

## XX.—Excerpts from Strabo and Stephanus in Byzantine Chronicles

AUBREY DILLER

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

In certain Byzantine chronicles of the tenth century the main narrative is embellished with references to ancient history and mythology. Most of them bear upon geographical names mentioned in the narrative, for which they attempt to give the origin or etymology. Because of this geographical tenor many of them are drawn from Strabo and Stephanus Byzantius, but other sources are represented also, and some of the notices are quite unique and are cited by scholars as primary material. It has scarcely been recognized,<sup>1</sup> however, that these references constitute a single phenomenon that should be considered as a whole to be best understood. They have common characteristics in form, contents and sources, and their occurrence is limited and interrelated. I shall first describe the chronicles involved and indicate their relation to each other, particularly as regards the extraneous references. Afterwards I will give the text of the notices themselves with indication of sources or parallels and other observations.

For the history of the Byzantine Empire in the period following the end of the chronicle of Theophanes (A.D. 813) we have two independent primary accounts, both written in the middle of the tenth century. One is the anonymous chronicle known as *Theophanes continuatus*,<sup>2</sup> which is a composite work and falls into three or four distinct parts. The first, covering the period 813–867, is addressed to Constantine Porphyrogenetus (d. 959) and was written under his direction. The second part, the life of Basil

<sup>1</sup> Joh. Geffcken, *De Stephano Byzantio. Commentatio H. Sauppe oblata* (Göttingen 1889), to whom I owe much in this article, though not accepting his wholesale derivation of the notices from Steph. Byz. See also L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1935) 215 f., and, from the Byzantine side, S. Shestakov, "On the MSS of Symeon Logothete" (in Russian), *Viz. Vrem.* 5 (1898) 59.

<sup>2</sup> Krumbacher, *Gesch. der byz. Litt.* (1897) 347–9; Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica I* (Budapest 1942) 340–3; H. G. Nickles, "The *Continuatio Theophanis*," *TAPA* 68 (1937) 221–7; and note 15 below. Mr. Nickles very kindly sent me the photographs of the main MS of this chronicle (Vatic. gr. 167, 11th cent.), which the Am. Council of Learned Societies had obtained for his projected edition and which will be deposited in the Library of Congress.

the Macedonian (867–886), was written by Constantine himself, grandson of Basil. The third part is a continuation down to 961 (or 963, as the end is missing) by a later author under Nicephorus Phocas (963–969), who drew on a Symeonian chronicle (see below) down to 948, where it ended, and from then on wrote his own account (the fourth part). We shall return to these secondary third and fourth parts later.

The other primary chronicle is the work of Symeon Logothete,<sup>3</sup> which gave a history of the world down to the death of Romanus I in 948. It was written with a bias in favor of Romanus and against Constantine. This chronicle has not survived in its original form, but is represented by numerous redactions and compilations, some of which are known under other names, e.g. Polydeuces, Theodosius of Melitene, Leo Grammaticus. The end of the chronicle also occurs repeatedly as a continuation of the world-chronicle of George Monachus or Hamartolus, which ended at A.D. 842. The recognition of the common original behind all these permutations and the identification of the author have long been tortuous problems for Byzantinologists and are not yet beyond controversy.

The historical references which are the subject of this article do not occur in either of the primary chronicles, that is, not in the first and second parts of *Theoph. cont.* and not in all the redactions of Symeon Logothete. They are confined rather to certain derivatives of the two primary works, to which we must now turn. The first is the chronicle ascribed to Joseph Genesius,<sup>4</sup> which covers more briefly the same period as the first two parts of *Theoph. cont.* (813–886) and is likewise addressed to Constantine Porphyrogenetus. The relation between the two chronicles has not been clarified. Genesius has long been regarded as primary and *Theoph. cont.* as secondary, but it has been stated recently that the relation may as well be the reverse.<sup>5</sup> In any case Genesius' material is much the same as in *Theoph. cont.* It differs in one respect, however, and that is the introduction of antique lore. The narrative is embellished throughout with allusions to mythology and history and quotations from Homer as well as geographical notices of the type mentioned above. All except the quotations from Homer are excerpted below pp. 246–248.

<sup>3</sup> Krumbacher 358–365, Moravcsik 321–3.

<sup>4</sup> Krumbacher 264 f., Moravcsik 175 f., and note 12 below.

<sup>5</sup> A. Werner quoted by H. Grégoire in *Byzantion* 5 (1929–30) 346.

Our next source for the references to ancient history is the family of derivatives of Symeon's chronicle comprising the anonymous chronicles in codd. graec. Paris. 854 (13th cent.), 1712 (PsSymeon, 11th cent., see below), Vatic. 1807 (14th cent.) and a Slavic translation of "Symeon" preserved in a MS in Leningrad dated A.D. 1638.<sup>6</sup> Within this family the first two members often agree against the last two, and they represent a later stage of development. For our purposes it is significant that at one point all four members contaminate Symeon with an extract from Genesius, while at another point Paris. 854 and 1712, but not Vatic. 1807 and the Slavic,<sup>7</sup> have a typical geographical notice on Adrianople as the birthplace of Basil the Macedonian (PsSymeon 686, p. 248 below). Unfortunately Paris. 854 breaks off soon after this point, and we can only surmise that the great series of notices that comes in PsSymeon 705-707 (pp. 248-251 below) occurred also in similar form and context in the redaction of Paris. 854. It is not in Vatic. 1807 and the Slavic. It consists of 22 notices on geographical names, only the first of which (Tripolis) is mentioned in the context — certainly an undigested mass of information! Although these notices are from the same rather rare sources as many in Genesius, none of them had actually occurred in Genesius — a fact that seems intentional. The long notice on Chrysopolis in PsSymeon 728 f. may also have come from the redaction of Paris. 854, as it does not occur elsewhere.

