Juan Signes Codoñer[a]

A Note on the Dossier of Geographical Glosses Used by the Compilers of the So-called Version B of the Logothete Chronicle under the Macedonian Emperors[*]

ABSTRACT: The article explains the list of geographical references included in the chronicle of the Pseudo-Symeon 705.16–707.10 (Bekker) as the result of the careless copying of a dossier of glosses connected with the preparatory work for a lost volume of the Historical Excerpts of Constantine VII. Comparison is made with other contemporary chronicles, such as Book VI of Theophanes continuatus and the so-called Logothete Chronicle B in order to substantiate this hypothesis. It is suggested that Ps-Symeon worked on a copy of the Logothete Chronicle A, which he used as a basis to create a new version of the text expanded with new sources and materials. The problems thus detected make it necessary to reconsider the position of Logothete B in the stemma and to take into account the use of dossiers and the "contamination" (i.e. sharing of sources) among the various versions of the Logothete complex.

KEYWORDS: Logothete Chronicle, Theophanes continuatus, Geographical Glosses, Text Compilation, Macedonian Renaissance

INTRODUCTION

Every antique historian was expected occasionally to embellish his narrative with beautiful and inspiring descriptions of the history and geography of the territory where the action, in particular military, took place. This was especially necessary when the historical narrative took place beyond the civilized and urban areas to which the readers belonged and entered remote foreign lands which required some sort of learned introduction. Such was the practice since Herodotos, who adorned his narrative with many geographical excurses, and it soon became a golden rule for historians to display geographical connoisseurship, frequently embedded in etymological explanations.

This pattern prompted abuses already denounced by Lucian, who, in his famous treatise *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit*, mocked an historian who "explained every city, every mountain and plain, every river, in order to be clear and forceful, as he thought"[1]. However, Lucian's condemnation of this abuse was in fact a recommendation for more sober use of such descriptions, for at the end of his opuscule he writes that "There is particular need of moderation in explanations of mountains, fortifications, and rivers, lest you appear to make vulgar display of your facility with words, neglecting history to your own advantage"[2]. I translate by "explain" and "explanation" the Greek terms ἑρμηνεύω and ἑρμηνεία for they convey better the idea of learned exegesis implied here by Lucian who does not use the terms ἐκφράζω or ἔκφρασις commonly employed for literary descriptions. En-

---

a Juan Signes Codoñer: Universidad de Valladolid, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Departamento de Filología Clásica, Plaza del Campus s/n, E-47011 Valladolid; juansignes54@gmail.com

1 … πάσας πόλεις καὶ πάντα ὄρη καὶ πεδία καὶ ποταμοὺς ἑρμηνεύσας πρὸς τὸ σαφέστατον καὶ ἰσχυρότατον, ὡς ᾤετο, Lucian, Quomodo historia conscribenda sit, ch. 19.

2 Μάλιστα δὲ σωφρονητέον ἐν ταῖς τῶν ὀρῶν ἢ τειχῶν ἢ ποταμῶν ἑρμηνείαις ὡς μὴ δύναμιν λόγων ἀπειροκάλως παρεπιδείκνυσθαι δοκοίης καὶ τὸ σαυτοῦ δρᾶν παρεὶς τὴν ἱστορίαν. Ibid., ch. 57.

cyclopaedic dictionaries such as the *Ethnika* of Stephen became an indispensable tool in the hand of learned historians[3].

It therefore comes as no surprise that geography constituted one of the most important concerns in the recovery of classicizing history in the reign of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. Not only were the *Ethnika* of Stephen much consulted at this time, and the famous collection of historical excerpts supposedly included some three volumes of mainly geographical content entitled περὶ οἰκισμῶν, περὶ ἐθνῶν and περὶ ἐθῶν, but other works emanating from Constantine's circle also contained a great deal of geographical information of a markedly antiquarian character, such as the *De administrando imperio* and the *De thematibus*[4].

THE CASE IN POINT

It is against this background that I want to examine some geographical explanations or glosses scattered in the historical narrative of three manuscripts of the so-called Version B of the Logothete chronicle:

Vat. gr. 167 (*Diktyon* 66798): usually referred to as Book VI of Theophanes continuatus, a new edition of this text is currently being prepared by M. Featherstone and myself for the *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*. We shall refer to it here as **TC VI** with indication of page, line and (in brackets) chapter in the edition of I. Bekker[5].

