Zonaras), but its language presents similarities to both texts, hence suggesting that it followed independently the common source:

Nevertheless, we can be certain that the SynChron used an additional source to draw information on the subject, as we can see in the passage on the expulsion of the patriarch Germanos and the installation of the patriarch Anastasios (SynChron, 121.19-23), in which although the similarities to Zonaras (3.339.6-11) are significant and confirm the connection through the common source, we notice the different manner in which the two texts provide the chronological information: Zonaras gives
the duration of the tenure of the outgoing patriarch whereas the SynChron provides this information for the incoming patriarch.

In conclusion, it would be interesting to attempt a first approach to the treatment of the source in the two texts. We have already mentioned the use of a text additional to the common source in the composition of the SynChron. The same applies to Zonaras, who – in his effort to be objective – conveys frequently different versions of events from different sources, one being the common source with the SynChron. Relevant examples include the conspiracy of Heraclianus against the emperor Gallienus (SynChron, 38.23-9) (the passage that is common with the SynChron, which derives from Zosimos, is introduced with "Οἱ μὲν οὖν οὕτως ἱστόρησαν ἀναιρεθῆναι τὸν Γαλιῆνον, οἱ δὲ παρὰ Ἡρακλειανοῦ τοῦ ἐπάρχου σφαγῆναι τούτον φασί." (Zon., 3.148.25-7)), the imperial election of Quintillus (SynChron, 39.3-6), the cause of death of the emperor Jovian (SynChron, 57.24-5) or the degradation of the relics of St Euphemia (SynChron, 126.11-6).473

Finally, we see that Zonaras tends to incorporate the material drawn from the source in a more thematic manner,474 whereas the SynChron stays closer to the traditional practice of chronicles and sorts the events – in most cases – in a chronological sequence. Although Zonaras’ account of Constantius’ reign does not bear any similarities to the SynChron, he appends three passages which do occur in SynChron, 54.10-55.8: a description of the religious (Arian) beliefs of Constantius (Zon., 3.207.32-208.8), followed by the description of the events surrounding the end of Arius (Zon., 3.208.8-20), and the subsequent patriarch (Zon., 3.208.20-4). The common passages must derive from the common source, but Zonaras selected to use them in his narrative in a different way from the author of the SynChron. The same applies to the relation of the events surrounding the reactions to the Henotikon and the subsequent appeal to the pope (SynChron, 88.18-26); Zonaras relates the incident in a

473 Interestingly, the alternative version can be found in a marginal note on Marc. Gr. 407, next to the relevant passage.

474 Afinogenof, “Observations”, 29, suggests that the synthesis of Zonaras’ text is based on the principle of subject-thematical unity and the principal of stylistic homogeneity, an idea that is in agreement with Zonaras’ practice in this case.
later instance, in order to explain the consequences of the issue, whereas the SynChron relates the events in chronological order.

**Constantine Manasses**

The Synopsis Chronike of Constantine Manasses was a popular chronicle covering the period from the Creation of the world up to 1081, written in the mid-twelfth century in poetic form. This special characteristic creates an added complication for comparison to the respective sections of the SynChron, as it obstructs the use of linguistic similarities as a criterion for drawing any conclusions about its relationships to other texts; Manasses’ text, being a poem, is bound to make more alterations to the original sources, in order to fit the metre. In the following example, the two texts seem to use the same source, but present their material in a very different manner:

"σὺ μὲν, λαμπρότατε ὁ φήσι, τρισμέγιστε στρατάρχα, οὐκ ἐπιτεύξῃ τῆς ἀρχῆς, εἰ καὶ μισθὶς κάμης"  
(Manass., 4521-2)

"σὺ μὲν οὐκ ἐπιτεύξῃ τῆς βασιλείας" (SynChron, 129.28)

As a result, we have to base any conclusions about the relationship between the two chronicles largely on similarities of content. This is not to say that any linguistic similarities (or differences) are to be ignored, but they may be used as supplementary criteria to clarify specific points. For example, the following passages on iconoclastic practices show remarkable linguistic resemblances that suggest the use of a common prototype, even though Manasses is referring to Leo V, whereas the SynChron refers to Constantine V:

αϊ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ Χριστοῦ μορφώσεις ἠσβολοῦντο, 
τιτάνῳ κατεχρίοντο, πυρὶ κατεμπιμπρῶντο (Manass., 4591-2)

πᾶσαν μὲν ἁγίαν εἰκόνα, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀπήλειψε, καὶ τιτάνῳ ἐνέχρισε (SynChron, 126.2-3)

---

475 The editor, Odysseus Lampsidis (Manasses, Breviarium Chronicum, XVIII-XX), argues for 1142 as a tempus pro quem of the composition of the text.
Patzig has already provided examples that suggest that the two texts are linked through a unique common source. The results of our research, as presented in chapter three, support Patzig's suggestion. The relation of the incident of the burning of the copies of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in the reign of Leo III Isauros is unique in Manasses (4232-6) and the *SynChron* (123.17-9), while the other sources attribute the burning of the valuable copies to a similar incident during the reign of Zeno (Kedr., 1.616.8-10, Zon., 3.256.28-257.1, Ephr., *Chron.*, 1008-19). Similarly, in the passage on Basiliscos' mission against Geiseric, Manasses (2860-7) and the *SynChron* (86.3-14) are the only texts that start with a reference to the improved finances of the state, an important factor that enabled Leo I to launch the campaign. In the description of the death of Constantine III, all the texts that we mention in the relevant section agree on the main aspects of Constantine's murder. However, Manasses and the *SynChron* relate the event with a similar slight shadow of doubt, by adding the expressions ὤς φάσιν (*SynChron*, 110.11) and ὤς λέγουσι (Manass., 3744), which probably spring from their common source. The presentation of the reign of Constantine VI and Irene's coup (*SynChron*, 128.16-129.4) is of particular interest for the relationship between Manasses and the *SynChron* as well. The *SynChron* omits the usual accounts about the disagreements and conflicts between Constantine and his mother and relates a rather mild and neutral account, and although there are no strong linguistic similarities between the two texts, Manasses is the only other text that echoes the same content and sentiment. Other examples of the connection between the two texts are the miracle of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus (which, from the chroniclers, only Manasses (2696-2705) and the *SynChron* (74.26-75.8 relate extensively), the common attitude towards the reign of the emperor Anastasios (Manass., 3024-51, *SynChron*, 92.8-12), and numerous other cases (e.g. *SynChron*, 20.5-21.2, 21.17-20, 24.15-23, 29.20-7 41.26-8, 107.27-108.3, 115.15-20, 129.5-8, 129.13-130.1, 143.1-12, 154.18-155.2, 155.25-156.15, 162.14-20, 164.7-17).

477 It should be noted, however, that the similarities between the entries of Zonaras and the *SynChron* suggest that they also derive from the same source, but the latter also consulted the common source with Manasses, which was probably the text that mixed up the fires (the confusion could be attributed to the same moniker given to the two emperors (Isauros)).
478 See p. 134.
479 Cf. Kaestner, *De imperio Constantini III (641-668)*, 13, who argues that Constantine's death was due to natural causes.
480 Also, Kallistos Xanthopoulos (146.1212D-1216B) has a more detailed description of the events.
As far as the sources of the common source itself are concerned, we could attempt to ascertain them based on the occasions in which Manasses' chronicle appears consistently among specific texts in the 'main' or 'other sources' of the previous chapter. It would be safe to assume that it made use of a text that discussed the early period of Roman History, using material that probably derived from an early source; we have already referred to the possible connection of Manasses and the SynChron to Eutropius' *Breviarium historiae Romanae*,481 and we can also see Manasses presenting parallel accounts to the SynChron and other early Roman histories in various instances, such as the story of Amulius and Numitur (SynChron, 20.5-21.2), the naming of Rome by Romulus (SynChron, 21.17-20)482 and the more detailed description of the foundation of Rome (SynChron, 21.21-30). Nevertheless, passages like the last one could have also originated from Malalas, whose text appears as a common source of the two texts on various occasions with considerable similarities (e.g. SynChron, 69.16-70.15, 86.3-16, 84.27-85.20, 88.4-8). Similarly, the common material of Manasses and the SynChron has significant parallels to the Epitome (e.g. SynChron, 28.18-22, 29.20-7, 32.27-9, 56.2-9, 62.23-4, 79.6-14, 90.18-26, 90.30-1, 91.3-8, 91.28-92.8, 98.11-8, 105.25-106.7, 120.1-3, 120.29-121.4, 123.1-17, 126.16-8, 133.24-134.3, 134.21-7, 135.11-136.7, 137.2-10, 137.22-138.8, 139.19-140.26, 141.11-5, 141.21-142.23, 146.26-147.5, 152.19-23, 25-8), which suggests that their common source made use of a text of the Epitome. However, since the above passages do not consistently point at the direction of a particular branch or text of the Epitome, and since the connections of the SynChron to the Epitome do not correspond to the passages that link it to Manasses, we can safely assume that the common source should not be identified with any of the Epitome texts that were utilised by the SynChron.

The common source of Manasses and the SynChron also presents similarities to Zonaras. An early example is the section on Amulius and Numitur (SynChron, 20.5-21.2), for which there are two transmitted versions, reflected in the 'other sources' and 'parallel passages' that we mention in the relevant section. Interestingly, the SynChron

---

481 See p. 209.
482 Also see Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras I", 31.
does not follow Malalas in this instance but draws its material from a text that reflects the earlier texts, and the same applies to the accounts of Manasses and Zonaras (whose version is the most extensive). Although this is far from a conclusive example,\(^{483}\) there are further instances that justify the connection of the three texts. Their similarities in the response of Leo I to Patrikios, son of Aspar, also suggest the use of the same tradition:

\[\text{ἐκείνος ἀνθυπέφερεν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ παρά τίνος ἀγεσθαι ὡς δοῦλον. (SynChron, 85.10-1)}\]

\[\text{kai ὃς ἀνθυπήνεγκεν "ἀλλ' οὐδὲ βιάζεσθαι καὶ ἀγεσθαι ὡς ἀνδράποδον." (Zon., 3.251.14-5)}\]

\[\text{πρὸς ὃν ἀνθυπεκρούετο σοφῶς ὁ βασιλεύων "οὐ χρὴ τὸν περικείμενον τὴν πορφυρὰν χλαμῦδα παρά τίνος κατάφερθαι καὶ δοῦλον χρηματίζειν." (Manass., 2900-2)}\]

Similarly, in the passage relating the mutiny of the fleet against the emperor Leontios (SynChron, 115.28-116.5), the three texts present clear parallels in structure and language, and in the case of the appointment of the emperor Anastasios (SynChron, 120.1-3), they are the only texts that stress the primary role of the senate in the process.\(^{484}\) And although it does not seem possible to establish the exact links between the texts, the individual similarities that the SynChron shares with each of Zonaras and Manasses (but not necessarily Manasses and Zonaras together) suggest a pattern like the one in Figure 3.\(^{485}\)

Finally, the common source of Manasses and the SynChron appears frequently in the last section of the first part of the SynChron,\(^{486}\) where the two texts seem to carry unique information that is not present in any other sources.

\(^{483}\) The story was not only part of the oral tradition of the Roman Empire, but was also included in other texts, even at a later age. For example, Appian's passage (Basil., 1.5-6, 1a.5-9) comes from Photios Bibliotheca (cod. 57, 16b.34-17a.15).

\(^{484}\) See p. 142.

\(^{485}\) Also see Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, 354.

\(^{486}\) Discussed in further detail at pp. 304ff.
Michael Glykas

The relationship between Glykas' chronicle and the SynChron has been discussed in detail by Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, who examined extensively the similarities between the two texts, especially in regard to a possible connection to Zonaras. Her results show that in the majority of cases, the similarities between the three texts suggest that Glykas also used the common source of Zonaras and the SynChron. However, a small number of common passages of Glykas and the SynChron are not present in Zonaras, and consequently cast doubt on this possibility. As a result, Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou suggests that of the two possibilities – either Glykas and the SynChron drawing their information from an additional common source, or having used a different version of the same text that Zonaras used – the latter is the more possible.

Indeed, there is no doubt about the strong link between Glykas and the SynChron; in addition to the numerous cases noted in Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou's study, the connection is confirmed by the constant occurrence of Glykas as a 'main' (SynChron, 25.23-7, 28.18-22, 30.3-8, 48.29-50.12, 62.23-4, 69.16-70.15, 84.21-6, 89.3-8, 91.3-8, 105.15-8, 110.13-6, 116.11-117.18, 123.1-17, 128.29-129.4, 141.21-142.23) or 'other source' (SynChron, 31.23-6, 39.6-8, 44.1-22, 44.26-55.23, 46.21-31, 48.10-6, 54.15-55.2, 56.23-9, 60.14-8, 60.27-61.14, 63.13-9, 63.21-6, 63.31-64.9, 69.8-15, 72.8-9, 75.8-15, 79.6-14, 81.4-9, 82.1-3, 87.13-5, 88.8-12, 99.7-100.17, 101.7-13, 118.4-119.11, 120.29-121.2, 128.29-129.4, 129.15-130.1, 131.19-132.4, 133.18-134.3, 134.21-136.7, 137.22-138.8, 143.22-145.2) of the SynChron, especially in the cases, in which it appears either along with Zonaras, or as the sole text connected to the respective passages of the SynChron (e.g. SynChron, 31.23-6, 44.2-6, 46.8-11, 50.15-22, 53.8-14, 58.23-4, 90.26-7, 100.22-101.3, 122.24-8, 125.13-31, 147.6-9).

As far as the relationship to the history of Zonaras is concerned, Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou's suggestion is based on certain passages, which are common to Glykas and the SynChron but are not found in Zonaras: SynChron, 62.23-4, 105.15-8, 87.7-15, 72.14-9, 84.21-6, 146.10-14, 44.1-20, 46.8-11, 125.7-31, 146.26-147.5.

487 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, passim, esp. 294-331.
A potential problem with Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou's hypothesis is her argument that all the above passages derive from the same (common) source. Although this is possible, it is not necessarily the case. As we note in the discussion of the respective passages in chapter three, we do not agree with the associations attributed by Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou with the passages on Theophano (SynChron, 146.10-4), the reactions of the Church to the fourth wedding of Leo VI (SynChron, 146.26-147.5, 150.17-26) and the monastery of Roufinianai (SynChron, 150.15-6, 152.30-1). We also express our doubts about the possibility of a link between Glykas and the SynChron in the passage on Constantine's second vision of the cross (SynChron, 44.1-22). Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, in her discussion of the passage, suggests that there is no connection between Malalas and the later texts and that that there are two (linked) versions of the same dream; on the one hand the anonymous Vit. Const. and on the other the SynChron and Glykas. However, we show a further connection between the SynChron and Malalas, overlooked by Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, namely the phrases "ηὔχετο ψυθήναι ἀπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλκυσθείς εἰς ὑπνόν" (Mal., 243.11) and "δεόμενος ψυθήναι [...], πρὸς ὑπνόν ἐλκυσθείς" (SynChron, 44.6-7). Hence, the link between Malalas and the SynChron appears stronger than assumed by Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou. Additionally, in the SynChron, the dream does not occur in the course of the war against Maxentius, but against various enemies in Thrace. As a result, although Glykas and the SynChron seem to follow the same tradition, they do not necessarily copy the same text in this instance. As a result, the above group of passages that are common to Glykas and the SynChron but not Zonaras does not seem to present such a strong argument for the use of an additional related source.

