

Rafał Kosiński
Uniwersytet w Białymstoku

The *Chronicle* by George the Monk and Its Relation to Theodore Lector's Work

Abstract: The hereby article deals with the dependence relation between the *Chronicle* by George the Monk and Theodore Lector's *Ecclesiastical History*. As our analysis has demonstrated, George the Monk makes ample use of the material from Theodore's *History*, either through the *Epitome* or through some unidentified abridgement of Theophanes' *Chronography*. In his treatment of the *Epitome* material, George the Monk frequently copies it literally, slightly adapting it to fit in with the composition of his *Chronicle*. The author also draws on the *Epitome* of John Diacrinomenos' work, from which he quotes fairly accurately. It is best to approach with caution Carl de Boor's proposition to ascribe two passages (annotated as E 397 and E 441 in Hansen's edition) to the *Epitome*, but it is fair to suggest that another passage from George the Monk's *Chronicle*, concerning the emperor Theodosius and an unidentified hermit (607, 13–608, 9), should be associated with the Theodoran tradition.

Key words: George the Monk, Theodore Lector, *Church History*, Theophanes

Chronicle by George the Monk

George the Monk's *Chronicle* (*Χρονικὸν σύντομον*) enjoyed much popularity in the Byzantine Empire, as may be attested by a considerable number of the extant manuscripts as well as by its rendition in Old Church Slavonic.¹ None the less, the *Chronicle* did not generate much interest in academic circles and its historical usefulness was not very highly regarded.² Consequently, source-related research on this work has been very limited, with Carl de Boor, the editor

¹ Cf. H. Hunger, 1978, p. 347–351.

² Cf. D.E. Afinogenov, 1991, p. 102–103.

of the *Chronicle*, being basically the only scholar who wrote a more comprehensive study on the subject.³ Following his edition of the *Chronicle* in 1904, only a handful of minor works, dealing mainly with issues such as the time of composition and manuscript tradition, were published, which would concentrate the attention of the scholars on the historical events from the period closest to the composition of the work.⁴ Recently, much of the attention has been focused on Dmitri Afinogenov's hypothesis, according to which the *Chronicle* version as published by de Boor (the so-called *vulgata*) is not its original form, but an elaboration of the earlier one that survived in the manuscript *Coislinianus* 305, considered by Marie-Aude Monégier du Sorbier, by contrast, as a later redaction of the *vulgate*.⁵

There is very little information on the author of the *Chronicle*. Based on the bits of information in the manuscripts, including referring to him usually as "sinner" (ἁμαρτωλός), it is assumed that George was a monk in an unspecified monastery in Constantinople.⁶ The *Chronicle* begins with the Creation of the World and is concluded in the year 843, with the re-establishment of the worship of icons. However, it was actually composed sometime later, most likely after 870.⁷ George makes very extensive use of the Biblical and patristic literature, generally ignoring secular works. For his account of the Late Antique history, he resorted to the works by Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius of Alexandria, Epiphanius of Salamis, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, Palladius, Rufinus, Mark the Monk, Nilus of Ancyra, Isidore of Pelusium, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret of Cyrrihus, Gelasius of Kyzikos, Ps.-Dionysios Areopagites, John Malalas, Theophanes, and many others such as, notably, Theodore Lector. As an author, George did not care much about the accuracy or the chronology of the passages drawn from a variety of sources, focusing on the edificatory aspect of the narratives and anecdotes that could enrich spiritually and improve morally his audience.⁸

The relation between George's *Chronicle* and Symeon the Logothete's work had already been long observed;⁹ it was assumed in the earlier historiography that the latter author had used George the Monk's *Chronicle*,¹⁰ yet it was fairly

³ C. de Boor, 1978, p. 5–83. The aforementioned preface is devoted, in large part, to the manuscript tradition of the *Chronicle*.

⁴ G. Moravcsik, 1983, p. 277–280. An exception is the unpublished doctoral dissertation of M.-A. Monégier du Sorbier, 1985. A number of Shestakov's works had already been published before de Boor's critical edition, cf. S.P. Shestakov, 1891 and S.P. Shestakov, 1892.

⁵ Cf. D. Afinogenov, 1999, p. 437–447; D. Afinogenov, 2004, p. 239–246 and M.-A. Monégier du Sorbier, 1985, p. 483–501.

⁶ According to S. P. Shestakov, 1891, p. 121 the term *Harmatulos* was also used to refer to other monks who composed chronicles. The 11th-century manuscript of the *Scorialensis* I, Φ, 1 also refers to George as οἰκουμενικός διδάσκαλος. Cf. C. de Boor, 1978, p. 20. For the meaning of this epithet, see R. Browning, 1962, p. 167–170, 178–180.

⁷ Cf. W. Treadgold, 2013, p. 115–116.

⁸ Cf. W. Treadgold, 2013, p. 117–119.

⁹ Cf. V. Vasiljevskij, 1895, p. 96–119; M. Weingart, 1923, p. 43–44 and A. Kazhdan, 1959, p. 127–142.

¹⁰ J.B. Bury, 1912, p. 457.

soon found out that such a dependence is impossible.¹¹ As a result, one might suppose that there must have existed a common source used by the two authors. According to Warren Treadgold's hypothesis, that source was an anonymous *Epitome* and a *Continuatio* of Theophanes' work, unfortunately now lost, composed c. 850. This putative work was supposed to have transformed the annalistic structure of Theophanes' *Chronography* into a continuous narrative and to have complemented it until the year 829, which is the date that terminates the parallels between the works of George and Symeon.¹²

Finally, it is necessary to say a few words about the aforementioned hypothesis on the preservation of George the Monk's original *Chronicle* within the manuscript *Coislinianus* 305 (C),¹³ not in the so-called *vulgata*. The correctness of this particular theory cannot be resolved in the present text, but it should be noted that the manuscript *Coislinianus* 305 deals with the events beginning from Marcian's up to Anastasius' reign in a very abridged form, as it omits two extensive passages which can be found in the *vulgata* version. The first of these is an account of the Council of Chalcedon (de Boor, p. 611, 20–612, 20). In the manuscript C f. 276v, line 7, the sentence referring to the convocation of the Council of Chalcedon (de Boor, p. 611, 18–19) is followed directly by the beginning of the narrative on Symeon Stylites (de Boor, p. 612, 21f), preceded with the conjunction καὶ. The other instance, of more significance here, is the omission in *Coislinianus* 305 of a very extensive narrative on Patriarch Euphemios of Constantinople, drawn from Theodore Lector's *Epitome* (de Boor, p. 623, 14–626, 2). The manuscript C on f. 280r, line 16, concludes the account of the emperor Anastasius' reign with a narrative on the Persian king Kavad (= de Boor, p. 622, 19–623, 13). Besides, there is one more, and very important, difference between the two versions of the *Chronicle*, which can also be applied to the passages drawn from the *Epitome* of Theodore's work. In the *vulgata*, the story of Patriarch Gennadios and a dishonourable priest (de Boor, p. 616, 15–18; C f. 278r, l. 6–10) is followed by the narrative of Gennadios' night vision (de Boor, p. 616, 19–617, 3), which in *Coislinianus* 305 is interpolated, with certain alterations, into Zeno's reign (f. 278r, l. 36–278v, l. 6), ensuing after the account of Basiliskos' usurpation. One of the possible reasons behind this change is an accidental omission of this narrative by the manuscript C's scribe/editor, who might have realized his mistake later on and provided the

¹¹ G. Moravcsik, 1983, p. 515–518. The most significant argument in favour of Symeon's independence from George is the presence of long theological deliberation on the pages of George's *Chronicle*, which are completely absent in the works of the Logothete and Theophanes. If Symeon had been dependent on George, he would have had to remove methodically all such passages, which is not very likely, cf. S. Wahlgren, 2006, p. 119*. Besides, the Logothete's work is more complete in certain places than that of George the Monk, who makes no mention of many political events, which would have been impossible if we were to assume that the latter author had been the main source for Symeon. Likewise, there are no parallels between these works for the period of the reigns of Theophilus and Michael III, cf. W. Treadgold, 1979, p. 168.

¹² W. Treadgold, 1979, p. 159–197 and W. Treadgold, 2013, p. 110.

¹³ For a description of this 11th century manuscript, see C. de Boor, 1978, p. 60–83; M.-A. Monégier du Sorbier, 1985, p. 266–277, and p. 479–502. Cf. also K. Prächter, 1906, p. 307–330.

missing part of the story at a further place. This explanation seems quite plausible in view of the fact that the account of the dishonourable priest as well as that of Gennadios' night vision end with the verb "ἔτελεύτησεν". It could be easily imagined that the scribe/editor of the manuscript C finished the first narrative with this verb and would have subsequently proceeded to the sentence coming after the same word that finished the other story.¹⁴ As he had become aware of this error, he added the narrative of Gennadios' night vision at the further place in the text. Apart from these omissions, the manuscript C shows, in the passages drawn from the *Epitome* of Theodore's and John Diacrinomenos' works, many minor differences, of which just one is closer to the *Epitome*: in the story of Kavad that concludes the account of Anastasius' reign, *Coislinianus* 305, f. 280r, l. 4 replaces the *vulgata* form θεραπόντων (de Boor, p. 623, 3) with the version μάγων, which can also be found in the *Epitome*. The other differences in the C are not closer to the *Epitome*.¹⁵ The omissions in the manuscript *Coislinianus* 305 in the part chronologically coincident with Theodore Lector's *History* may suggest that the *vulgata* represents a more complete (earlier?) version of George's *Chronicle*, while the manuscript C – an abridged (later?) one. Regardless of the question of which version of the *Chronicle* is the original one, for which we would need to make a thorough comparison between the both versions of the *Chronicle*,¹⁶ the present text has been based on de Boor's critical edition,¹⁷ with all the alterations as present in the manuscript *Coislinianus* 305, here designated with the C, taken into consideration, identified, and indicated.

As early as 1882, in one of his studies on George the Monk, Carl de Boor concentrated his attention on the sources for the earlier events represented in the *Chronicle*, from the reigns of Leo I, Zeno, and Anastasius.¹⁸ He showed indisputably that the source of information for many of the events from that period described there was the *Church History* by Theodore Lector, or, funda-

¹⁴ According to M.-A. Monégier du Sorbier, 1985, p. 268, the part concerning the period in question was written by the main copyist of this manuscript.

¹⁵ Although G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 30, states that "Der Codex Coislinianus gr. 305 (P), eine Redaktion von Γ [George the Monk's *Chronicle*], hat übrigens einige weitere Exzerpte aus E [*Epitome*] zugesetzt, manchmal auch seinen Text E etwas angeglichen," this comment refers in fact to other sources, not to the passages from the epitome of the *History* by Theodore and John Diacrinomenos (in an explanation of his conjecture at n. 5, Hansen makes reference to an article by de Boor [de Boor, 1882, p. 176–179], who analyzed a citation from the work by Philip of Syde, as found in George the Monk's *Chronicle*).

¹⁶ The differences between *vulgata* and *Coislinianus* 305 can be found in de Boor's *apparatus critici* (but one should be aware of certain errors at several places); the most important of these are also given in M.-A. Monégier du Sorbier, 1985, p. 273–274 and 479–483.

¹⁷ As there have been no critical studies or editions of the manuscript *Coislinianus* 305 published to date, the statement of Alexander Kazhdan (Kazhdan, 2006, p. 45), as cited by Warren Treadgold (Treadgold, 2013, p. 114, n. 120), rings true: "We shall ignore the problem of manuscript tradition, and accept for better or worse the edition of de Boor as the original of *Chronicle*".

¹⁸ C. de Boor, 1882, p. 276–295. On the sources for the reigns of Theodosius II and Marcian see Shestakov, 1892, p. 29–33. For the question of the relation of George the Monk's *Chronicle* to Theodore Lector's work, cf. also C. de Boor, 1978, p. lxxviii–lxxix.

mentally, the *Epitome* of that history. As de Boor's findings were not disputed, Günther Christian Hansen adopted them in full for the purpose of his critical edition of Theodore's work.

The present article aims to focus on George's borrowings from Theodore's work, George the Monk's *modus operandi* with this source against a background of the use of Theophanes' *Chronography*. Further on, it will examine if the two passages from the *Chronicle* that Hansen incorporated in the edition of Theodore's work as part of his *Epitome* (E 397 and E 441) may have actually come from this particular source, with a consideration of the question as to which manuscript tradition of the *Epitome* was employed by George. The final section will discuss whether Theodore's or the epitomator's work could have been the source for another account from the *Chronicle* (607, 13–608, 9).

Passages Drawn from the *Epitome* by Theodore Lector

George's work features as many as 12 passages borrowed from Theodore's *Epitome* which are quoted verbatim or almost literally:¹⁹

- George the Monk, 616, 15–18 ~ E 383 (**P**, f. 17r A, l. 19–24 [Cramer 103, 24–26]; **V** 46 Papadopoulos-Kerameus; **B**, f. 237r, l. 19–20 [PG I, 16]) almost literal,
- George the Monk, 616, 19–617, 3 ~ E 396 (**P**, f. 17v B, l. 3–13 [Cramer 104, 28–32]; **V** 56 Papadopoulos-Kerameus; **B**, f. 237v, l. 8–10 [PG I, 26]) ~ Theophanes AM 5955 (112, 33–113, 2),
- George the Monk, 617, 3–5 ~ E 385 (**P**, f. 17r B, l. 4–7 [103, 31–32 Cramer]; **V** 48 Papadopoulos-Kerameus; **B**, f. 237r, l. 23 [PG I, 18]) ~ Theophanes AM 5957 (114, 11–12),
- George the Monk, 618, 10–14 ~ E 391 (**V** 53 Papadopoulos-Kerameus; **B**, f. 237r, l. 33–37 [PG I, 21]) from ἀποταξάμενος literal,
- George the Monk, 618, 21–619, 8 ~ E 436 (**B**, f. 238r, l. 9–12 [PG II, 2]),
- George the Monk, 624, 4–12 ~ E 446 (**B**, f. 238r, l. 21–26 [PG II, 6]) ~ Theophanes AM 5983 (136, 5–13),
- George the Monk, 624, 12–15 ~ E 448 (**B**, f. 238r, l. 26–28 [PG II, 7]) ~ Theophanes AM 5983 (136, 13–16),
- George the Monk, 624, 15–625, 3 ~ E 449 (**B**, f. 238r, l. 31–40 [PG II, 9]) ~ Theophanes AM 5985 (137, 23–25),
- George the Monk, 625, 3–6 ~ E 450 (**B**, f. 238r, l. 40–42 [PG II, 10]) ~ Theophanes AM 5988 (140, 7–8), the final sentence in the *Epitome*

¹⁹ In the listing below, the following critical editions are referenced: C. de Boor, 1978 and V.M. Istrin (George the Monk), Hansen, 1995 (Theodore Lector and John Diacrinomenos) and C. de Boor, 1883 (Theophanes). For the individual manuscripts of the *Epitome* (because of the uniform character of Hansen's edition), I have used the manuscripts (except for the manuscript V, which was unfortunately unavailable) as well as their previous editions: **B** – *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 86.1, cols. 165–216; **V** – A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 1901, p. 1–25; **P** – J. A. Cramer, 1839, p. 100–109; **M** – E. Miller, 1873, p. 396–403. In references to particular places in the text, places in a specific manuscript and in the relevant editions are indicated.