Vat. gr. 153 (*Diktyon* 66784): edited by B.M. Istrin, this text is very close to that in Holkham gr. 61 (Oxford, *Diktyon* 48129), which is unedited. We shall refer to it here as **Log B (Istrin)** in order to differentiate it from the other main version of Log B represented by Vat gr. 163 (*Diktyon* 66794) which is also unedited but does not contain any of the geographical glosses discussed by us here. All three manuscripts, Vat. gr 153, Vat. gr. 163 and Vat. gr 167, will be used by S. Wahlgren in his intended edition of Logothete B in the *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*. For Vat. gr. 153 we shall refer here to the pages and lines of the edition by Istrin[6].

Paris gr. 1712 (*Diktyon* 68341): usually referred to as Pseudo-Symeon, this text is highly abbreviated in comparison to the two previous versions. Athanasios Markopoulos is currently preparing an edition of it for the *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*. We shall refer to it here as **Ps-Sym** with indication of page, line and chapter in the edition of I. Bekker[7].

The geographical glosses under consideration are found in the account of the reigns of the Macedonian emperors up to Romanos II in only these three manuscripts, as well as in Holkham 61, where the text is almost identical to that in Istrin's edition of Vat. gr. 153, but in none of the numer-

---

[3] See now M. Billerbeck et al. (ed), Stephani Byzantii Ethnica (*Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae* 43), Berlin – New York 2006–2017, 5 vols.

[4] For the geographical volumes in the Constantinian Excerpts see A. Németh, Imperial systematization of the Past. Emperor Constantine VII and his historical excerpts. Budapest 2010 (Doctoral Thesis), 81–82; For the geographical content of *De administrando imperio* and *De thematibus* see the overview of P. Magdalino, Constantine VII and the historical geography of Empire, in: Imperial geographies in Byzantine and Ottoman space, ed. S. Bazzaz – Y. Batsaki – D. Angelov. Washington 2013, 3–42, and A. Németh, The Excerpta Constantiniana and the Byzantine appropriation of the past. Cambridge 2018, 121–144.

[5] I. Bekker, Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus Continuatus (*Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*). Bonn 1838, 353–481. For occasional references to the first four books see now M.J. Featherstone – J. Signes Codoñer, Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur libri I–IV (*CFHB* 53), Berlin 2015.

[6] B.M. Istrin, Prodolzhenie chroniki Georgiia Amartola po Vatikanskomu spisku No. 153, in: B.M. Istrin, Chronika Georgiia Amartola v drevnem slavianorusskom perevode. Tekst, issledovanie i slovar II. Petrograd 1922, 1–65.

[7] Bekker, Theophanes Continuatus 603–760.

ous manuscripts of related versions such the original Logothete chronicle (Logothete A)[8], nor in the above-mentioned Vat. gr. 163 or in the history of Ioannes Skylitzes[9].

The glosses are mostly short explanations of certain geographical names mentioned in the narrative and are not very numerous. Their interest to us lies not in the information they provide, but rather in the various ways in which they have been inserted into the narrative of TC VI, Log B (Istrin) and Ps-Sym, for this allows us to draw conclusions concerning the working methods of the authors who produced these three versions and their mutual relationship. This latter point is a very troubled question on which there is, as yet, no consensus and which is obviously of prime importance to the critical editions now in progress[10].

Here below we have listed all the geographical glosses in two columns. In the left column we copy the text of the glosses as they are transmitted in Ps-Sym, numbered in the order of appearance in the text. In the right column we put the references as transmitted in TC VI, also numbered in the order of appearance, making them coincide at the same level, when possible, with the corresponding reference in the list of Ps-Sym. As the order of appearance of the glosses is frequently different in the two columns, there are inevitably empty spaces. If there is no correspondence, that is, if a gloss is found in Ps-Sym which does not appear in TC VI or vice-versa, this is expressly noted. If, however, the correspondence exists but the passages appear at different levels in the two lists, we put the cross-reference to the passage number, either above or below, in the other column. The geographical glosses in Log B (Istrin) are listed under TC VI, as their sequence is the same and their wording almost identical.

