

XIV.—The Composition of Procopius, *De aedificiis*

G. DOWNEY

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

DUMBARTON OAKS RESEARCH LIBRARY AND COLLECTION

WASHINGTON, D. C.

1. The *De aedificiis* in its present form is unfinished. The existence of major differences in the text of the two principal surviving MSS gives reason to suspect that there were two redactions of the treatise. 2. The treatise was written in an effort to offset the impression produced by the calamities which marked the last years of Justinian's reign, and in order to bolster the Emperor's prestige.

1.

The *De aedificiis* of Procopius, a panegyric description of the building activities of the Emperor Justinian, is such a transparent piece of flattery that although it is a source of considerable value for the archaeologist and for the economic and social historian it has received relatively little attention in other respects. There are, however, certain aspects of the literary form and composition of the treatise which will repay study and will enable us to reach a more just evaluation of the work. In an earlier study¹ the present writer summarized the principal features of the panegyric aspect of the treatise and analyzed one passage (the account of the rebuilding of Antioch after its sack by the Persians in 540) in which Procopius' description can be evaluated on the basis of independent evidence. This analysis illustrated the fashion in which Procopius

¹ "Procopius on Antioch: A Study of Method in the *De aedificiis*," *Byzantion* 14 (1939) 361-378. See also the introduction to the edition of the *De aed.* in the Loeb Classical Library (1940), ed. and transl. by H. B. Dewing with the collaboration of the present writer. The bibliography of Procopius through 1940 is collected by G. Moravcsik, *Die byz. Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker* (Budapest, 1942) 302-310; add: L. W. Daly, "Echinos and Justinian's Fortifications in Greece," *AJA* 46 (1942) 500-508; O. Wulff, "Das Raumerlebnis des Naos im Spiegel der Ekphrasis," *ByzZ* 30 (1929/30) 531-539, and the Russian translation of the *De aed.* by S. P. Kondratiev, *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (Moscow), 1939, fasc. 4, 203-298 (which I have not seen). A useful brief account of Procopius' life and works is given by J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire* (London, 1923) 2.419-430. References in the present study are to J. Haury's Teubner text, *Procopii opera omnia*, III, 2 (Leipzig, 1913). The passages studied here are cited in translation (often that of the Loeb edition) both for reasons of economy and because the reader will need in any case to have Haury's edition at hand. I am indebted to Miss Sirarpie Der Nersessian for valuable criticism of this study.

selected and manipulated his material in order to magnify the Emperor's wisdom and accomplishments.

Further examination of the text will make it plain that the treatise, in the form in which it has reached us, is unfinished. In the first place, Procopius lets it be understood, at the beginning of the work, that he will describe all the building activities of Justinian; yet he does not describe any of the Emperor's works in Italy, though his conquests there are mentioned in 1.10.16. This of course suggests at once that the work in its present state is unfinished. The same conclusion seems indicated by the form and contents of Book 6, which is the concluding book in the present state of the text. At the opening of Book 5, Procopius writes (5.1.1-3, p. 149 Haury): "The buildings erected by the Emperor Justinian in all Europe have been recorded, as far as possible, in the preceding book. We must now go on to the remaining parts of Asia. In fact all the fortifications of cities and the fortresses, as well as the other buildings which he erected throughout the East, from the boundary of Persia as far as the city of Palmyra, which chances to be in Phoenicia by Lebanon, have, I think, been sufficiently described by me above [in Books 2 and 3]. So at present I shall tell also of all that was done by him in the rest of Asia and in Libya. . . ." After this introduction, the reader is surprised to find that Book 5 is entirely occupied with the Emperor's activities in Asia Minor, Syria and Palestine, and contains nothing concerning Libya. Libya, indeed, is treated only in Book 6, which opens with an account of Justinian's undertakings in Egypt and continues with a description, progressing westward, of the imperial building activities along the southern shore of the Mediterranean, ending with the Pillars of Hercules. This partition of the material suggests that what is now Book 6 originally formed the latter part of Book 5, and that Procopius later made the latter part of Book 5 a separate book, without making the necessary alteration in the original introduction (just quoted) to Book 5. This conclusion may find support in the present lengths of the books, which are as follows:

1 (Constantinople)	40	Teubner	pages
2 (Persian frontier)	37	"	"
3 (Armenia; Euxine regions)	20	"	"
4 (Europe)	47	"	"
5 ("Asia and Libya")	22	"	"
6 (Egypt; North Africa)	15	"	"

Book 6, then, is the shortest of the books. If it were combined with 5, the resultant book would be of the same length as 2, and shorter than 1 and 4. If Procopius intended to describe Justinian's activities in Italy (as he certainly must have done), he would presumably (in view of the geographical arrangement of the present books) have treated these in a final book. If, however, he found that he would be unable to write this book, he might then have decided to divide his original Book 5 into two (the present 5 and 6), thus producing the unusually brief final book which we have.

That Book 6 was not originally a separate book is suggested also by the lack of reference in it to the preceding book. Procopius begins Book 2 with the remark (2.1.1, p. 45 Haury): "All the new churches which the Emperor Justinian built both in Constantinople and in its suburbs . . . have been described in the preceding book." At the opening of the third book he writes (3.1.1, p. 82 Haury): "Thus the Emperor Justinian strengthened the territory of the East with fortifications, as I have set forth in the preceding book." His similar remark at the opening of Book 5 has been quoted above (172). These remarks are of course a literary device for providing a smooth transition from book to book; there is no similar remark at the opening of Book 4, but that book has a special introduction, more elaborate than those of the others. At the opening of Book 6, however, Procopius merely writes (6.1.1, p. 171 Haury), "Thus were these things done by the Emperor Justinian," a phrase which actually could have been intended simply to provide a suitable conclusion for the classified list of buildings with which Book 5 now closes.² This lack of reference to the preceding book, or, alternatively, of a special introduction such as stands at the head of 4, gives further reason to suspect that 6 was not originally designed as a separate book. Moreover, Books 2, 4 and 5 open with general considerations on the importance and extent of Justinian's work, and there is nothing of this at the opening of 6.

Further understanding of the method of composition of the treatise may be gained from study of the schematic lists of building activities which Procopius gives in three places (4.4, pp. 116-124; 4.11, pp. 145-149; 5.9, pp. 169-171 Haury). At least the first two of these lists evidently reproduce the contents of government

² Procopius frequently uses similar brief phrases to indicate the conclusion of one topic and the introduction of another. To cite only a few examples, see 1.8.1; 1.10.1; 2.5.11; 2.6.11; 2.7.1; 2.8.1.

archives to which Procopius was given access for his work; the third, while it may represent an official source, could, from its form, represent Procopius' own working notes, which he may have intended eventually to write out in full. In introducing the first list he writes (4.4.3, p. 116 Haury) that it will be preferable to list all these activities "in catalogue form so that my narrative may not become utterly irksome by the interspersions of a crowd of place-names in it." Certainly this list is more carefully compiled than the second. In the first list, Procopius carefully distinguishes between new fortifications and rebuilt fortifications; this distinction is not made in the second list.³ As might be expected in the circumstances, the lists contain a certain number of duplications and apparent errors which should have been removed if the treatise had been edited with any care; the barbarian names, especially, must have been vexing for Procopius (as well as for the imperial officials who compiled the lists which he must have used), and he no doubt would not have paid close attention to them when he first prepared his lists, though later study would have removed some of the inaccuracies which now appear to exist. Thus it looks as though the town called *Κουιμέδαβα* in 4.1.32, p. 106, 20 Haury, were the same as the *Κουμούδεβα* included in the first list (4.4, p. 123, 29 Haury). The second list enumerates *Κουσκάβιρι* and *Κούσκουλις* in successive entries (p. 145, 32–33 Haury), with *Κούσκανρι* and *Κούσκουλι*, evidently the same places, in successive entries at p. 148, 25–26 Haury. *Βάκουστα* (4.4, p. 117, 6 Haury) and *Βακουστή* (*ibid.*, p. 117, 2 Haury) are very likely the same place, as are *Βεσαίανα* (*ibid.*, p. 120, 42 Haury) and *Βεσίανα* (*ibid.*, p. 119, 54 Haury), and perhaps *Κασωπᾶς* (*ibid.*, p. 119, 9 Haury) and *Κάσσωπες* (*ibid.*, p. 119, 30 Haury).