Our historical notices are best known to scholars in the form in which they occur in another family of derivatives of Symeon's chronicle. This is the continuation of George Monachus preserved in codd. Vind. hist. gr. 40 (11th cent., now incomplete), Vatic. gr. 153 (13th cent.), the Old Slavic translation of George Hamartolus (11th cent.) and the third part of *Theoph. cont.* (see above), which is simply a section of this continuation of George.<sup>8</sup> In these texts

<sup>6</sup> G. Ostrogorsky, "The Slavic translation of the chronicle of Symeon Logothete" (in Russian), *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 5 (1932) 17-37, with reference to previous studies.

<sup>7</sup> Serruys in *ByzZ* 16 (1907) 14, Ostrogorsky (see note 6) 26. PsSymeon 667.10-668.2 is from Genesius 99.5-102.6.

<sup>8</sup> Moravcsik (see note 2) 141 and note 14 below. This continuation of George is quite distinct from the continuation given in Bekker's *Theoph. cont.* (see note 15) pp. 763-924, which does not have references to ancient history. Both continuations are represented in Muralt's edition of Georg. Mon. (*MPG* 110 [1863]), and both are excluded in De Boor's (Teubner 1904).

we find the same historical notices as in the previous family (minus several, however, and plus three), but distributed differently. The notice on Adrianople is transferred from the birth of Basil to the capture of the city by the Bulgarians in 914. The great series of notices evidently gave the redactor some exercise. He found places for some of them further on in the chronicle, but most of them remained quite irrelevant and were either omitted or accommodated by making a place for them. In PsSymeon 705 the great series occurs at the mention of Tripolis in connection with the invasion of the Aegaeon Sea by the Saracen fleet under Leo of Tripoli in 904. In this family most of these notices are inserted in the following account of the movements of the Byzantine fleet under Himerius on the same occasion.

*Theoph. cont.* 367 f. δς "Αβυδον διελθὼν τὴν καθ' Ἑλλάσποντον καὶ τὸ Αἰγαῖον πέλαγος, ἐξῆς δὲ προσωρμηκὼς Στροβίλῳ τῇ κατὰ Κιβύρραν καὶ Λαμψάκῳ, μετὰ ταῦτα τῇ Ἰμβρῳ διεληλυθὼς Σαμοθράκην δὲ διαβάς καὶ τῇ Θάσῳ προσπελάσας, τοὺς πολεμίους κατέλαβεν.

Considering the gross improbability of this route and the absence of this passage from the other redactions of Symeon's chronicle, I conclude that it was forged by our redactor to serve as a scaffold for part of the intractable historical notices in the great series in PsSymeon 705–707. Before leaving this family we must notice the fact that a large part of the text of Genesius has here been infiltrated into the original texts of George and Symeon.<sup>9</sup>

The four unique Bithynian notices in the fourth part of *Theoph. cont.* (464 f.), after the end of the Symeonian text of *Georg. cont.*, constitute a third separate occurrence of our historical notices.

The anonymous world-chronicle of cod. Paris. gr. 1712 — known as Pseudo-Symeon, since it was first ascribed to Symeon Logothete by mistake<sup>10</sup> — which we have introduced above as belonging to the redaction of Paris. 854, is not a simple member of this family, but a conflation of several previous works, among which were Genesius and *Theoph. cont.* (all four parts of it) as well as the Symeonian redaction of Paris. 854. While PsSymeon gives the notice on Adrianople (686) and presumably the great series (705–707) as they occurred in Paris. 854, he gives another group (746)

<sup>9</sup> A. Werner in *ByzZ* 31 (1931) 258.

<sup>10</sup> Krumbacher 359, 361, Moravcsik 310 f., and note 13 below.

as it occurs in *Theoph. cont.* (423 f.), actually duplicating some of the previous great series. He has also acquired three notices (603 and 637) from Genesisius (29 and 59), though he has put them into new and partly irrelevant contexts. The chronicle ends at A.D. 963 and was probably composed soon after, under Nicephorus Phocas (963–969), like *Theoph. cont.* It is the latest chronicle containing the references to ancient history, being compiled from all of the previous sources that have them.

The compilation of our historico-geographical notices began with Genesisius (under Constantine VII, 944–959) and ended with Ps-Symeon (under Nicephorus II, 963–969). It consisted in the main of two separate injections into the chronographical tradition, in Genesisius and in the Symeonic redaction of Paris. 854, the later redactions merely rearranging this material. But the two separate injections do not seem entirely independent of each other, in view of the common characteristics and of the mutual exclusion between them mentioned above. Even the redactions of Vatic. 153, *Theoph. cont.* and PsSymeon are not mere copy-work, but rather seem to handle the notices with attention and freedom, introducing them in new connections. It looks as if all of our chroniclers belonged to a single school in which the idea of historical embellishment was an oral as well as a written tradition. The use of Genesisius' chronicle, found in every source in which the historical notices occur, is also an indication of relations within a school. As for the idea itself of embellishment with references to ancient history and mythology, it is parallel to the revival of antique pagan themes in contemporary Byzantine plastic arts.<sup>11</sup>

Following is the text of the historical notices, first those in Genesisius,<sup>12</sup> then those in PsSymeon,<sup>13</sup> *Georg. cont.*<sup>14</sup> and *Theoph. cont.*<sup>15</sup> When the same notice occurs in more than one place, I have usually preferred the text of Genesisius and PsSymeon 705–707,

<sup>11</sup> Ch. Diehl, *Manuel d'art byzantin*<sup>2</sup> (1925–6) 399, 657–9; K. Weitzmann, "Euripidean scenes in Byzantine art," *Hesperia* 18 (1949) 159–210.