On the other hand, Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou overlooked the implications of another passage that connects the three texts. She argues that the anecdote on the lack of education of the patriarch Niketas is shared only by the SynChron (125.13-31) and Glykas (527.14-528.1); however, Zonaras may also have been aware of the incident, as his comment "οὐδ’ ἀναγνώσας δυνάμενον" (Zon., 3.352.9-10) seems to allude to it. This last example supports the connection of Glykas, Zonaras and the

---

488 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 312-4.
489 Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou, Michael Glykas, 314.
*SynChron* through a common source, but it also raises the possibility of a different alternative; that all three texts used the same common source, and the material missing from Zonaras was actually left out in purpose. Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou argues that this is not likely, as there are seven incidents (*SynChron*, 44.1-20, 46.8-11, 125.7-31, 146.26-147.5, 150.17-26, 152.30-1, 129.1-4, 138.19-26) present only in Glykas and the *SynChron*. However, we argued that the two texts are not necessarily linked in three out of seven cases, and another one was known by Zonaras, but was probably abridged and included in the *Epitome Historiarum* in the manner mentioned above.

**Conclusion**

The research of Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou covers the subject of the relationship between Glykas and the *SynChron* substantially, and her suggestion linking the common source of the two texts to the common source of Zonaras and the *SynChron* appears entirely legitimate. As far as the exact relationship between the texts is concerned, it can only be based on minor points and differences, which cannot produce conclusive results. In Figure 4 and Figure 5, we present the two most possible associations, as derived by Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou's argument and the results of our research above and in the previous chapter.

**Joel**

The chronicle of Joel was written in the thirteenth century by an otherwise unknown author, and – according to Krumbacher and Hunger – is of limited historical or literary value. It presents, however, some interesting – albeit minor – parallels to the *SynChron*, not less in the spine of the narrative structures. Joel's chronicle focuses on providing the names of the rulers, the duration of their reign and – often – the cause of their death, a practice also followed in the *SynChron*. The chronological similarities are such as to suggest a connection, but not necessarily a close or a direct one. The similarities in the content seem to point in the same direction; sections from Joel appear very frequently in the 'parallel passages' of the *SynChron*, and – on occasions – in the 'other sources' (e.g. *SynChron*, 39.16-7, 54.10-55.2, 60.27-61.14,

---

101.14-24, 114.31-115.2, 117.19-26), an indication that the two texts are probably linked through an indirect source.

It is possible that a common indirect source of the two texts is one of the Epitome texts that were used in the compilation of the SynChron, since the two texts present similarities in certain passages originating from the pool of the Epitome. For example, the passage describing the arrangements between Marcian and Pulcheria (SynChron, 79.6-14), has great similarities to the respective passage of Joel (41.3-12). Since the passage is also present in other texts (such as Theophanes), it could be argued that it does not necessarily come from the Epitome. Nevertheless, there are further cases, in which Joel appears to be part of a small number of sources that relate an event, whose source is a text of the Epitome (e.g. SynChron, 42.19-25, 94.5-7, 110.13-6, 113.22-3, 114.1-26, 120.1-3, 120.10-5, 120.26-121.2, 146.26-147.5, 147.26-30), and a strong case in point is the description of the incident following the burial of the emperor Anastasios:

φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν μετὰ τὸ ταφῆναι μεθ’ ἡμέρας τινὰς βοῶν “ἐλεήσατε με καὶ ἀνοίξατε” τῶν μνημοσαλίων δὲ εἰπόντων “άλλος βασιλεύει,” έφη “οὐδὲν μοι μέλει εἰς μοναστήριον ἀπαγάγετε με,” οἱ δὲ εἰσαν αὐτὸν. λέγεται δὲ μετ’ οὗ πολὺ τὸ μνήμα ἀνοιγήναι, καὶ εὐφρενίκαν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ πεινῆς φαγόντα τοὺς βραχίονας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ καλῆγα ἀ ἐφόρει. (Leo Gramm., 120.19-121.2)

φασὶ δὲ μετὰ τὸ ταφῆναι μεθ’ ἡμέρας βοῶν “ἐλεήσατε με καὶ ἀνοίξατε.” τῶν μνημοναρίων δὲ εἰπόντων “άλλος βασιλεύει,” εἰπεὶν “οὐδὲν μοι μέλει εἰς μοναστήριον ἀπαγάγετε με καὶ ποιῆσατε μοναχόν.” οἱ δὲ εἰσαν αὐτὸν, μετ’ οὗ πολὺ δὲ τοῦ μνήματος ἀνοιγέντος εὐρέθη φαγὼν τοὺς βραχίονας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ καλήγα, ἀπερ ἐπεδέθυ. (Joel, 43.20-44.4)

φασὶ δὲ τούτον τὸν βασιλέα μεθ’ ἡμέρας τοῦ ταφῆναι αἰφνὶς βοὰν ἐλεήσατε καὶ ἀνοίξατε μοι. Τῶν δὲ μνημοσαλίων εἰπόντων, Άλλος βασιλεύει, εἰπεὶν, οὐδὲν μοι μέλει, εἰς μοναστήριον ἀπαγάγετε με. τῶν δὲ τότε μὴ ἀνοιξάτων, ὡς μετὰ καιρὸν συνέβη ἀνοιγήναι τὸ μνήμα, εὐφρενίκαν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ πεινῆς φαγόντα τοὺς βραχίονας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ καλῆγα. (SynChron, 91.28-92.4)

Ephraem

The chronicle of Ephraem, which is roughly contemporary to the SynChron, was another text that was written in poetic form, like Manasses. It has been suggested that one of its sources was the same text that was used in the compilation of the
Both narratives conclude in 1261, and – as we have seen in chapter three – Ephraem appears constantly in the 'parallel passages' of the SynChron. Additionally, Ephraem's chronicle is present as one of the 'other sources' of the SynChron in a several instances (SynChron, 40.11-3, 42.7-15, 61.21-62.2, 62.14-22, 76.13-6, 80.24-7, 123.17-9, 124.20-5), in two of which it is the unique 'other source' (SynChron, 110.22-4, 124.25-6). Although such similarities could be perceived as a clear sign of connection between the two texts, they are not so strong as to suggest a direct common source, a suggestion supported further by the small number of strong similarities that the two texts present overall, namely in the section describing Constantine's conversion to Christianity (SynChron, 44.26-45.23). The passage, which also appears in the tradition of Pseudo-Symeon, suggests a possible mutual link to the Epitome. However, any further connections are limited (SynChron, 55.22-8, 79.6-14, 139.19-140.26) and can also be attributed to the use of a separate common source, such as Theophanes. Additionally, material from the Epitome found in the SynChron is not always present in Ephraem, and in certain cases the two texts convey contradictory information. For example, the SynChron mentions the persecution of the bishop Euthymios as part of the first actions of Leo I after the resumption of iconoclasm (SynChron, 131.4-14), following the same tradition as Leo the Grammarian (209.5-15) and Pseudo-Symeon (609.8-11); Ephraem, on the other hand, attributes the imprisonment of Euthymios (and later of Methodios) to Michael (Ephr., Chron., 2219-21), who is portrayed as more impartial in the subject in the SynChron (132.14-6).

As a result, the constant similarities between the two texts suggest that they have used a common source, although the limited amount of strong links suggests that Ephraem only used it as a supplementary pool of information.

Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos

The Ecclesiastical History of Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos is the last Byzantine text of its kind, written in the beginning of the fourteenth century, and relates the

---

491 Lampsidis, Beiträge, 43, 49, 51-5, mainly referring to the later part of the chronicle, which was based on Akropolites.

492 As do Genesios (2.14), Theophanes Cont. (48.8-12), and Skylitzes (28.82-9).

493 Similarly, the SynChron attributes the imprisonment of Methodios to Theophilos (134.21-7).
history of the church from its beginnings up to 610. Although it is not directly connected to the *SynChron*, we have included it in this study for its similarities to the *SynChron*, which can provide helpful indications for its sources. As we can see in the previous chapter, sections from the *Ecclesiastical History* appear constantly as 'parallel passages' to the *SynChron*, and in numerous instances they are part of the 'other sources' (*SynChron*, 42.15-9, 44.26-45.23, 46.12-20, 56.1-5, 56.5-22, 57.9-16, 57.29-58.11, 61.28-62.14, 66.2-9, 66.14-5, 72.8-25, 73.8-20, 73.29-74.6, 76.17-77.27, 87.16-7, 88.11-2, 89.3-10, 90.18-26, 90.30-1, 93.19-24, 94.1-5, 101.14-24, 106.7-31), signifying a close link between the two texts. Certain passages from these 'other sources' present stronger similarities, not commonly present in other texts. For example, we have already discussed the common use of Evagrius in the relation of the abolition of the *chrysargyron* tax by the emperor Anastasios, and we find analogous similarities in the description of the incident with the monk Isaakios and the death of the emperor Valens, as well as to the life of Constantine, for which both texts seem to use an uncommon vita, the *Vit. Const.* (Guidi)).

Scholarship has already established the diversity of the sources used by Xanthopoulos, most of which are also part of the source material of the *SynChron*. As a result, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the two authors had consulted the sources independently; however, passages such as the life of Constantine or the abolition of *chrysargyron* above, which show a mutual use of uncommon sources only by the *SynChron* and Xanthopoulos indicate that the material may originate from a text that was consulted by the two authors, or – possibly – by the author of the common source of the *SynChron* and Zonaras. Although this does not cover all the parallel passages of the two texts, especially since other passages of the *SynChron* and Xanthopoulos present stronger similarities to the original sources than between themselves, our analysis of the sources of the section on the bishops of Byzantium seem to confirm the case for a common source.
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494 See p. 221.

495 See pp. 286ff, Winkelmann and Gentz, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, 190.

496 Winkelmann and Gentz, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, 182-191.

497 See p. 218, where we discuss passages on Theodosius that originate from Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History*, and can only be found in Zonaras, the *SynChron* and Xanthopoulos.

498 See p. 295.
**Hagiographical texts**

The influence and use of hagiography has been noted on numerous occasions in the presentation of the sources of the *SynChron* in the previous chapter. Although the use of hagiographical texts is not always direct, or so clear-cut as to allow us to consistently identify particular texts as the sources, the frequent employment of their information and tropes suggests that their inclusion was a conscious choice of the author.

We find numerous examples of hagiographical material throughout the text: the brief presentation of the life and teachings of Jesus Christ (*SynChron*, 25.23-7, 27.19-27), the persecutions of the early Christians (*SynChron*, 28.26-8, 30.12, 31.12-3, 35.29-31, 37.23-5, 40.9-11, 40.27-41.1), the exile of St John to Patmos and his subsequent release (*SynChron*, 30.13-4, 30.17-9), the persecution of St Chariton (*SynChron*, 39.16-7), the translation of the relics of St Andrew and St Luke the Evangelist (*SynChron*, 56.1-5), of St John Prodrom and St Paul (*SynChron*, 65.5-10), of St Flavian (*SynChron*, 79.2-5), of St Lazaros and Maria Magdalene (*SynChron*, 147.7-8), of St Gregory (*SynChron*, 153.3-12), the persecution by the emperor Julian (*SynChron*, 56.29-57.4), the teaching of St Gregory (*SynChron*, 60.10-4), the burning of the ship with the clerics by the emperor Valens (*SynChron*, 60.14-8), the translation of the "holy robe" and the relics of St Anastasia to Constantinople (*SynChron*, 87.3-6), the iconoclastic persecutions and the (*SynChron*, 124.20-31), the degradation of the relics of St Euphemia (*SynChron*, 126.11-6), the martyrdom of St Methodios (*SynChron*, 134.21-136.7), *et al.* Not all of them derive directly from hagiographical texts; on the contrary, they had become part of the chronicle tradition, some of them from as early as the synchronisations in Eusebius' *Chronicle*. Nevertheless, the text has made considerable direct use of hagiographical material, notably in the account of Constantine's reign, but also in other cases, such as the sections on the persecution of St Eustathios and his family (*SynChron*, 31.13-4), and the miracle of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus (*SynChron*, 74.26-75.8).
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499 In p. 171, we discuss the possible connections of the passage (or its source) to the relevant hagiographical texts.

500 With the exception of Manasses, who must have used the same source with the *SynChron*. 
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Similarly, there are various examples of hagiographical tropes utilised in the Synopsis. We have already mentioned the topos of the proem that echoes a passage of a vita of John of Cyprus (Leontios, 344.64-9). In the passage on the dispute that took place during the fourth Ecumenical Council, which was finally resolved with the use of the body of St Euphemia (SynChron, 82.11-83.20), we see the influences of the hagiographical sources of the incident, as shown in the following exclamations:

τῶν θαυμασίων σου, κύριε (Zon., 3.248.30)

ὁ τής ἀφάτου σου πρός ἡμᾶς φιλανθρωπίας Χριστέ (SynChron, 83.10-1)

τίς οὐ θαυμάσει, Χριστέ μου, τὸ ύπερβάλλον τῆς δυνάμεως σου καὶ τῆς κρίσεως; (BHG3 624m, 3.9-10).

(παράδοξόν τι καὶ μέγα ὁ τῶν θαυμάτων δημιουργὸς εἰργάσατο κύριος. (BHG3 621, 9.18-9))

Likewise, the phrase "ὡ τῶν ἀρρήτων σου κριμάτων φιλάνθρωπε κύριε" (SynChron, 125.13-4) seems to share similar influences,502 as well as the reference of Trajan's attitude towards his friends (SynChron, 30.25-9) to Ignatios the Deacon's Vita Nicephori (SynChron, 181.25).503

A case of use of a hagiographical text, even through an intermediary text, is Alexander the Monk's The Discovery of the True Cross,504 which we trace in the SynChron in the passages on the emperor Vespasian (SynChron, 29.20-7) and St Helen (SynChron, 52.19-31), but more evidently in the emperor Tiberius' attempt to officially proclaim the divine status of Jesus Christ:

Τιβέριος δὲ, ἀκούσας ταύτα καὶ θαυμάσας, ἐπίστευε τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ ἐβούλετο παραχρῆμα τούτον διὰ βασιλικοῦ τύπου ἀναγορεύσαι Θεόν. Ἀντεπράχθη δὲ υπὸ τῆς ιδίας συγκλήτου, μωρίαν ἤγησαμένης τὸν λόγον τοῦ σταυροῦ. (Alex., Invent., 4037.29-33)

501 Although not an exclamation, it is a hagiographical text with expression similar to the SynChron.

502 See p. 148.

503 See p. 60.

504 For the current view of the composition and aims of the text by modern scholarship, see Nesbitt, "Alexander the Monk", 23-39.
οὗτος ἀκούσας τὰ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ βασιλικοῦ τύπου ἠθέλησε διὰ βασιλικοῦ τύπου ἀναγορεύσαι θεόν. ἀλλὰ τούτο μὲν ἀντεπράχθη παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου (Leo Gramm., 58.20-2)

οὗτος ὁ Τιβέριος ἀκούσας τὰ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θαύματα ἠβουλήθη διὰ βασιλικοῦ τύπου ἀναγορεύσαι αὐτὸν θεόν ἀλλὰ ἀντεπράχθη τούτω παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου, καθὼς οὖν Εὐσέβιος λέγει. (Kedr., 345.10-3)

Οὗτος ἀκούσας τὰ περὶ Χριστοῦ ἠθέλησε διὰ βασιλικοῦ τύπου ἀναγορεύσαι τούτον θεόν· ἀλλ' ἐκωλύθη παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου. (SynChron, 28.1-3)

The use of hagiographical elements is nowhere else more evident than in the extensive section on Constantine's reign. As we note elsewhere, it is not possible to identify a sole source, or a group of sources, for the entire reign. This is partly due to the substantial impact of hagiographical texts on the presentation of the reign, notably vitae that do not appear often amongst the sources of historiographical texts, especially as late as the SynChron.