The third list (5.9, pp. 169–171 Haury), as has been suggested, may represent notes made by Procopius which he did not write up as he originally intended to do. This is indicated by the circumstance that the list is not a classified catalogue, as are the first two lists, but is already partly in literary form, and by the fact that in the section on the province of Phoenice he has entries for Daphne near Antioch and for Laodicea (p. 170, 15–16 Haury). These two places of course were not in Phoenice but in the province of Syria. Procopius apparently listed them here either by mistake or because

³ This difference between the forms of the lists could also indicate that the archives which Procopius consulted were differently compiled.

he did not consider Justinian's activities in these places very important.

Another indication that the treatise did not receive definitive revision by the author is the duplication of the account of the repair of the circuit-wall of Chalcis in Syria. In 2.11.1, p. 80 Haury, we read that "In the same manner he also repaired the circuit-wall of the city of Chalcis, which had been faultily built in the first place and had been wrecked by the years; he restored this along with the outworks and rendered it much more defensible than before, and gave it the form which we now see." A little later, in 2.11.8, p. 81 Haury, we again read that "Also he restored the entire circuit-wall of the city of Chalcis, which had fallen down to the ground and anyhow was unsuitable for defence, by means of exceptionally stout masonry, and he strengthened it with outworks."

Haury printed both passages in his text, but considered that the latter should be deleted as a repetition of the former. This suggestion, however, seems to have been a hasty one, for consideration of the problem indicates that the two passages can hardly represent merely a careless repetition. They are so close together that it hardly seems possible that Procopius duplicated the account simply by an oversight. Nor does it seem possible that the two passages refer to the two places named Chalcis, viz. Chalcis ad Belum (modern Kinnasrin, about 35 km. south of Aleppo) and Chalcis of Lebanon (near modern Medjdal Anjar, about 65 km. from Beyrouth, near the Beyrouth-Damascus road). Chalcis ad Belum was an important place in Justinian's time, while the other Chalcis sank into obscurity after the middle of the first century of our era. Moreover, there is an inscription of Chalcis ad Belum, dated A.D. 550, which refers to the rebuilding of a wall which is evidently the city wall, while there is no such evidence preserved for the other Chalcis.⁴ It seems much more likely that both passages were written by Procopius in the form in which they appear in the MSS because Procopius was not able to decide, originally, in which of the two places he wished to record the work at Chalcis. He may have written the account twice, simply in order to see in which place it

⁴ Cf. Benzinger in *RE* s.v. "Chalkis" nos. 14 and 15; R. Dussaud, *Topographie historique de la Syrie* (Paris, 1927) 400-401, 476-477; W. K. Prentice, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions (Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria, 3* [New York, 1908]) no. 305 = L. Jalabert and R. Mouterde, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie* (Paris, 1929 — in progress) no. 348; R. Mouterde and A. Poidebard, *Les limes de Chalcis* (Paris, 1945) frontispiece (map), 3-7, 17, 19-23, 35-36, 229-240.

looked more appropriate. If this were the case, he would have intended eventually to expunge the less satisfactory passage. He may, however, have been unable for some reason to settle the question, and may have had to allow both passages to stand.

The decisive evidence for the unfinished state of the treatise is, as has been noted, the absence of any account of Justinian's buildings in Italy. Justinian, even if he did not command the writing of the treatise, knew that it was being written, for Procopius, after having described the Emperor's churches of Christ at Constantinople, says that to continue the account (1.3.1, p. 20 Haury) "we must begin with the churches of Mary the Mother of God. For we know that this is the wish of the Emperor himself. . . ." From this it appears that Justinian made at least "suggestions" concerning the plan of the treatise, and we can scarcely suppose that he would have approved the planning of an account of his building activities which failed to contain a description of his work in Italy. The Emperor could hardly have been content to have St. Apollinare in Classe and St. Vitale at Ravenna⁵ omitted from a treatise on the building activities of his reign, even though he may actually not have had as much to do with their construction as he did with Hagia Sophia and the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople.