<sup>12</sup> Gen., ed. C. Lachmann (Bonn 1834).

<sup>13</sup> PS, the last part (A.D. 813–963) ed. Bekker with TC (see note 15), pp. 603–760.

<sup>14</sup> GC, ed. V. M. Istrin, *The Chronicle of George Hamartolus in the Old Slavo-Russian Translation* (in Russian) II (Petrograd 1922) 1–73, from cod. Vatic. gr. 153. I shall not cite the Old Slavic text edited by Istrin in his vol. I (1920), as it is merely a translation of the Greek text of Vatic. 153.

<sup>15</sup> TC, ed. Im. Bekker (Bonn 1838). The third part is pp. 353–441, the fourth 441–481.

adopting only a few readings from the other occurrences. The text of the notices is not always entirely intelligible.

Gen. 27.15 ἐν Βυζαντίῳ τῷ ὑπὸ Μεγαρέων κτισθέντι καὶ Βύζαντος, κατ' Εὐρώπῃν συνελθόντων ἐν τῇ τούτου πολίσει Καρυστίων Μυκηναίων καὶ Κορινθίων ἄλλων τε πολλῶν, φιλοσόφοις ἅμα καὶ ῥήτορισι. For Byzas as leader of the Megarians cf. Steph. Byz. and Hesychius *Patria C-poleōs* 5 ed. Preger, and for the multiple origin of the colonists Const. Porph. *De them.* p. 46.17 ed. Bonn. See *RE*, Halbband 5 (1897) 1129.40, 1159.1.

Gen. 29.1, PS 603.7 Ἀρμενίους δὲ φασιν ἐξ Ἀρμένου κληθῆναι τοῦ ἀπὸ Ἀρμενίου πόλεως Θετταλίας, ὃς Ἰάσονι συνεστράτευσεν. From Strabo 11.530c rather than 503cd.

Gen. 45.13 Ἡράκλεια ἡ πάλαι Πέρυνθος καλουμένη. Commonplace, cf. Malalas p. 262.1 ed. Bonn.

Gen. 58.6 Παφλαγονία ἀπὸ Παφλαγόνος υἱοῦ Φινέως τῆς τοιαύτης γῆς ἐγκρατήσαντος ἀγορεύεται. Cf. Arrian *Bithyniaca* 156 F 77 Jacoby, St. Byz., Const. Porph. *De them.* p. 30.1–3.

Gen. 59.4, PS 637.5 τὴν μὲν Σινώπῃν κλήσιν ἐξειληφέναι Σινώπης ἀπὸ τινος τῶν Ἀμαζόνων αὐτὴν δειμαμένης. Cf. Schol. Ap. Rh. 2.946, PsScymnus 941, Orosius 1.15.6.

Gen. 59.5, PS 637.6 τὴν δὲ Ἀμαστριν τὸ πρὶν Κρῶμναν ὠνομασμένην ἐκ τινος Περσίδος Ἀμάστριδος θυγατρὸς Ὁξύартου ἀδελφοῦ Δαρείου, ἥτις συνοικήσασα Διονυσίῳ τῷ Ἡρακλείας τυράννῳ, ὑπ' ἐκείνῳ οὔσαν τὴν πόλιν ἀπὸ τῆς συζύγου ὠνομακέναι. From St. Byz. (Strabo 12.544d).

Gen. 66.18 Ταρσὸς ἡ Κίλιξ ὠνόμασται τῇ πτώσει Βελλεροφόντου ἐκέισε φοιτήσαντος καὶ κατὰ τὸν ταρσὸν πεπονθότος· ἡ Τερσὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ταῦρον τὸ ὄρος Τερσίαν κεκληθῆναι τὸ πρὶν, διὰ τὸ πρῶτον ἀνικμωθῆναι αὐτὸ κατακλυσμοῦ ἐξυδατοθείσης γῆς· τέρσαι γὰρ τὸ ἀναξηρᾶναι λέγεται. From St. Byz.

Gen. 67.1 ὑπάρχει δὲ αὕτη παράδυτος, τῷ ἐμφανῇ εἶναι τὸν Ταῦρον καὶ τούτου τοῖς γηλόφοις εἶργεσθαι, ταύτης δὲ διὰ μέσου Κύδνον τὸν ποταμὸν ὀδεύοντα εὐφορον χρηματίζειν τὴν χώραν . . . ἣν δὲ πάλαι Κύδνῳ τῷ ποταμῷ νῆσος, ἥτις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ περικλυζομένη εἰς τὴν νῦν θέσιν ἐλήλυθεν. Cf. Procop. *Aed.* 5.5.14–20, see *RE* Supplbd. 4 (1924) 1124.