On the one hand, there are three vitae of Constantine (Vit. Const. (Guidi), Vit. Const. (Patmos), Vit. Const. (Angel. 22)), as well as a vita of St Eusignios, that present great similarities to the account of the SynChron, mainly in the passages SynChron, 42.4-25, 46.21-47.27, 50.15-22, 53.1-3. The information often appears in the text of Pseudo-Symeon as well, a possible indication that the material may have arrived in the SynChron through it. The connection is evident in the relation of the first vision of the cross by Constantine. Pseudo-Symeon, the Patmos' Life of Constantine and the SynChron are the only texts that convey the tradition that Christ commissioned the building of Constantinople in honour of the Virgin: "οἱκοδομήσεις δὲ πόλιν τῇ μητρὶ μου" (SynChron, 42.12), "Καὶ τῇ μητρὶ μου οἰκοδομήσεις πόλιν ἐν ὦ τόπῳ σοι ύποδείξω" (Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 5.1-2), "ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ μητρὶ μου τῇ θεοτόκῳ Μαρίᾳ οἰκοδομήσεις πόλιν πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἡλίου ἐν ὦ τόπῳ αὐτὸς ύποδείξω σοι" (Vit. Const. (Patmos), 5.24-5).

---

505 Kedrenos has two different versions for the event, the second one (cited here) being similar to the passages of Alexander and Leo the Grammarian, with the addition of the attribution to Eusebius. Cf. Patzig, "Quellen des Zonaras 1", 28.
506 See p. 519.
507 Kazhdan, "Constantin Imaginaire", 196-250 discusses in detail the presentation of the legend of Constantine in these texts, but does not include any references to the (later) account of the SynChron.
508 Also present in the Synopsis Lambros.
509 Halkin, "Une Nouvelle vie", 79 n. 3, notes the connection between the SynChron and the vita.
As we see in the relevant passage, they also have respective similarities in the introduction of the passage dealing with the foundation of Constantinople:

Εἰς μνήμην δὲ ἐλθὼν τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν φωνῆς τοῦ Κυρίου καθ’ ὑπνους λεγούσης, ἔγειρες τῇ μητρὶ μου πόλιν ἐν ὦ ὑποδείξω σοι τόπῳ. (SynChron, 46.21-3)

Εν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις εἰς μνήμην ἔρχεται τοῦ γενομένου ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς αὐτὸν κατὰ τοὺς υπνοὺς προστάγματος λέγοντος οἰκοδομεῖν τῇ θεοτόκῳ πόλει ἐν ὦ τόπῳ αὐτὸς ὑποδείξω σοι. (Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 10.1-4)

Ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις εἰς μνήμην ἔρχεται τοῦ γενομένου πρὸς αὐτὸν πλησίον ῾Ρώμης ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου κατὰ τοὺς υπνοὺς προστάγματος, ὅπερ ἦν οἰκοδομήσαι τῇ θεοτόκῳ πόλιν ἐν ὦ τόπῳ αὐτὸς ὑποδείξω σοι λέγοντος. (Vit. Const. (Patmos), 8.1-5)

These are also shared by Kedrenos, who copies Pseudo-Symeon:

ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις εἰς μνήμην ἔρχεται τοῦ γενομένου πλησίον ῾Ρώμης ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς αὐτὸν κατὰ τοὺς υπνοὺς προστάγματος, ὅπερ ἦν λέγοντος οἰκοδομῆσαι τῇ θεοτόκῳ πόλιν ἐν ὦ τόπῳ αὐτὸς ὑποδείξω σοι. (Kedr., 1.495.22-496.2)

We find further similarities between the texts in the relation of the legend of the foundation of the City (Constantine looking for the appropriate place, beginning of building in Bithynia, the miracle with the eagles prompts him to alter the place to Byzantium), as well as in the structure of the relation of the events (decision for foundation and first actions – Persian campaign).

Having said that, the discussion of the passage on the campaign of Constantine against the Persians and his subsequent capture indicates that the SynChron presents stronger similarities to the hagiographical tradition than Pseudo-Symeon. Pseudo-Symeon (and Kedrenos) have a brief reference to the campaign and the subsequent capture and the order of the events is the same as in the SynChron (first the decision for the foundation of Constantinople, then the campaign against the Persians and finally the capture of Constantine). However, the similarities between the SynChron and the versions transmitted in the Lives of Constantine and St Eusignios (mainly the former, which structures the events in the same way as the SynChron and Pseudo-Symeon) are stronger, both in content and in language (e.g. "τῆς μεγάλης σου ανοχῆς, Χριστέ μου" (Vit. Const. (Guidi), 316.26-317.1), "ὡ τῶν κριμάτων σου,
Κύριε" (SynChron, 47.2), "ἀλλὰ σκοπεῖ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαθότητα, πῶς ἐν ἀπόροις πόρους δίδωσι" (Vit. Const. (Patmos), 9.13-4). It seems that the SynChron either drew the material from the hagiographical pool, or from a version of Pseudo-Symeon that maintained more elements of the vitae than the surviving text.

Similarly, part of the material used for the conversion of Constantine to Christianity (SynChron, 44.26-46.4) seems to come from a life of the Pope Sylvester (Vit. Silvestr.), although not necessarily directly or exclusively. For example, the passage of the SynChron that describes Constantine's dream of Sts Peter and Paul is almost identical to the respective passage of Kedrenos, which apparently derives from the vita:


Οὗτος γάρ, εἶπον, ὑποδείξει σοι κολυμβήθραν εὐσεβείας ἐν ᾗ λουσάμενος τὰς τοῦ σώματος τραύματα καὶ τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποσμήξεις καὶ ζήσῃ καλῶς [...] (Vit. Silvestr., 34-7).

Καὶ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ὁρᾷ καθ’ ὑπνούς τοὺς τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων πρωτοθρόνους, Πέτρον καὶ Παύλον τοὺς ἁγίους, προτεταμένους αὐτῷ Σίλβεστρον ἐπιζητῆσαι τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον· αὐτὸς γὰρ, ἔφησαν, ὑποδείξει σοι κολυμβήθραν δι’ ἢς τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος νόσους ιαθήση. (SynChron, 45.10-5).

And the same seems to apply to the description of the baptism of Constantine:


Ἐν τῷ βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Σιλβέστρου ἐπὶ τῷ εὐβαπτίσματι τῆς παναγίας καὶ ἑωραχικῆς τριάδος, ἐξαίφνης κολυμβήθρας ἐξαίφνης φωτὸς ἐξέλαμψε καὶ ἦχος ἐγένετο ὡς ὄμος δονομένου, καὶ ἔζηλθεν ὁ μέγας βαπτιστής Ἡρῴδης ἔπειτα τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ βαπτισμοῦ τοῦ τῶν σαρκῶν καὶ καθαριζούσης τῆς νόσου» (Vit. Const. (Guidi), 328.20-8).

Ἐν δὲ τῷ τοῦτον βαπτίζεσθαι λαμπηδών τις ἐξαίφνης φωτὸς ἐξέλαμψε καὶ ἥχος ἐγένετο ὡς ὄμος δονομένου, καὶ ἀνήλθε τῆς κολυμβήθρας ἕξω ἐπληρωθήσαν. Ἐλεγε δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὅτι ἐν
Finally, another rarely used hagiographical text, whose influence we recognise in the SynChron is a life of Metrophanes and Alexander, bishops of Constantinople (Vit. Metr. et Alex.), or – most possibly – a different version of the text that was circulating in the thirteenth century. A first indication of its use can be found in the passage that relates the presidents of the first Ecumenical Council (SynChron, 50.6-12), in which case, the SynChron is the only text that names Alexander as the bishop of Constantinople during the Council, whereas most of the other texts mention Metrophanes. From the texts that do not share this information, Pseudo-Symeon mentions Alexander as the bishop of Constantinople at the time of the council, who was not able to attend due to old age (Pseudo-Symeon (Halkin), 10.54-60). Also, there is a note in the catalogue of the participants in Gelasius Ecclesiastical History ("Ἀλέξανδρος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τότε πρεσβύτερος ἔτι ὄν εἰς ύστερον δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς ἱερατείας τῆς αὐτόθι ἐκκλησίας λαχών" (Gelas., HE, 2.38.13)), which indicates that there was a different tradition for Alexander being the bishop, but this was not followed by any later sources. Finally, the life of Metrophanes and Alexander states that Alexander went to the council representing Metrophanes, who was not able to attend due to sickness and old age (Vit. Metr. et Alex., 12.4-7).

Although the similarities are not striking, it is possible that the information of the SynChron derives from the tradition of the Vita, especially since it contains further material that originates in the Vita that is not present in any other texts; namely, the section of the SynChron on the issue of the succession of Metrophanes (SynChron, 51.3-52.10), whose source cannot be found amongst the chronicles or even the early ecclesiastical histories, presents strong similarities to the Vita (and the Vit. Metr. (Menolog.), mainly in content and structure, and also in language, but not to a great extent (Vit. Metr. et Alex., 14.1-15.4); however, the additional information in the two texts suggest that it is more possible that the source of the SynChron was not the Vita itself, but a separate text from the same tradition.

---

511 Gelasius refers to the issue of old age of Metrophanes, as the reason for the procedures for his succession. However, this is a brief passage, without the details that we find in the SynChron and with no reference to any intervention by Constantine.
Unidentified and unknown sources

The SynChron, and especially the first part of the text (3-173), is not considered a particularly valuable historical source for the events it relates. This is mainly due to the fact that it merely reproduces other known accounts, and seldom offers information that cannot be found in other texts. However, as we have seen in the previous and present chapters, the SynChron contains numerous passages, for which we were not able to identify a 'main source'. Although this sometimes indicates that the SynChron presents unique or unknown information, this is not always the case; more often than not, it is indicative of the difficulties we face in the identification of the sources of sections of different nature. Often, passages with no apparent source are sections that were composed by the author himself, with the possible use of the sources that appear in the 'other sources' or the 'parallel passages'. To give an example, we do not cite any 'main' or 'other sources' for the passage referring to the 'trisagios hymn' argument and the miracle with the boy snatched up to the air (SynChron, 75.21-31), but only 'parallel passages'. Nevertheless, the passage does not necessarily derive from an unknown source; it just refers to a well known incident, and we can assume that it was written by the author of the SynChron himself. In other cases, we find the same material in other texts which are commonly sources of the SynChron, but is either presented in the SynChron in a different manner (language or structure), or significantly abridged. These passages are re-workings of the material of the original sources, in order to correspond to the programme of the author. Omissions or changes in the presentation may reflect specific opinions of the author, and considerable abridgments come in line with the initial statement of the author in the proem advocating the compilation of a synopsis. However, we should always be cautious in such cases, as it is difficult to distinguish when the author merely altered the material from known sources, and when he used an unknown source. For example, on a first look, the 'Santabarenos incident' (SynChron, 145.21-8) seems to only abridge the information of the other sources we mention in the 'parallel passages', and could easily be attributed to them; the SynChron, however, is the only text that mentions the exile of Leo to Thessaloniki, a clear indication that a different or an additional source was used. Another category of passages that commonly appears without a known source includes sections which present trivial information, such as names of members of the imperial family (e.g. SynChron, 131.5-7, 143.13-6);
although we are sometimes able to find the material in other texts, it is difficult to
recognise a particular text as the source, especially since it is possible that the author
may have learned the information from his earlier readings or even through oral
tradition, and inserted it in the appropriate place in the chronicle. Finally, there are
passages whose sources do not seem to have survived; either the material they convey
is unique or the presentation is so different to the other sources as to suggest that the
*SynChron* was indeed based on a text that is not known to us.

In the following, we attempt to present in the order they appear in the text the
passages and sections of the *SynChron* discussed above. We do not, however, include
all the passages with no 'main source'; as we have already mentioned, many passages
are re-workings of the material conveyed in the 'other sources' or 'parallel passages',
and their inclusion in this section would not offer any further insight into the sources
of the *SynChron*. Also, on various occasions – which we discuss either in the relevant
passages in chapter three or in the appropriate section of this chapter – we propose the
characteristics of the source, according to the connections of the passage to 'other
sources'. For example, the presence of numerous 'other sources' from the Epitome
family suggests that the source of the passage is the Epitome source(s) used by the
author of the *SynChron*, as described in the relevant section; or the passages stating
thoroughly the alterations of the patriarchs of Constantinople, which we discuss in the
section dealing with the relationship between the *SynChron* and Zonaras. Such
passages are not included in the following discussion either, and neither parts from the
first section of the text (*SynChron*, 4.19-19.16), as any applicable sections are dealt
with in the relevant place in chapter three.\(^{512}\)

**The passages**

**Lepidus (24.26)**

The *SynChron* conveys (twice) the unique form "Λεπίδιος" (the common form is
"Λέπιδος").

---

\(^{512}\) See pp. 37ff.
The sack of Jerusalem by Titus (29.27-30)

Most of the other texts either provide a more extensive account of the events, or are more precise in the presentation of the chronological information (‘second year of Vespasian's reign', as in the Chronikon Epitomon, Pseudo-Symeon and Kedrenos, which are commonly sources of the SynChron). Although we could explain the differences by attributing the passage to the pen of the author (with the use of any of the above sources), the fact that we cannot identify a source for the subsequent passage on Herakleia raises the possibility of use of an independent source, unknown to us.

Herakleia – Perinthos (29.30-30.1)

The founding of the city and the change of its name to Perinthos is not found in any other source. Zonaras (3.183.10-3) has a reference to the 'episkope' of the city, but the information refers to the reign of Severus. The two names of the city was common knowledge and several texts mention them (Zosim., 1.62.1, Theodoret, HE, 82.16, Sozom., HE, 3.5.10.4, Genes., 2.9.8, Xanth., HE, 147.381C, Tzetz., Chil., 1.31.844, 3.815b), but they do not mention when or who made the alteration.

Judgment on the emperor Commodus (32.18-9)

The SynChron reflects the negative attitude towards Commodus that is shared by all the sources, but the vocabulary used ("ἀνάξιος, κατὰ πάντα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ καταγέλαστος") does not allow us to connect it to any of them. They may derive from the unknown Roman source used in other instances, but it can also be an abridgment of the existing material by the author of the SynChron himself.