Besides the numerical reference to the passage, we provide also a short summary of the context of the narrative where the glosses are inserted, and we print in small capitals the geographic name which triggers the learned explanation. When the gloss has no relation at all to the adjacent narrative, we put the name in square brackets preceded by an asterisk. We use arrowheads in the left column to refer to other passages connected with the geographical glosses, mainly taken from works by Constantine VII or produced in his circle. We will not be occupied here with the original sources on which the mythical and etymological information of the glosses depends. Aubrey Diller, who dealt with these antiquarian glosses, suggested that they were mainly taken from Strabo and Stephen of Byzantium, although the question needs to be studied again in detail. We will come later to some of the conclusions advanced by Diller, who also pointed to connections between Genesios and Ps-Sym for their common use of some geographical glosses[11].

PASSAGE I	PASSAGE I
Ps-Sym / Basil I (686.16–687.5 = § 1)	**TC V** / Basil I (§ 4.3)[12]
[Basil I came from Adrianople]	[Basil I came from Adrianople]
1. ADRIANOPLE:	ADRIANOPLE:
ὥρμητο δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀδριανουπόλεως τῆς Μακε-δονίας, ἥτις πρότερον μὲν Ὀρεστιὰς ἐκαλεῖτο ἐξ Ὀρέστου υἱοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὃς ζήλῳ δικαίῳ διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Κλυταιμνήστρας δολοφο-	No gloss here. *Cf. infra* **TC VI** 12

⁸ Edited by St. WAHLGREN, Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon (*CFHB* 44/1). Berlin – New York 2006.

⁹ I. THURN, Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum (*CFHB* 5). Berlin – New York 1973. Skylitzes based his history on an older and better copy of TC VI than that in Vat gr. 167, but he has omitted the geographical glosses, apparently considering them inappropriate and disruptive to his narrative.

¹⁰ References works are A. MARKOPULOS, Ἡ Χρονογραφία τοῦ Ψευδοσυμεὼν καὶ οἱ πηγὲς της. Ioannina 1978 (Doctoral Thesis), and the lengthy introduction of WAHLGREN, Symeonis Magistri 1*–139*.

¹¹ A. DILLER, Excerpts from Strabo and Stephanus in Byzantine Chronicles. *TAPA* 81 (1950) 241–253.

¹² We refer to book V of TC by chapter and line in the edition of I. ŠEVČENKO, Chronographiae quae Theophanis Continuati nomine fertur. Liber quo Vita Basilii imperatoris amplectitur (*CFHB* 42). Berlin – New York 2011.

νίαν ταύτην σὺν Αἰγίσθῳ ἀπεκτονηκὼς λίαν ἐκμέμηνεν, καὶ ἐν τῇ συνελεύσει Ἕβρου Ἄρξου τε καὶ Ἀρτάβου 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,

2. HAIMOS:
… ἠγκαλισμένη ὄρει τῷ Αἵμῳ, παρ' ᾧ οἱ τρεῖς ποταμοὶ ἐς μισγάγκειαν οἷον συμβάλλετον ὄμβριμον ὕδωρ. *Cf. infra* **Ps-Sym** no. 2bis (PASSAGE III)

PASSAGE II	PASSAGE II
Ps-Sym / Leo VI (705.14–16 = § 13)	**TC VI /** Leo VI (366.15–17 = § 20) [= Log B (Istrin) 31.32–33]
[Attack of Leo of Tripoli]	[Attack of Leo of Tripoli]
3. TRIPOLITANS: Τριπολῖται δὲ ἐκλήθησαν διὰ τὸ τριῶν ἐκ γενεῶν συναχθῆναι, ἐξ Ἀράβων καὶ Τυρίων καὶ Σιδονίων ἀποίκων.	**1.** TRIPOLITANS: καὶ Τρίπολις μὲν ὠνόμασται ἡ κατὰ Φοινίκην τρισὶ διαιρεθεῖσα ταῖς γενεαῖς ἐξ Ἀραδίων καὶ Τυρίων καὶ Σιδονίων ἀποίκων. ➤ Περὶ οἰκισμῶν of Excerpta Const.?