Gen. 67.4 καὶ μὴν ὑπὸ Ἐριχθονίου κτίσεως ἐτετεύχε, κατεσχέθη δὲ παρὰ Ὀρσάνου ἐνὸς τῶν Τιτάνων καὶ ἐπικτίσεως εἴληχεν . . . εἴτε παρὰ Σεμιράμειως ἐπισκευῆς καὶ οἰκισμοῦ μείζονος εὐτύχηκεν, αὐτῆς τε εἰκόνα ἐκεῖσὶ φασιν ἀφωσιῶσθαι τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ, παρισταμένην Νίνῳ τῷ ταύτης ἀνδρὶ. All unique. Erichthonius and Orsanes are variants on Triptolemus and Heracles. See Roscher's *Lexikon* 4 (1910–15) 325 f. and *RE* 8A (1932) 2415 f.

Gen. 67.10 μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἐρειπιωθείσα ταῖς μετοικήσεσι παρὰ Σαρδανα-

πάλου ἐκ βάθρων σὺν Ἀγχιάλῃ ἀνέκτισται, ἐφ' αἷς ἐπιγέγραπται "Νινευὴς βασιλεὺς Ἀνακυνδαράξου παῖς ἐν μῇ ἡμέρᾳ Ταρσὸν τε καὶ Ἀγχιάλῃν ἔδειμεν." Of the several parallels Schol. Aristoph. *Aves* 1021 seems to be the nearest.

Gen. 94.8 καθὼς ὁ Ξέρξης κατὰ τὸ πρὸς Ἑλλησπόντου ζεύγμα σιδηροῖς ταύτην ἐμάστιξεν. Commonplace after Hdt. 7.35.

Gen. 107.14 ὑπῆρχε δὲ ὁ Βασίλειος ἐκ γένους μὲν πρεσβυτέρου Πάρθου Ἀρσάκου αὐχῶν, τοῦ περιθεμένου τὴν Ἀσσυρίων ἀρχὴν ἑαυτῷ ἐκ ψυχικῆς καὶ σωματικῆς καρτερότητος, καθεξῆς δὲ καὶ Τηριδάτου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς αὐτῆς σειρᾶς ἐξημμένου· ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ Φιλίππου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τῶν ἀρίστων ἡγεμόνων ἐξείχετο. From Nicetas-David *Vita Ignatii* (MPG 105 coll. 565–8); cf. *Theoph. cont.* 212, PsSymeon 689, and see *Byzantion* 9 (1934) 232; 11 (1936) 88.

Gen. 107.20 τραφεῖς τε νεανικῶς ὡς εἴ τις Ἀχιλλεὺς Χείρωνι τῷ Κενταύρῳ. Commonplace.

Gen. 111.12 αὐτοῦ ἐφαλλόμενος ὡς εἴ τις ἄλλον Βουκεφάλου Ἀλέξανδρος, ὡς Βελλεροφόντης Πηγάσῳ. Commonplace (Strabo 15.698D etc.).

Gen. 116.5 καὶ τὸ μὲν ὄνομα Ἰταλία ἐφεύρεν ἀπὸ Ἰταλοῦ τοῦ Σικελοῦ γενετῆρος, τοῦ μὲν πατὴρ τῆς Ἰταλίας χώρας τοῦ δὲ υἱοῦ Σικανίας ἢ Τρινακρίας ἐγκρατῶν γεγονότων. From Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.22, the only other place where Italus and Sicelus are father and son. See Jacoby on Hellanicus 4 F 79.

Gen. 116.7 Ἰταλία δὲ καὶ οὕτως, ἀπὸ τίνος περαιωσαμένης βοός, ἣν ἀθρόαν ἰδόντες ἐγχώριοι ἐκ γῆς ἐτέρας τὸν ἀπόπλουν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ποιουμένην διωκομένην τε παρὰ τῶν κτητόρων αὐτῆς ἐβόησαν "Ἰταλὸς Ἰταλός," ὃ τῇ ἑαυτῶν διαλέκτῳ ἐρμηνεύεται βοῦς, ἣ ἀπὸ τίνος ληστοῦ Ἰταλοῦ δι' Ἡρακλέους ἐκέισε ἀναιρεθέντος, τὴν κλῆσιν ἡγάγετο. Unique. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.35 and Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.110 (Hellanicus 4 F 111 Jacoby). The story of the cow here is somewhat similar to the story of the doe and the Huns at the Cimmerian Bosphorus (A. A. Vasiliev, *The Goths in the Crimea* [Cambridge, Mass. 1936] 24–30). For the ληστῆς δι' Ἡρακλέους ἀναιρεθείς compare PS 706.15 and GC 60.34 below.

Gen. 116.12 Λογγιβαρβία δὲ ἀπὸ τίνος Λογγιβάρβου τοῦ πρώτως κατασχόντος τὴν χώραν, ἐφ' ὅτῳ καὶ μέγα ἐξήνθιστο γένειον· λόγγη γὰρ παρὰ Λογγιβάρβους τὸ μέγα, βάρβα δὲ τὸ γένειον. If the misspelling is genuine, this is a forced, though obvious, invention of the author. See *RE* 23 (1924) 686.

Gen. 117.2 Συρακούσαις ὄνομα ἀπὸ τινων κτισασῶν ταύτας Ἀρχίου θυγατρῶν Σύρας καὶ Κόσσης, ἣ ἀπὸ τίνος ἐκέισε λίμνης, ἣ ἀπὸ τῆς πρὶν μὲν

κρήνης Συρακοῦς νῦν δὲ Ἀρεθούσης. Cf. Choeroboscus *In Theodosium* p. 751 Gaisford (2.242 Hilgard), also Plut. *Mor.* 773B (*Amat. narr.* 2). St. Byz. has a lake Syraco.