- complemented as based on the works of George the Monk and Theophanes,²⁰
- George the Monk, 625, 6–15 ~ E 455 (**B**, f. 238v, l. 4–9 [PG II, 12]²¹) ~ Theophanes AM 5987 (139, 12–13),
 - George the Monk, 625, 15–626, 1 ~ E 457 (**B**, f. 238v, l. 11–16 [PG II, 15]) ~ Theophanes AM 5889 (140, 19–26),
 - George the Monk, 626, 1–2 ~ E 458 (**V** 78 Papadopoulos-Kerameus; **B**, f. 238v, l. 10–11 [PG II, 14]) ~ Theophanes AM 5889 (140, 26–27).

Table 1. Literal analogies between the *Chronicle* by George the Monk and the *Epitome* of Theodore's work (bold type is used to mark the verbatim citations from the *Epitome* in George the Monk or Theophanes; literal analogies in George the Monk and Theophanes are underlined)

George the Monk, <i>Chronica</i>	Theodore Lector, <i>Epitome</i>	Theophanes, <i>Chronographia</i>
616, 15–18 ὅς γε θεῖος ἀνὴρ Γεννάδιος [C <i>om.</i> Γεννάδιος] Ἐλευθερίῳ τῷ μάρτυρι δι' ἓνα κληρικὸν τοῦ ναοῦ αὐτοῦ μὴ καλῶς πολιτευόμενον ἐδήλωσε φάσκων· ὁ στρατιώτης σου [C <i>om.</i> σου] ἀτακτεῖ· ἢ διόρθωσαι τοῦτον ἢ ἔκκοψον. ὁ δὲ εὐθύς [C: παρευθύς] ἔτελεύτησεν.	383 PVB Ἐλευθερίῳ τῷ μάρτυρι δι' ἓνα κληρικὸν τοῦ ναοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐδήλωσεν ὁ Γεννάδιος ὅτι «ὁ στρατιώτης σου ἀτακτεῖ· ἢ διόρθωσαι τοῦτον ἢ ἔκκοψον.» ὁ δὲ εὐθύς ἔτελεύτησεν.	absent
616, 19–617, 3 ὁ αὐτὸς νυκτὸς [C <i>om.</i> ὁ αὐτὸς νυκτὸς; <i>add.</i> Ἐφ' οὗ Γεννάδιος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως] ἐλθὼν [C κατελθὼν νυκτὸς] εἰς τὸ ἅγιον [C <i>om.</i> ἅγιον] θυσιαστήριον εὐξασθαι [C προσεύξασθαι] εἶδέ τι [C <i>om.</i> εἶδέ τι; <i>add.</i> καὶ ἰδὼν] φάσμα δαιμόνιον, ᾧ [C ὁ καὶ] ἐπιτιμῆσας ἤκουσε κράζοντος ὡς αὐτοῦ μὲν ζώντος ἐνδίδωσιν, ὕστερον δὲ κρατήσῃ πάντως [C <i>om.</i>	396 PV (underlined is the word missing in this version) B Γεννάδιος <u>νυκτὸς</u> κατελθὼν εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον εὐξασθαι εἶδέν τι φάσμα δαιμόνιον. ᾧ ἐπιτιμῆσας ἤκουσε κράζοντος, ὡς αὐτοῦ μὲν ζώντος ἐνδίδωσιν, ὕστερον δὲ κρατήσῃ πάντως τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὅπερ δείσας Γεννάδιος πολλὰ τὸν θεὸν ἰκετεύσας μετὰ μικρὸν ἔτελεύτησεν.	AM 5955 (112,33–113,2) τοῦ δὲ Γενναδίου τ νυκτὶ εὐχομένου ἐντὸς τοῦ θυσιαστήριου, ἰδεῖν λέγεται φάντασμα διαμονίου, ᾧ καὶ ἐπιτιμῆσας ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ κρατήσῃ πάντως τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὅπερ δείσας Γεννάδιος πολλὰ ὑπὲρ τούτου τὸν θεὸν ἐδυσώπει.

²⁰ The manuscript **B** contains a gap of about 15 characters between the words ὁ — ἠσβόλωσαν. As Hansen assumes, they may have been likely removed on purpose, cf. Theodoros Anagnostes, p. 127, *apparatus*. The editor reconstructed the last sentence on the basis of the accounts in George the Monk and Theophanes.

²¹ The manuscript **B** overlaps with the **V** 77 only to a very slight degree: προχειρίζεται δὲ Μακεδόνιον, πρεσβύτερος ὑπάρχων τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ σκευοφύλαξ.

<p>πάντως] <u>τῆς ἐκκλησίας. τὸν θεὸν</u> ἰκετεύσας μετὰ μικρὸν [C <i>om.</i> τῆς – μικρὸν; <i>add.</i> καὶ πολλὰ δεηθεὶς Γεννάδιος τῷ Θεῷ μὴ τὴν ταραχὴν ὄψεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας μετ' ὀλίγον] <u>ἔτελεύτησεν.</u></p>		
<p>617, 3–5 [C <i>add.</i> καὶ] <u>Δανιήλ</u> δὲ ὁ <u>θαυμάσιος ἐκ τῆς μάνδρας ἐλθὼν</u> [C ἐκ τῆς μάνδρας ἐλθόντος δὲ ὁ θαυμάσιος] <u>Συμεῶνος ἐν τῷ Ἀνάπλω ἐπέβη τῷ στύλῳ.</u></p>	<p>385 PVB Δανιήλ ὁ θαυμάσιος ἐκ τῆς Συμεῶνος μάνδρας ἐλθὼν τῷ στύλῳ ἐπέβη τῷ ἐν τῷ Ἀνάπλω.</p>	<p>AM 5957 (114, 11–12) τούτοις δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις καὶ <u>Δανιήλ</u> ὁ Στυλίτης ἐν τῷ Ἀνάπλω στύλῳ ἐπέβη, ἀνήρ θαυμάσιος.</p>
<p>618, 10–14 Ἐφ' οὗ <u>Μαρτύριος</u> Ἀντιοχείας διὰ τὴν τοῦ Ζήνωνος περὶ τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν διαστροφὸν ἀποταξάμενος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς <u>ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας</u> ἔφη· κλήρω <u>ἀνυποτάκτῳ καὶ λαῷ ἀπειθεῖ καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐρρυπωμένῃ ἀποτάττομαι φυλάττων ἑμαυτῷ τὸ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀξίωμα.</u></p>	<p>391 V (missing fragment underlined) B Μαρτύριος πρὸς βασιλέα ἐλθὼν σὺν πολλῇ τιμῇ ἀπελύθη σπουδῇ <u>καὶ παραινέσει</u> Γενναδίου· ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ βλέπων Ἀντιοχείς ταραχαῖς καὶ στάσσει χαίροντας καὶ Ζήνωνα τοῦ τοις συμπράττοντα, ἀπετάξατο τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας εἰπὼν· «κλήρω ἀνυποτάκτῳ καὶ λαῷ ἀπειθεῖ καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐρρυπωμένῃ ἀποτάττομαι, φυλάττων ἑμαυτῷ τὸ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀξίωμα.»</p>	<p>absent</p>
<p>618, 21–619, 8 καὶ <u>Βαρνάβα</u> τοῦ ἀποστόλου τὸ λείψανον εὐρέθη ἐν Κύπρῳ ὑπὸ δένδρον κερατέαν ἔχον ἐπὶ στήθους τὸ κατὰ <u>Ματθαῖον</u> εὐαγγέλιον <u>ιδιόγραφον τοῦ Βαρνάβα.</u> ἐξ ἧς προφάσεως καὶ περιγεγόνασι Κύπριοι τοῦ ἀκέφαλον εἶναι τὴν κατ' αὐτοὺς μητρόπολιν καὶ μὴ τελεῖν ὑπὸ Ἀντιόχειαν. ὅπερ εὐαγγέλιον ἀποθέμενος <u>Ζήνων ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ</u> εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ ἁγίου Στεφάνου κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀναγινώσκειται τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ [C <i>om.</i> καὶ μεγάλῃ] πέμπτη.</p>	<p>436 B Βαρνάβα τοῦ ἀποστόλου τὸ λείψανον εὐρέθη ἐν Κύπρῳ ὑπὸ δένδρον κερατέαν, ἔχον ἐπὶ στήθους τὸ κατὰ <u>Ματθαῖον</u> εὐαγγέλιον <u>ιδιόγραφον τοῦ Βαρνάβα.</u> ἐξ ἧς προφάσεως καὶ περιγεγόνασι Κύπριοι τοῦ αὐτοκέφαλον εἶναι τὴν κατ' αὐτοὺς μητρόπολιν καὶ μὴ τελεῖν ὑπὸ Ἀντιόχειαν. τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον εὐαγγέλιον Ζήνων ἀπέθετο ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ Στεφάνῳ.</p>	<p>absent</p>

<p>624, 4–12 Ζήνων βασιλεὺς ἐτελεύτησεν, ἀναγορεύεται δὲ εἰς βασιλέα ὑπὸ Ἀριάδνης τῆς Αὐγούστης Ἀναστάσιος ὁ σιλεντιάριος. περὶ οὗ ἀντέστη <u>Εὐφήμιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος αἰρετικῶν καλῶν καὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν ἀνάξιον.</u> Ἀριάδνης δὲ <u>καὶ τῶν τῆς συγκλήτου</u> συναινεῖν ἀναγκαζόντων Εὐφήμιον, οὐκ ἄλλως τοῦτο ποιῆσαι ἠνέσχετο, εἰ μὴ ὁμολογίαν ἔγγραφον παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἔκομίσατο, ὡς εἰς ὄρον πίστεως δέχεται τὰ ἐν <u>Χαλκηδόνι</u> δογματισθέντα.</p>	<p>446 B Ζήνων ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐτελεύτησεν, ἀναγορεύεται δὲ εἰς βασιλέα ὑπὸ Ἀριάδνης τῆς Αὐγούστης Ἀναστάσιος ὁ σιλεντιάριος ἐκ τοῦ Δυρραχίου ὀρμώμενος, περὶ οὗ ἀντέστη Εὐφήμιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος αἰρετικῶν καλῶν καὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀνάξιον. Ἀριάδνης δὲ καὶ τῶν τῆς συγκλήτου συναινεῖν ἀναγκαζόντων Εὐφήμιον, οὐκ ἄλλως τοῦτο ποιῆσαι ἠνέσχετο, εἰ μὴ ὁμολογίαν ἔγγραφον παρ’ αὐτοῦ ἔκομίσατο, ὡς εἰς ὄρον πίστεως δέχεται τὰ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι δογματισθέντα· ὁ καὶ πεποίηκεν.</p>	<p>AM 5983 (136, 5–11) βασιλεύσας οὖν ὁ Ἀναστάσιος ἔγραφον ἠπαιτήθη ὁμολογίαν παρὰ Εὐφημίου πατριάρχου πρὸς τὸ μὴ σαλευσαί τι τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆς πίστεως, ἀβάξιον αὐτὸν ἀποκαλῶς τῶν Χριστιανῶν καὶ τῆς βασιλείας, βιαζομένης δὲ αὐτὸν τῆς βασιλίδος Ἀρεάδνης καὶ τῆς συγκλήτου, ἔλαβεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ἰδιόχειρον, ὡς ἀποδέχεται εἰς ὄρον πίστεως τὰ δόγματα τῆς ἐν Χαλκηδόνι συνόδου.</p>
<p>624, 11–12 τὴν δὲ ὁμολογίαν αὐτοῦ βιαίως τὸν Εὐφήμιον ἀπήτησε βασιλεύσας.</p>	<p>447 B Τὴν ὁμολογίαν αὐτοῦ βιαίως τὸν Εὐφήμιον ἀπήτησεν Ἀναστάσιος βασιλεύσας.</p>	<p>AM 5987 (139, 19–20) Ἀναστάσιος δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν ὁμολογίαν αὐτοῦ παρὰ Εὐφημίου μετὰ βίας ἀφείλατο.</p>
<p>624, 12–15 <u>Μανιχαῖοι καὶ Ἀρειανοὶ ἔχαιρον Ἀναστασίῳ, Μανιχαῖοι μὲν ὡς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ζηλωτρίας οὕσης αὐτῶν, Ἀρειανοὶ δὲ ὡς Κλέαρχον τὸν θεῖον πρὸς μητρὸς Ἀναστασίου ὁμόδοξον ἔχοντες.</u></p>	<p>448 B Μανιχαῖοι καὶ Ἀρειανοὶ ἔχαιρον Ἀναστασίῳ, Μανιχαῖοι μὲν ὡς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ζηλωτρίας οὕσης αὐτῶν, Ἀρειανοὶ δὲ ὡς Κλέαρχον τὸν θεῖον πρὸς μητρὸς Ἀναστασίου ὁμόδοξον ἔχοντες.</p>	<p>AM 5983 (136, 13–16) Μανιχαῖοι δὲ καὶ Ἀρειανοὶ ἔχαιρον ἐπὶ Ἀναστασίῳ, Μανιχαῖοι μὲν ὡς τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως ζηλωτρίας οὕσης καὶ πρὸς φιλοῦς αὐτῶν, Ἀρειανοὶ δὲ ὡς Κλέαρχον, τὸν θεῖον αὐτοῦ, ἀδελφὸν τῆς αὐτῆς κακόφρονος μητρὸς, ὁμόδοξον ἔχοντες.</p>
<p>624, 15–625, 3 πολλὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἄτοπα καὶ ἀπάνθρωπα τολμώντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, Ἀναστάσιος ἅπαντας τῆς βασιλίδος ἐξέβαλεν. οἱ δὲ ἐξεληθόντες πρὸς τυραννίδα ὤρμησαν καὶ ἕως τοῦ Κοτναείου ἐξέδραμον. καθ’ ὧν ὁ βασιλεὺς στρατὸν ἐξέπεμψε καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Σκύθην καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν</p>	<p>449 B Πολλὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἄτοπα καὶ ἀπάνθρωπα πραξάντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἀναστάσιος ἅπαντας τῆς βασιλίδος ἐξέβαλεν. οἱ δὲ ἐξεληθόντες πρὸς τυραννίδα ὤρμησαν καὶ ἕως τοῦ Κοτναείου ἐξέδραμον. καθ’ ὧν ὁ βασιλεὺς στρατὸν ἐξέπεμψε καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Σκύθην καὶ</p>	<p>AM 5985 (137, 23–25) Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Ἀναστάσιος ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἰσαύρους διὰ πολλὰς ἀτοπίας ἐδίωξεν, οἱ ἐξεληθόντες τυραννίδα ἐμελέτησαν. AM 5987 (139, 6–12) ἀποκαμῶν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν τὸν πόλεμον ἐθάρρησεν Εὐφημῖν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ὡς εἰρήνης ἐφίεται, καὶ συνάξει τοὺς</p>