PASSAGE III	PASSAGE III
Ps-Sym / Leo VI cap. 13 (705.16–707.10 = § 13)	**TC VI /** Leo VI (367.5–22 = § 20) [= Log B (Istrin) 32.9–22]
[Sea route of Himerios against Leo of Tripoli] No gloss here. *Cf. infra* **Ps-Sym** no. 8	[Sea route of Himerios against Leo of Tripoli] **2.** HELLESPONT: καθ' Ἑλλήσποντον, ἣν Μιλησίων κατῴκισαν ἄποικες [*sic*], Ἑλλήσποντον τὸν ἀπὸ Ἕλλης τῆς Φρίξου ἀδελφῆς τῷ ἐκεῖσε πελάγει ῥιφείσης οὕτως ἀγορευόμενον. ➤ Etymologicum Gudiaum s.v. Ἑλλήσποντος· ἡ ἐν τοῖς στενοῖς θάλασσα παρακειμένη τῇ Τροίᾳ, οὕτω προσαγορευθεῖσα ἀπὸ Ἕλλης τῆς Φρίξου θυγατρὸς τῷ ἐκεῖσε πελάγει διαρριφείσης.
4. AEGEAN SEA: ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ Αἰγαῖον πέλαγος τὴν κλῆσιν ἀπείληφεν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ὑδάτων φορᾶς, ἀΐσσούσης κατὰ τρόπον αἰγός.	**3.** AEGEAN SEA: καὶ Αἰγαῖον πέλαγος, ὃ τὴν κλῆσιν ἀπείληφεν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ὑδάτων φορᾶς ἀΐσσούσης κατὰ τρόπον αἰγός,
5. STROBILOS: ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Στρόβηλος ὠνομάσθη ἀπὸ τῆς τοπικῆς θέσεως,	**4.** STROBILOS: καὶ Στρόβηλος μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς τοπικῆς θέσεως,
Cf. infra **Ps-Sym** no. 9	**5.** KIBYRRA: Κιβύρρα δὲ ἀπὸ Κιβύρρου ἀδελφοῦ Μαρσοῦ τε καὶ Κιδράμου

➤ *De thematibus*, Asia 9: Κιβύρρα πόλις ἐκείνη, ἐξ ἧς καὶ τὸ θέμα τὴν ἐφύβριστον καὶ πονηρὰν ὀνομασίαν ἐκληρονόμησεν.

6. Lampsakos: καὶ Λάμψακος ἀπὸ φωτὸς λάμψεως, ὅπερ ἐν νυκτὶ Φωκέων θεμελιούντων ταύτην καὶ εὐξαμένων θεόθεν ἐπέλαμψεν, καὶ ἡ τῶν θεμελίων βάσις καλῶς κεκραταίωται.

6. Lampsakos: καὶ Λαμψάκῳ, ἀπὸ φωτὸς λάμψεως ὠνομασμένη, ὅπερ νυκτὶ Φωκαέων θεμελιούντων ταύτην εὐξαμένων θεόθεν ἐπέλαμψεν, καὶ ἡ τῶν θεμελίων βάσις καλῶς κεκραταίωτο,

7. Imbros: καὶ Ἴμβρος ἀπὸ Ἴμβρου κέκληται υἱοῦ Ἀνθέος, οὗ γενέτης Στάφυλος, Διονύσου φίλτατος υἱός.

7. Imbros: μετὰ ταῦτα τῇ Ἴμβρῳ διεληλυθώς, ἥτις ἀπὸ Ἴμβρου κέκληται υἱοῦ Ἄνθου, οὗ γενέτης Στάφυλος Διονύσου φίλτατος ἔγγονος,

8. Hellespont: καὶ Ἑλλήσποντος ἀπὸ Ἕλλης τῆς Φρίξου ἀδελφῆς, τῷ ἐκεῖσε πελάγει ριφείσης.

Cf. supra **TC VI** no. 2

9. Kibyrra: Κιβύρρα δὲ ὑπὸ Κιβύρρου ἀδελφοῦ.

Cf. supra **TC VI** no. 5

10. Thasos: ἡ δὲ Θάσος Χρυσῆ πρῴην ἐλέγετο.

8. Thasos: τῇ Θάσῳ προσπελάσας, ἣν Χρυσῆν οἱ πρὶν διεφημίζοντο,

11. Samothrake: Σαμοθράκη δὲ ἡ ἐν τῇ Θράκη χερρόνησος, ἥτις πρῴην Θηριοῦσα διὰ τὸ θηρίων πεπληρῶσθαι, καὶ ἱερὰν νυμφῶν οὖσαν, ὠνομάζετο, μετέπειτα δὲ τοῦ ῥοῦ συρραγέντος εἰς νῆσον συνέστη, καὶ ὑπὸ Σαμίων κατοίκων ἐν κατασχέσει γενομένη Σαμοθράκη μετωνομάσθη.