General presentation of Septimius Severus' actions (32.31-33.1)

We were not able to identify a source for the passage. Notably, the SynChron presents a positive portrayal of the practices of the emperor, whereas in the few cases in which other chronicles include a reference, they are negative in their comments. Since the presentations of Septimius Severus, Didius and Elegabalus in the SynChron have the

513 See p. 206.
unique common characteristic of being positive, it is possible that they all derive from the same source. 514

**Elegabalus (33.29-34.31)**

Sathas, the editor of the *SynChron*, was the first to note the unique material in the section on the emperor Elegabalus, 515 and proposed the use of a source that has not survived. Thurn seems to suggest that they derive from Malalas 516 (or the closely related text used by the author of the *SynChron*). This is possible, but does not necessarily apply to the whole passage. The first part of the section, the general presentation of the emperor (*SynChron*, 33.31-34.2) has similarities to other introductory passages to Roman emperors (such as Commodus, Didius and Septimius Severus), and they may all derive from the same separate source. Additionally, the passage *SynChron*, 34.19-29, which Thurn does not attribute to Malalas, presents additional difficulties in the identification of its sources. From the two 'other sources' we suggest, Zonaras drew from Herodian's text, and the content and style of *SynChron* suggests that it followed a parallel tradition. However, there is no existing source for the beginning of the passage (34.19-22), which suggests the use of a source other than Malalas' chronicle (or in addition to it), probably the translation of a compendium of Roman history that we have mentioned elsewhere. 517

**Military successes of Aurelian (39.10-1)**

No direct source could be found for this reference, which, however, can an abridgment of the relevant extensive account of Zosimos (1.18.61).

**Carus (40.6)**

The format of the name used in the *SynChron* (Σάρος) does not appear in any of the other sources. 518

---

514 See p. 206.
515 *Synopsis Chronike*, σμθ’. Interestingly, the *Synopsis Lambros* does not share the same attitude with the *SynChron*; that is to say that the passage 33.29-34.31 of the *SynChron* is missing from the *Synopsis Lambros*, whereas the latter includes a passage (287.10-289.5), which provides a poor picture of Elegabalus' reign.
516 See the critical apparatus of Mal., 225.IIb, IIIc.
517 See p. 206.
518 Nor is it found in the *Synopsis Lambros*, which writes Κάρος, hence providing another argument against the theory that the *Synopsis Lambros* derives from the *SynChron*.
The reign of Constantine I (41.26-54.9)

It is difficult to identify the main sources for the overall treatment of the reign of Constantine in the SynChron. The large number of the secondary sources and parallel passages presented in the respective section of chapter three indicate that the events of the life of Constantine were related by numerous authors in various types of texts (hagiography, historiography etc), often following different versions and traditions.\(^{519}\)

The author of the SynChron seems to have used this pool of information to compile his account of Constantine, but does not seem to have followed directly and consistently a unique source. The use of multiple sources is confirmed by the incidents and events, which are related twice in the course of the narration. More specifically, there are two passages on the vision of the cross (attributed to different times in the life of the emperor, although the SynChron is not the only source that relates more than once visions of the cross); two passages on the chronology of the Nicean Council (which provide contradictory information, verifying the hypothesis that they were drawn from different sources); and two passages on the death of Constantine.

Here, we only include the three passages that do present unique material, which strongly suggest the use of a different text from the ones we mention in the 'other sources' and the 'parallel passages'.\(^{520}\)

Constantine's second vision of the cross (44.1-22)

We discuss the passage elsewhere,\(^{521}\) where we note its relationship to Malalas and Glykas. The connection to the former may suggest that the source was the different version of Malalas used by the SynChron, but it could also be the case that it was part of the hagiographical tradition that was used extensively for the reign of Constantine.

---

\(^{519}\) See Kazhdan's statement about the various hagiographical versions of Constantine: "I do not think that there was a Vorvita behind this corpus; rather, they took shape as oral tales dedicated to individual episodes in the story of Constantine" (Kazhdan, "Constantin Imaginaire", 247). Also see Winkelmann, "Ein Ordnungsversuch", 267-84.

\(^{520}\) As well as the section on the earlier bishops of Byzantium, which – although it falls within Constantine's reign – is a separate section by itself.

\(^{521}\) See p. 279.
Provision of free bread to the population of the City (52.17-8)

From the surviving sources that we mention in the 'parallel passages' of the passage, Photios' *Bibliotheca* is the only other text that mentions a number of the provided bread rations ("μυριάδες ὀκτώ"); the *SynChron* writes "ὀκτώ χιλιάδας τὸν ἀριθμὸν". Photios' passage comes from a life of Paul of Constantinople, a possible indication that the source of the *SynChron* was a hagiographical text.

Two edicts of Constantine about the church, the clerics and the bishops (53.1-7)

First edict: the passage in Theodoret's history (182.8-9) is a later reference to Constantine' edict. Most of the historians relate that Constantine ordered the closure of the Hellenic temples in favour of Christianity (e.g. Mal., 243.22-4, Theoph., 25.1-3, Kedr., 1.498.6-9). The reference in the vitae of Constantine indicates that it was part of the hagiographical tradition, which may have been the source of the *SynChron*.

Second edict: we were not able to find any references in any of the other texts. The *SynChron* implies that the author had access to the text of the edict itself ("ἀπερ ὁ βουλόμενος μαθεῖν ἐντυγχανέτω τῇ πρὸς τὸν ἅγιον Σίλβεστρον διατάξει αὐτοῦ" (*SynChron*, 53.4-6)), but decided against incorporating it in the chronicle. The phrase "ἡμεῖς γὰρ σύνοψιν συντιθέμενοι, διὰ τὸ μὴ κοι παρεδράμομεν" (*SynChron*, 53.6-7) seems to be a topos (*Vit. Const. (Patmos)*, 5.53, Planud., *Epist.*, 55.22, Seides, 1.1.102-7, Chryst., *In Epist. Rom.*, 13-7, Zon., 1.261.22-5), which alludes to the proem of the *Synopsis*.

The list of the bishops of Byzantium (48.16-49.27)

Although catalogues of bishops and patriarchs were in common circulation in Byzantium, they do not commonly appear incorporated in historiographical works – the exceptions being the respective sections of the *SynChron* (48.16-49.27) and Kallistos Xanthopoulos' *Ecclesiastical History* (146.28C-29C). A list of bishops is also part of the patriarch Nikephoros' *Chronographikon Syntomon* (113.19-114.18),

522 Fischer, "De Patriarcharum", 263-333.

523 For a brief discussion of the use of lists of bishops by Byzantine historiographers, see Winkelmann, "Metrophanes", 50-2, who does not mention the *SynChron* in the discussion.
and we can find similar free-standing catalogues in Ephr., *Catal. Patriarch.*, 9563-9616, at the end of Ephraem’s chronicle, and in a separate text, the "Enarratio de Episcopis Byzantini", written by Kallistos Xanthopoulos. Their original common ancestor seems to be the catalogue of bishops that was compiled by Dorotheos of Tyre, but the exact relationship between them, if any, is not clear.

The lists of the *SynChron* and Kallistos Xanthopoulos have the same content, which is consistent with other similarities between them. However, there are certain linguistic differences; the *Ecclesiastical History* is more extensive and more eloquent, whereas the *SynChron* is mainly a list of the bishops (whilst the "Enarratio" is even more abridged); nevertheless, in certain cases (as we see below) the *SynChron* contains more information than the *Ecclesiastical History*. There are also a few differences in the years attributed to each bishop; for example, in the case of the bishop Eleutherios, Dorotheos (282.18) and the *SynChron* (49.4) write 17, whereas Xanthopoulos' two texts and Nikephoros write 7 (Niceph., *Chron. Synt.*, 112.25, Xanth., *HE*, 146.28D, Xanth., *Episc.*, 452A). Another difference is that Dorotheos, the patriarch Nikephoros and the *SynChron* write Καστῖνος, whereas the *Ecclesiastical History* writes Κωνσταντίνος. The study of specific passages does not seem to provide definite answers.

Ανδρέας ὁ ἁγιώτατος ἀπόστολος παραγενόμενος ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ καὶ κηρύξας τὸν σωτήριον λόγον, ἐκκλησίαν πιστῶν συστήσαμεν καὶ εὐκτήριον οἶκον πέραν ἐν τῇ νῦν λεγομένῃ Ἀργυροπόλει ἀνεγείρας, ἐν ᾧ ὑστερον ἀπετέθη τὸ λείψανον τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Ἀδριανοῦ, χειροτονεῖ ἐπίσκοπον αʹΣτάχυν τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως πρῶτον, οὗ καὶ μέμνηται Παῦλος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ, ὃς ἐπεσκόπησεν ἔτη ιϞʹ. (Fischer (ed.), 282.6-12)

Α’ Ανδρέας ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐν Βυζαντίῳ τὸν λόγον κηρύξας, εὐκτήριον οἶκον πέραν ἐν Ἀργυροπόλει δειμάμενος, χειροτονεῖ ἐπίσκοπον τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως Στάχυν, οὗ

---

524 Although Ephraem's catalogue is also related to the other texts, its connection to the *SynChron* is not as strong, hence its omission from the following discussion. It also appears as a parallel text to the *SynChron* in certain passages relating the change of the patriarchs (e.g. *SynChron*, 65.16-23, 109.27-9, 111.14-6, 134.17-20, 147.10-4), which do not suggest any further connection between the two texts.

525 Kallistos Xanthopoulos, "Enarratio", 449-468.

526 See Fischer, "De Patriarcharum", 273-5. The text is published in Fischer, "De Patriarcharum", 282-94, and a stem of the links with later texts can be found in Fischer, "De Patriarcharum", 280.

527 See pp. 282ff.

528 The name is missing in Xanthopoulos' *Enarratio*, and the editor adds Καστίνος.
μέμνηται ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ. (Niceph., Chron. Synt., 113.11-8)

Ἀνδρέας ὁ πρωτόκλητος ἀπόστολος· οὗτος ἐν τῷ διαπλέειν τὴν Ποντικὴν θάλασσαν, παραγενόμενος κἀν Βυζαντίῳ καὶ κηρύξας ἐν αὐτῷ τὸν σωτήριον λόγον ἐκκλησίαν τε πιστῶν συστησάμενος καὶ οἶκον εὐκτήριον ἀνέγειρας ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ Αργυρουπόλει ἀναγείρας, ὅπου καὶ τὸ ἅγιον λείψανον κατετέθη τοῦ μάρτυρος Ἀδριανοῦ, χειροτονεῖ ἐπίσκοπον τῆς Βυζαντος πόλεως Στάχυν ἐν τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα, ὡς ἐπεσκόπησεν ἐν Ἰστανμβολί. (SynChron, 48.24-49.1)

Ἀνδρέας γὰρ ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀπόστολος, τὰ περὶ Θρᾴκην καὶ Μακεδονίαν καὶ τὸνΕὔξεινον κλῆρον λαχών, ἐπεὶ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ γενόμενος ἐκήρυττε τὸν Χριστὸν, ὑπὸ Ζευξίππου τοῦ τηγακίδα τυραννοῦντος ζητοῦμενος, ἐν Αργυρουπόλει μετέβαινε· καὶ χρόνον διετῆ ἐκείσε συνάγων, πολλοὺς ἐπεσπάτο πίστει τῇ ἐς Χριστὸν. Θυσιαστήριον τοίνυν τῷ τόπῳ ἑδράσας, καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Στάχυν ἐκείς χειροτονήσας ἐπίσκοπον, εἰς Σινώπην ἀπαίρει. (Xanth., HE, 146.28C-D)

Περτίναξ ὑπατικὸς καὶ συγκλητικὸς Ῥώμης ἔτη ιθʹ. Οὗτος ἑτέραν ἐκκλησίαν ἀνίστησιν ἐν παραθαλασσίῳ τόπῳ ἐπιλεγομένῳ Συκαῖ. ((Fischer (ed.), 283.14-6)

Περτίναξ ὑπατευκὼς συγκλήτου ἔτη ιθʹ. Οὗτος ἔτεραν ἐκκλησίαν ἀνέστησεν ἐν τῷ παραθαλασσίῳ τόπῳ ἐπιλεγομένῳ Συκαῖς, Εἰρήνην τὸν οἶκον προσαγορεύσας. (Xanth., Episc., 452B)

In the first passage, Dorotheos, the SynChron and the "Enarratio" share the reference λεγομένη/καλουμένη to Argyroupolis, and the reference to martyr Adrianos, both of
which are missing from the Chronographikon Syntomon and the Ecclesiastical History. On the other hand, Dorotheos, the Chronographikon Syntomon and the "Enarratio" have the common reference to Paul's epistle to the Romans, which is missing from the SynChron and the Ecclesiastical History. Finally, the SynChron and the "Enarratio" are the only texts carrying the phrase "ἐνα τῶν ἐβδομῆκοντα". However, in the second passage, Dorotheos, the SynChron and the Chronographikon Syntomon write ἀνίστησιν, whereas the "Enarratio" writes ἀνέστησεν. Similarly, the SynChron, the patriarch Nikephoros and the Ecclesiastical History write προσαγορεύσας, whereas the "Enarratio" writes ἐπαγορεύσας. As a result, the link between the SynChron and the Ecclesiastical History of Kallistos Xanthopoulos does not seem to be a direct one; nevertheless it is possible that the idea of incorporating it within the historic narrative came from a commonly-read source. The similarities between the SynChron and Chronographikon Syntomon could suggest that the latter was the common source of the SynChron and Kallistos Xanthopoulos; however, the connection to Dorotheos' original text, the rest of the existing similarities between Xanthopoulos' Ecclesiastical History and the SynChron, and the fact that there are no other direct connections between the SynChron and the Chronographikon Syntomon indicate that the SynChron and Kallistos Xanthopoulos drew their material from a separate text, that does not survive.529

Laeta (Gratian's wife) (62.22-3)

The SynChron is the only other text (along with Zosim., 5.39.4.2) that carries a reference to the name of Gratian's wife, Laeta.530 However, since the context of Zosimos' reference does not suggest that it was the source of the SynChron in this instance, we assume that the source of the passage is an unknown text.

The placement of the obelisk in the hippodrome (67.7-9)531

With the exception of the two references in Patr. Const., 183.16-9 and Marc. Com., AD390, we were not able to find a source for the entry of the SynChron; in addition to

529 Hence, Winkelmann's suggestion (Winkelmann and Gentz, Die Kirchengeschichte, 81) that the whole passage is an addition of Xanthopoulos should be rejected, and the passage should be attributed to another text, unknown to us.

530 See Jones, et al., Prosopography, I, 492.

531 Bassett, The urban image, 219-221 discusses the various references to the obelisk, but does not include the SynChron. For a more detailed discussion on the obelisk, see Iversen, Obelisks in exile, II, 9-35.
the placement of the obelisk, the passage mentions the names of the prefect of the city (Proclus) and the prefect of the court (Tatianus). The inscription on the basis of the obelisk holds similar information to the SynChron and could be considered as a possible source, but its omission of Tatianus (the inscription does include Proclus) indicates that a different source was used.