<p>Κυρτόν. τοῦ δὲ πολέμου ἐπὶ ε. ἔτη κρατήσαντος, Ἀναστάσιος ἀποκαμῶν ἐθάρρησεν Εὐφημίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς εἰρήνης ἐφίεται, καὶ ἵνα συναγάγῃ τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους καὶ δόξῃ ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἰσαύρων παρακαλεῖν. Εὐφήμιος δὲ ἐξήγαγε τὸ λεχθὲν πρὸς Ἰωάννην πατρίκιον πενθερὸν Ἀθηνοδώρου ἑνὸς τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τῶν Ἰσαύρων. ὁ δὲ δραμῶν πάντα ἀναγγέλλει τῷ βασιλεῖ, ὅπερ εἰς ἔχθραν τὸν βασιλέα κατὰ Εὐφημίου ἐξώπλισε μείζονα.</p>	<p>Ἰωάννην τὸν Κυρτόν. τοῦ δὲ πολέμου ἐπὶ πέντε ἔτη κρατήσαντος Ἀναστάσιος ἀποκαμῶν ἐθάρρησεν Εὐφημίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ὡς εἰρήνης ἐφίεται, καὶ ἵνα συναγάγῃ τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους καὶ δόξῃ ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἰσαύρων παρακαλεῖν. Εὐφήμιος δὲ ἐξήγαγε τὸ λεχθὲν πρὸς Ἰωάννην πατρίκιον πενθερὸν Ἀθηνοδώρου ἑνὸς τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τῶν Ἰσαύρων. ὁ δὲ δραμῶν πάντα ἀναγγέλλει τῷ βασιλεῖ. ὅπερ εἰς ἔχθραν τὸν βασιλέα κατὰ Εὐφημίου ἐξώπλισεν.</p>	<p>ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους προσέταξε παρακαλέσοντας δῆθεν περὶ τῶν Ἰσαύρων. Εὐφήμιος δὲ τὸ μυστήριον ἐξήγαγε πρὸς Ἰωάννην πατρίκιον, πενθερὸν Ἀθηνοδώρου τοῦ ἐξάρχου τῆς τυραννίδος. ὁ δὲ δραμῶν τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀπήγγειλεν, ὅπερ εἰς ἀδιάλλακτον ἔχθραν κατ' Εὐφημίου τὸν βασιλέα Ἀναστάσιον ἤγειρεν.</p>
<p>625, 3–6 Ἀναστάσιος δὲ βασιλικώτερον κινήθεις κατὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων τούτους κατὰ κράτος ἐνίκησε καὶ πέμψας πρὸς Εὐφήμιον Εὐσέβιον τὸν μάγιστρον δηλοῖ αὐτῷ· αἰ εὐχαί σου, ὁ μέγας, τοὺς φίλους σου ἡσβόλωσαν.</p>	<p>450 B Ἀναστάσιος βασιλικώτερον λοιπὸν κινήθεις κατὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων τούτους κατὰ κράτος ἐνίκησεν· καὶ πέμψας πρὸς Εὐφήμιον Εὐσέβιον τὸν μάγιστρον δηλοῖ πρὸς αὐτὸν· «αἰ εὐχαί σου, [ὁ μέγας, τοὺς φίλους σου ἡσβόλωσαν.]*»</p>	<p>AM 5988 (140, 7–8) Εὐφημίῳ δὲ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἐδήλωσε δι' Εὐσεβίου μαγίστρου· αἰ εὐχαί σου, ὁ μέγας, τοὺς φίλους σου ἡσβόλωσαν.</p>
<p>625, 6–15 Ἀναστάσιος βασιλεὺς τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἐπιγράψας Εὐφημίῳ, καὶ ὡς εἶη γράμματα πεπομφῶς τοῖς τυράννοις, συνήγαγε τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους, οἵτινες βασιλεῖ χαριζόμενοι ἀκοινωνησὶα καὶ καθαιρέσει τὸν ἄνδρα ἡμείψαντο. καὶ προχειρίζεται ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς ἐπίσκοπον Μακεδόνιον πρεσβύτερον τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ σκευοφύλακα. ὁ μέντοι λαὸς δι' Εὐφήμιον ἐστασίαζον· ἐν οἷς εἰς τὸ ἵπποδρόμιον ἔδραμον λιτανεύοντες. ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ὦνησαν, τοῦ γὰρ βασιλέως ἐνίκα ἢ ἔνστασις.</p>	<p>455 B (the underlined part also in V) Ἀναστάσιος ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἐπιγράψας Εὐφημίῳ καὶ ὡς γράμματα πεπομφότος τοῖς τυράννοις συνήγαγεν τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους· οἵτινες βασιλεῖ χαριζόμενοι ἀκοινωνησὶα καὶ καθαιρέσει τὸν ἄνδρα ἡμείψαντο. προχειρίζεται δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς ἐπίσκοπον Μακεδόνιον πρεσβύτερον τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ σκευοφύλακα. ὁ μέντοι λαὸς δι' Εὐφήμιον ἐστασίαζον· ἐν οἷς εἰς τὸ ἵπποδρόμιον ἔδραμον λιτανεύοντες· ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ὦνησαν· τοῦ γὰρ βασιλέως ἐνίκα ἢ ἔνστασις.</p>	<p>AM 5987 (139, 12–13) ὄθεν <καὶ> τὰς τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἐπιβουλὰς Εὐφημίῳ ἐπιγράψεν. AM 5988 (140, 9–16) συναγαγὼν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους κατὰ Εὐφημίου ἐνεκάλει, οἱ καὶ χαριζόμενοι τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀκοινωνησὶαν καὶ καθαιρέσιν αὐτοῦ ἐψηφίζοντο. προχειρίζεται δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνιον ἐπίσκοπον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, σκευοφύλακα ὄντα <τότε τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας>. ὁ μέντοι λαὸς διὰ τὸν Εὐφήμιον ἐστασίαζον.</p>

	456 V (underlined is the part of the sentence which is missing in the edition of Papadopoulos–Kerameus) <u>Μακεδόνιος πεισθείς βασιλεῖ τῷ ἐνωτικῷ Ζήνωνος</u> καθυπέγραψεν.	καὶ εἰς τὸ ἵπποδρόμιον ἔδραμον λιτανεύοντες, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ὀνήσαι ἴσχυσαν, τοῦ πεισθείς κακῶς νικᾶν σπεύδοντος. Μακεδόνιος δὲ κακῶς πεισθείς Ἀναστασίῳ ὑπέγραψε τῷ ἐνωτικῷ Ζήνωνος.
625, 15–626, 1 <u>Εὐφήμιον εἰς Εὐχάϊταν βασιλεὺς περιορισθῆναι προσέταξεν. ὁ δὲ λόγον ἤτησε διὰ Μακεδονίου λαβεῖν ὡς ἐπιβουλῆς χωρὶς κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἀπάγεται. ἐπιτραπεῖς δὲ τὸν λόγον δοῦναι ὁ Μακεδόνιος ἐπαινετόν τι σκεψάμενος, ἐν τῷ βαπτιστηρίῳ τοῦ Εὐφημίου ὄντος, τὸ ὠμοφόριον τὸ ἐπισκοπικὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀφαιρεθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχidiaκόνου προσέταξε καὶ οὕτως εἰσήλθε πρὸς τὸν Εὐφήμιον. δανεισάμενος δὲ καὶ χρήματα</u> παρέσχε τῷ <u>Εὐφημίῳ</u> εἰς δαπάνας τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ.	457 B Εὐφήμιον εἰς Εὐχάϊτα βασιλεὺς περιορισθῆναι προσέταξεν. ὁ δὲ λόγον ἤτησεν διὰ Μακεδονίου λαβεῖν, ὡς ἐπιβουλῆς χωρὶς κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἀπάγεται. ἐπιτραπεῖς δὲ τὸν λόγον δοῦναι ὁ Μακεδόνιος ἐπαινετόν τι σκεψάμενος ἐν τῷ βαπτιστηρίῳ τοῦ Εὐφημίου ὄντος τὸ ὠμοφόριον τὸ ἐπισκοπικὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀφαιρεθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχidiaκόνου προσέταξε, καὶ οὕτως εἰσήλθε πρὸς τὸν Εὐφήμιον. δανεισάμενος δὲ καὶ χρήματα δέδωκε τῷ Εὐφημίῳ εἰς δαπάνας τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ.	AM 5889 (140, 19–26) Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Εὐφήμιον Ἀναστάσιος εἰς Εὐχάϊτα ἐξόριστον ἀπέστειλεν. ὁ δὲ λόγον ἤτησεν διὰ Μακεδονίου λαβεῖν, ἀνεπιβούλευτον μείναι ἐν τῷ ἀπάγεσθαι. ἐπιτραπεῖς δὲ Μακεδόνιος δοῦναι τὸν λόγον, εἰσερχόμενος ἐν τῷ βαπτιστηρίῳ πρὸς τὸν Εὐφήμιον ἀφελεῖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠμόφορον τῷ ἀρχidiaκόνῳ προσέταξεν, καὶ οὕτω λιτὸς πρὸς Εὐφήμιον εἰσελθὼν δανεισάμενός τε χρήματα δέδωκεν Εὐφεμίῳ, ὡς παρὰ πολλῶν ἐπαινεθῆναι κατὰ τοὺς δύο τρόπους.
626, 1–2 <u>Μακεδόνιος</u> ἀσκητὴς ἦν <u>καὶ ἱερός, ὡς ὑπὸ Γενναδίου τραφεῖς, οὗ καὶ ἀδελφιδοῦς ὑπῆρχεν.</u>	458 VB Μακεδόνιος ἀσκητικὸς ἦν καὶ ἱερός ὡς ὑπὸ Γενναδίου τραφεῖς, οὗ καὶ ἀδελφιδοῦς, ὡς λόγος, ὑπῆρχεν.	AM 5889 (140, 26–27) ἀσκητικὸς γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἱερός, ὡς ὑπὸ Γενναδίου τραφεῖς, οὗ καὶ ἀδελφιδὸς ὑπῆρχεν.

* The ending of this passage of the *Epitome* has been reconstructed by Hansen on the basis of the accounts in George the Monk and Theophanes, cf. G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 127, *apparatus*.

The *Epitome* of Theodore Lector became therefore the source of literal citations for two groups of narratives: one concerning Patriarch Gennadios of Constantinople and the other, dealing with Patriarch Euphemios. The remaining three accounts treat of Daniel Stylites, Patriarch Martyrios of Antioch, and the finding of Apostle Barnaba's relics in Cyprus. Interestingly, the narratives that do not relate to Constantinople have no equivalent in the *Chronography* by Theophanes, who also made use of the *Epitome* of Theodore's work. For this reason, it is obvious that George could not have drawn from this latter work for citing these narratives.

There are also six passages in George the Monk's *Chronicle* that have their analogies in both the *Epitome* and Theophanes' work; in four of these cases,

George seems to be, generally speaking, closer to Theophanes' account, in one case – to the *Epitome*, and in one – he is equally close to both of his literary predecessors:

- 610, 18–22 ~ E 363 (**B**, f. 236v, l. 21–25 [PG I,5]; V 32 Papadopoulos-Kerameus) ~ Theophanes AM 5945 (106, 25–29), closer to Theophanes
- 611, 5–11 ~ E 352 (**V** 22 Papadopoulos-Kerameus) ~ Theophanes AM 5941 (101, 13–17), close to both
- 621, 9–19 ~ E 513 (**B**, f. 239v, l. 18–25 [PG II, 35]) ~ Theophanes AM 6005 (159, 19–160, 1), closer to Theophanes
- 621, 19–622, 1 ~ E 516 (**P**, f. 19v A, l. 22–B, l. 14 [Cramer 108, 3–12]) ~ Theophanes AM 6008 (162, 9–12), closer to Theophanes
- 622, 19–623, 13 ~ E 512 (**B**, f. 239v, l. 9–18 [PG II, 34]) ~ Theophanes AM 6009 (163, 16–28), closer to *Epitome*
- 623, 14–20 ~ E 440 (**V** 75 Papadopoulos-Kerameus) ~ Theophanes AM 5981 (133, 14–16), closer to Theophanes

Table 2. Closer parallels between the *Chronicle* by George the Monk, the *Epitome* of Theodore's work and the *Chronography* by Theophanes

(bold type is used to mark the verbatim citations from the *Epitome* in George the Monk or Theophanes; literal parallels in George the Monk and Theophanes are underlined)