9. Samothrake: Σαμοθράκην δὲ ἐν Θράκη χερόνησον τὴν πρότερον Θηριοῦσαν διὰ τὸ θηρίων πεπληρῶσθαι, ἱερὰν Νυμφῶν οὖσαν, μετέπειτα τοῦ ῥοῦ συρραγέντος εἰς νῆσον συστῆναι καὶ ὑπὸ Σαμίων μετοίκων ἐν κατασχέσει γενέσθαι καὶ Σαμοθράκην κληθῆναι, τοὺς πολεμίους κατέλαβεν.

12. *[Laodikeia]*: Λαοδίκεια κατωνομάσθη ἀπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς Σελεύκου τοῦ Ἀντιόχου, ὃς ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι ταύτης ἔκτισε τὴν Λαοδίκειαν.

No correspondence in the text of **TC VI**
➤ Laodicea is mentioned in De cer. 657.10–11 in the context of the expedition of Himerios

13. Tenedos: Τένεδος δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Τέννου τοῦ υἱοῦ Κύκνου τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος, καὶ τοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ ἱεροῦ ἔδους τῆς Ἀθήνης.

The island is mentioned without gloss in **TC VI** 438.2 = § 3 of the reign of Const. VII
➤ Diod. Siculus 5.83.4: οὐ παραλειπτέον δ' ἡμῖν περὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς Τενεδίοις μυθολογουμένων περὶ τοῦ κτίσαντος τὴν πόλιν Τέννου· Κύκνον γάρ φασι τὸν πατέρα etc.
➤ Περὶ οἰκισμῶν of Excerpta Const.?

14. *[Mesembria]*: Μεσημβρία δὲ ἡ πρὶν Μεμνεβρία, ἀπὸ τοῦ Μέμνου Θρακὸς τοῦ ταύτην οἰκίσαντος καὶ βρία τὸ παρά τισι Θρακῶν πόλισμα λεγόμενον· πρὸς δὲ τὸ εὐφραδέστερον Μεσημβρία νῦν ὀνομάζεται. *Cf. infra* Passage VII

Cf. infra **TC VI** no. 12

2bis. *[Haimos]*: Αἷμος ἀπό τινος ἀναιρεθέντος ἐκεῖσε δι' Ἡρακλέους καὶ τὸν τόπον αἱμάξαντος·

Cf. infra **TC VI** no. 11

ἀκρωτήριον δέ ἐστι Θράκης. *Cf. supra* **Ps-Sym**
nr. 2 (Passage I)

15. *[Medeia]: Μήδεια ἀπὸ Μήδης τῆς Αἰήτου θυγατρὸς κατωνόμασται.

No correspondence in the text of **TC VI**
► Medeia is the ancient Salmydessos in Thrace

16. *[Selymbria]: Σηλυβρία ἀπὸ Σήλυος τοῦ Θρᾳκῶν βασιλέως, ὅστις αὐτὴν ᾤκισεν.

No correspondence in the text of **TC VI**
► Stephanus Byz. s.v. Σηλυμβρία, πόλις Θράκης. κέκληται δὲ ἀπὸ Σήλυος.
► De thematibus, Europa 1: ἥ τε Μεσημβρία καὶ Σηλυμβρία, βασιλέων προσηγορίας ἔχουσαι πόλεις
► Περὶ οἰκισμῶν of Excerpta Const.?

17. *[Amathia]: Μακεδονία ἡ πρὶν Ἀμαθία λεγομένη ἀπὸ ἀρχαίου τινὸς ἡγεμόνος. ἦν δὲ καὶ πόλις Ἀμαθία λεγομένη πρὸς τῇ θαλάσσῃ τῷ ἔθνει ἐπώνυμος.