**Promotus (67.15)**

Although Flavius Promotus was a well known general, the suggestion that he was Eudoxia's father ("θυγατέρα Προμότου") is unique to the SynChron.

**Placidia returns to Constantinople (69.3-5)**

The return of Galla Placidia to Constantinople is not mentioned in any other related sources. From the texts that we mention in the parallel passages, Photios (whose passage comes from Olympiodorus) and Manasses relate that Placidia went to Ravenna, and not Constantinople. The passage of Philostorgius is a later reference to Placidia's trip to Constantinople, but the context does not hold any similarities to the SynChron.

**Verina exiled (88.11-2)**

The incident is mentioned in the 'parallel passages', which may suggest that it comes from the version of Malalas used by the SynChron, but is not to be found in other later historians and chroniclers.

**Removal of heretics from the diptychs by Pope John (94.8-12) - Persecution of heretics (94.13-6)**

The removal from the diptychs is not mentioned in any of the other historiographical texts, and the persecution is described in a different manner and language by all Theophanes, Kedrenos and Manasses, which suggest that the SynChron used a different source.

---

533 See Oost, Galla Placidia, 176-8.
Belisarius' wars in Italy, Asia, Thrace (98.19-31)

The section of the *SynChron* relating the Vandal wars and the subsequent triumph of Belisarius (*SynChron*, 96.10-98.18) derives mainly from Theophanes and the Epitome. However, the subsequent part (*SynChron*, 98.19-31), which summarises the wars in Italy, Asia and Thrace, does not seem to originate from either. If we are to take into account the source of the previous passage (referring to the triumph), we could hypothesise that the passage derives from the unknown Epitome source of the *SynChron*, but the evidence is not conclusive.

Building of the church of the Forty Martyrs (105.3-4)

None of the 'parallel passages' seem to be the original source of the *SynChron*. The passage could originate from the author's independent – perhaps oral – knowledge of the tradition of the church, or from an unknown text.

Phokas' family (107.1-4)

We were not able to identify a source with the detailed information of the *SynChron* about Phokas' family, especially in regard to Phokas' two brothers, Domentziolos and Komentziolos.

The siege of Constantinople – The Akathist Hymn (108.16-109.9)

The *SynChron* uniquely attributes the attack to the Scythians and Russians, instead of the Avars. Although we could attribute the disparity to a mistake or misunderstanding on behalf of the author, the general structure and content of the events, which is not found in any other sources, indicate that the author had consulted a text that has not survived.

Death of the emperor Heraclius (110.3-4)

The majority of the texts mentioned in the 'other sources' and 'parallel passages' connects the death of the emperor Heraclius to the monophysite heresy (Georg. Monk, 673.9-3, Leo Gramm., 155.4-8, Kedr., 1.752.15-9, Zon., 3.312.23-5, Glyc., 515.15-20, Joel, 46.24-47.3), the exceptions being the patriarch Nikephoros and the *SynChron*. However, since there are no other indications that Nikephoros is the source of the *SynChron* in this instance, it could be possible that another source was used for the passage (especially if we are to take into account that there is no known source for the
following passage, which refers to a census ordered by Heraclius); in any case, the linguistic similarities to Leo the Grammarian and Kedrenos suggest that the sentence derives from the pool of the Epitome, a possible indication for the source of the following passage as well.

**Census of land (110.5-7)**

Unknown source; as we hypothesise in the previous passage, its source may be the Epitome text used by the *SynChron*. Kaegi discusses in more detail the circumstances in which the census was performed, and notes that the *SynChron* is the unique witness of the event.534

**Constantine IV's orthodoxy (113.20-1)**

There is no similar phrase describing Constantine IV in any of the other sources (Zonaras' sentence (3.319.4-5) in the 'parallel passages' introduces the Sixth Ecumenical Council), and either it is a general comment added by the author of the *SynChron* or drawn from an unknown source.

**Constantine IV's wife and son (113.22-3)**

The name of Constantine's wife is not found in any of the texts that are usually used in the compilation of the *SynChron* (Theophanes' reference of Anastasia is in a different place than in the *SynChron* - in the section on the reign of Justinian II (Theoph., 367.20-1))

**Characterisation of Justinian (115.2)**

We were not able to find similar expressions describing Justinian II; they were either written by the author himself, or drawn from an unknown source.

**The Quinisext Council (115.5-12)**

The description of the Quinisext Council is not found in any of the other texts which are related with the *SynChron* for that period (Leo the Grammarian, Zonaras, Kedrenos, Glykas, Manasses; Theophanes has a general comment on the chronology of the publication of the canons (Theoph., 361.17-362.31), which bears no similarities to the account of the *SynChron*).

534 Kaegi, "A Neglected Census", 17-8, Kaegi, Early Islamic conquests, 256-8.
Presentation of the emperor Anastasios II (120.3-4)

We were not able to find a similar passage on Anastasios; it was either written by the author himself, or drawn from an unknown source.

Characterisation of Constantine V (123.23-29)

There are no substantial similarities between SynChron's extensive description of Constantine V and his iconoclastic practices, and the other sources. It could have been drawn from an unknown source, but the use of rhetorical elements seem to suggest that it was composed by the author of the SynChron himself; for example, the expression "φιλανθρώπους ἀπέδειξε" (SynChron, 123.29) is attributed by Gregory of Nazianzus (Greg. Naz., Funebr. Orat., 5.1.1-4) and Michael Psellos (Psell., Hist. Synt., 41.62-3) to the emperor Maximinus and the victims of the persecution he conducted against the Christians.

Leo's family (126.19-21)

Although the information can be found elsewhere, the SynChron is unique in its presenting it at the beginning of the reign.

Constantine VI's marriage and daughters (127.2-6)

Similarly to the previous passage, the SynChron is unique in presenting the information concerning Constantine's family in the beginning of his reign.

Blinding of the sons of Constantine VI (128.27-9)

The events are conveyed differently by the sources; some texts suggest that some of the murders took place on the advice of Irene ("πεισθεὶς ταῖς μητρικαῖς εἰσηγήσεσι") (Theoph., 468.14, Leo Gramm., 198.14-5, Georg. Monk (PG), 965.23), whereas in the account of the SynChron, Irene does not only stand against such actions, but moves against her son exactly due to them ("Ταῦτα δὲ ὁ ὅρθος ἡ μήτηρ, καὶ λυπουμένη [...]" (SynChron, 128.29)). The source is unknown, although there is a possibility that it is the common source with Manasses, with whom the SynChron shares the same source for the other events of the section.
Michael's family (130.17-20)

Although the 'parallel passages' contain some of the information found in the SynChron, their presentation and place in the narrative are different, and suggest that the information derived from another source.

General comments on Michael's reign (145.2-8)

The passage is a general judgment of Michael's reign, which is articulated with the use of rhetorics. It is possibly a comment inserted by the author of the SynChron, as we cannot find any parallel comments in the related texts.

The row between Basil and Leo (145.21-8)

Although the event was well known and conveyed by the majority of the sources (as they appear in the 'parallel passages'), the account of the SynChron does not have substantial similarities to any of them, and notably it is the only text that relates that Leo and his wife were exiled to Thessaloniki.

Coins (149.21-2)

Τούτων πέντε ὄντων, τὰ νομίσματα τούτων τοὺς τύπους φέροντα, πενταλαίμια ὄνομάζοντο.

We were not able to identify other references to coins with the name or characterisation "πενταλαίμια". In fact, the main surveys of Byzantine numismatics do not have a record of a coin from this period with the representation of five figures. Furthermore, the names of Stephen and Constantine, the sons of Romanos Lekapenos, "do not appear on the coins until after the death of Christopher in 931"; this suggests that the coins mentioned in the SynChron (if we are to accept that the account is credible, although there is no reason to argue against it) would have been circulated after Stephen and Constantine were crowned (924) but before Christopher's death (931).


536 Wroth, Imperial Byzantine coins, 458.

537 Especially for a period with such confusing numismatic evidence, as mentioned in the relevant bibliography. It is characteristic that we do not have a coin of Romanos II, which makes the lack of coins from the 'period of the five emperors' probable.
Romanos Lecapenos' reign: The co-emperors and their families (149.23-9)

None of the usual sources have such a detailed passage relating the different imperial families in the beginning of Romanos' reign. Either the passage comes from a text that has not survived, or was compiled by the author of the archetype of the SynChron (since the passage is also present in the Synopsis Lambros) himself.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus – Nikephoros Botanaiiates (152.8-173.8)

Following the relation of the reign of Romanos Lekapenos and the beginning of the second leg of the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, we notice that a different pattern of use of the sources in the composition of the SynChron is emerging. As we saw in the previous chapter, the passage on Sergios and Polyeuktos (SynChron, 151.17-152.7) is the last one for which we can identify and propose a 'main source' (namely, Pseudo-Symeon). Thereafter, none of the usually related sources convey a text that has such strong similarities to the SynChron in either language, structure or chronology, as to enable us to recognise a strong relationship between them. This is not to say that there are no similarities at all; as we have seen earlier, in the discussion of each of the texts that appear either as 'other sources' or 'parallel texts' of the section of the SynChron (Theophanes Continuatus, Michael Psellos, Leo Deacon, John Skylitzes, Skylitzes Continuatus, Michael Attaleiates, George the Monk (PG)), there are similarities in the content, which suggest that the SynChron was often based on material that is also present in those texts; however, the lack of any further similarities does not allow us to identify any of those texts as a 'main' source. The two possible explanations for the composition of this section of the text are either that the section is an original compilation of different sources of the period written by the author of the SynChron, or that it derives from an intermediary source or sources, which probably have not survived. Although the former possibility is plausible, it cannot be substantiated conclusively; on the contrary, the latter suggestion can be supported further by additional arguments.

The lack of significant linguistic similarities and direct links with any of the existing sources of the period not only weakens the possibility that they were used as main sources of the SynChron, but also highlights an inconsistency in the usual approach of the text towards its sources. We have seen that the composition of the rest of the text is based on copying the texts of other authors, and subsequently making minor
corrections, additions or omissions; a text from the family of the *Chronikon Epitomon*, Zosimos, Malalas, Theophanes, Epitome, and in the later part of the text (*SynChron*, 188.9-556.7) the histories of Niketas Choniates and George Akropolites. Although the sources are not always copied verbatim and they may be treated differently, their presence is central, and easily recognisable. On the other hand, in the case of the section 152.8-173.8, the hypothesis that the author wrote it himself by only consulting the sources, but not copying them, would produce a contradiction with the common practice of the rest of the text.

An additional strong argument in support of the existence of a different source is the similarities of the *SynChron* to another later text, the *Synopsis* of Manasses, which can only be explained by the common use of the same source or the same tradition. We discuss elsewhere the use of the same sources by Manasses and the *SynChron*, but there are numerous examples from the section 152.8-173.8 that further demonstrate this point: the appointment of Nikephoros Phokas as the General of the East (Manass., 5595-600, *SynChron*, 154.18-24), the subsequent reference to the letter from Joseph to John Tzimiskes (Manass., 5604-14, *SynChron*, 154.25-155.2), the confinement and the coup of Tzimiskes (Manass., 5736-52, 5767-73, 5779-81, *SynChron*, 155.25-156.15), the portrait of John Tzimiskes (Manass., 5618-33, 5811-22, *SynChron*, 156.30-157.12), the relationship of the emperor Romanos III with the monastic habit (Manass., 5972-3, *SynChron*, 159.21-6), the return of Constantine Monomachos from exile (Manass., 6132-42, 6152-3, *SynChron*, 162.14-20). Since the similarities of the above passages are strong and consistent, they can be attributed to the use of a common source by the two authors, thus invalidating the idea that the section is the product of the author of the *SynChron*. Nevertheless, the fact that the above examples come from the early part of the section suggests that their potential common source did not cover it all.

It is also telling that the section concerning the reign of Alexios I Komnenos (*SynChron*, 177.1-188.9), which follows the section under examination, is the only other whole part of the *SynChron* whose origin cannot be attributed to a specific

---

538 See pp. 274.
source. It is possible, as a result, to assume that a single text was the source of both the section on Alexios I and the section 152.8-173.8, or at least the last part of it. Although it could be suggested that the narrative of the reign of Alexios is extensive and more detailed than earlier reigns in the SynChron, the sections on the emperors Michael VII and Nikephoros III Botaneiates are also extensive, with numerous pieces of information of unknown origin (most notably, the letter of Nikephoros Botaneiates to Michael (SynChron, 169.28-170.14)). In fact, in neither of the two narratives we could identify a 'main' or 'other source', and, furthermore, in numerous cases we are not even able to suggest a parallel passage (e.g. SynChron, 167.20-30, 168.1-8, 168.18-21, 169.7-28). It should also be noted that the bull of Alexios that is included in the edition of Sathas (SynChron, 173.11-176.22) is not necessarily part of the chronicle. Although it is at the same place in the Vat. Gr. 407, its inclusion in the SynChron is not substantiated by any other evidence. As a result, it divides artificially the text into two parts, and conditions readers of the text to regard the two parts as two separate texts, whereas they should be read as a single narrative, possibly based on the same sources.

Conclusion

The compilation of the section 152.8-173.8 should rather be attributed to the use of sources that have not survived, than to a personal contribution by the author himself. Although it is not possible to identify the manner in which each source was used, it seems that the first part of the section has similarities to Manasses, which suggest that the material came from their common source. The second part of the section does not resemble any of the existing sources, and corresponds to the characteristics of the following part on the reign of Alexios Komnenos; thus, the possibility that they are both based on the same unknown source is a plausible hypothesis, although not sufficiently proven.

539 The source (and credibility) of the section on Alexios has been the subject of discussion and debate in scholarship, mainly due to the unique – amongst the Greek sources – reference to the role of Alexios in the instigation of the First Crusade (SynChron, 184.28-185.17), with no conclusive results; see Charanis, "Origin of the First Crusade", 17-36, Charanis, "Greek Source", 93-4, Harris, Byzantium and the Crusades, 48, Lemerle, "Byzance et la croisade", 600-1, Magdalino, "The Pen of the Aunt", 26, Shepard, "Cross-purposes", 128 n.69, and cf. de la Force, "Les conseillers latins", 153-65, Joranson, "Spurious Letter", 811-32, Munro, "Alexius", 731-3.
Passages on the imperial families

A recurring theme in the above passages is the unique information that the SynChron carries in the presentations of members of the imperial families: Laeta (Gratian's wife) (62.22-3), Promotus (67.15), Phokas' family (107.1-4), Constantine IV's wife and son (113.22-3), Leo's family (126.19-21), Constantine VI's marriage and daughters (127.2-6), Michael's family (130.17-20), Romanos Lecapenos and the families of his sons. To these, we could add the references to the family members of Romanos II (153.18-21), Constantine VIII (159.10-2) and Michael VII; although they are part of the section 152.8-173.8, for which we propose a separate source, as these passages are similar in style and content to the above reference, and they do not have any 'parallel passages', it is possible that they were insertions from a different source. If we also take into account that they are free standing passages, positioned in the introduction of the respective reign, we can reasonably assume that they are taken from a separate source, which has not survived.

\[^{540}\text{See pp. 304ff.}\]
Chapter Five: Conclusions

We stated in the introduction of this thesis that its main aspiration is the description of the background of the SynChron, and the determination of its place in the Byzantine chronicle tradition. Our presentation and discussion of its sources in the previous chapters cover the subject in great length, but primarily on a passage-by-passage or on a single text basis. In this concluding chapter, we shall attempt to review our earlier arguments, with special emphasis on the most significant and innovative ones, and combine the different data and suggestions, in order to produce— to the degree that this is possible – conclusions and propositions that define the sources of the SynChron on a wider scale.