George the Monk, <i>Chronica</i>	Theodore Lector, <i>Epitome</i>	Theophanes, <i>Chronographia</i>
610, 18–22 πολλά οὖν ποιήσασα κατορθώματα καὶ πολλοὺς εὐκτηρίους οἴκους καὶ πτωχοτροφεΐα καὶ ξενώνας καὶ ξενοτάφια καὶ μοναστήρια, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸν τοῦ ἁγίου Λαυρεντίου ναόν, οἰκοδομήσασα ἐτελεύτησε παρθένος καταλιπούσα Μαρκιανὸν βασιλεύειν.	363 BV (the missing text in this manuscript is underlined) Πουλχερία ἢ εὐσεβῆς ἐτελεύτησε πολλά ποιήσασα κατορθώματα καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐαυτῆς πτωχοῖς καταλείψασα· ἄπερ Μαρκιανὸς πρὸς οἷς οὐκ ἀνέτρεψεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς χρεΐαις ἀπάσαις προθύμως ὑπηρετήσεν. ἔκτισε δὲ καὶ εὐκτηρίους οἴκους Πουλχερία πολλοὺς, <u>τὸν ἐν Βλαχέρναις, τὸν Χαλκοπρατείων, τὸν Ὀδηγῶν· μεθ' ὧν καὶ τὸν [V: ὧ ἐστὶν ὁ] Λαυρεντίου τοῦ μάρτυρος.</u>	AM 5945 (106, 25–29) Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Πουλχερία ἢ μακαρία καὶ εὐσεβῆς ἐκοιμήθη ἐν κυρίῳ πολλά ποιήσασα κατορθώματα καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐαυτῆς πτωχοῖς καταλείψασα· ἄπερ Μαρκιανὸς πλεῖστα ὄντα προθύμως διέδωκεν. ἔκτισε δὲ ἢ αὐτῇ πολλοὺς εὐκτηρίους οἴκους καὶ πτωχεΐα καὶ ξενώνας καὶ ξενοτάφια, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸν ναὸν τοῦ ἁγίου μάρτυρος Λαυρεντίου.
611, 5–11 ὁ δὲ φύσει νωθρός τε καὶ ἀπερίσκεπτος εἰς πάντα μὲν ὑπῆρχεν, μάλιστα δὲ εἰς τοὺς ὑποβάλλοντας αὐτῷ χάρτας ἀπαραναγνώστως ὑπέγραψεν· ὅπερ ἢ σοφωτάτη γνοῦσά ποτε Πουλχερία [C Πουλχερία]	352 V Θεοδοσίου τοῦ βασιλέως ὁ ἱστορῶν καθάπτεται ὡς πειθομένου ὡς ἔτυχε καὶ εὐμεταγῶγου ὄντος, καὶ ὅτι τοῖς ὑποβάλλουσιν αὐτῷ χάρτας ἀπαραναγνώστως ὑπέγραψεν· ὅπερ γνοῦσα Πουλχερία ἢ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ	AM 5941 (101, 13–17) Θεοδόσιος δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς εὐρίπιστος ἦν, παντὶ ἀνέμῳ φερόμενος, ὅθεν καὶ χάρταις ἀπαραναγνώστοις πολλάκις ὑπέγραψεν· ἐν οἷς καὶ Πουλχερία ἢ σοφωτάτη δωρεὰν AM 5941 (101, 13–17)

<p>σοφωτάτη <u>γνοῦσά</u> ποτε <u>Πουλχερία</u> [C Πουλχειρία] σοφῶς <u>ὑπήλθεν</u> αὐτόν <u>δωρεὰν ὑποβαλοῦσα</u> δῆθεν <u>πρὸς δουλείαν ἐκχωροῦσαν τὴν</u> ἑαυτοῦ <u>γαμετὴν Εὐδοκίαν</u>. ἦν καὶ καθυπογράψας μὴ πρότερον ἀναγνοὺς ὕστερον <u>δεινῶς</u> ὠνειδίετο <u>παρὰ τῆς Πουλχερίας</u> [C Πουλχειρίας].</p>	<p>σοφῶς ὑπήλθεν αὐτόν, δωρεὰν ὑποβαλοῦσα Θεοδοσίῳ ἐκχωροῦσαν πρὸς δουλείαν Εὐδοκίαν τὴν γαμετὴν αὐτοῦ· ἦν καὶ ὑπέγραψεν καὶ δεινῶς ὑπὸ τῆς Πουλχερίας ὠνειδίετο.</p>	<p>Θεοδόσιος δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς εὐρίπιστος ἦν, παντὶ ἀνέμῳ φερόμενος, ὅθεν καὶ χάρταις ἀπαραναγνώστοις πολλάκις <u>ὑπέγραψεν</u>· ἐν οἷς καὶ <u>Πουλχερία</u> ἢ σοφωτάτη δωρεὰν ὑπέβαλεν ἀπαραναγνώστον <u>ἐκχωροῦσαν πρὸς δουλείαν Εὐδοκίαν, τὴν γαμετὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑπέγραψεν δεινῶς</u> παρὰ Πουλχερίας ὠνειδισθεῖς.</p>
<p>621, 9–19 Ἐφ’ ὧν χρόνον καὶ Μούδαρος [C Μούδραος] ὁ <u>τῶν Σαρακηνῶν</u> φύλαρχος βαπτισθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἐν Συρίᾳ, <u>Σευῆρος ἐπισκόπου</u> <u>ἔπεμψε</u> πρὸς αὐτόν <u>δύο</u> θέλων <u>αὐτῷ μεταδοῦναι</u> τῆς οἰκείας αἰρέσεως [C τὴν οἰκείαν αἵρεσιν]. ὧν τοῦ δόγματος τὸ ἄτοπον αἰσθόμενος ἔφη μετὰ πανουργίας· <u>ἐδεξάμεν γράμματα</u> σήμερον <u>ὅτι Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος</u> ἀπέθανεν. <u>τῶν δὲ εἰπόντων ἀδύνατον</u> εἶναι τοῦτο, καὶ <u>πῶς</u>, φησὶν, <u>θεὸς γυμνός</u> ἐσταυρώθη καθ’ ἡμᾶς, <u>εἰ μὴ</u> ἐκ <u>δύο φύσεων</u> ἦν <u>ὁ Χριστός</u>, εἴγε μὴδὲ <u>ἄγγελος ἀποθνήσκει</u>; ὅπερ ἀκούσαντες καὶ σφόδρα καταπλαγέντες εἰς τὸ φυσικὸν φρόνημα τῆς προτάσεως αὐτοῦ <u>ἀνεχώρησαν μετ’ αἰσχύνης</u>.</p>	<p>513 B Ἀλαμουνδάρου τοῦ φυλάρχου Σαρακηνῶν χριστιανίσαντος δύο ἐπισκόπους ἔπεμψεν ὁ Σευῆρος ἐφ’ ᾧ τῆς ἰδίας μεταδοῦναι τῷ φυλάρχῳ κακίας. θεὸς δὲ προφθάσας ὑπὸ τῶν δεχομένων τὴν σύνοδον τὸν ἄνδρα βαπτισθῆναι πεποίηκεν. τῶν <δὲ> ὑπὸ Σευήρου σταλέντων ἐναντία τῶν ἀληθῶν δογμάτων σπουδαζόντων διδάξει τὸν φύλαρχον δράμα εἰς ἔλεγχον τῶν λεγομένων συνέθηκεν. τοῦτο δὲ ἦν τὸ δόξαι γράμματα δέχεσθαι μηνύοντα, ὅτι Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος τέλει τοῦ βίου ἐχρήσατο. τῶν δὲ τοῦτο λεγόντων ἀδύνατον «πῶς οὖν», ὁ φύλαρχος ἔφησεν, «εἰ μὴ δύο ὁ Χριστός, θεὸς γυμνός σταυρὸν κατεδέξατο, ὅτε μὴδὲ ἄγγελος πάσχειν ἢ ἀποθνήσκειν πέφυκεν;» οὕτως οὖν οἱ Σευήρου αἰσχυθέντες ἀσυντάκτως ὑπανεχώρησαν.</p>	<p>AM 6005 (159, 19–160, 1) Ἀλαμουνδάρῳ δέ, τῷ φυλάρχῳ τῶν Σαρακηνῶν, βαπτισθέντι <u>Σευῆρος</u> ὁ δυσσεβῆς <u>δύο ἐπισκόπους ἔπεμψε</u> τῆς λώβης αὐτοῦ <u>μεταδοῦναι</u> αὐτῷ. θεοῦ δὲ προνοία <u>ὑπὸ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐβαπτίσθη τῶν δεχομένων τὴν σύνοδον</u>. <u>τῶν δὲ</u> ἐπισκόπων <u>Σευήρου</u> διαστρέφειν τὸν φύλαρχον τοῦ ἀληθοῦς δόγματος σπευδόντων, θαυμαστῶς αὐτοὺς ἤλεγξεν Ἀλαμουνδάρως δραματούργια τοιαύτη. ἔφη γὰρ πρὸς αὐτούς· «<u>γράμματα</u>, » φησιν, «ἐδεξάμην σήμερον σημαίοντά μοι <u>ὅτι Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος</u> τέθηκεν. » τῶν δὲ εἰπόντων <u>ἀδύνατον</u> εἶναι τοῦτο, ἔφη <u>ὁ φύλαρχος</u>· «καὶ <u>πῶς</u> θεὸς γυμνός ἐσταυρώθη καθ’ ἡμᾶς, <u>εἰ μὴ</u> δύο φύσεων ἦν <u>ὁ Χριστός</u>, εἴπερ μὴδὲ <u>ἄγγελος ἀποθνήσκει</u>;» καὶ οὕτω μετ’ αἰσχύνης ἀνεχώρησαν <u>οἱ</u> τοῦ <u>Σευήρου</u> ἐπίσκοποι.</p>
<p>621, 19–622, 1 καὶ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ δὲ <u>πλεῖστοι ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες</u></p>	<p>516 P Δεινὴ πληγὴ κατὰ Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐπῆλθεν ὑπὸ</p>	<p>AM 6008 (162, 9–12) Τῷ δ’ αὐτῷ ἔτει ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ πλεῖστοι</p>

<p>ἄθρόως ὑλάκτου. <u>περὶ ὧν τις εἶδε καθ' ὕπνου φοβερὸν τινα λέγοντα· διὰ τοὺς ἀναθεματισμοὺς τῆς συνόδου ταῦτα πάσχουσι</u> δικαίως [C εἰκότως].</p>	<p>πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων παιδευομένων, ἔν τε τῇ πόλει καὶ πάση τῇ περιχώρῳ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ νηπίων ἐνοχλουμένων πλήθους ἀπείρου καὶ ὑλακτούντων. κατ' ὄναρ δέ τις εἶδέν τινα λέγοντα ὡς διὰ τοὺς ἀναθεματισμοὺς τοὺς κατὰ τῆς συνόδου ταῦτα πάσχουσι. τινὲς δὲ ἔλεγον, ὅτι διὰ τοὺς ἀθέσμους ὄρκους, οὓς κατὰ τοῦ θείου τολμῶσιν ὀμνύειν, τὰ τοιαῦτα παιδεύονται. ἕτεροι δὲ ἔφασκον, ὅτι διὰ τὸ κωλυθῆναι ἀνέρχεσθαι εἰς τὴν ὕψωσιν τοῦ σταυροῦ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα τοὺς Ἀλεξανδρεῖς καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ὁ θεὸς ὀργῇ τούτους ἐξέπεμφεν.</p>	<p>ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ νήπια δεινῶς πληγέντες ὑπὸ διαμόνων ἀθρόως ὑλάκτου. <u>καθ' ὕπνου δέ τις εἶδέ τινα φοβερὸν λέγοντα· ὅτι διὰ τοὺς ἀναθεματισμοὺς τῆς συνόδου ταῦτα πάσχουσι.</u></p>
<p>622, 19–623, 13 Καὶ Κωάδης ὁ βασιλεὺς Περσῶν ἔν τινι φρουρίῳ τῶν ἠκωῖσε <u>μαθῶν ὡς λίθους τιμίους</u> ἀποκεῖσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ, βουλόμενος αὐτοὺς ἀνελέσθαι διεκωλύετο παρὰ τῶν αὐτόθι δαιμόνων οἰκούντων. <u>πᾶσαν τοίνυν μαγείαν ἐπιδειξαμένων τῶν θεραπόντων [C μάγων] αὐτοῦ καὶ μηδὲν ἰσχυσάντων ἦλθε διὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. ἀποτυχῶν δὲ κάκειθεν συνεβουλευθῆ διὰ τῶν χριστιανῶν καταργῆσαι τοὺς δαίμονας. ὁ δὲ τῶν ἐν Περσίδι χριστιανῶν ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ σύναξιν ἐπιτελέσας καὶ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων μεταλαβῶν καὶ τοῖς συνοῦσι χριστιανοῖς μεταδούς καὶ τῷ σημείῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ διώξας τοὺς δαίμονας τῷ Κωάδῃ τὸ φρούριον παρέδωκεν. ὃς καταπλαγεῖς</u></p>	<p>512 B Κάστρον ἐστὶ μεταξὺ Περσῶν καὶ Ἰνδῶν ᾧ ὄνομα Τζουνδαδεέρ. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ χρήματα πολλὰ καὶ λίθους τιμίους κεῖσθαι μαθῶν Κωάδης ὁ βασιλεὺς ταῦτα λαβεῖν ἐβουλεύσατο. δαίμονες δὲ τὸν τόπον οἰκοῦντες τοῦ ζητουμένου Κωάδην ἐκώλυον. πᾶσαν τοίνυν μαγείαν ἐπιδειξαμένων τῶν μάγων αὐτοῦ καὶ μηδὲν ἰσχυσάντων ἦλθε διὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. ἀποτυχῶν δὲ κάκειθεν συνεβουλευθῆ διὰ τῶν Χριστιανῶν καταργῆσαι τοὺς δαίμονας. ὁ δὲ ἐπίσκοπος Χριστιανῶν τῶν ἐν Πέρσαις σύναξιν ἐπὶ τοῦτο τελέσας καὶ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων μεταλαβῶν καὶ μεταδούς τοῖς συνοῦσι Χριστιανοῖς τῷ σημείῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ διώξας τοὺς δαίμονας τῷ Κωάδῃ τὸ κάστρον ἀπόνως παρέδωκεν.</p>	<p>AM 6009 (163, 16–28) <u>μεταξὺ δὲ Ἰνδῶν καὶ Περσῶν κάστρον ἐστὶν ὀνόματι Τζουνδαδεέρ, ἔνθα πολλὰ χρήματα καὶ λίθους τιμίους εἶναι πολλοὺς Κουάδης μαθῶν ἐπεζέτει τοῦτο λαβεῖν. δαίμονες δὲ τῷ τόπῳ παρεδρεύοντες ἐκώλυον αὐτὸ χειρωθῆναι. πᾶσαν οὖν κινέσας τῶν παρ' αὐτῷ μάγων ἐπίνοιαν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ Ἰουδαίων, καὶ τοῦ σκοποῦ μὴ ἐπιτυχῶν, πεισθεὶς διὰ τῆς πρὸς θεὸν εὐχῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν τούτου κυριεῦσαι, ἐπίσκοπόν τινα Χριστιανῶν τῶν ἐν Περσίδι περὶ τούτου παρεκάλεσεν, ὃς σύναξιν ἐπιτελέσας καὶ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων μεταλαβῶν, προσελθὼν τῷ τόπῳ τοὺς ἐκεῖσε δαίμονας ἐξεδίωξε καὶ τῷ Κουάδῃ τὸ κάστρον ἀπόνως παρέδωκεν· τούτῳ Κουάδης καταπλαγεῖς</u></p>