No correspondence in the text of **TC VI**

18. *[Nikopolis]: Νικόπολις κατὰ τὸ ἐπώνυμος τῆς νίκης, ἣν Αὔγουστος Σεβαστὸς κατὰ Ἀντωνίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας εἰργάσατο, καὶ τὴν Αἰγυπτίων ἀρχὴν τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ὑπέκλινεν.

Cf. infra **TC VI** no. 13

19. *[Hieron]: Ἱερὸν Εὐξείνου, ὃ παρὰ τῶν τῆς Ἀργοῦς πλωτήρων διερχομένων ἐκεῖσε ἀνίδρυται.

Cf. infra **TC VI** no. 17

20. *[Pharos]: Φάρος δὲ ἀφιδρυμάτιον ᾧ πυρσὸς ἐπιτίθεται εἰς ὁδηγίαν ἀπρόσκοπτον τοῖς ἐν νυκτὶ παροδίταις.

Cf. infra **TC VI** no. 15

21. *[Rhos]: Ῥῶς δέ, οἱ καὶ Δρομῖται, φερώνυμοι ἀπὸ Ῥῶς τινὸς σφοδροῦ διαδραμόντες ἀπηχήματα τῶν χρησαμένων ἐξ ὑποθήκης ἢ θεοκλυτίας τινὸς καὶ ὑπερσχόντων αὐτούς, ἐπικέκληνται. Δρομῖται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀξέως τρέχειν αὐτοῖς προσεγένετο. ἐκγένους δὲ τῶν Φράγγων καθίστανται. — *Cf. infra* **Ps-Sym** no. 21bis (Passage IX)

Cf. infra **TC VI** no. 14

22. *[Trikephalos]: ὁ δὲ Τρικέφαλος βουνὸς κατὰ τὸ Ὀψίκιον ἀπὸ τοῦ τριχῇ κεφαλοῦσθαι τῷ σχήματι εἴρηται,

No correspondence in the text of **TC VI**

23. *[Rhadenos]: ὥσπερ καὶ Ῥαδηνὸς ἀπὸ Ῥάδης κώμης τοῦ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν θέματος.
Cf. infra Passage VI

Cf. infra Passage VI

PASSAGE IV	PASSAGE IV
Cf. supra **Ps-Sym** no. 1 (PASSAGE I)	**TC VI** / Const. VII (387.15–24 = § 8) [=Log B (Istrin) 42.27–43.1] [Pankratios treachously delivers Adrianople to Symeon] **10.** ADRIANOPLE: τὴν Ἀδριανούπολιν τῷ Συμεὼν προδέδωκεν, ἥτις τὸ πρὶν μὲν Ὀρεστιὰς ἐκαλεῖτο, ἐξ Ὀρέστου υἱοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὃς ζήλῳ δικαίῳ διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Κλυταιμνήστρας δολοφονίαν ταύτην σὺν Αἰγίσθῳ ἀποκτείνας λίαν ἐκμέμηνεν καὶ ἐν τῇ συνελεύσει Ἔβρου Ἄρζου τε καὶ Ἀρτάκου τῶν τριῶν ποταμῶν γε λουσάμενος τῆς νόσου ἀπήλλακτο· ἔνθα ταύτην οἰκοδομήσας ἐπὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀνόματι κέκληκεν· Ἀδριανὸς δὲ Καῖσαρ εὐκτίστοις οἰκήμασιν αὐτὴν μεγαλύνας πόλιν Ἀδριανοῦ μετακέκληκεν. αὕτη τρίτης ἡμέρας παρὰ ἀνδρὸς εὐπετοῦς ἐν διόδῳ Φιλιππουπόλεως σταδιάζεται,
Cf. supra **Ps-Sym** nos. 2 (PASSAGE I) and 2bis (PASSAGE III)	**11.** HAIMOS: … ἠγκαλισμένη τῷ ὄρει τῷ Αἴμῳ, παρ' ᾧ οἱ τρεῖς ποταμοὶ συμβάλλονται τὸ ὀμβρινὸν ὕδωρ.