It thus seems quite certain that the *De aedificiis*, at least in the form in which it has reached us, is unfinished. There is further evidence which may suggest that there existed two redactions of the treatise, one of which consisted of a version in which the author himself had revised an earlier draft which had already got into circulation. The revised, but apparently still unfinished version, would have been issued either during Procopius' life or after his death. The evidence for this hypothesis, while slender and not conclusive, will repay examination.

In establishing his text of the *De aedificiis*, Haury perceived that of the two principal surviving MSS, that which he called V was superior to that which he called A.⁶ Haury did not, however, realize the possible significance of some of the differences between these two MSS; he saw only that V is in general more correct (sometimes, more elegant) in language and grammatical construction than A. While this is true, as a glance through Haury's critical

⁵ Ch. Diehl, *Manuel d'art byzantin* (Paris, 1925-1926) 1.186-190.

⁶ See the stemma in the introduction of Haury's text. V = cod. Vaticanus gr. 1065, saec. 13. A = cod. Ambrosianus gr. 182 sup., saec. 14.

apparatus will show, further study of some of the passages in question will suggest that some of the differences are more significant than Haury supposed.

The most striking occurs in 1.1.22-26 (p. 9 Haury). In the account of the building of St. Sophia, V reads:

"So the whole church at that time [after the Nika riot] lay a charred mass of ruins. But the Emperor Justinian built not long afterwards a church so finely shaped, that if anyone had enquired of the Christians before the burning if it would be their wish that the church should be destroyed and one like this should take its place, showing them some sort of model (*ektypōma*) of the building we now see, it seems to me that they would have prayed that they might see their church destroyed forthwith, in order that the building might be converted into its present form. At any rate the Emperor, disregarding all questions of expense, eagerly pressed on to begin the work of construction, and began to gather all the artisans from the whole world. And Anthemius of Tralles, the most learned man in the skilled craft which is known as the art of building, not only of all his contemporaries, but also when compared with those who had lived long before him, ministered to the Emperor's enthusiasm, duly regulating the tasks of the various artisans, and preparing in advance designs of the future construction; and associated with him was another architect,⁷ Isidorus by name, a Milesian by birth, a man who was intelligent and worthy to assist the Emperor Justinian. Indeed this also was an indication of the honor in which God held the Emperor, that He had already provided the men who would be most serviceable to him in the tasks which were waiting to be carried out. And one might with good reason marvel at the discernment of the Emperor himself, in that out of the whole world he was able to select the men who were most suitable for the most important of his enterprises."

In A, the passage from "if any one had inquired" to the end of the quotation is represented by the following rather exiguous sentences:

"If previously any one had inquired, showing some sort of model of that which we now see, they would wish that this [church] should be destroyed, so that it might be seen transformed to its present form. And the Emperor began to gather all the artisans from the whole world. [He brought] Anthemius of Tralles, the most ingenious man in the skilled craft which is known as the art of building, not only of all his contemporaries, but also when com-

⁷ On the meaning of *mēchanopoios*, see G. Downey, "Byzantine Architects: Their Training and Methods," to be published in *Byzantion* 18, and "Pappus of Alexandria on Architectural Studies," to be published in *Isis* 38, nos. 113-114.

pared with those who had lived long before him, [in order to] regulate the tasks of the artisans, preparing in advance designs of the future construction. [He also brought] Isidorus of Miletus, an architect."

While A's version is adequate as a factual account, the last two sentences are not grammatically correct, and the whole passage lacks the characteristically Procopian fulsomeness of V's version. Comparison of the Greek originals will show several places in which the text, as represented in V, has been touched up and improved, e.g. V's substitution (p. 9, 10 Haury) of *logiôdtatos* for the awkward *mêchanikôdtaton* of A.