Gen. 118.11 Ζάκυνθος πρὸς ἄνεμον Ζέφυρον κατὰ τὸν καλούμενον Ἴχθὺν ἀπονένευκεν ἕκ τε Ζακύνθου τοῦ Μέροπος τῆς προσηγορίας τετύχηκεν. For Ἴχθὺς cf. Strabo 17.836D and Agathem. 24 (*GGM* 2.485). Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.50 and Paus. 8.24.2 (St. Byz.) make Zacynthus son of Dardanus.

Gen. 118.15 Μεθώνην τὴν πρὶν Πήδασον καλουμένην. From Strabo 7.359D rather than Paus. 4.35.1.

Gen. 126.10 Ἐν δὲ ταῖς κατὰ κυνηγεσίαν καὶ σφαιρισμὸν ἀχθοφορίαν τε καὶ πρὸς ἄλματα γενναιότησι πάννυ περιδέξιος ἦν ὁ ἄναξ Βασίλειος, ὥστε κατὰ κυνηγεσίαν μὲν καθυπερτερεῖν τῶν Κενταύρων, κτλ. I have shown in a note to appear in *CP* 46 (1951) that this passage is drawn from Nonnus *Dion.* 13–14, aside from references to Homer, whom Genesius often quotes elsewhere (62, 88, 89, 97, 101).

PS 686.16, GC 42.27, TC 387.15 (see above pp. 243, 244) Ἀδριανούπολις, ἥτις πρότερον μὲν Ὀρεστιάς ἐκαλεῖτο ἐξ Ὀρέστου υἱοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὃς ζήλῳ δικαίῳ διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Κλυταιμνήστρας δολοφονίαν ταύτην σὺν Αἰγίσθῳ ἀπεκτόνῳς λίαν ἐκμέμνηεν καὶ ἐν τῇ συνελύσει Ἔβρου Ἀρξοῦ τε καὶ Ἀρτάκου τῶν τριῶν ποταμῶν λουσάμενος τῆς νόσου ἀπήλλακτο· ἔνθα ταύτην οἰκοδομήσας ἐπὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀνόματι κέκληκεν. Ἀδριανὸς δὲ Καῖσαρ εὐκτίστοις ἐρύμασιν αὐτὴν μεγαλύνας πόλιν Ἀδριανοῦ μετακέκληκεν. αὕτη τρίτης ἡμέρας παρὰ ἀνδρὸς εὐπετοῦς ἐν διόδῳ Φιλιππουπόλεως σταδιάζεται, ἡγκαλισμένη ὄρει τῷ Αἴμῳ, παρ' ᾧ οἱ τρεῖς ποταμοὶ ἐς μισγάγγειαν οἶον συμβάλλετον ὀμβριμον ὕδωρ. Cf. *SHA Elagab.* 7 and Leo Diaconus p. 130 ed. Bonn., neither of which gives the names of the three rivers. *Artaces* is unique for the river *Tonzos* (see *RE* s. vv.), but cf. *Artanes* in Hdt. 4.49. From the Old Slavic translation of George Hamartolus (including GC) this notice passed into the Russian so-called *Chronicle of Nestor* (11th cent.); see S. H. Cross, "The Russian Primary Chronicle," *Harvard Studies in Philology and Literature* 12 (1930) 157.

PS 705.14, GC 31.32, TC 366.15 Τρίπολις ἡ κατὰ Φοινίκην διὰ τὰ τριῶν ἐκ γενεῶν συναχθῆναι, ἐξ Ἀραβίων καὶ Τυρίων καὶ Σιδονίων ἀποίκων. From St. Byz. (Strabo 16.754D).

GC 32.8, TC 367.5 (om. PS) Ἀβυδὸν τὴν καθ' Ἑλλάσποντον, ἣν Μιλησίων κατῴκισαν ἄποικοι. From St. Byz. (Thuc. 8.61, Strabo 13.587C, 590D).



PS 705.16, GC 32.10, TC 367.8 τὸ Αἰγαῖον πέλαγος τὴν κλῆσιν ἀπέιληφεν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ὑδάτων φορᾶς αἰσούσης κατὰ τρόπον αἰγός. Cf. Schol. Ap. Rh. 1.831 ed. Wendel, where codex A adds this same *etymon*.

PS 705.18, GC 32.12, TC 367.11 Στρόβιλος ὠνομάσθη ἀπὸ τῆς τοπικῆς θέσεως. The island of Strobilus, between Myndus and Halicarnassus (Const. Porph. *De them.* p. 36.20), was attacked by the Saracens ca. 914 (*Theoph. cont.* 388, *Georg. Mon. cont.* 880, etc.).

PS 705.19, GC 32.13, TC 367.12 Λάμψακος ἀπὸ φωτὸς λάμψεως, ὅπερ νυκτὶ Φωκέων θεμελιούντων ταύτην εὐξαμένων θεῶθεν ἐπέλαμψεν καὶ ἡ τῶν θεμελίων βάσις καλῶς κεκραταίωται. Cf. *Etym. magn.* and *Etym. Gud.* (Seleucus Alex. p. 164.23 Reitzenstein), and, for a different *etymon*, Charon of Lampsacus 262 F 7 Jacoby.

PS 705.21, GC 32.16, TC 367.15 "Ιμβρος ἀπὸ "Ιμβρου κέκληται υἱοῦ "Αθηος, οὗ γενέτης Στάφυλος Διονύσου φίλτατος υἱός. Unique and remarkable for the quotation of an unknown epic verse, perhaps from Dionysius *Bassarica*, often quoted by St. Byz. *Anthes* should be *Euanthes*, who is elsewhere son of Oenopion instead of Staphylus, or son of Dionysus himself. See *RE* 11 (1907) 845.62; 28 (1930) 1911.34; 6A (1929) 2146.63.