PASSAGE V	PASSAGE V
Ps-Sym / Const.VII–Rom. I (728.21–729.19 = § 14) [Leo Phokas arrives at Chrysopolis] **24.** CHRYSOPOLIS: τὴν Χρυσόπολιν καταλαβών, ἥτις ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρον περιτυχόντα τῇ πόλει τοῦ Βύζαντος κατά τινά τε ταύτης χῶρον τὸν αὐτοῦ λαὸν στρατηγῆσαι, ἐφ' ὅτῳ τεθείκότα περίβολον προσονομάσαι Στρατήγιον, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν μεταναστεύσαντα καὶ τοῖς ἀντίπεραν προσελθόντα χρυσίον ἱκανὸν ἐπιδοῦναι τῷ οἰκείῳ λαῷ, Χρυσόπολις προσηγόρευται. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρυσὸν ἐκ μετάλλων αὐτῆς γίνεσθαι ταύτην φασὶν ὠνομάσθαι,	**TC VI** / Const. VII (396.1–3 = § 13) [Leo Phokas arrives at Chrysopolis] Chrysopolis, Damalis and Chalkedon are mentioned without gloss both in TC and Log B (Istrin) 47.7–8 ► Περὶ οἰκισμῶν of Excerpta Const.?
25. CHALKEDON: ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ Χαλκηδὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔχειν χαλκόν, ἢ ἀπὸ Χαλκίδος θυγατρὸς Νικομήδους τῆς ταύτην κτισάσης.	No correspondance in the Text of **TC VI**
24bis. CHRYSOPOLIS: ἐν τοιαύτῃ γοῦν τῇ Χρυσοπόλει καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοῦ Χάρητος παράκοιτις ἐτελεύτησε, Δάμαλις ὀνομαζομένη, αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χάρητος Ἀθήνηθεν πεμφθέντος ἐπαμῦναι τοῖς Βυζαντίοις·	

26. Damalis: ἧς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μνημείου δάμαλις βοῦς καθ᾽ ὁμωνυμίαν ἐν κίονι ἀνεστήλωται, συμβεβλημένον καὶ ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον ὧδε,

Ἰναχίης οὐκ εἰμὶ βοὸς τύπος, οὐδ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ἐμεῖο
 κλήζεται ἀντωπὸν Βοσπόριον πέλαγος.
κείνην γὰρ τὸ πάροιθε βαρὺς χόλος ἤλασεν
          [Ἥρης,
 ἐντάφιον τόδ᾽ ἐγὼ Κεκρόπος εἰμὶ νέκυς.
εὐνέτις ἦν δὲ Χάρητος· ἔπλων δ᾽ ὅτε ἔπλεν
          [ἐκεῖνος
 τῆδε Φιλιππείων ἀντίπαλος σκαφέων.
βοΐδιον δὲ καλεῦμ᾽ ἂν ἐγὼ τότε, νῦν δὲ
          [Χάρητος
 εὐνέτις ἠπείροις τέρπομαι ἀμφοτέραις.

Καταλαβὼν οὖν τὴν Χρυσόπολιν, ὡς εἴρηται, διέστησε παρατάξεις…

► The same verses appear in *De thematibus* Europa 12: Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τοῦ κίονος τῆς ἀντίπεραν γῆς Χρυσοπόλεως, ἐν ᾧ μαρμαρίνη δάμαλις ἵδρυται, φάσκον οὕτως·

Ἰναχίης οὐκ εἰμὶ βοὸς τύπος, οὐδ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ἐμεῖο
 κλήζεται ἀντωπὸν Βοσπόριον πέλαγος.
Κείνην γὰρ τὸ πάροιθε βαρὺς χόλος ἤλασεν
          [Ἥρης
 ἐς Φάρον, ἥδε δ᾽ ἐγὼ Κεκροπὶς εἰμὶ νέκυς.
Εὐνέτις ἦν δὲ Χάρητος· ἔπλων δ᾽ ὅτε πλῶεν
          [ἐκεῖνος
 τῆδε Φιλιππείων ἀντίπαλος σκαφέων·
Βοιίδιον δὲ καλεῦμαι ἔθ᾽ ὡς τότε· νῦν δὲ
          [Χάρητος
 εὐνέτις ἠπείροις τέρπομαι ἀμφοτέραις