A similar divergence occurs in the introduction to the treatise, in which Justinian is compared with the Persian Cyrus, who (Procopius writes) is the best ruler of whom knowledge is preserved. Here (1.1.15-16, p. 7, 18 ff. Haury) V reads:

"But in the case of the king of our times, Justinian (whom one would rightly, I think, call a king by nature as well as by inheritance, since he is, as Homer says, 'as gentle as a father'), if one should examine his reign with care, he will regard the rule of Cyrus as a sort of child's play. The proof of this will be that the Roman Empire, as I have just said, has become more than doubled both in area and in power generally, while, on the other hand, those who treacherously formed the plot against him, going so far even as to plan his assassination, are not only living up to the present moment, and in possession of their own property, even though their guilt was proved with absolute certainty, but are actually still serving as generals of the Romans, and are holding the consular rank to which they had been appointed."

For the words "But in the case . . . in power generally," A reads simply: "And a token of the Emperor's benevolence (*philanthrôpia*). . . ."

A brief passage in which there is striking divergence between V and A in a rather difficult point of technical description occurs in the account of the building of the eastern arch of Hagia Sophia. Here (1.1.68-69, p. 15, 23 ff. Haury) V reads:

"One of the arches which I just now mentioned (*lôroi* the architects* call them), the one which stands toward the east, had already been built up from either side, but it had not yet been wholly completed in the middle, and was still waiting. And the piers above which the structure was being built, unable to carry the mass which bore down upon them, somehow or other suddenly began to crack, and they seemed on the point of collapsing."

* See the preceding note.

For the words from the beginning of the quotation through "which bore down upon them," A reads:

"One of the arches (*lôroi* the architects call them), the one toward the east, which was not yet finished, weighed down the piers by its mass; and they . . ."

Again the version of A, while correct, is inferior, as a technical description, to that of V, which looks as though it had been rewritten from A with some care.

The final piece of evidence to be considered in this connection is the long list of fortifications which, Procopius writes, the Emperor constructed or rebuilt in New Epirus (4.4, pp. 116-124 Haury). This list is given only by V and is completely lacking in A. The other two similar lists of place-names (4.11, pp. 145-149; 5.9, pp. 169-171 Haury) are present in both mss. The presence of the first list (4.4) in V alone may suggest that this list was not included in Procopius' original draft (represented by A), but was added when he may have made the changes and improvements over A which the versions in V appear to represent.

Further indication that the first list was later inserted into an already written text may be found in the fact that the last two lists stand at the end of Book 4 and at the end of Book 5 respectively, in positions in which their prosaic character would not be so obvious. On the other hand the first list is inserted in the middle of Book 4, which might mean that it was added in this place when Procopius decided to expand this book. With this list, Book 4 comprises 47 Teubner pages (see the table above, 172) and is the longest of the books; without the list, Book 4 would comprise 39 Teubner pages and would be more nearly comparable in length with Books 1 and 2 (and with Book 5 as well, if 6 originally formed a part of 5).

It seems difficult to find a wholly satisfactory and convincing explanation of the differences between A and V which have been pointed out. If the divergences were more numerous, we might think that A represents an epitome; but this can hardly be the case when the differences noted occur in a relatively small number of passages. It can be supposed that such differences are the work of an editor or scribe who sought to abbreviate a tedious text, or, conversely, wished to try his hand at expanding the text which he found. However, it also seems possible (at least to the present writer) that, in view of the style and contents of the passages

examined, the differences represent revisions made by the author, so that in the passages in question A would represent an earlier draft of the treatise which was later worked over and improved by Procopius himself.