- As a starting point of our study, we carried a preliminary analysis of the SynChron, focusing on its content and structure. The text follows the traditional patterns of the chronicle genre, which was first modelled by Eusebius, and conveys the events in a rigid chronological structure that focuses on the lives of the biblical patriarchs and kings, and later on the Roman rulers and emperors. In addition to the structure, the contents of the text are also consistent with the established chronicle tradition. Its extensive focus on the history of the Roman Empire falls in line with the common practice of chronicles to demonstrate its major importance within the universal history; similarly, it interpolates numerous trivia and instances of divine intervention, as well as beneficial deeds or acts of justice, usually in regard to favourite emperors. Such an approach would not necessarily be in line with contemporary chronicle writing – as confirmed by the different practice followed in the second part of the text – but reflects the heavy use of material from earlier chronicles; hence, the necessity to investigate the Quellengeschichte of the text, before proceeding to any further study.

- As far as the issue of the authorship is concerned, we have studied the arguments for the identification of Theodore Skoutariotes as the author of the SynChron, in conjunction with more recent scholarship and data drawn from this study, mainly the recovery of the Synopsis Lambros; we have concluded that the Skoutariotes’

---

541 Our comments refer to the first part of the SynChron (3.1-173.8).
identification, while sensible, is not sufficiently convincing. As a result, and as long as no new evidence is forthcoming, the issue of the authorship of the SynChron should remain open, and the text be considered anonymous.

- A main contribution of this thesis to the study of Byzantine chronicles is the re-evaluation of the Synopsis Lambros. The Synopsis Lambros was a text known to scholarship, but has not been studied further since Lambros had prepared a critical edition of the text, which still remains unpublished. Although it was assumed that the chronicle was a mere alternate version of the SynChron, our extensive study suggests that – notwithstanding its strong similarities to the SynChron – it is in fact a separate text. Furthermore, our juxtaposition of the similarities and differences of the two texts has shown that the assumption that the Synopsis Lambros, being a later text, had derived from the SynChron is false; both texts stem from a common archetype, which was copied extensively by the two authors, who supplemented its material with various additions from other texts or personal recollections and opinions.

- As it has been noted by scholarship, the SynChron includes unique information about early Roman history, especially in the portrayals of a number of Roman emperors. We suggest that the chronicle has utilised three sources for the composition of the respective section. First, a Latin compendium of Roman history, with material from (or connected to) Herodian and the Historia Augusta, which was later translated to Greek; notably, it does not seem that any other known sources had access to it, although Zonaras must have also consulted a similar text. Second, the common source with Zonaras. Third, Eutropius' Breviarium historiae Romanae, passages from which we also find solely in the SynChron; in Eutropius' case, we hypothesize that the material reached the SynChron through the common source with Manasses, or the text that was also the source for the material of John of Antioch.

- We have established that the SynChron drew the material of Zosimos through an intermediary source, which preserved the original remarkably well. From the numerous passages of the Historia Nova that we find in the SynChron, often not present in any other known texts, the majority lies in the section dealing with the
period 192-282 (Commodus – Probus), which roughly coincides with the first book of Zosimos' history. Following from that, we suggest the possibility that the material of Zosimos may have reached the SynChron through the same source that was used for early Roman history, namely the common source with Zonaras, who did not use the material to the same extent as the SynChron.

- The numerous similarities of the SynChron to Malalas' Chronographia seem to be due to the use of a different variant of the text, which was also the source of the passages of the SynChron that resemble the Chronicon Paschale and the text of John of Nikiu. Since our understanding of the tradition of Malalas' chronicle lacks sufficient clarity, it is difficult to define with certainty the exact link of the used version to the existing text of Malalas; the most plausible possibility is that the SynChron reflects an earlier and more complete version of Malalas' text.

- The SynChron has used extensively the chronicle of Theophanes Confessor, for the whole period that it covers, and it usually reproduces it faithfully; we often note, however, the use of additional sources to complement the narrative. Theophanes was a main intermediary source for the SynChron, through which it accessed the texts of Procopius, Theodore Anagnostes, and possibly some of the material from Eusebius' chronicle.

- Our study suggests that John of Antioch's Historia Chronica was linked to the SynChron through an intermediary text that was not used by any other later texts. The editorial problems concerning the text of John of Antioch, however, do not allow any definite conclusions about the source. The suggestion of the new editor of the text about the circulation of an epitome of the chronicle, consisting mainly of the so-called Salmasian excerpts, may be the answer to the question, as well as the idea that part of the material was often present in the Epitome.

- A major source of the SynChron was a text from the Chronikon Epitomon family. We suggest that a major part of the Chronikon Epitomon is linked to the Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae, a sixth-century abridgment of the Septuagint attributed to Athanasios that has not been taken into account before. Otherwise, the tradition of the Chronikon Epitomon is not clear, and it seems that not all the related texts
have survived. Our study of the language and structure of the *Chronikon Epitomon*, the *Vind. Gr. 99* and the *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae*, in comparison to the *SynChron*, suggests that the latter is more closely related to the *Vind. Gr. 99*, and derive from a common ancestor, from which the *Chronikon Epitomon* also drew the bulk of its material; our proposal about the links between the texts can be found in Figure 2.

- The connection between the *SynChron* and the family of the Epitome is well established, but the identification of the exact source – or sources – of the *SynChron* amongst the different texts of the Epitome tradition is a different matter, with no easy answer at hand. We have detected strong common patterns with at least four texts (Leo the Grammarian, Pseudo-Symeon, George Kedrenos, George the Monk (PG)), none of which appears exclusive. On the contrary, the evidence not only confirms the use of a text of the Epitome that has not survived, but also the use of more than one source from the Epitome. This suggestion is corroborated by the applicable juxtaposition of the *SynChron* to the texts of Glykas and Zonaras, with whom it shares common sources, often deriving from the Epitome as well; the shared links prove the existence of at least two separate Epitome sources used in the *SynChron*, which do not survive.

- Our study also confirms the regular use of George the Monk. Its description, however, is dependant on the issue of the different circulating versions of the text and on its connection to the Epitome. As we show in the respective section, the most possible link between the *SynChron* and George the Monk is a later version of the latter, probably a variant of George the Monk (PG), which extends until 1143 and incorporates parts of the continuation of George the Monk and the Epitome.

- Our research does not corroborate the suggestion that Skylitzes was a main source of the *SynChron*. Although there are strong similarities between the two texts, they do not necessarily suggest a common link. Skylitzes' *Synopsis Historiarum* covers extensively the period 811-1057, and overlaps substantially with the *SynChron*. However, any similarities do not follow the usual pattern of treatment of sources by the *SynChron*; furthermore, the study of specific passages show
considerable differences in their approach and suggests that it is more likely that any Skylitzes material reached the SynChron through intermediary sources.

- On the other hand, our study shows a previously undetected connection between the SynChron and Attaleiates' History. Although the similarities are not very extensive, our discussion suggests that the author of the SynChron had either consulted Attaleiates' text, or drew the related material from a faithful intermediary source.

- Our research also confirms that Zonaras and the SynChron had consulted to a great extent a common source. It seems that the SynChron accessed through this source the following texts: one of the sources for early Roman history (which incorporated material from Lydus and Cassius Dio), Zosimos, the ecclesiastical histories of Philostorgius and Theodoret, Malalas, possibly Theophanes, and an unknown text of the Epitome; additionally, the common source included a separate section on ecclesiastical matters, especially the succession of the patriarchs of Constantinople. Zonaras, who seems to have had the luxury of consulting a wider selection of sources, followed a more thematic approach of the material, whereas the SynChron presented its account in a stricter chronological manner, which often resulted in different treatment of the same material.

- We also confirm the strong connection between Glykas and the SynChron. Furthering Mauromate-Katsougiannopoulou's research, we also show that the common similarities of the two texts to Zonaras are more frequent and stronger than previously thought. Drawing on that, we have concluded that either all three texts derive from the same source, or that the SynChron and Glykas commonly derive from a different version of the source of Zonaras (see Figure 4 and Figure 5).

---

542 As it appears from the comparison of the related sections of Zonaras, Glykas and the SynChron, it is also possible that Zonaras and the SynChron had used two different versions of the same text (see Figure 4).
543 Note that this text should not be confused with a different text that was also used for material from the early Roman history, which was unique to the SynChron; see p. 206.
544 It is not necessary that this was the sole source for Malalas.
Our discussion also substantiates the use of an additional source, common with Constantine Manasses. The text presents similarities to Glykas, which – nevertheless – do not seem to suggest that all three texts had been using a common source; it is more likely that Glykas used Manasses directly, and that the SynChron drew information from Manasses' source,\textsuperscript{545} hence the explanation for the similarities between the three texts, as well as for those with Zonaras. Our conclusions on the relationships between Zonaras, Glykas, Manasses and the SynChron, taking into account the Synopsis Lambros can be found in Figure 6.

The similarities between the SynChron and the Ecclesiastical History of Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos suggest a connection between the two texts through a common source, which probably dealt with religious and ecclesiastical events, and had used Evagrius as one of its sources. The text was not used heavily by the SynChron, and we are not able to offer further information about its characteristics, especially as it was not detected by the study of the sources of Xanthopoulos' history. Nevertheless, its existence is confirmed by the shared unique sections of the SynChron and Xanthopoulos, and their similarities and differences.

Hagiography appears to have had a significant and twofold influence on the writing of the SynChron. First, hagiographical texts are used extensively as sources for a variety of events; moreover, the SynChron includes frequently unique accounts of hagiographical origin, which are missing from other chronicles. Second, the style of the SynChron appears to occasionally employ hagiographical tropes (such as linguistic elements commonly found in hagiographical texts) to present its subject in a more literary manner.

Finally, in regard to the sources of the section SynChron, 152.8-173.8, which barely presents similarities to any surviving texts, we propose the following ideas. For its first part (Constantine VIII – Romanos IV), we suggest that the source in use was the common source with Manasses. For the second part of the section (Michael VII – Nikephoros III), we propose the use of an unknown history of the

\textsuperscript{545} Which was possibly the conveyor of the common material from Eutropius' \textit{Breviarium historiae Romanae}. 
period, from which the *SynChron* obtained the more extensive narrative and information, such as the transcript of Botaneiates' letter (*SynChron*, 169.28-170.14, and possibly the reign of Alexios (*SynChron*, 177.1-188.9),\textsuperscript{546} with the unique material on the first crusade.

In conclusion, the *SynChron* (4.19-173.8) follows the traditional chronicle practice, presenting the material in a chronological fashion, which was probably borrowed from its sources. This is particularly evident in the first part (*SynChron*, 4.19-19.16), where a text from the *Chronikon Epitomon* family seems to be the main source. It is possible (as the connection both to the *Chronikon Epitomon* and the *Chronica* seems to attest) that the chronology from the same text was used as the spine of the rest of the narrative of the *SynChron*, supplemented with additional material from a variety of sources, as reviewed above. Although most of the sources were consulted through one or more intermediary texts, it is interesting that the *SynChron* occasionally provides unique accounts and information, suggesting that the material derives from sources that were not utilised by other texts, and have not survived. As a result, the exact and detailed restitution of the sources of the *SynChron* proves to be a most intricate task, and we hope that we have managed to identify its main strands, which – along with further research into the sources of other chronicles – will lead to a more comprehensive understanding of the background of the Byzantine chronicle tradition.

St Andrews, 1 March 2007

\textsuperscript{546} We have not discussed this part of the *SynChron* in a great extent, as it falls beyond the framework of this thesis.
# Appendix: Chronological tables

First Major Time Frame: Adam - Subversion of the Roman Republic

**Table 1. Adam - Noah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Cain</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Seth</td>
<td>230+x</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam †</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Enos</td>
<td>230+205</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth †</td>
<td>230+92</td>
<td>1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Cainan</td>
<td>435+190</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos †</td>
<td>625+715</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Mahalaleel</td>
<td>625+170</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainan †</td>
<td>795+740</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Jared</td>
<td>795+165</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maleleel †</td>
<td>960+730</td>
<td>1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Enoch</td>
<td>960+162</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared †</td>
<td>1122+800</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Methouselah</td>
<td>1122+165</td>
<td>1287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Metathesis</em> Enoch</td>
<td>1287+200</td>
<td>1487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Lamech</td>
<td>1287+165</td>
<td>1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methouselah †</td>
<td>1452+788</td>
<td>2240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Noah</td>
<td>1452+188</td>
<td>1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamech †</td>
<td>1640+535</td>
<td>2175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Shem, Ham, Japheth</td>
<td>1640+500</td>
<td>2140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>1640+600</td>
<td>2240 or 2042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

547 Key to the tables: In the second column, we give the figures of the calculation that we made according to the information in the *SynChron*, in the third column its result, namely the year from Adam, and in the fourth column we provide the reference of the relevant passage in the *SynChron*.

548 The narrative of the *SynChron* does not start from the Creation of the world but from the first man; cf. Gelzer's suggestion (Gelzer, *Africanus*, I, 35-6; also see Adler, *Time Immemorial*, 45-7) that Africanus chose to start his chronicle from Adam with the intention to write a history of humanity. In the case of the *SynChron*, the choice creates confusion in the chronology of the subsequent events, as the text uses the terms 'years from the Creation' and 'years from Adam' interchangeably but reckons the dates from Adam.

549 Although the *SynChron* does not convey a precise number for Seth's birth ("Ἀδάμ μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι ἐτῶν διακοσίων τριάκοντα, ἐγένετο τὸν Καίν, τὸν Ἀβέλ καὶ τὸν Σήθ ..." (4.25-6)); also see Synkellos' comments (106.18-20) on a similar issue in regard to Terah), we hereafter use the customary 230 for our calculations, which is also the number given in the *Septuagint* (Gen. 5.3).