<p>πάνυ καὶ φόβῳ κατασχεθεὶς [C om. καὶ φόβῳ κατασχεθεὶς] <u>προκαθεδρία τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐτίμησεν, ἕως τότε Ἰουδαίων καὶ Μανιχαίων προτιμώνων</u> [C μὴ προτιμώνων], καὶ μέντοι καὶ τοὺς χριστιανοὺς ἀγαπήσας ἔκτοτε τελείαν <u>ἄδειαν δέδωκε τοῖς χριστιανίζειν ἐθέλουσιν.</u></p>	<p>ὅπερ καταπλαγεὶς ὁ ἀνὴρ προκαθεδρία τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐτίμησεν, ἕως τότε Ἰουδαίων καὶ Μανιχαίων προτιμώνων. ὁ δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς χριστιανίζειν ἐθέλουσιν ἄδειαν δέδωκεν.</p>	<p>τῷ σημείῳ <u>προκαθεδρία τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐτίμησεν, ἕως τότε Μανιχαίων καὶ Ἰουδαίων</u> προκαθεζομένων, <u>ἄδειαν</u> δὲ παρέσχε καὶ τοῖς βουλομένοις βαπτίζεσθαι.</p>
<p>623, 14–624, 3 <u>Εὐφήμιός τις πρεσβύτερος καὶ πτωχοτρόφος</u> <u>Νεαπόλεως</u> τῆς κειμένης ἐν τῷ Ἀνάπλω <u>προχειρίζεται</u> εἰς ἐπίσκοπον <u>Κωνσταντινουπόλεως</u>, ὃς ἅμα τῇ χειροτονίᾳ πρὶν ἢ ἀνελθεῖν εἰς τὸ σύνθρονον ἐκ <u>τῶν ἱερῶν διπτύχων ἀπέλειψε</u> Πέτρου <u>τοῦ Μογγοῦ τὸ ὄνομα</u> ταῖς <u>ἰδίαις χερσὶ</u> καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὸν ἐπισκοπικὸν <u>θρόνον</u> ἐκάθισεν. οὗτος δὲ ὁ Μογγὸς Ἀλεξανδρείας μὲν ἦν ἐπίσκοπος, αἰρετικὸς δὲ διάπυρος.</p>	<p>440 V Ἀκάκιος ἔτη τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς προεδρεύσας ἐτελεύτησε, καὶ προχειρίζεται Φρανίτας πρεσβύτερος τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν Συκαῖς Θέκλης τῆς πρωτομάρτυρος. καὶ τρεῖς ἡμισυ μῆνας ἐπιζήσας ἐτελεύτησε, καὶ προχειρίζεται Εὐφήμιός τις πρεσβύτερος, ζηλωτῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως, ὃς ἐξαυτῆς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Μογγοῦ ἀπῆλειψεν τῶν ἱερῶν διπτύχων.</p>	<p>AM 5981 (133, 14–18) τοῦ δὲ Φρανίτα τελευτήσαντος, <u>Εὐφήμιος, πρεσβύτερος καὶ πτωχοτρόφος</u> <u>Νεαπόλεως</u>, τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν <u>Κωνσταντινουπόλεως</u> ἐκράτησε καὶ εὐθέως ἰδίαις χερσὶ <u>τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Μογγοῦ τῶν διπτύχων ἀπῆλειψεν</u>. καὶ οὕτως ἐκάθισεν εἰς τὸν θρόνον καὶ τὸ τοῦ Φίλικος τῆς Ῥώμης ἐνέταξεν.</p>

The closeness between Theophanes and George the Monk's *Chronicle*, in particular the use of some characteristic expressions (for instance, referring to Euphemios as πτωχοτρόφος, which cannot be found in the *Epitome*) makes it possible to assume that George was, to some extent, dependent on Theophanes. Nevertheless, because he does not quote him with any accuracy (except for the passage dealing with a supernatural phenomenon in Alexandria), such as when he cites the *Epitome* passages listed in Table 1, and the differences between the two texts cannot be exclusively a result of the stylistic transformation of the text (e.g., George states the name of a Saracene phylarch in the form Μούδαρος (in the Old Church Slavonic version: Мοударъ), while Theophanes, like the *Epitome*, has Ἀλαμούνδαρος), it should be assumed that he did not have access to the version of the *Chronography* that is well known now, but only perhaps its epitome.

In addition, let us also mention the following three passages which very loosely refer to both the *Epitome* and Theophanes (where some correlation between the latter can be seen):

- George the Monk, 611, 12–17 ~ E 365 (P, f. 15v B, l. 27–f. 16r A, l. 10 [Cramer 101, 24–29]; V 34 Papadopoulos-Kerameus; B, f. 236v, l. 25–29 [PG I, 6]) ~ Theophanes AM 5949 (109, 27–30),
- George the Monk, 616, 6–10 ~ E 398b (P, f. 17v B, l. 17–23 [Cramer 105, 2–4]; V 57 Papadopoulos-Kerameus; B, f. 237v, l. 3–4 [PG I, 24]) ~ Theophanes AM 5966 (119, 29–30),
- George the Monk, 616, 10–15 ~ E 382 (P, f. 17r A, l. 10–18 [Cramer 103, 20–23]; V 45b Papadopoulos-Kerameus; B, f. 237r, l. 16–18 [PG I, 45]) ~ Theophanes AM 5955 (112, 29–32).

Table 3. Further parallels between George the Monk's *Chronicle*, the *Epitome* of Theodore's work, and the *Chronography* by Theophanes

(bold type is used to mark the verbatim citations from the *Epitome* in George the Monk or Theophanes; literal parallels in George the Monk and Theophanes are underlined)

George the Monk, <i>Chronica</i>	Theodore Lector, <i>Epitome</i>	Theophanes, <i>Chronographia</i>
611, 12–17 Ὁ μέντοι Μαρκιανός εὐσεβῆς ἄγαν καὶ δικαιοκρίτης ὑπάρχων ἐκέλευσεν ἄρχοντα ἐπὶ δόσει χρημάτων μὴ γίνεσθαι. οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῆς ἐλεημοσύνης ἀνάπλεως ὦν ἐν ταῖς γινομέναις <u>ἐν τῷ Κάμπῳ λιταῖς πεζός ἐξήρχετο</u> σὺν τῷ πατριάρχῃ Ἀνατολίῳ πολλὰς δωρεὰς τοῖς πένησι παρεχόμενος.	365 PVB Ἐν ταῖς λιταῖς ταῖς γινομέναις ἐν τῷ Κάμπῳ πεζός Μαρκιανός ἐξερχόμενος πολλὰς τοῖς δεομένοις δωρεὰς παρεῖχεν. Ἀνατόλιον δὲ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον προετρέπετο κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς πόλεως ἀπὸ τοῦ Ταύρου φορεῖω φερόμενον λιτανεύειν ἕως τοῦ Κάμπου· ὁ δὲ Μαρκιανὸν βλέπων πεζεύοντα καὶ αὐτὸς πεζεύων ἐλιτάνευεν.	AM 5949 (109, 27–30) πάνυ δὲ ἦν εὐλαβῆς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεὸν ὁ Μαρκιανός , ὅστις <u>ἐν ταῖς λιταῖς τοῦ Κάμπου πεζός ἐξῆι</u> πολλὰ τοῖς δεομένοις εὐ ποιῶν· ὅθεν τοῦτον ὁρῶν ὁ πατριάρχης Ἀνατόλιος καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκέτι φορεῖω φερόμενος κατὰ τὸ ἔθος ἐλιτάνευεν, ἀλλὰ πεζός.
616, 6–10 ἐφ' οὗ σημεῖον ἐφάνη <u>ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ</u> νεφέλη σαλπυγοειδῆς ἐπὶ ἡμέρας μ'. καὶ ἔβρεξε σποδὸν ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει σπιθαμῆς τὸ πάχος, τῶν νεφῶν πυρακτούντων. καὶ πάντες ἐλιτάνευον λέγοντες <u>ὅτι πῦρ ἦν</u> καὶ τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσβέσθη.	398b PVB ἡ κόνις τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ κατῆλθεν μηνὶ Νοεμβρίῳ πυρακτούντων νεφῶν φανέντων ἐν οὐρανῷ πρότερον, ὡς πάντας πιστεῦσαι ὅτι πῦρ ἦν τὸ μέλλον καταφέρεισθαι.	AM 5966 (119, 29–30) Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει ἡ κόνις κατῆλθεν πυρακτούντων τῶν νεφῶν προφανέντων, ὡς πάντας νομίζειν, ὅτι πῦρ βρέχει.
616, 10–15 καὶ <u>ζωγράφου</u> τινὸν γράψαι τὸν Χριστὸν <u>καθ' ὁμοιότητα τοῦ Διὸς τολμήσαντος</u> [C <i>add.</i> καὶ], παραυτίκα <u>ἢ χεῖρ</u> [C τῆς χειρὸς] αὐτοῦ	382 PVB Ἐπὶ Γενναδίου ἡ χεῖρ τοῦ ζωγράφου ἐξηράνθη τοῦ ἐν τάξει Διὸς τὸν σωτήρα γράψαι τολμήσαντος· ὃν δι' εὐχῆς ἰάσατο ὁ Γεννάδιος.	AM 5955 (112, 29–32) Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει ζωγράφου τινὸς <u>τὸν σωτήρα</u> γράψαι τολμήσαντος καθ' ὁμοιότητα τοῦ Διὸς <u>ἐξηράνθη ἡ χεῖρ</u> · ὃν ἐξαγορεύσαντα δι' εὐχῆς

<p>ἐξηράνθη [C ἐξηράνθεισης]. ἰάσατο δὲ αὐτὸν [C om. δὲ αὐτὸν] Γεννάδιος ὁ πατριάρχης. φασὶ δέ τινες τῶν ἱστορικῶν ὅτι τὸ οὐλον καὶ ὀλιγότριχον ἐπι τοῦ Χριστοῦ σχῆμα οἰκειότερόν ἐστιν.</p>	<p>φησὶ δὲ ὁ ἱστορῶν ὅτι τὸ ἄλλο σχῆμα τοῦ σωτήρος, τὸ οὐλον καὶ ὀλιγότριχον, ὑπάρχει τὸ ἀληθέστερον.</p>	<p>ἰάσατο ὁ Γεννάδιος. φασὶ δέ τινες τῶν ἱστορικῶν, ὅτι τὸ οὐλον καὶ ὀλιγότριχον σχῆμα ἐπι τοῦ σωτήρος οἰκειότερόν ἐστιν.</p>
--	---	---

Finally, George also draws three passages from the *Epitome* of John Diakrinomenos, one of which has an parallel in Theophanes:

- George the Monk, 612, 21–26 ~ E 535 (**M**, f. 28v, l. 22–26; **B**, f. 239v, l. 39–42 [PG II, 41–42]),
- George the Monk, 618, 14–21 ~ E 547 (**M**, f. 29r, l. 21–26; **B**, f. 240r, l. 9–11 [PG II, 48]),
- George the Monk, 622, 3–8 ~ E 555 (**M**, f. 29v, l. 10–15; **B**, f. 240r, l. 20–23 [PG II, 54]; **P**, f. 20r B, l. 19–20v A, l. 2 [Cramer 109, 15–20]) ~ Theophanes AM 5995 (144, 6–10).

Table 4. Parallels between George the Monk's *Chronicle* and the *Epitome* of John Diacrinomenos' work (bold type is used to mark the verbatim citations from the *Epitome* in George the Monk or Theophanes; literal parallels in George the Monk and Theophanes)

George the Monk, <i>Chronicle</i>	John Diacrinomenos, <i>Epitome</i>	Theophanes, <i>Chronographia</i>
<p>612, 21–26 [C καὶ] Συμεῶν ὁ θαυμάσιος ἐπιβὰς τῷ στύλῳ, ἡ σύνοδος ἐπιμεμψαμένη (πρῶτος γὰρ τοῦτο ἐπενόησεν)</p>	<p>535 MB Οἱ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μοναχοὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεῶνος μαθόντες ὅτι ἐπὶ κίονος ἴσταται, μεμψάμενοι τῷ ξένῳ</p>	<p>absent</p>
<p>ἀκοινωνησίαν αὐτῷ ἔπεμψαν. εἶτα μαθόντες οἱ θεῖοι πατέρες τὸν βίον καὶ τὸ ἄτυφον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς πάλιν αὐτῷ ἐκοινώνησαν.</p> <p>πρὸς ὃν ὁ βασιλεὺς Μαρκιανὸς [C om. Μαρκιανὸς] ἐν ἰδιωτικῷ σχήματι παραγενόμενος τῆς ἱεράς εὐχῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ θεὰς κατηξίωται.</p>	<p>τοῦ πράγματος (πρῶτος γὰρ αὐτὸς τοῦτο ἐπενόησεν) ἀκοινωνησίαν αὐτῷ ἔπεμψαν. εἶτα ἐγνωκότες τὸν βίον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τὸ ἄτυφον πάλιν αὐτῷ ἐκοινώνησαν.</p> <p>536 MB Μαρκιανὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν σχήματι ἰδιώτου πρὸς τὸν ὄσιον Συμεῶνα ἀφανῶς παρεγένετο.</p>	
<p>618, 14–21 οὔτινος ἀναχωρήσαντος Πέτρος ὁ Κναφεὺς τυραννικῶς τῷ θρόνῳ ἐπεπήδησεν [C εἰσεπήδησεν].</p>	<p>547 MB Πέτρον φησὶ τὸν Κναφέα ἐπινοῆσαι τὸ μύρον ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγιάζεσθαι καὶ τὴν</p>	<p>absent</p>