If this were the case (and it must be repeated that this is a hypothesis which cannot be demonstrated), we should have to suppose that an early draft of the *De aedificiis*, represented by A, got into circulation and continued to be reproduced independently of the revised but still unfinished draft represented by V.⁹ It may be significant that the principal differences between A and V occur in the first book, which, being concerned with the imperial buildings at Constantinople, was the most important portion of the treatise and would naturally be the part to which Procopius would give most careful attention if he revised his work in any detail. Whether the publication of the supposed earlier draft would have been authorized or not by Procopius, we of course cannot say. Perhaps, being pressed to publish his treatise before he had finished it, he published the version now contained in A, but continued to work over the treatise and made the changes represented in V, though V itself, as we have it, still does not seem to represent all of the author's original intention. It has already been shown that Procopius was unable, for some reason, to finish the work. At the end of the present Book 6, he writes (6.7.18–20, p. 186 Haury):

“As many, then, of the buildings of the Emperor Justinian as I have succeeded in discovering, either by seeing them myself, or by hearing about them from those who have seen them, I have described in my account to the best of my ability. I am fully aware, however, that there are many others which I have omitted to mention, which either went unnoticed because of their multitude, or remained altogether unknown to me. So if anyone will take the pains to search them all out and add them to my treatise, he will have the credit of having done a needed work and of having won the renown of a lover of fair achievements.”

These words would, according to the hypothesis proposed here, have appeared originally in the “first edition,” presumably as a kind of apology for the unfinished character of the treatise, in which

⁹ Compare the *History* of George the Monk, a world-chronicle beginning with Adam and coming down to the first year of Michael III, A.D. 842/3. It appears that George himself wrote out his chronicle twice. The first version, which was rough and perhaps incomplete, got into circulation, and a later copy of it exists today. Later George prepared a revised version, now represented by several MSS. See J. B. Bury, *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire* (London, 1912) 454.

readers would have been surprised to find no account of Justinian's work in Italy. If the second edition were published in Procopius' lifetime, still in its unfinished state, he would have allowed the statement to stand for the same reason. If, however, no second edition were published during Procopius' life, he would have left this concluding paragraph in his manuscript, intending to revise or replace it when he finished the whole work; and it is possible, of course, that he died before carrying out his final intention, and that the version of V was published only after his death.

2.

That the *De aedificiis* was written in response to an imperial wish is sufficiently clear.¹⁰ The circumstances in which it was written have not yet, however, been reviewed, so that it will be useful to examine briefly the political and literary background of the composition of the work.

Concerning the date of composition of the treatise, we know only that Procopius was at work on it during the year A.D. 559/60.¹¹ This was not the happiest period of Justinian's reign. As L. Bréhier points out,¹² from 527 to 533 the emperor had planned and elaborated his program and had acquired authority and prestige, so that the years 533–540 were those of victorious action; but the final and longest period of his reign, extending from 540 to 565, was filled with difficulties and reverses. In 558 a horde of seven thousand Kutrigurs succeeded in crossing the Wall of Anastasius and spread panic in Constantinople. Discontent with the administration was

¹⁰ See the passage in 1.3.1 on the churches of the Virgin, quoted above, 176. The use which Procopius evidently made of official records in compiling his schematic lists of buildings (see above, 173) also indicates that the work was carried out under official patronage.

¹¹ In his account of the construction of a new bridge over the Sangarius river Procopius writes (5.3.10, p. 155 Haury) that "the Emperor Justinian has now undertaken the project of building a bridge over the river. Having already begun the task, he is now much occupied with it; and I know well that he will complete it not long hence." Theophanes (A.M. 6052, p. 234, 15–18 De Boor) states that this work was carried out during the year A.D. 559/60. Since it seems unlikely that the work of bridging such a river can have been begun in the autumn or winter, we may suppose that operations were actually inaugurated in the spring or summer of 560. Another possible indication of the date of Procopius' writing unfortunately cannot be controlled. In 1.8.15, p. 35 Haury, Procopius writes that the emperor "recently" dedicated a shrine of St. John the Baptist at the Hebdomum, but there seems to be no independent evidence for the date of construction of this church.