550 There are three chronological indications for the year of the flood in the text. The first is the sum of the years of the patriarchs, as seen in Table 1; based on these figures the flood must have taken place in AM 2240. The second indication is the statement that Methouselah died in the year of the flood; hence, that places the flood in AM 2240. However, the author adds: "Ὡς συνάγεσθαι τὰ ἀπὸ Αδάμ ἐως τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ ἔτη δισχίλια τεσσαράκοντα δύο" (5.22-3). It is not clear how the text reaches that conclusion. It is inconsistent with the previous information and does not agree with any other source. It could probably be a mistake of the copyist of the
Table 2. Adam - Shem: Deaths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>Age of death</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>5.4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enos</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>5.6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cainan</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahalaleel</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>5.10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metathesis (transposition) of Enoch</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methouselah</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamech</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem</td>
<td>2741</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

manuscript, which would relate the commonly accepted date for the cataclysm (AM 2242) – the SynChron accepts this date as the year of the flood in another instance (8.13). The difference of the two years could be due to the fact that the SynChron offers a different date for the birth of Lamech. According to the text, Lamech was born at the 165th year of Methuselah, albeit the Septuagint relates 167 (Gen. 5.25). In any case, we shall continue to use hereafter the year 2240 for the calculation of the years, as it is consistent with the previous calculations, as described in Table 1.
Table 3. Arphaxad - Abram

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth of Arphaxad</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2140+101</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or 2240+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shem †</td>
<td>2241+500</td>
<td>2741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Kainan</td>
<td>2241+135</td>
<td>2376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Salah</td>
<td>2376+39</td>
<td>2415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Eber</td>
<td>2415+130</td>
<td>2545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Peleg</td>
<td>2545+134</td>
<td>2679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Reu</td>
<td>2679+135</td>
<td>2814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Serug</td>
<td>2814+132</td>
<td>2946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Nahor</td>
<td>2946+135</td>
<td>3081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Terah</td>
<td>3081+79</td>
<td>3160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Abram</td>
<td>3160+70</td>
<td>3230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood-Abraham</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation-Abraham:</td>
<td>6030&lt;sup&gt;551&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.19-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>551</sup> The final sentences of the time frame do not convey consistent information. The sum of the dates of the section is 990 years, for the period between the flood and the birth of Abram. It is not easy to explain the inconsistency of the text and the addition of 98 years. The figure 6030 for the period between the Creation and the birth of Abram is obviously wrong. It can be assumed, though, that this can be a copyist’s mistake; the copyist could have easily mistaken γυλ’ (3330) for στλ’ (6030). The figure 3330 is not consistent with the information of the text either, but can be explained as the result of the addition of the years 2242 (one of the years of the flood) and 1088 (which the text holds that is the period between the flood and the birth of Abram); 2242+1088=3330. The figures 2242 and 1088 are repeated later in the text (8.13-4), which strengthens the assumption for a copyist mistake in the second figure (6030), but leaves open the question of the origin of the other figure.
### Table 4. Promise to Abraham - Exodus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promise to Abraham</td>
<td>3230+70</td>
<td>3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus from Egypt</td>
<td>3300+430</td>
<td>3730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Isaac</td>
<td>3230+100</td>
<td>3330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belus reigns first over the Assyrians</td>
<td>3230+69</td>
<td>3299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the kingdom of the Assyrians</td>
<td>3299+1300</td>
<td>4599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegialeus reigns first over the Sicyonians</td>
<td>3230+101 or 3330+1</td>
<td>3331 or 3331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Esau and Jacob (sons of Isaac)</td>
<td>3330+60</td>
<td>3390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of the dynasty of the Egyptians</td>
<td>3390+13 or 3330+73</td>
<td>3403 or 3331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the dynasty of the Egyptians</td>
<td>3403+1663</td>
<td>5066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of the sons of Jacob</td>
<td>3390+85</td>
<td>3475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Kohath</td>
<td>3475+45</td>
<td>3520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inachos reigns first over the Argeans</td>
<td>3520+38</td>
<td>3558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Inachos' reign</td>
<td>3558+545</td>
<td>4103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition of the reign to Mycynae</td>
<td>4103</td>
<td>4103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the reign of Mycynae - Descent of the Heraclides</td>
<td>4103+210</td>
<td>4313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Amram</td>
<td>3520+60</td>
<td>3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Moses</td>
<td>3580+72</td>
<td>3652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>3652+80</td>
<td>3732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood: 2242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood-Abraham: 1088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham-Exodus: 505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation-Exodus: 3835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Moses' death - Samuel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses †</td>
<td>3652+120</td>
<td>3772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua's son of Nun reign</td>
<td>3772+27</td>
<td>3772-3779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogygos' cataclysm</td>
<td>3652+10</td>
<td>3662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekrops king of Athens</td>
<td>3662+200</td>
<td>3862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finees and the Presbyterians over Israel</td>
<td>3779+30</td>
<td>3779-3809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chushanrishathaim, king of Mesopotamia rules over Israel</td>
<td>3809+50</td>
<td>3809-3859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othniel judges Israel</td>
<td>3859+40</td>
<td>3859-3899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekrops king of Athens</td>
<td>3859+18</td>
<td>3877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Athens' kingdom</td>
<td>3877+876</td>
<td>4753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deukalion's cataclysm in Thessaly</td>
<td>3859+39</td>
<td>3898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaethon's burning in Ethiopia</td>
<td>3859+39</td>
<td>3898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eglon the king of Moab</td>
<td>3899+18</td>
<td>3899-3917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehud and Shamgar</td>
<td>3917+80</td>
<td>3917-3997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabin</td>
<td>3997+20</td>
<td>3997-4017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah and Barak</td>
<td>4017+80</td>
<td>4017-4097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreib, Zeb and Zevee</td>
<td>4097+7</td>
<td>4097-4104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>4104+40</td>
<td>4104-4144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abimelech the son of Gideon</td>
<td>4144+3</td>
<td>4144-4147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tola the son of Puah</td>
<td>4147+23</td>
<td>4147-4170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jair the Gileadite</td>
<td>4170+22</td>
<td>4170-4192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children of Ammon</td>
<td>4192+18</td>
<td>4192-4210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jephthah</td>
<td>4210+6</td>
<td>4210-4216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibzan (Esevon)</td>
<td>4216+7</td>
<td>4216-4223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elon the Zebulonite</td>
<td>4223+10</td>
<td>4223-4233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdon (Labdan the Pirathonite)</td>
<td>4233+8</td>
<td>4233-4241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistines</td>
<td>4241+40</td>
<td>4241-4281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>4281+20</td>
<td>4281-4301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli the priest</td>
<td>4301+20</td>
<td>4301-4321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>4301+40</td>
<td>4301-4341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anarchia</em></td>
<td>4321+30</td>
<td>4321-4351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>4351+20</td>
<td>4351-4371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus-Saul: 633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Saul - Death of Alexander

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saul, first king of Israel</td>
<td>4371+40</td>
<td>4371-4411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David the prophet</td>
<td>4411+40</td>
<td>4411-4451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>4451+40</td>
<td>4451-4491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehoboam</td>
<td>4491+17</td>
<td>4491-4508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abijam</td>
<td>4508+3</td>
<td>4508-4511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asa</td>
<td>4511+41</td>
<td>4511-4552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoshaphat</td>
<td>4552+25</td>
<td>4552-4577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoram</td>
<td>4577+8</td>
<td>4577-4585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahazian</td>
<td>4585+1</td>
<td>4585-4586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhoas</td>
<td>4586+40</td>
<td>4586-4626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaziah</td>
<td>4626+29</td>
<td>4626-4655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah (Uzziah)</td>
<td>4655+52</td>
<td>4655-4707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Olympics</td>
<td>4655+48</td>
<td>4703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>4707+16</td>
<td>4707-4723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahaz</td>
<td>4723+16</td>
<td>4723-4739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah</td>
<td>4739+29</td>
<td>4739-4768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manasseh</td>
<td>4768+55</td>
<td>4768-4823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amon</td>
<td>4823+2</td>
<td>4823-4825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josiah</td>
<td>4825+32</td>
<td>4825-4857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoahaz</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>4857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliakim (Jehoiakim)</td>
<td>4857+113</td>
<td>4857-4868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim (Jehoiachin)</td>
<td>3 m</td>
<td>4868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattaniah (Zedekiah)</td>
<td>4868+11</td>
<td>4868-4879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture and burning of Jerusalem and the Temple</td>
<td>4879+70</td>
<td>4879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building of the Temple in Jerusalem</td>
<td>4879-424.5</td>
<td>4455/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of the Hebrews to Jerusalem</td>
<td>4879+70</td>
<td>4949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar</td>
<td>4857+3</td>
<td>4860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar</td>
<td>4868</td>
<td>4868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar becomes king</td>
<td>4868-8</td>
<td>4860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar</td>
<td>4868+11</td>
<td>4879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>4860+19</td>
<td>4879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar</td>
<td>4860+44</td>
<td>4860-4904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merodach</td>
<td>4904+6</td>
<td>4904-4910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belteshazzar</td>
<td>4910+4</td>
<td>4910-4914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capture of Babylonians by the Persians and Medes (Cyrus - Darius - Astyages)\textsuperscript{552} 4914 15.3-5
Return of the Hebrews - Zorobabel ruler of the Hebrews 4949 15.12
War between Cyrus and Croesus 4914+14 4928
Cyrus 4914+31 4914-4945 16.18
Cambyses 4945+2 4945-4947 16.19
Darius Hystaspos 4947+36 4947-4983 16.23
Rebuilding of the Temple 4947+2 4949 17.3
or 4879+70
Xerxes 4983+28 4983-5011 17.6
Artaxerxes 'Makrocheir' 5011+41 5011-5052 17.14
Xerxes 2 m 5052 17.16
Sogdianus 7 m 5052-5053 17.16
Darius 'Nothos' 5053+19 5053-5072 17.17
Artaxerxes and Parysatidos 'Mnemon' 5072+42 5072-5114 17.20
Artaxerxes 'Ochos' 5114+22 5114-5136 17.21
End of the dynasty of the Egyptians 5114+12 5126 17.23
Arses 5136+4 5136-5140 17.25
Darius Arsakes 5140+6 5140-5146 17.25
Alexander the Macedonian 5146+8 5146-5154 17.28-29
or 5142+12 5142-5154 18.1

\textsuperscript{552} 'καὶ μετ᾽ οὐ πολὺ' (SynChron, 15.3).
Table 7. The Ptolemies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Lagos</td>
<td>5154+40</td>
<td>5154-5194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Philadelphos</td>
<td>5194+39</td>
<td>5194-5233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Euergetes</td>
<td>5233+26</td>
<td>5233-5259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Philopator</td>
<td>5259+17</td>
<td>5259-5276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Euergetes</td>
<td>5276+24</td>
<td>5276-5300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Philometor</td>
<td>5300+35</td>
<td>5300-5335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Phouskon</td>
<td>5335+12</td>
<td>5335-5347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Alexander</td>
<td>5347+10</td>
<td>5347-5357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy (his brother)</td>
<td>5357+8</td>
<td>5357-5365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy Dionysus</td>
<td>5365+29</td>
<td>5365-5394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleopatra(^{553})</td>
<td>5394+22</td>
<td>5394-5416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the Roman Republic</td>
<td>5394+4</td>
<td>5398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Synopsis of the first major time frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation – Adam</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>2042 or 2242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>3230</td>
<td>3330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Abraham</td>
<td>3732</td>
<td>3835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>4371</td>
<td>4468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul king of Israel</td>
<td>5154</td>
<td>5068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Alexander</td>
<td>5398</td>
<td>(5330)(^{554})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Caesar - Monarchy</td>
<td>5398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: (1) The result of the calculation of all the dates, as given by the text.  
(2) The year stated explicitly in the SynChron for the relevant event.

---

\(^{553}\) The text states that the total of the years of the reign of the Ptolemies is 258 (19.7), but the total of their reigns appears to be 240.

\(^{554}\) The figure is not present in the text: it is the total of the years until the death of Alexander, the years of the reign of the Ptolemies and the years of the reign of Cleopatra: 5068+258+4=5330.
Second Major Time Frame: Aeneas - Alexios I Komnenos

Table 9. Sack of Troy - Birth of Jesus Christ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sack of Troy</td>
<td>X555+3</td>
<td>4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas' reign</td>
<td>X+3+38</td>
<td>4313-4351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvius</td>
<td>X+41+29</td>
<td>4351-4380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas</td>
<td>X+70+31</td>
<td>4380-4411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinus</td>
<td>X+101+44</td>
<td>4411-4455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba</td>
<td>X+145+57</td>
<td>4455-4512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atys</td>
<td>X+202+26</td>
<td>4512-4538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capys</td>
<td>X+228+28</td>
<td>4538-4566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capetus</td>
<td>X+256+13</td>
<td>4566-4579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>X+269+8</td>
<td>4579-4587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrippa</td>
<td>X+277+41</td>
<td>4587-4628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areaculus</td>
<td>X+318+19</td>
<td>4628-4647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aventinus</td>
<td>X+337+30</td>
<td>4647-4677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procas</td>
<td>X+367+23</td>
<td>4677-4700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amulius</td>
<td>X+390+42</td>
<td>4700-4742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numituir</td>
<td>X+432+2</td>
<td>4742-4744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romulus &amp; Remus</td>
<td>X+434+37</td>
<td>4744-4781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numa Pompilius</td>
<td>X+471+43</td>
<td>4781-4824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancus Hostilius</td>
<td>X+514+32</td>
<td>4824-4856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancus Marcius</td>
<td>X+546+24</td>
<td>4856-4880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priscus Tarquinius</td>
<td>X+570+38</td>
<td>4880-4918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servius Tullius</td>
<td>X+608+48</td>
<td>4918-4966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarquinius Suprervus</td>
<td>X+656+24</td>
<td>4966-4990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various consuls</td>
<td>X+680+464</td>
<td>4990-5454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaius Julius Caesar</td>
<td>X+1144+4&amp;8m</td>
<td>5454-5458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus Octavius</td>
<td>X+1148+56&amp;6m</td>
<td>5458-5515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Syria-Egypt</td>
<td>X+1148+14</td>
<td>5472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>X+1148+42</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

555 Although the text still uses a strict chronological structure, with continuous references to the years of reign of each ruler, it does not provide a date for the reference time point, the sack of Troy, apart from a vague reference in the previous time frame (SynChron, 9.27-8), which puts the Trojan war between the years 4301 and 4321. Hence the x in our calculation, which we define as 4310 for the sake of the continuation of our calculation, based on the subtraction of the respective years from 5500, the year of birth of Jesus Christ.