PS 706.2, GC 32.9, TC 367.7 Ἑλλησποντος ἀπὸ Ἑλλης τῆς Φρίξεο ἀδελφῆς τῷ ἐκείσε πελάγει ριφείσης. Commonplace.

PS 706.3, GC 32.13, TC 367.11 Κιβύρρα ἀπὸ Κιβύρρου ἀδελφοῦ [Μαρσοῦ τε καὶ Κιδράμου]. The words in brackets are lacking in Vatic. 167 (fol. 129r, see note 2) as well as in PS and GC, and I am at a loss to know where the editors of TC obtained them. St. Byz. s.v. Τάβαι mentions the brothers Cibyras and Marsyas, but Cidramas is quite unknown. If the words are genuine, they probably came from St. Byz. s.v. Κίδραμα in the lacuna in kappa. Robert (see note 1) discusses this notice at length.

PS 706.3, GC 32.17, TC 367.17 ἡ Θάσος Χρυσὴ πρώην ἐλέγετο. From Arr. *Bithyn.* 156 F 68 Jacoby.

PS 706.4, GC 32.18, TC 367.18 Σαμοθράκη ἡ ἐν τῇ Θράκῃ χερρόνηρος, ἥτις πρώην Θηριούσα διὰ τὸ θηρίων πεπληρῶσθαι καὶ ἱερὰν νυμφῶν οὔσαν ὠνομάζετο, μετέπειτα δὲ τοῦ ῥοῦ συρραγέντος εἰς νῆσον συνέστη καὶ ὑπὸ Σαμίων μετοίκων ἐν κατασχέσει γενομένη Σαμοθράκη μετωνομάσθη. Unique except for the Samians (Apollod. 244 F 178 Jacoby, Ps-Scymnus 693, *et al.*).

PS 706.8 Λαοδίκεια κατωνομάσθη ἀπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς Σελεύκου τοῦ Ἀντιόχου, ὃς ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι ταύτης ἔκτισε τὴν Λαοδίκειαν. From Malalas

p. 202.21 rather than St. Byz. (Strabo 16.749D). Malalas says Laodice was daughter of Seleucus Nicator, Strabo and Stephanus say she was his mother; neither mentions Antiochus.

PS 706.10 Τένεδος ἀπὸ τοῦ Τέννου τοῦ υἱοῦ Κῦκνου τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ ἱεροῦ ἔδους τῆς Ἀθήνης. Athena is a mistake for Apollo. St. Byz. is the only other author who gives the *etymon* ἔδος, and he does not mention Poseidon. See *RE* 9A (1934) 502–6.

PS 706.12, GC 55.25, TC 413.3 Μεσημβρία ἢ πρὶν Μενεβρία ἀπὸ Μένου Θρακὸς τοῦ ταύτην οἰκίσαντος καὶ βρία τὸ παρὰ τισι Θρακῶν πόλισμα λεγόμενον, πρὸς δὲ τὸ εὐφραδέστερον Μεσημβρία νῦν ὀνομάζεται. From Strabo 7.319B rather than St. Byz. Cf. PS 706.17 below and Const. Porph. *De them.* p. 45.1–2.

PS 706.15 Αἷμος ἀπὸ τινος ἀναιρεθέντος ἐκέισε δι' Ἡρακλέους καὶ τὸν τόπον αἰμάξαντος· ἀκρωτήριον δέ ἐστι Θράκης. Unique. Cf. Hesychius *Patria C-poleōs* 17 and, for Heracles, Gen. 116.7 above. See Jacoby on Arr. *Bithyn.* 156 F 75.

PS 706.16 Μήδεια ἀπὸ Μήδης τῆς Αἰήτου θυγατρὸς κατωνόμασται. Corrupt. *Media* was derived from *Medeia* (Hdt. 7.62) or *Medos* son of *Medeia* (Jacoby on Hecataeus 1 F 286).

PS 706.17 Σηλυβρία ἀπὸ Σήλνους τοῦ Θρακῶν βασιλέως, ὅστις αὐτὴν ῥκισεν. From Strabo 7.319B, cf. PS 706.12 above.

PS 706.18 Μακεδονία ἢ πρὶν Ἀμαθία λεγομένη ἀπὸ ἀρχαίου τινὸς ἡγεμόνος. ἦν δὲ καὶ πόλις Ἀμαθία λεγομένη πρὸς τῇ θαλάσῃ τῷ ἔθνει ἐπώνυμος. From Strabo 7 frag. 11.

PS 706.21, GC 59.6, TC 420.8 Νικόπολις κατὰ τὸ ἐπώνυμον τῆς νίκης ἦν Αὔγουστος Σεβαστὸς κατὰ Ἀντωνίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας εἰργάσατο καὶ τὴν Αἰγυπτίῳ ἀρχὴν τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ὑπέκλινεν. From Strabo 7.325c, cf. Const. Porph. *De them.* p. 55.6–8.