<p>ὁς καὶ πρῶτος ἐπενόησε τὸ μύρον ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγιάζεσθαι καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων ἐν τοῖς θεοφανίοις ἐπικλησιν ἐν ἑσπέρα γίνεσθαι καὶ ἐν ἑκάστη εὐχῇ τὴν θεοτόκον ὀνομάζεσθαι καὶ ἐν πάσῃ συνάξει τὸ σύμβολον τῆς πίστεως λέγεσθαι πρότερον μὴ λεγόμενον εἰ μὴ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐναυτοῦ ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ παρασκευῇ.</p>	<p>ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων ἐν τοῖς θεοφανίοις ἐπικλησιν ἐν τῇ ἑσπέρα γίνεσθαι καὶ ἐν ἑκάστη εὐχῇ τὴν θεοτόκον ὀνομάζεσθαι καὶ ἐν πάσῃ συνάξει τὸ σύμβολον λέγεσθαι.</p>	
<p>622, 3–8 καὶ ἐν Νεοκαισαρείᾳ δὲ <u>σεισμοῦ γίνεσθαι μέλλοντος</u> ἄνθρωπός τις <u>ὀδεύων ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν</u> εἶδε <u>στρατιώτας</u> προάγοντας <u>καὶ ἕτερον ὀπισθεν κρᾶζοντα· φυλάξατε τὸν οἶκον</u> τοῦ θαυματουργοῦ <u>Γρηγορίου· καὶ τοῦ σεισμοῦ γενομένου τὸ μὲν πλείστον τὴν πόλεως ἔπεσεν, ὁ δὲ ναὸς τοῦ ἁγίου διεσώθη.</u></p>	<p>555 MBP Ἐν Νεοκαισαρείᾳ σεισμοῦ τηλικαῦτα μέλλοντος γίνεσθαι στρατιώτης τις ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν ὀδεύων δύο στρατιώτας ἀπιόντας ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἐθεάσατο καὶ τούτων ὀπισθεν ἕτερον κρᾶζοντα· «φυλάξατε τὸν οἶκον ἐν ᾧ ἡ θήκη Γρηγορίου ἐστίν.» καὶ ὁ μὲν σεισμός ἐγένετο καὶ τὸ πλείστον μέρος τῆν πόλεως ἔπεσεν, ὁ δὲ οἶκος τοῦ Θαυματουργοῦ διεσώθη.</p>	<p>AM 5995 (144, 6–10) Ἐν Νεοκαισαρείᾳ δὲ <u>μέλλοντος γίνεσθαι σεισμοῦ, στρατιώτης ὀδεύων ὡς δύο στρατιώτας ἐπ' αὐτὴν εἶδε καὶ ὀπισθεν ἄλλον κρᾶζοντα· «φυλάξατε τὸν οἶκον ἐν ᾧ ἡ θήκη Γρηγορίου ἐστίν.»</u> γενομένου δὲ τοῦ σεισμοῦ, <u>τὸ πλείστον μέρος τῆν πόλεως ἐπτώθη</u> πλὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου <u>τοῦ θαυματουργοῦ.</u></p>

As the above listing shows, the borrowings from the *Epitome* of the works by Theodore and John are most often literal, as George would usually only alter the initial, or possibly sometimes final, sentence, adapting them to his narration.²² Still, some of the excerpts have been treated with more of a latitude; in some cases, it could be presumed that George the Monk might have used some version of Theophanes' *Chronography*, rather than the account from the *Epitome*, as his base source material.

Carl de Boor's hypothesis of attributing two passages from George the Monk's *Chronicle* to the *Epitome*

In his study published in 1882, de Boor posited that the two passages from George's work (617, 5–13 and 623, 20–624, 3) be considered as excerpts from the *Epitome*. Carl de Boor's hypothesis was accepted by Hansen, with the passage treating of the finding of Mary's robe and the translation of that relic to Constantinople incorporated in the GCS edition as *Epitome* 397. However, de Boor based his proposition on fairly narrow grounds, arguing that this narrative would fit in with the context which could only be found in Theodore, John

²² G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 30.

Malalas, and Theophanes. The absence of the passage in the works of Theophanes and Malalas should point to Theodore's authorship.²³

In order to check if the excerpt E 397 is actually drawn from Theodore Lector's *Epitome*, we should focus our attention on the correlation between the works of George the Monk and Symeon the Logothete, as already noted before. The E 397, which is absent in sources antecedent to George, can also be found in an abridged version in Symeon's work.²⁴

Table 5. The story of Mary's robe in George the Monk's *Chronicle* and in Symeon the Logothete's *Chronicle* (bold type indicates literal parallels between these two works)

George the Monk, <i>Chronica</i>	Symeon the Logothete, <i>Chronica</i>
617.5–13 (= E 397) Τῆς θεοτόκου ἢ ἐσθῆς εὐρεθεῖσα ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις παρά τινι εὐλαβεστάτῃ γυναικί Ἑβραῖδι καὶ παρθένῳ ἱερῶς διαφυλαττομένη καὶ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει διακομισθεῖσα ἐν Βλαχέρναις ἀπετέθη, ἔνθα ὁ βασιλεὺς ναὸν οἰκοδομήσας τῆς θεομήτορος καὶ σορὸν ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου κατασκευάσας κατέθετο ταύτην. ἥτις ἐξ ἐρίων εὐφθάρτων ἐξυφασμένη, καὶ ὁ στήμων ὁμοειδῆς καὶ ὁμόχρους, ἀδιάφθορος [C ἀδιαφθόρως] ἐστι καὶ ἀδιάλυτος μέχρι νῦν τὸ θαῦμα τῆς ἀειπαρθένου [C <i>add.</i> καὶ ἀδιαφθόρου] σαφῶς κηρύττουσα.	99.2a Ἐπι τούτου δὲ ἠνέχθη ἐσθῆς τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων, εὐρεθεῖσα παρά τινι γυναικί εὐλαβεστάτῃ Ἑβραῖδι καὶ παρθένῳ,

According to Staffan Wahlgren's view, the main source for Symeon the Logothete's *Chronicle* was the *Chronography* by Theophanes,²⁵ but it is more likely that it may have rather been, as Treadgold argues, a source common to both Symeon and George, which was based on Theophanes' work. An analysis of the correlations between George and Symeon is made more difficult by the limited number of critical studies on George, as I have already noted. In any case, Wahlgren appears to side with Afinogenov's proposition that de Boor's edition is not based on the best manuscript, namely the *Coislinianus* 305, which makes comparisons between the two works more complicated.²⁶ At the same time, the Logothete's work shows a number of connections with Theodore Anagnostes' *History*, as evident from many parallels to the *Epitome*. Besides, the Logothete used narrative details derived from the works by John Malalas, *Chronicon Paschale*, *Historia syntomos* by Nicephorus, and the work of George Synkellos. Most probably, Symeon did not use those sources directly, but only through some other sources.²⁷

²³ Cf. C. de Boor, 1882, p. 283.

²⁴ Symeon the Logothete, 99, 2a (S. Wahlgren, 2006, p. 130, 10–13).

²⁵ S. Wahlgren, 2006, p. 118*.

²⁶ S. Wahlgren, 2006, p. 118*.

²⁷ S. Wahlgren, 2006, p. 119*.

If indeed Symeon had used the epitome version of Theodore's *History*, not George the Monk's work, the presence of the shortened version E 397 in his work may be an argument for considering it as drawn from the *Epitome*.²⁸ A more likely explanation is the presence of this narrative in the lost common source (an *Epitome* of Theophanes, as posited by Treadgold), which would indicate that this account came into being later than Theodore's work or even its *Epitome*. This hypothesis is corroborated by the lack of the E 397 not only in all of the surviving manuscripts of the *Epitome*, but also in the known version of Theophanes' *Chronography*.

Of course, the incomplete version of Theodore's *Epitome* is the only one that survives to this day, while the individual offshoots of the manuscripts had been subjected to redaction alterations. Perhaps, then, an explanation for the absence of the E 397 in any of the sources prior to the mid-9th century should be sought in the offshoot of the *Epitome* manuscripts used by George the Monk. All the passages that George faithfully derives from Theodore can be found in the manuscript *Codex Baroccianus* gr. 142 (Bodleian Library, Oxford), designated as **B** in Hansen's edition.²⁹ Manuscripts of that family were also used by Theophanes.³⁰ The codex in question dates from the early 14th century, so it is not known whether the above-mentioned narrative was removed in the copying process, but it seems not very likely especially considering its absence in Theophanes' work. It could rather be conjectured that this account had never been a part of the Family **B**. Five of George's literal quotations from the *Epitome* can also be found in the *Codex Vatopedinus* 286 from the 13th century (marked **V** in Hansen's edition³¹), while three are in the *Codex Parisinus* gr. 1555 A from the 13th–14th century (marked **P** in Hansen's edition³²). The manuscripts **B** and **V**, nonetheless, show certain minor discrepancies in these narratives, e.g., at E 396 the manuscript **V** omits the word *νυκτός*, present in both the manuscript **B** and George's work, which suggests that this author was based on the tradition of **B** also at those places that can be found in the other manuscripts. It should be added that out of the three passages from George's *Chronicle* which are identical to the *Epitome* of John Diacrinomenos, each one of them can be found in both **B** and the *Codex Parisinus suppl.* gr. 1156 from the 10th or 11th century (marked **M** in Hansen's edition³³). In all likelihood, therefore, George must have used a manuscript from the family **B** in this particular case as well.

In turn, in the case of further analogies or paraphrases from the *Epitome*, parallel fragments can be found also in the manuscript **B** (three cases, including one closer to the *Epitome* than to Theophanes), but also **V** (three cases as well, one common with the **B**) and **P** (just one case). This would confirm

²⁸ Thus in G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 30.

²⁹ G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 27–28. On this frequently referenced manuscript, see also C. de Boor, 1884, p. 478–494 and B. Pouderon, 1997, p. 169–192.

³⁰ G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 35, stemma; P. Nautin, 1994, p. 214, stemma.

³¹ G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 26–27; A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 1901, p. 1–9.

³² G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 25–26. On this manuscript, see also B. Pouderon, 1998, p. 169–191.

³³ G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 24–25.

the hypothesis of Günther Hansen and Pierre Nautin that **B** and **V** belonged to one and the same family of manuscripts (marked β by Hansen and “n” by Nautin),³⁴ which would have been used by Theophanes as well. In view of this, it is safe to assume that George must have used a manuscript from that family. Loose references to the *Epitome* do not bring anything new to this question, as they find their parallels in the manuscripts **B**, **P**, and **V**, except for **M**, to which offshoot of the *Epitome* manuscripts George probably had no access. An argument in support of the hypothesis of the use by Theophanes and George of the same offshoot of the manuscripts β/n can be found in the structure of the E 363, dedicated to the church foundations of Pulcheria in Constantinople. Both George the Monk and Theophanes, as well as the manuscript **V** 52, mention by name only the Church of St Laurentius, while **B** I, 5 also makes reference to the churches at Blachernae, Chalkoprateia, and Hodegon. This would indicate that these churches were interpolated into the tradition of **B** after the 9th century, whereas George and Theophanes would have used it prior to the said interpolation. Considering the fact that George the Monk and Theophanes used a similar manuscript of the *Epitome*, representing the offshoot β/n , the absence of this narrative in Theophanes would call for approaching the attribution of E 397 to the *Epitome* with caution.

The second passage from George the Monk, which de Boor proposed to consider as an excerpt from Theodore Lector’s *Epitome*, is apparently less disputable. It is featured at the beginning of the account on the conflict between Bishop Euphemios and the Emperor Anastasius, which is, as noted before, almost entirely a literal citation from the *Epitome*. Moreover, the content bears resemblance to the article “φατρία” in the *Suda*,³⁵ where an identical narrative can be found, as well as to the account in Theophanes’ *Chronography*.

Table 6. Postulated E 441 vs. F33 from the *Suda* and Theophanes

(bold type indicates the verbatim parallels between the text of the *Suda* and the *Chronography* by Theophanes vs. George the Monk’s *Chronicle*)

George the Monk, <i>Chronica</i> 623,20–624,3 (= E 441)	<i>Suda</i> , φατρία IV, 704, 14–20 (= F 33)	Theophanes, <i>Chronographia</i> AM 5982 (134, 19–25)
Εὐφημῖος ζηλωτῆς ἦν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως καὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐδίωκεν, ὧν πρῶτος ἦν Ἀναστάσιος ὁ τότε σιλεντιάριος, ὕστερον δὲ βασιλεὺς γενόμενος, ὃν τὰ Εὐτυχοῦς μαθὼν φρονοῦντα καὶ ὀχλοποιοῦντα ἰδὼν τὴν καθέδραν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐν τῇ	Ἀναστάσιος σιλεντιάριος , ὁ μετέπειτα βασιλεύσας, ἐπὶ Εὐφημίου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καθέδραν κατασκευάσας μετὰ τινων ἐφατρίαζεν. ὁ δὲ Εὐφήμιος μετὰ ἀπειλῆς λέγει αὐτῷ ἢ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ θαμίζοντα τὰ ταύτης φρονεῖν	Εὐφήμιος δὲ ὁ ὀρθοδοξότατος Ἀναστάσιον σιλεντιάριον, τὸν κακῶς μετὰ ταυῦτα βασιλεύσαντα, τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐδίωκεν ὡς αἰρετικὸν καὶ ὁμόφρονα Εὐτυχοῦς , ὃν ὀχλοποιοῦντα ὁρῶν τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καθέδραν αὐτῷ ἀνέτρεψεν ,

³⁴ G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 35 (stemma) and P. Nautin, 1994, p. 214, stemma. It would follow, however, from Hansen’s stemma that Theophanes might not have known the offshoot **V** of that family.

³⁵ A. Adler, 1935, p. 704, 14–20.