¹² *Vie et mort de Byzance* (Paris, 1947) 23.

spreading; in September 560 there was a false rumor of the death of Justinian which caused riots, and in 562 a plot was made against the Emperor, the discovery of which caused the dismissal of Belisarius. When the Emperor died in 565 at the age of eighty-two, his death was greeted with relief by his subjects.¹³

Among the severest misfortunes of Justinian's later years were the series of accidents suffered by his great church, Hagia Sophia. The earthquake of August, 553, weakened the structure, and the even more violent shock of 14 December 557 split the crown of the great eastern arch. Repairs were begun, but only a few months later, on 7 May 558, the eastern arch, part of the eastern semi-dome, and probably a part of the main dome, all fell.¹⁴ The rebuilding was not completed until 562, when the celebration of the restoration was begun on 24 December. It was apparently on this occasion that Paulus Silentiarius, on 6 January 563, read his celebrated poem on the church.¹⁵

In these circumstances, it would appear that the principal motive behind the composition of the *De aedificiis* was a desire on the part of Justinian (or of Procopius) to provide a panegyric treatise which would serve at least in part to offset this series of calamities and to bolster the prestige of the emperor by setting forth his achievements as a builder. Procopius, the foremost historian of the day, who had already described Justinian's wars, would be the logical person to continue the tale of the Emperor's achievements by cataloguing his magnificent buildings.¹⁶

¹³ Bréhier, *op. cit.* 31, 33; Bury, *Hist. of the Lat. Rom. Emp.* 2.69–70, 359.

¹⁴ E. H. Swift, *Hagia Sophia* (New York, 1940) 13. There is a slight difficulty in the date of the collapse of the arch and the domes. Malalas, a contemporary, dates the collapse (p. 489, 19 ff. Bonn ed.) in the sixth indiction (cf. line 15) = 1 Sept. A.D. 557 — 31 Aug. 558. Theophanes (A.M. 6051, p. 232, 27 ff. ed. De Boor) states that the collapse occurred on 7 May in the year 6051 of the Alexandrian era = 7 May 559. Cedrenus (1.676, 20 ff. Bonn ed.) dates the accident in the 32nd year of Justinian (who came to the throne 1 Aug. 527) = 558/9. Some scholars have adopted the date of Malalas, others that of Theophanes and Cedrenus. In such a disagreement it seems preferable to follow Malalas, who was a contemporary. Theophanes may have confused the date of the collapse with the date of the beginning of the repair, which may have been started only in the following year of the era. Cedrenus seems simply to have followed the tradition represented by Theophanes.

¹⁵ P. Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza u. Paulus Silentiarius* (Berlin, 1912) 109–110.

¹⁶ Some scholars have supposed that Procopius wrote the treatise in order to redeem himself from supposed disfavor with the Emperor (who may have resented the veiled criticisms which appeared in the books on the wars) or simply to gain favor; cf. F. Dahn, *Prokopius von Cäsarea* (Berlin, 1865) 356, 361–362; J. Haury, *Procopiana* (Progr., Augsburg, 1891) 28–31. Bury (*Hist. of the Lat. Rom. Emp.* 2.428) adopts the

view that private motives of gratitude impelled Procopius to write the treatise. While some such consideration may have been present in Procopius' mind, the time at which the work was written, and the circumstances of Justinian's last years, seem to provide a much more significant explanation for the origin and tone of the treatise. Students have exercised themselves to explain why Procopius does not mention the collapse of the arch and domes of Hagia Sophia. Dahn, not knowing the passage in Theophanes which shows that Procopius was writing in 559/60 (see above, note 11), argued that the treatise must have been written before the collapse (which he wrongly dates in 559; see above, note 14) because Procopius could hardly have failed to mention so important an event in his account of the church (*op. cit.* 38). Haury supposed that Procopius' silence showed that Book 1 was written before 558, the remainder in or after 559/60. On the contrary, Procopius, in the writer's opinion, would deliberately omit this catastrophe, which could scarcely be described along with the account which Procopius was constrained to give of the major role which Justinian supposedly played in the original construction of the building. Procopius' task was to magnify the Emperor's achievements, rather than to describe accidents which marred them.