GC 60.34, TC 424.1, PS 746.18 (om. PS 706) Εὐξείνος πόντος, ὃς κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν κέκληται· κακὸς εἶνος γὰρ διὰ τὰς συνεχεῖς τῶν ἐκεῖσε ληστῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἐπεξενωμένους καταδρομὰς, οὓς ὥς φασιν ἀνελάν Ἡρακλῆς καὶ ἀδείας τυχόντες οἱ παροῖται τοῦτον Εὐξείνον ἐπώνομασαν. Cf. Schol. Dion. Per. 21, 146 (*GGM* 2.432, 438) and *Etym. magn.*

PS 706.23, GC 61.1, TC 424.5, PS 746.22 Ἱερὸν Εὐξείνου, ὃ παρὰ τῶν τῆς Ἀργοῦς πλωτῶρων διερχομένων ἐκεῖσε ἀνίδρυται. Commonplace after Ap. Rh. 2.531, Polyb. 4.39.6.

PS 707.1, GC 60.32, TC 423.22, PS 746.17 Φάρος ἀφίδρυμά τι ῥ πυρὸς ἐπιτίθεται εἰς ὁδηγίαν ἀπρόσκοπτον τοῖς ἐν νυκτὶ παροδίταις. The Pharos at the upper end of the Bosphorus is mentioned in the Russian

attacks of 941 and 1043 (*Georg. Mon. cont.* p. 914, Cedrenus II p. 552 ed. Bonn.).

PS 707.3, GC 60.26, TC 423.16, PS 746.12 ῥως, οἱ καὶ Δρομίται, φερώνυμοι ἀπὸ ῥως τινος σφοδροῦ διαδραμόντες ἀπηχήματα τῶν χρησαμένων ἐξ ὑποθήκης ἢ θεοκλυτίας τινὸς καὶ ὑπερσχόντων αὐτοὺς, ἐπικέκληνται. Δρομίται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀξέως τρέχειν αὐτοῖς προσεγένετο. ἐκ γένους δὲ τῶν Φράγγων καθίστανται. GC, TC and PS 746 omit φερώνυμοι — προσεγένετο. This unique notice, which figured in the historic controversy over the nationality of the first Russians, was discussed by E. Kunik, *Die Berufung der schwedischen Rodsen durch die Finnen und Slaven* II (St-Petersburg 1845) 394–421, 495 f., who referred Δρομίται to the Ἀχίλλειος δρόμος (St. Byz.). S. Runciman, *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus* (Cambridge, Eng. 1929) 111, refers the term to the Russian boats (corsairs).

PS 707.7 ὁ Τρικέφαλος βουνὸς κατὰ τὸ Ὀψίκιον ἀπὸ τοῦ τριχῆ κεφαλουῖσθαι τῷ σχήματι εἴρηται, ὥσπερ καὶ Ῥαδηνὸς ἀπὸ Ῥάδης κώμης τοῦ τῶν Ἀρατολικῶν θέματος. I have not found other mention of these places. The admiral Joannes Radinos is mentioned at PS 723.17 and 735.12.

GC 65.5, TC 437.16 (om. PS) Προικόνησος, ἦντινα Νεβρίαν ὠνομασμένην κατὰ χρησμόν δεδομένον ἀποίοις Σαμίων, οἷς ἀφικομένοις πρὸς νῆσον καὶ τῷ θεῷ ἱλασκομένοις ἀριστοποιουμένοις τε ἀπορία ἐτύγχανεν ὁπόθεν ὕδωρ κομίσουσιντο· γυνή δέ τις ἔφη αὐτοῖς, “εἰ ἔχετε πρόχουν, δώσω ὑμῖν ὕδωρ.” ὅπερ λαβόντες, ὡς ὁ χρησμός, καὶ γῆν ἐξητήσαντο· τῆς δὲ καὶ ταύτην δεδωκυίας Πρόχουν τὴν νῆσον ὠνόμασαν καὶ τοῖς ἀργυροῖς νομίμασι πρόχουν εἰκόνιζον. The text of this notice is corrupt in Vatic. 167 (fol. 153v, see note 2) and interpolated in the editions of TC. I follow Istrin's text of Vatic. 153 (see note 14). For the story cf. Schol. Ap. Rh. 2.279 and *Etym. magn. gen.* s.v. πρόκας, which give Milesians instead of Samians. Νεβρία (*Nebria*, *Neuris*) is also in Plin. *NH* 5.151 and St. Byz. s.v. Ἀλώνη.

PS 728.21 Χρυσόπολις, ἥτις ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρον περιτυχόντα τῇ πόλει τοῦ Βύζαντος κατὰ τινὰ τε ταύτης χώρον τὸν αὐτοῦ λαὸν στρατηγήσαι, ἐφ' ὅτῳ θεεικότα περίβολον προσονόμασαι Στρατήγιον, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν μεταναστεύσαντα καὶ τοῖς ἀντίπεραν προσελθόντα χρυσίον ἱκανὸν ἐπιδούναι τῷ οἰκείῳ λαῷ, Χρυσόπολις προσηγόρευται. From Malalas p. 192 f.; cf. PsCodin. *Patria C-rolēis* p. 183 ed. Preger.

PS 729.4 οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρυσὸν ἐκ μετάλλων αὐτῆς γίνεσθαι ταύτην φασὶν ὠνομάσθαι, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ Χαλκηδὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔχειν χαλκόν, ἢ ἀπὸ Χαλκίδος θυγατρὸς Νικομήδους τῆς ταύτην κτισάσης. The *etyma* from gold

and bronze, though obvious, seem to be unique. The daughter of Nicomedes is also unique. See *RE* 20 (1919) 1555.