<p>ἐκκλησία ἀνέτρεψε καὶ αὐτῶ χαλεπῶς ἀπειλῶν ἐδήλωσεν ὡς, εἰ μὴ τὰ τῆς ἡσυχίας ἄγει, τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἀποκείρει καὶ τοῖς δήμοις θριαμβεύει. καὶ βασιλεῖ δὲ τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐγνώρισε καὶ ἐξουσίαν τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἔλαβεν.</p>	<p>ἢ μηδὲν ἐπιβαίνειν πρὸς τὸ διαστρέφειν τοὺς ἀπειροτέρους. «εἰ δὲ παρὰ ταῦτα πράξειαι, ἐκτεμών σου τὴν κόμην τοῖς δήμοις σε θριαμβεύσω.» ἔκτοτε ἡσυχίαν ἤγεν ἀντείχετο γὰρ τῆς Εὐτυχοῦς δόξης.</p>	<p>ἀπειλήσας αὐτῶ, ὡς, εἰ μὴ παύσοιτο, ἀποκείρει τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις αὐτὸν θριαμβεύσει. ἐνεκάλεσε δὲ καὶ Ζήνονι καὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐξουσίαν ἔλαβεν.</p>
---	---	---

Because of the above parallel, the article from the lexicon was regarded as an excerpt of Theodore Lector's (or, possibly, John of Antioch's) *Church History*, *nota bene* also by Carl de Boor,³⁶ but it can be seen, on closer inspection of George's account, that the beginning of the Euphemios narrative (623, 14–624, 3) has basically no analogy with the extant *Epitome* manuscripts, only showing the faintest references to the manuscript V, while the further part of the story is an almost literal citation from the B. The manuscript V of the *Epitome* only states the information that Euphemios was a presbyter, a fervent supporter of the Chalcedonian doctrine, who removed the name of Peter Mongos from the diptychs. On the other hand, George the Monk provides many more details in the relevant passage: Euphemios was a presbyter and a protector of the poor at Neapolis near Anaplis. He was also an opponent of the heretics, of whom the most notable representative was the future emperor Anastasius, preaching the Eutychian heresy from his chair at the Great Church of Constantinople. Euphemios threatened Anastasius with public condemnation and obtained from the emperor Zeno authority over the silentarios. Furthermore, the similarity between George's transmission and the article featured in the *Suda* is illusory, in particular because the latter text is about 1/5 shorter than the version used, which George the Monk had access to and which, according to de Boor and Hansen, may have derived from the epitomized version of Theodore's *History*. In all the cases where the original texts of the *History* and the *Epitome* survive, the rule is just the opposite. It does not seem, for this reason, that the texts of Theophanes and George would have drawn on the one cited in the *Suda*, as both of them appear to have referred to some common, unfortunately unknown, source. Still, it is possible to presume, considering the differences between these two accounts as well as George the Monk's preferred *modus operandi*, that it was him, not Theophanes, who transmitted the content of that source in a form closer to the original.

The linking of this narrative with Theodore's *History* made it more credible and turned it into a fundamental point widely represented in all of the studies concerning Anastasius (including those by the author of the present article),³⁷ whereas the listing of the complete passage in George the Monk clearly shows that the whole paragraph, which serves as an introduction to the figure of Eu-

³⁶ C. de Boor, 1917, p. 314–315.

³⁷ P. Charanis, 1939, p. 12; C. Capizzi, 1969, p. 69–70; A. Grillmeier, 1987, p. 264; F.K. Haarer, 2006, p. 2; R. Kosiński, 2012, p. 62–63. None of these authors questions the transmissions by George the Monk and Theophanes.

phemios, should attest to the very remote analogy to the manuscript V of the *Epitome* (which George would have surely not used for this specific place in the text), but it has much in common with Theophanes' text that transmits all the elements of the conflict between the future emperor and the patriarch. At this point in the text, Symeon the Logothete's account is of no use, as it summarizes the whole confrontation between Euphemios and Anastasius in just three sentences.

Table 7. Narrative on Euphemios in George the Monk and in the *Epitome* by Theodore Anagnostes (bold type indicates the verbatim parallels between the text of George the Monk's *Chronica* and the *Epitome* of Theodore)

George the Monk, <i>Chronica</i>	<i>Epitome</i> of Theodore Lector
623, 14–624, 3 Εὐφήμιός τις πρεσβύτερος καὶ πτωχοτρόφος Νεαπόλεως τῆς κειμένης ἐν τῷ Ἀνάπλῳ προχειρίζεται εἰς ἐπίσκοπον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ὃς ἅμα τῇ χειροτανίᾳ πρὶν ἢ ἀνελθεῖν εἰς τὸ σύνθρονον ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν διπτύχων ἀπήλειψε Πέτρου τοῦ Μογγοῦ τὸ ὄνομα ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶ καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὸν ἐπισκοπικὸν θρόνον ἐκάθισεν. οὗτος δὲ ὁ Μογγὸς Ἀλεξανδρείας μὲν ἦν ἐπίσκοπος, αἰρετικὸς δὲ διάπυρος. 623,20–624,3 (= E 441) Εὐφημιὸς ζηλωτὴς ἦν τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως καὶ τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐδίωκεν, ὧν πρῶτος ἦν Ἀναστάσιος ὁ τότε σιλεντιάριος, ὕστερον δὲ βασιλεὺς γενόμενος, ὃν τὰ Εὐτυχοῦς μαθὼν φρονοῦντα καὶ ὀχλοποιοῦντα ἰδὼν τὴν καθέδραν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀνέτρεψε καὶ αὐτῷ χαλεπῶς ἀπειλῶν ἐδήλωσεν, ὡς, εἰ μὴ τὰ τῆς ἡσυχίας ἄγει, τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἀποκείρει καὶ τοῖς δήμοις θριαμβεύει καὶ βασιλεῖ δὲ τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐγνώρισε καὶ ἐξουσίαν τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἔλαβεν.	440 V καὶ τρεῖς ἡμισὺ μῆνας ἐπιζήσας [Φραυίτας] ἐτελεύτησε, καὶ προχειρίζεται Εὐφήμιός τις πρεσβύτερος, ζηλωτὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως, ὃς ἐξαυτῆς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Μογγοῦ ἀπήλειψεν τῶν ἱερῶν διπτύχων.
624, 4–11 Ζήνων βασιλεὺς ἐτελεύτησεν, ἀναγορεύεται δὲ εἰς βασιλέα ὑπὸ Ἀριάδνης τῆς Αὐγούστης Ἀναστάσιος ὁ σιλεντιάριος, περὶ οὗ ἀντέστη Εὐφήμιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος αἰρετικὸν καλῶν καὶ τῶν χριστιανῶν ἀνάξιον. Ἀριάδνης δὲ καὶ τῶν τῆς συγκλήτου συναινεῖν ἀναγκαζόντων Εὐφήμιον, οὐκ ἄλλως τοῦτο ποιῆσαι ἠνέσχετο, εἰ μὴ ὁμολογίαν ἔγγραφον παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκομίσατο, ὡς εἰς ὄρον πίστεως δέχεται τὰ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι δογματισθέντα.	446 B Ζήνων ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐτελεύτησεν, ἀναγορεύεται δὲ εἰς βασιλέα ὑπὸ Ἀριάδνης τῆς Αὐγούστης Ἀναστάσιος ὁ σιλεντιάριος ἐκ τοῦ Δυρραχίου ὀρμώμενος, περὶ οὗ ἀντέστη Εὐφήμιος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος αἰρετικὸν καλῶν καὶ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀνάξιον. Ἀριάδνης δὲ καὶ τῶν τῆς συγκλήτου συναινεῖν ἀναγκαζόντων Εὐφήμιον, οὐκ ἄλλως τοῦτο ποιῆσαι ἠνέσχετο, εἰ μὴ ὁμολογίαν ἔγγραφον παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐκομίσατο, ὡς εἰς ὄρον πίστεως δέχεται τὰ ἐν Χαλκηδόνι δογματισθέντα· ὃ καὶ πεποίηκεν.

<p>624, 11–12 τὴν δὲ ὁμολογίαν αὐτοῦ βιαίως τὸν Εὐφήμιον ἀπήτησε βασιλεύσας.</p> <p>624, 12–15 Μανιχαῖοι καὶ Ἀρειανοὶ ἔχαιρον Ἀναστασίῳ, Μανιχαῖοι μὲν ὡς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ζηλωτρίας οὕσης αὐτῶν, Ἀρειανοὶ δὲ ὡς Κλέαρχον τὸν θεῖον πρὸς μητρὸς Ἀναστασίου ὁμόδοξον ἔχοντες.</p> <p>624, 15–625, 3 πολλὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἄτοπα καὶ ἀπάνθρωπα τολμώντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, Ἀναστάσιος ἅπαντας τῆς βασιλίδος ἐξέβαλεν. οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες πρὸς τυραννίδα ὠρμησαν καὶ ἕως τοῦ Κοτταεῖου ἐξέδραμον. καθ' ὧν ὁ βασιλεὺς στρατὸν ἐξέπεμψε καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Σκύθην καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Κυρτόν. τοῦ δὲ πολέμου ἐπὶ ε. ἔτη κρατήσαντος, Ἀναστάσιος ἀποκαμῶν ἐθάρρησεν Εὐφημίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς εἰρήνης ἐφίεται, καὶ ἵνα συναγάγῃ τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους καὶ δόξῃ ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἰσαύρων παρακαλεῖν. Εὐφήμιος δὲ ἐξήγαγε τὸ λεχθὲν πρὸς Ἰωάννην πατρικίον πενθερὸν Ἀθηνοδώρου ἐνὸς τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τῶν Ἰσαύρων. ὁ δὲ δραμῶν πάντα ἀναγγέλλει τῷ βασιλεῖ, ὅπερ εἰς ἔχθραν τὸν βασιλέα κατὰ Εὐφημίου ἐξώπλισε μεῖζονα.</p> <p>625, 3–6 Ἀναστάσιος δὲ βασιλικώτερον κινηθεὶς κατὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων τούτους κατὰ κράτος ἐνίκησε καὶ πέμψας πρὸς Εὐφήμιον Εὐσέβιον τὸν μάγιστρον δηλοῖ αὐτῷ· αἰ εὐχαί σου, ὁ μέγας, τοὺς φίλους σου ἡσβόλωσαν.</p> <p>625, 6–15 Ἀναστάσιος βασιλεὺς τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἐπιγράψας Εὐφημίῳ, καὶ ὡς εἶη γράμματα πεπομφῶς τοῖς τυράννοις, συνήγαγε τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους, οἵτινες βασιλεῖ χαριζόμενοι ἀκοινωνησὶα καὶ καθαιρέσει τὸν ἄνδρα ἡμείψαντο. καὶ προχειρίζεται ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς ἐπίσκοπον Μακεδόنيον πρεσβύτερον τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ σκευοφύλακα. ὁ μέντοι λαὸς δι' Εὐφήμιον ἐστασίαζον· ἐν οἷς εἰς τὸ ἵπποδρόμιον ἔδραμον λιτανεύοντες. ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ὤνησαν, τοῦ γὰρ βασιλέως ἐνίκα ἢ ἐνστασις.</p>	<p>447 B Τὴν ὁμολογίαν αὐτοῦ βιαίως τὸν Εὐφήμιον ἀπήτησεν Ἀναστάσιος βασιλεύσας.</p> <p>448 B Μανιχαῖοι καὶ Ἀρειανοὶ ἔχαιρον Ἀναστασίῳ, Μανιχαῖοι μὲν ὡς τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ζηλωτρίας οὕσης αὐτῶν, Ἀρειανοὶ δὲ ὡς Κλέαρχον τὸν θεῖον πρὸς μητρὸς Ἀναστασίου ὁμόδοξον ἔχοντες.</p> <p>449 B Πολλὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἄτοπα καὶ ἀπάνθρωπα πραξάντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἀναστάσιος ἅπαντας τῆς βασιλίδος ἐξέβαλεν. οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες πρὸς τυραννίδα ὠρμησαν καὶ ἕως τοῦ Κοτταεῖου ἐξέδραμον. καθ' ὧν ὁ βασιλεὺς στρατὸν ἐξέπεμψε καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Σκύθην καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Κυρτόν. τοῦ δὲ πολέμου ἐπὶ πέντε ἔτη κρατήσαντος Ἀναστάσιος ἀποκαμῶν ἐθάρρησεν Εὐφημίῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ὡς εἰρήνης ἐφίεται, καὶ ἵνα συναγάγῃ τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους καὶ δόξῃ ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἰσαύρων παρακαλεῖν. Εὐφήμιος δὲ ἐξήγαγε τὸ λεχθὲν πρὸς Ἰωάννην πατρικίον πενθερὸν Ἀθηνοδώρου ἐνὸς τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τῶν Ἰσαύρων. ὁ δὲ δραμῶν πάντα ἀναγγέλλει τῷ βασιλεῖ. ὅπερ εἰς ἔχθραν τὸν βασιλέα κατὰ Εὐφημίου ἐξώπλισεν.</p> <p>450 B Ἀναστάσιος βασιλικώτερον λοιπὸν κινηθεὶς κατὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων τούτους κατὰ κράτος ἐνίκησεν· καὶ πέμψας πρὸς Εὐφήμιον Εὐσέβιον τὸν μάγιστρον δηλοῖ πρὸς αὐτὸν· «αἰ εὐχαί σου, [ὁ μέγας, τοὺς φίλους σου ἡσβόλωσαν.】</p> <p>455 B Ἀναστάσιος ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς τῶν Ἰσαύρων ἐπιγράψας Εὐφημίῳ καὶ ὡς γράμματα πεπομφῶς τοῖς τυράννοις συνήγαγεν τοὺς ἐνδημοῦντας ἐπισκόπους· οἵτινες βασιλεῖ χαριζόμενοι ἀκοινωνησὶα καὶ καθαιρέσει τὸν ἄνδρα ἡμείψαντο. προχειρίζεται δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς ἐπίσκοπον Μακεδόنيον πρεσβύτερον τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ σκευοφύλακα. ὁ μέντοι λαὸς δι' Εὐφήμιον ἐστασίαζον· ἐν οἷς εἰς τὸ ἵπποδρόμιον ἔδραμον λιτανεύοντες· ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ὤνησαν· τοῦ γὰρ βασιλέως ἐνίκα ἢ ἐνστασις.</p>
---	---