556 For the different ideas and opinions in regard to the chronology of Jesus Christ by the early chroniclers, see Grumel, La chronologie, 26-30.
### Table 10. Contemporary Hebrew Rulers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>26.3-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.8-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.17-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.26-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11. Tiberius - Constantine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5515-5537</td>
<td>27.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5530</td>
<td>27.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5533</td>
<td>27.22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5537-5541</td>
<td>28.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5541-5554</td>
<td>28.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5554-5568</td>
<td>28.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5568-5569</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5570-5579</td>
<td>29.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5579-5582</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5582-5597</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5597-5598</td>
<td>30.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5598-5599</td>
<td>30.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5618-5640</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5618-5629</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5640-5664</td>
<td>31.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5664-5684</td>
<td>31.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5684-5699</td>
<td>32.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5699</td>
<td>32.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5699</td>
<td>32.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5699-5717</td>
<td>32.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Era/Year</td>
<td>5717+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoninus Caracalla – Antoninus Geta</td>
<td>5717+6 &amp;8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrinus</td>
<td>5724+3 &amp;9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoninus Elegabalus</td>
<td>5727+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>5739+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximinus</td>
<td>5742 &amp;2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupienus</td>
<td>&amp;3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balbinus</td>
<td>22 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordian (his son)</td>
<td>5743+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordian the third</td>
<td>5749+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severus Hostilianus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>5755+6 &amp;6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 years from the foundation of Rome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marius</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decius</td>
<td>5761+1 &amp;9m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus Volusianus</td>
<td>5763+2 &amp;3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aemilianus</td>
<td>4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerian</td>
<td>5766+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallienus</td>
<td>5782+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>5791+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintillus</td>
<td>6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelian</td>
<td>5799+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacitus</td>
<td>5805 &amp;7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probus</td>
<td>5805+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carus</td>
<td>5807+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerianus</td>
<td>5809+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinus</td>
<td>5811+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocletian</td>
<td>5813+20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximianus Herclius</td>
<td>5833+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximianus Galerius</td>
<td>5833557+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius Chlorus</td>
<td>5833558+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>5837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galerius, Maximinus, Severus, Maxentius, Constantine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation - Birth of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus' life</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension - Start of Constantine's reign</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

557 The AM 5833 is not the year of the beginning of his reign, but the indication of the text that defines the end of his reign ("seven years after Diocletian").

558 The same note applies to Constantius Chlorus ("four years after Diocletian").
Table 12. Constantine - First Ecumenical Council\textsuperscript{559}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>5837+32 &amp; 10m</td>
<td>5837-5870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine in Constantinople</td>
<td>5837+12</td>
<td>5849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Ecumenical Council in Nicaea</td>
<td>5837+15</td>
<td>5852 or 5818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Ecumenical Council (end)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5533+318=5851 or 5837+20=5857</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. First Ecumenical Council & - Second Ecumenical Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constans (W), Constantius (E) &amp; Constantine (II) (France)</td>
<td>(5911)\textsuperscript{560} +6</td>
<td>-5917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius</td>
<td>5870+24</td>
<td>5870-5894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian</td>
<td>5894+2 &amp; 6m</td>
<td>5894-5897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovian</td>
<td>5897 &amp; 9m</td>
<td>5897-5898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentinian (W)</td>
<td>5898+11</td>
<td>5898-5909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valens (E)</td>
<td>5898+13</td>
<td>5898-5911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentinian II</td>
<td>5911+6</td>
<td>5911-5917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War against the Goths in Thrace</td>
<td>5911+3</td>
<td>5914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius (E)</td>
<td>5914+16</td>
<td>5914-5930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Ecumenical Council in Constantinople</td>
<td>5914+6</td>
<td>5920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First - Second Council: 56 or 63 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 5874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{559} The SynChron uses the system of Council intervals to divide the narrative of the second major time frame. For a general treatment of the system and its various uses, see Munitiz, "Synoptic Byzantine Chronologies", 193-218.

\textsuperscript{560} Gratian was crowned emperor by his father earlier; the figure describes the years that he ruled after Valens' death.
### Table 14. Second Ecumenical Council - Third Ecumenical Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkadios</td>
<td>5930+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius the younger</td>
<td>5944+42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Ecumenical Council in Ephesus AM 5915</td>
<td>5944+25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15. Third Ecumenical Council - Fourth Ecumenical Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcian</td>
<td>5986+6 &amp;6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Ecumenical Council in Chalcedone AM 5945</td>
<td>5986+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16. Fourth Ecumenical Council - Fifth Ecumenical Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leo the Great</td>
<td>5992+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudoxia in Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudokia with Onorichos</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo (II)</td>
<td>6009+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeno</td>
<td>6010+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasios</td>
<td>6027+27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>6054+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian the Great</td>
<td>6063+39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of the building of St Sophia (sic)</td>
<td>6063+[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Ecumenical Council AM 6047</td>
<td>6063+27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Start of the building of St Sophia AM 6068
### Table 17. Fifth Ecumenical Council – Sixth Ecumenical Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justin (II)</td>
<td>6102-6115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius</td>
<td>6115-6119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>6119-6139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phokas</td>
<td>6139-6147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>6147-6178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War with the Persians</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine (III)</td>
<td>4 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraklonas &amp; Martina</td>
<td>6178-6179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans (II)</td>
<td>6179-6206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine (IV)</td>
<td>6206-6223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogonatos</td>
<td>6206+27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Ecumenical Council in Constantinople</td>
<td>6218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 18. Sixth Ecumenical Council - Seventh Ecumenical Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justinian (II)</td>
<td>6223-6233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian exiled</td>
<td>6223+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontios</td>
<td>6233-6236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apsimaros</td>
<td>6236-6243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian (II) Rinotmetos</td>
<td>6243-6249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippikos or Bardanes</td>
<td>6249+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Bishops - Anathema on the Sixth Council</td>
<td>6249+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall of Dardanes from power</td>
<td>6249+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemios or Anastasios (II)</td>
<td>6251+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius (III)</td>
<td>6253-6254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo (III) Isauros</td>
<td>6254-6278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of the iconoclasm</td>
<td>6254+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine (V) Kopronymos</td>
<td>6278-6313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artabasdos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo (III)</td>
<td>6313-6318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene and Constantine (VI)</td>
<td>6318-6328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Ecumenical Council</td>
<td>6318+4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AM 6296 127.10-11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constantine (VI) (alone)</td>
<td>6328+7</td>
<td>6328-6335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>6335+5</td>
<td>6335-6340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikephoros</td>
<td>6340+9</td>
<td>6340-6349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staurakios</td>
<td>6349+2 m</td>
<td>6349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>6349+2</td>
<td>6349-6351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo the Armenian</td>
<td>6351+7 &amp;6m</td>
<td>6351-6359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael (II)</td>
<td>6359+8 &amp;9m</td>
<td>6359-6367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophilos</td>
<td>6367+12</td>
<td>6367-6379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Methodios in jail</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6379-6394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodora and Michael (III)</td>
<td>6379+15</td>
<td>6379-6394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael (III) alone</td>
<td>6394+11</td>
<td>6394-6405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael (III) - Basil</td>
<td>6405+1</td>
<td>6405-6406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael killed by Basil</td>
<td>6379+27</td>
<td>6406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basil</td>
<td>6406+19</td>
<td>6406-6425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo (VI) &amp; Alexander</td>
<td>6425+25</td>
<td>6425-6450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander - Constantine (VII) Porphyrogenitus</td>
<td>6450+1 &amp;1m</td>
<td>6450-6451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine (VII) Porphyrogenitus</td>
<td>6451+48</td>
<td>6451-6499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with his mother and trustees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6451-6499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- with his father in law Romanos</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- alone (with his son Romanos (II))</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Basil, son of Romanos</td>
<td>6451+47</td>
<td>6498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Constantine (VII)</td>
<td>6498+1</td>
<td>6499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanos (II)</td>
<td>6499+3 &amp;2m</td>
<td>6499-6503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophano</td>
<td>4 m</td>
<td>6503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikephoros (II) Phokas</td>
<td>6503+6 &amp;6m</td>
<td>6503-6509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tzimiskes' coronation: AM 6478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 20. John Tzimiskes - Alexios I Komnenos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year from Adam</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Tzimiskes</strong></td>
<td>6509+6 &amp;6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basil (II) &amp; Constantine (VIII)</strong></td>
<td>6514+50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constantine (VIII)</strong></td>
<td>6564+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romanos (III)</strong></td>
<td>6567+5 &amp;6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael (IV) &amp; Zoe &amp; Theodora</strong></td>
<td>6572+7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael (V)</strong></td>
<td>6579 &amp;4m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constantine (IX)</strong></td>
<td>6580+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theodora</strong></td>
<td>6593+1 &amp;7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael (VI) Geron</strong></td>
<td>6594+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isaakios Komnenos</strong></td>
<td>6595+2 &amp;2m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constantine (X) Doukas</strong></td>
<td>6597+7 &amp;7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eudokia &amp; Michael &amp; Constantine &amp; Andronikos</strong></td>
<td>6605 &amp;7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romanos (IV) Diogenes &amp; Eudokia &amp; Michael &amp; Andronikos &amp; Constantine &amp; Nikephoros &amp; Leo</strong></td>
<td>6606+3 &amp;8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael (VIII) Doukas &amp; Andronikos &amp; Constantine &amp; Nikephoros (III) Botaneiates</strong></td>
<td>6609+6 &amp;6m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nikephoros (III) Botaneiates</strong></td>
<td>6616+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexios Komnenos</strong></td>
<td>6619+37 &amp;4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 21. Synopsis of the second major time frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sack of Troy</td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of Jesus Christ</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>5837</td>
<td>5830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Ecumenical Council</td>
<td>5852</td>
<td>5818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Ecumenical Council</td>
<td>5920</td>
<td>5874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Ecumenical Council</td>
<td>5969</td>
<td>5915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Ecumenical Council</td>
<td>5988</td>
<td>5945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Ecumenical Council</td>
<td>6090</td>
<td>6047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Ecumenical Council</td>
<td>6218</td>
<td>6176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Ecumenical Council</td>
<td>6322</td>
<td>6296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tzimiskes</td>
<td>6509</td>
<td>6478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexios Komnenos</td>
<td>6619</td>
<td>before 6590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** (1) The result of the calculation of all the dates, as given by the text.  
(2) The year stated explicitly in the SynChron for the relevant event.
### Table 22. Bishops of Constantinople

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years in the patriarchal throne</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stachys</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onesimos</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polykarpos</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutarch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedekion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleutherios</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polykarpos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenodoros</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euzoiios</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurentios</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alypios</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertinax</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympianos</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markos</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrillianos</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastinos</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titos</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dometianos</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrophanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23. Patriarchs of Constantinople

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>SynChron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metrophanes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55.3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>55.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebios</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonios</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudoxios</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demophilos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Theologian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64.15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nektarios</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67.20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chrysostom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67.31-68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsakios</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attikos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70.19-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisinios</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestorios</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74.7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximianos</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>75.9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proklos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76.12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatolios</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78.23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gennadios</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85.23-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akakios</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>86.17-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fravytas</td>
<td>3 m 15 d</td>
<td>88.28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphemios</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88.30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makedonios</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89.19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timotheos (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>90.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cappadocean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphanios</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>93.31-94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthimos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menas</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95.21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutychios</td>
<td>12 y 5 m</td>
<td>99.4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scholastikos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutychios</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nesteutes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuriakos</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105.21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>107.13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergios</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>107.22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrhos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>109.28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>110.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrhos</td>
<td>4 m</td>
<td>111.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>111.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>2 y 7 m</td>
<td>111.25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>111.26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoros</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113.27-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>6 y 3 m</td>
<td>113.30-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoros</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114.28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>115.3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallinikos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>115.14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyros</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>117.28-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>119.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanos</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120.6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasios</td>
<td>20 y 4 m</td>
<td>121.22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>124.18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niketas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>125.17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>126.24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarasios</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>127.8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikephoros</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>130.8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodotos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>131.16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>132.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>134.19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodios</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>137.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatios</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>138.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photios</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>141.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatios</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>143.18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photios</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>145.19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>4 y 3 m</td>
<td>146.3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>146.6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>146.8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarch</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euthymios</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>147.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>147.17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No patriarch</td>
<td>1 y 5 m</td>
<td>150.12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophylaktos</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>150.14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyeuktos</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>153.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>156.26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>156.28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>158.25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisinios</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>158.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergios</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>158.31-159.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustathios</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>159.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexios</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>159.4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>162.28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantine</td>
<td>4 y 6 m</td>
<td>165.3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No patriarch</td>
<td>5 m</td>
<td>165.19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Xiphilinos</td>
<td>11 y 7 m</td>
<td>165.20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosmas</td>
<td>5 y 9 m</td>
<td>168.30-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** ( ) The figures in brackets refer to the years not mentioned explicitly in the text, but drawn from the reference to the next patriarch.

---

561 The *SynChron* omits the patriarch Tryphon.
Use of other chronological systems or points of reference

Creation / Adam

- Flood: 2042 years from Adam (5.23-24)
- Birth of Abraham: 6030 years from the Creation (6.20-21)
- Belus' reign: 3390 years from the Creation (7.3-6).
- Aegialeus' reign: 3422 years from the Creation (7.8-10).
- Flood: 2242 years from Adam (8.13)
- Exodus: 3835 years from the Creation (8.16-17)
- Death of Alexander: 5068 years from the Creation (17.31-18.1)
- Birth of Jesus Christ: 5500 years from the Creation (25.25)
- Birth of Jesus Christ: 5500 years from the Creation (42.26-27)
- Constantine's reign: 5830 years from the Creation (43.2-3)
- First Ecumenical Council: 5818 years from the Creation (50.13-15)
- Second Ecumenical Council: 5874 years from the Creation (63.21)
- Third Ecumenical Council: 5915 years from the Creation (70.26)
- Fourth Ecumenical Council: 5945 years from the Creation (80.29-30)
- Start of the building of the church of St Sophia: 6040 years from the Creation (95.13-15).
- Fifth Ecumenical Council: 6047 years from the Creation (99.7-8)
- Sixth Ecumenical Council: 6176 years from the Creation (114.2-3)
- Seventh Ecumenical Council: 6296 years from the Creation (127.10-11)
- Unity of the separated dioceses: 6428 years from the Creation (150.20).
- Nikephoros Phokas: 6471 years from the Creation (156.17-18).
- John Tzimiskes: 6478 years from the Creation (156.18-19)

Generations

- Enoch: Seventh from Adam (5.12-13).
Flood

- Death of Methuselah (5.15-16).
- Birth of Arphaxad: "the second year after the Flood" (5.25).
- Birth of Abraham: 1088 years from the Flood (6.20)
- Birth of Abraham: 1088 years from the Flood (8.13-14)

Biblical events as chronological points of reference

- Exodus: 430 years after Jacob's transition to Egypt (8.9-10).
- Exodus: 505 years after Abraham (8.14-16)
- Saul: 633 years after Exodus
- Rebuild of the temple: 70 years after the (third) capture of the Hebrews by Nebuchadnezzar.
- Birth of Jesus Christ: 34th year of Herod (25.24)

Other Rulers

- End of Aegialeus' reign: 9th year of prophet Samuel.
- End of the Dynasty of the Egyptians: 12th year of Ochus.
- End of Inachos' reign: 15th year of the Ammanites.
- End of the reign of Mycenae: 10th year of Saul.
- End of the kingdom of Athens: 27th year of Manasseh.

Jesus Christ

- Beginning of His teachings: 30 years after His birth (27.20).
- Death and Resurrection: 33 years after His birth (27.22-23).
- Constantine's reign: 297 years from the Ascension (42.31-43.2)
- 20th year of Constantine's reign or First Ecumenical Council: 318 years from the Ascension (50.23-25)
Foundation of Rome

- Celebrations for the 1000 years from the foundation of the city (37.17-18)
- Seizure of the western part of the Empire: 1303 years after the foundation of Rome (87.13-15).

Indictions

- Nikephoros Phokas' coronation: Sixth indiction, AM 6471.
- John Tzimiskes' coronation: Thirteenth indiction, AM 6478.
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