PS 729.7 ἐν τοιαύτῃ γούν τῇ Χρυσοπόλει καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοῦ Χάρητος παράκοιτις ἐτελεύτησε, Δάμαλις ὀνομαζομένη, αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χάρητος Ἀθήνηθεν πεμφθέντος ἐπαμύναι τοῖς Βυζαντίοις· ἥς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μνημείου δάμαλις βούς καθ' ὁμωνυμίαν ἐν κίονι ἀνεστήλωται, συμβεβλημένον καὶ ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον ὧδε· Ἰναχίης οὐκ εἰμι βοὸς τύπος, κτλ. From Hesychius *Patria C-poleōs* 28–30, cf. Const. Porph. *De them.* p. 63 f.

TC 464.6 Πρίετος, ἥτις Πραίνετος παρὰ τῶν ἐγχωρίων ἐπωνόμασαι ἔκ τινος πατρὶου θεοῦ Βιθυνῶν τὴν κλήσιν ἐπιτεθεῖσα. Cf. Plin. *NH* 31.23, Arr. *Bithyn.* 156 F 94 Jacoby; Philostr. *Vita Ap.* 1.6; see Roscher's *Lexikon* 3.2 (1909) 2990.

TC 464.21 Ὀλυμπος, οὗ καὶ Μυσίων προπάλαι γραφῇ παραδέδωκεν (*sic*), Μυσῶν τὸ παλαιὸν ἐν τούτῳ οἰκούντων. Commonplace: Strabo 13.564B, Arr. *Bithyn.* 156 F 15, 59 Jacoby.

TC 465.4 Προῦσα πόλις ἀνδρὸς τὸ πάλαι Βιθυνῶν βασιλεύοντος, <ὃς> ἀνδραγαθίας καὶ πολέμων τῶν τῆνικάδε βασιλέων ὑπεραρθέντων σύμβολον μνήμης τὴν τοιάνδε πόλιν ἐξεργάσατο. Cf. Strabo 12.564B, St. Byz., Euseb. *ad an. Abr.* 1390.

TC 465.9 θερμά, ἐν οἷς μῦθοί φασιν Ἡρακλῆν κατὰ ζήτησιν Ὕλου περιπλανώμενον τὸν ἐξ Ὕλου φόνον τῷ λύθρῳ ἐναποσμήξασθαι. No other author makes Heracles murder Hylas, if that is what these words mean. Cf. Strabo 12.564A.

Our attempt to identify the sources of the notices has been only partially successful. While in some cases the source is certain and in others it is certainly lost, there remain a number of uncertain cases where a source is possible if we assume some alteration in substance on the part of the excerptor.

Strabo and Stephanus Byzantius seem to have supplied the greatest number of notices.<sup>16</sup> Two well-known facts raise a problem with these sources: Stephanus himself used Strabo extensively in his own work, and the extant text of Stephanus is a much abridged epitome of the original work. As some of our notices from Strabo are actually *via* Stephanus, it is tempting to suppose the same for all of them, and even to attribute other unattached notices to the lost unabridged work of Stephanus. This was the view of Joh. Geffcken (see note 1). However, the notices from Stephanus agree closely with the extant epitome, with no traces of a fuller text, and

<sup>16</sup> I overlooked the Byzantine chronicles in my article "The tradition of Stephanus Byzantius," *TAPA* 69 (1938) 333–348.

some of the notices from Strabo are entirely lacking in Stephanus. It seems more probable to me, therefore, that the authors of our notices used the epitome only of Stephanus and Strabo also along with it. It is true, however, that Constantine Porphyrogennetus, who was not very distant from them, used the work of Stephanus unabridged or at least less abridged than we have it.

Another probable source for several of the notices is Arrian's *Bithyniaca*, since some of them agree with extant fragments and others refer to Bithynian history. This work was still used by Eustathius in the 12th century. Other sources certainly used, though less extensively, were John Malalas' chronicle, Hesychius' *Patria Constantinopoleōs* and probably Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities*. Genesius also quoted Homer and in one passage drew on Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* (see p. 248). Various scholia seem to have contributed some notices, especially those on Apollonius Rhodius and Dionysius Periegetes. These scholia were also among the sources of the *Etymologicum magnum genuinum*, which was perhaps a contemporary work.<sup>17</sup>

The multiplicity of sources shows that the compilation of our notices was not a simple process. On the other hand, the occurrence of similar notices in two or three entirely different works — Genesius, Paris. 854 and the fourth part of *Theoph. cont.* — shows contrarily that the compilation was repeated and hence was not complicated. L. Robert (see note 1) supposes that the notices were taken from some single lost source, such as an etymological or geographical lexicon. But it is improbable that such a valuable work, if it was finished and published, would have perished since the tenth century without leaving other traces. More probably, the notices may have been collected informally from their various sources<sup>18</sup> and then became the property of a school of chronography, as I have stated above (p. 245), which produced the various chronicles in which they now occur. Several of the notices have parallels in Constantine Porphyrogennetus' *De thematibus*, suggesting still closer connection with his literary activities than is indicated by Genesius' dedication to him.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Reitzenstein in *RE* 11 (1907) 812–4.

<sup>18</sup> Compare the collection of similar historico-geographical notices edited from an unknown source by John Hudson, *Geographiae veteris scriptores graeci minores* IV (Oxford 1712) 38–40.

<sup>19</sup> Postscript. I have just seen the article by R. J. H. Jenkins, "The supposed Russian attack on Constantinople in 907: evidence of the Pseudo-Symeon," *Speculum* 24 (1949) 403–6, which deals with part of the above material.