<p>625, 15–626, 1 Εὐφήμιον εἰς Εὐχάιταν βασιλεὺς περιορισθῆναι προσέταξεν. ὁ δὲ λόγον ἤτησε διὰ Μακεδονίου λαβεῖν ὡς ἐπιβουλῆς χωρὶς κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἀπάγεται. ἐπιτραπεῖς δὲ τὸν λόγον δοῦναι ὁ Μακεδόνιος ἐπαινετόν τι σκεψάμενος, ἐν τῷ βαπτιστηρίῳ τοῦ Εὐφημίου ὄντος, τὸ ὠμοφόριον τὸ ἐπισκοπικὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀφαιρεθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχidiaκόνου προσέταξε καὶ οὕτως εἰσήλθε πρὸς τὸν Εὐφήμιον. δανεισάμενος δὲ καὶ χρήματα παρέσχε τῷ Εὐφημίῳ εἰς δαπάνας τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ.</p>	<p>457 B Εὐφήμιον εἰς Εὐχάιτα βασιλεὺς περιορισθῆναι προσέταξεν. ὁ δὲ λόγον ἤτησεν διὰ Μακεδονίου λαβεῖν, ὡς ἐπιβουλῆς χωρὶς κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἀπάγεται. ἐπιτραπεῖς δὲ τὸν λόγον δοῦναι ὁ Μακεδόνιος ἐπαινετόν τι σκεψάμενος ἐν τῷ βαπτιστηρίῳ τοῦ Εὐφημίου ὄντος τὸ ὠμοφόριον τὸ ἐπισκοπικὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀφαιρεθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχidiaκόνου προσέταξε, καὶ οὕτως εἰσήλθε πρὸς τὸν Εὐφήμιον. δανεισάμενος δὲ καὶ χρήματα δέδωκε τῷ Εὐφημίῳ εἰς δαπάνας τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ.</p>
<p>626, 1–2 Μακεδόνιος ἀσκητὴς ἦν καὶ ἱερός, ὡς ὑπὸ Γενναδίου τραφεῖς, οὗ καὶ ἀδελφιδοῦς ὑπῆρχεν.</p>	<p>458 VB Μακεδόνιος ἀσκητικὸς ἦν καὶ ἱερός ὡς ὑπὸ Γενναδίου τραφεῖς, οὗ καὶ ἀδελφιδοῦς, ὡς λόγος, ὑπῆρχεν.</p>

As it is, the whole story of the conflict between the silentarios Anastasius and Euphemios is not attested prior to the 9th century, with Theophanes' *Chronography* remaining the oldest evidence thereof. In all probability, therefore, after a brief introduction to the figure of Euphemios, which also included an anecdote on his admonishing of silentarios Anastasius (likely with the intent of explaining the emperor's later hostile attitude towards the bishop), derived from an unidentified source (used also by Theophanes and the *Suda* lexicon), George copied the rest of the narrative from the *Epitome* of Theodore Lector. It is then impossible to say, with any certainty, that E 441 is derived from the *Epitome*, and not from some other later source.

Can the passage 607, 13–608, 9 of George the Monk's *Chronicle* come from Theodore Lector?

There is one more passage from George the Monk's *Chronicle* that cannot be found in any of the surviving earlier sources but does correspond to Theodore Lector's interests, as evident in the narrative of the emperor Zeno and the Paphlagonian monk Severus, which is present in his work and preserved only in the manuscript *Athos Iviron* 497 (fol. 25^r), dating from the 17th century (F 37)³⁸. In his article of 1882, Carl de Boor did not examine the passage at all, since he considered the period from the reign of Leo I to Anastasius, while the said narrative treats of Theodosius II. Let us quote this excerpt (607, 13–608, 9; C: f. 274r, l. 2–23):

Τοῦ [C καὶ ὁ] βασιλέως [C *add.* ἐξελθῶν] κυνηγῆσαι ἐξελθόντος [C *om.* ἐξελθόντος, *add.* καὶ], τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ πάντας [C *om.* πάντας] διαλαθῶν ἦλθε [C ἦλθεν] διὰ μακρᾶς ὁδοῦ πρὸς τινα μοναχὸν ἐν κελλίῳ καθεζόμενον πλησίον τῶν προαστείων

³⁸ Cf. G.Ch. Hansen, 1995, p. 23 and S.P. Lambros, 1900, p. 157 (no. 4617).

Κωνσταντινουπόλεως· ὄν ὁ γέρων ἐπέγνω μὲν, ἐδέξατο δὲ ὡς ἓνα τῶν στρατιοτῶν. [C *add.* καὶ] τοῦ δὲ [C *om.* δὲ] βασιλέως ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ καὶ καύσωνος [C καύματος] ὀλιγορήσαντος, ἔβρεξεν ἄρτους ὁ γέρων, καὶ βαλὼν ὄξος καὶ ἔλαιον, ἔφαγεν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ἔπιεν ὕδωρ. καὶ φησιν ὁ βασιλεὺς [C *om.* ὁ βασιλεὺς]· οἶδας, τίς εἰμι, πάτερ; ὁ δὲ μοναχὸς [C *om.* μοναχὸς] εἶπεν· ὁ θεὸς οἶδέ σε. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔφη· ἐγὼ εἰμι Θεοδόσιος ὁ βασιλεὺς. καὶ ἀναστὰς εὐθὺς ὁ γέρων προσεκύνησεν αὐτόν. εἶπεν οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς [C *om.* προσεκύνησεν – ὁ βασιλεὺς; *add.* καὶ προσκυνήσας καὶ ἐπευξάμενος αὐτῷ ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτόν ἀντεσπάσατο γνησίως λέγων]· μακάριοι καὶ τρισμακάριοί ἐστε ὄντως ὑμεῖς [C ὑμεῖς ὄντως] οἱ μοναχοὶ καὶ ἀμέριμνοι τοῦ [C *add.* ματαίου] κόσμου. [C *add.* καὶ τῆς θείας χάριτος ἔμπλεοι] ἐπ' ἀληθείας γὰρ λέγω σοι, πάτερ, ὅτι ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ ἐγεννήθη καὶ οὐδέποτε [C *om.* ἐγεννήθη καὶ οὐδέποτε; *add.* ἀνατραφεὶς οὐδέποτε] μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἀπήλαυσα βρώσεως καὶ πόσεως ὡς σήμερον. τοῦ δὲ λαοῦ φθάσαντος, καὶ ἐνώπιον πάντων [C *add.* ὁ βασιλεὺς] ἀξιοπρεπῶς τιμήσαντος [C *om.* τιμήσαντος; *add.* τιμήσας αὐθις] τὸν γέροντα καὶ πάντας ἀξιωθῆναι τῆς εὐχῆς αὐτοῦ κελεύσαντος τοῦ βασιλέως, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ μετ' εἰρήνης, καὶ ἤρξατο ἀπὸ τότε τιμᾶν αὐτόν ὁ βασιλεὺς. ὁ δὲ γέρων ἀναστὰς ἔφυγε καὶ πάλιν ἦλθεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον [C *om.* κελεύσαντος – Αἴγυπτον; *add.* κελύσας ἔφυγεν ὁ γέρων εἰς Αἴγυπτον αἰσθόμενος τὸν βασιλέα βουλόμενος αὐτόν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια προσκαλέσασθαι].

There are several motifs here convergent with the F 37; the emperor's admiration of the hermit, the modest attitude of the latter and his reluctance towards being venerated by the emperor, his escape or refusal to receive money. Besides, the narrative concerns Constantinople, on which Theodore's work is focused. It should be noted, at the same time, that the narrative cited above, due to its actual length, is likely to have come from the full version of Theodore's *History*, rather than from its epitomized version. George may have come across it through an unidentified source. This proposition is, of course, just as hypothetical as the one that identifies the story of Mary's robe with the *Epitome*, but it would be good to consider the possible provenance of this excerpt from Theodore in our attempt to examine it more thoroughly.

In conclusion, George the Monk used in his *Chronicle* an *Epitome* of Theodore Lector's work, which he copied faithfully in most cases, limiting his interventions to spelling modifications and the adjustment of the composition to the text structure. Some of the texts with their origin in the *Epitome* were treated with more liberty, especially in the case of those passages that are also present in Theophanes' *Chronography*, which may suggest that George used the latter source, rather than the *Epitome* of Theodore's work, in these cases. However, since in none of the cases discussed above George cites the *Chronography* literally, even though he does so when drawing on the other authors,³⁹ it

³⁹ George's faithful use of his sources can be attested by an extensive passage on Symeon Stylites (de Boor 613, 1–616, 3 = C f. 276v, l. 14–277v, l. 31), which is essentially a literal quote from Theodoret of Cyrillus' *Historia religiosa* xxvi, 12–13 (with some elements of the later subsections), concluded with a citation from the treatise *On the Holy Spirit* by Basil of Caesarea (IX, 23). George deftly combines these two texts, preserving their original wording.

may be assumed that he used an epitomized version of Theophanes' volume. Of course, the present analysis deals with only a small fragment of George's *Chronicle* that covers a period dealt by Theodore's *Church History*. For a better understanding of George the Monk's literary technique, it is necessary to juxtapose the *Chronicle* with the other sources he used, which could help us to verify more clearly the hypothesis of the existence of the anonymous *Epitome* and the *Continuatio* of Theophanes' volume, presumably used by George.

Bibliography

- Adler A., 1935, *Suidae Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, vol. 4, Lipsiae.
- Afinogenov D.E., 1991, *Композиция Хроники Георгия Амартола*, "Византийский Временник", 52, p. 102–112.
- Afinogenov D., 1999, *The Date of Georgios Monachos Reconsidered*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift", 92, p. 437–447.
- Afinogenov D., 2004, *Le manuscrit grec Coislin. 305: la version primitive de la Chronique de Georges le Moine*, "Revue des Études Byzantines", 62, p. 239–246.
- Browning R., 1962, *The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century*, "Byzantion", 32, p. 167–180.
- Bury J.B., 1912, *A History of Eastern Roman Empire from Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (A.D. 802–867)*, London.
- Capizzi C., 1969, *L'imperatore Anastasio I (491–518). Studio sulla sua vita, la sua opera e la sua personalità*, Roma.
- Charanis P., 1939, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire, The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491–518*, Madison.
- Cramer J.A., 1839, *Anecdota graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae Parisiensis*, ed. J.A. Cramer, vol. 2, Oxonii.
- de Boor C., 1882, *Zur Kenntnis der Weltchronik des Georgios Monachos*, [in:] *Historische Untersuchungen Arnold Schaefer zum fünfundzwanzigjährigen Wirksamkeit gewidmet*, Bonn, p. 276–295.
- de Boor C., 1883, *Theophanis Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, vol. 1, Lipsiae.
- de Boor C., 1884, *Zur Kenntnis der Handschriften der griechischen Kirchenhistoriker Codex Baroccianus 142*, "Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte", 6, p. 478–494.
- de Boor C., 1889, *Neue Fragmente des Papias, Hegesippus und Pierius in bisher unbekannte Excerpten aus der Kirchenhechichte des Philippus Sidetes*, [in:] *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 5.2*, Leipzig, p. 165–184.
- de Boor C., 1917, *Zu Suidas*, "Hermes", 52, p. 314–315.
- de Boor C., 1978, *Georgii Monachi Chronicon*, ed. C. de Boor, editionem anni MCMIV correctorem curavit P. Wirth, vol. 1–2, Stutgardiae.
- Grillmeier A., 1987, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2, part 1, *From Chalcedon to Justinian I*, translated by P. Allen, J. Cawte, Atlanta.
- Haarer F.K., 2006, *Anastasius I, Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Hansen G.Ch., 1995, *Theodoros Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.Ch. Hansen, Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage, Berlin.

- Hunger H., 1978, *Die Hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, 1. Band, *Philosophie, Rhetorik, Epistolographie, Geschichtsschreibung, Geographie*, München.
- Istrin V.M., 1920–1930, *Хроника Георгия Амартола въ древнемъ славянорусскомъ переводѣ, текстъ, изслѣдование и словарь*, т. 1–3, Петроградъ.
- Kazhdan A., 1959, *Хроника Симеона Логофета*, “Византийский Временник”, 15, p. 125–143.
- Kazhdan A., 2006, *A History of Byzantine Literature*, vol. 2, Athens.
- Kosiński R., 2012, *Euphemos, Patriarch of Constantinople in 490–496*, “Jahrbuch der Österreichisches Byzantinistik”, 62, p. 57–79.
- Lambros S.P., 1900, *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos*, vol. 2, Cambridge.
- Miller E., 1873, *Fragments inédits de Théodore le Lecteur et de Jean d'Égée*, “Revue Archéologique”, 26, p. 396–403.
- Monégier du Sorbier M.-A., 1985, *Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite de la Chronique de Georges le Moine. La tradition directe*, Paris.
- Moravcsik G., 1983, *Byzantinoturcica*, Band I, *Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker*, Leiden.
- Nautin P., 1994, *Théodore Lector et sa «Réunion de différentes histoire» de l'Église*, “Revue des Études Byzantines”, 52, p. 213–243.
- Papadopoulos-Kerameus A., 1901, *Νέα τεμάχια τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Ἱστορίας Θεοδώρου Ἀναγνώστου τοῦ Ἐντολέως*, “Журналъ Министерства Народнаго Просвѣщенія”, 333, p. 1–25.
- Pouderon B., 1997, *Les fragments anonymes du Baroc. Gr. 142 et les notices consacrées à Jean Diacrinoménos, Basile de Cilicie et l'Anonyme d'Héraclée*, “Revue des Études Byzantines”, 55, p. 169–192.
- Pouderon B., 1998, *Le codex Parisinus graecus 1555 A et sa récénsion de l'Épitomé byzantin d'histoires ecclésiastiques*, “Revue des Études Byzantines”, 56, p. 169–191.
- Shestakov S.P., 1891, *О происхожденіи и составѣ хроники Георгия монаха (Амартола)*, Казань.
- Shestakov S.P., 1892, *По вопросу объ источникахъ хроники Георгия монаха (Амартола). IV книга хронки*, Санкт-Петербургъ.
- Treadgold W., 1979, *The Chronological Accuracy of the Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete for the Years 813–845*, “Dumbarton Oaks Papers”, 33, p. 159–197.
- Treadgold W., 2013, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Basingstoke.
- Vasiljevskij V., 1895, *Славянскій Логоветъ и хроника Георгия Амартола*, “Византийский Временник”, 2, p. 96–119.
- Wahlgren S., 2006, *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, recensuit S. Wahlgren, Berolini et Novi Eboraci.
- Weingart M., 1923, *Byzantské kroniky v literatuře církevněslovanské. Přehled a rozbor filologický, část II*, Bratislava.

Rafał Kosiński
Uniwersytet w Białymstoku
Instytut Historii i Nauk Politycznych
Plac Uniwersytecki 1, 15-420 Białystok
e-mail: rkosiu@interia.pl