Passage VI	Passage VI
Ps-Sym / Const.VII–Rom. I (735.11 =§ 28) [Ioannes Rhadenos drungarios of the fleet] No gloss here. *Cf. supra* **Ps-Sym** no. 23 (Passage III)	**TC VI** / Rom. I (405.14 = § 14) [Ioannes Rhadenos drungarios of the fleet] No gloss here either in TC or in Log B (Istrin) 52.3 ► Suda: Ῥαδηνός: ἀπὸ τόπου τινός

Passage VII	Passage VII
Ps-Sym / Const.VII–Rom. I (§ 34) [The ambassadors of the emperor meet the Bulgars] Mesembria is not mentioned in the summary made by Symeon of his source. *Cf. supra* **Ps-Sym** no. 14 (Passage III)	**TC VI** / Rom. I (413.3–6 = § 22) [=Log B (Istrin) 55.25–28] [The ambassadors of the emperor meet the Bulgars in Mesembria] **12.** Mesembria: ἐν Μεσημβρίᾳ, τὸ πρὶν μὲν Μενεβρίᾳ καλουμένη, ἀπὸ Μένου Θρακὸς τοῦ ταύτην οἰκίσαντος καὶ Βρία τὸ παρά τισι Θρακῶν πόλισμα λεγόμενον· πρὸς δὲ τὸ εὐφραδέστερον Μεσημβρία ὀνομάζεται. ► De thematibus, Europa 1: ἥ τε Μεσημβρία καὶ Σηλυμβρία, βασιλέων προσηγορίας ἔχουσαι πόλεις ► Περὶ οἰκισμῶν of Excerpta Const.?

Passage VIII	Passage VIII
No correspondence in the text of **Ps-Sym**, who probably suppressed this passage when he summarized his sources. *Cf. supra* **Ps-Sym** no. 18 (Passage III)	**TC VI** / Rom. I (420.8–10 = § 29) [=Log B (Istrin) 59.6–8] [The Bulgarian prince Michael attacks Nikopolis]

13. Nikopolis: τὴν Νικόπολιν προσχωρῆσαι καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖσε πάντα ληΐσασθαι. Νικόπολις δὲ ἐπωνόμασται κατὰ τὸ ἐπώνυμον τῆς νίκης, ἣν Αὔγουστος Σεβαστὸς κατὰ Ἀντωνίου καὶ Κλεοπάτρας εἰργάσατο καὶ τὴν Αἰγυπτίων ἀρχὴν τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ὑπέκλινεν.

➤ De *thematibus*, Europa 8: Νικόπολις μητρόπολις. Ἐκλήθη δὲ Νικόπολις δι᾽ αἰτίαν τοιαύτην· Καῖσαρ ἐκεῖνος ὁ σεβαστὸς καὶ περιώνυμος Αὔγουστος πόλεμον ἔσχε μετὰ Κλεοπάτρας τῆς Αἰγυπτίας καὶ Ἀντωνίου τοῦ ταύτης ἀνδρός· ὃς ἦν πρότερον ἐπ᾽ ἀδελφῇ τοῦ Καίσαρος γαμβρός, ἀπέστη δὲ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἀρχῆς δι᾽ ἔρωτα τῆς Κλεοπάτρας αὐτῆς καὶ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων γῆς πάσης ἐκράτησεν. Ναυτικῷ οὖν στόλῳ ἐπὶ ναυσὶ χιλίαις καὶ διακοσίαις συνέβαλον μετὰ Καίσαρος ἐν πολέμῳ, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ἀκρωτηρίῳ τῷ καλουμένῳ Ἀκτίῳ· καὶ νικήσας ὁ Καῖσαρ τὸν Ἀντώνιον καὶ τὴν Κλεοπάτραν ἔκτισε πόλιν, καλέσας αὐτὴν Νικόπολιν, διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖσε ἡττηθῆναι τὸν Ἀντώνιον.

Passage IX	Passage IX
Ps-Sym / Const.VII–Rom. I (746.12–13 = § 46)	**TC VI** / Rom. I (423.15–17 = § 39) [=Log B (Istrin) 60.26–27]
[The Rhos attack Constantinople]	[The Rhos attack Constantinople]
21bis. Rhos: κατέπλευσαν οἱ Ῥῶς οἱ καὶ Δρομῖται λεγόμενοι, οἱ ἐκ γένους τῶν Φράγγων ὄντες. *Cf. supra* **Ps-Sym** no. 21 (Passage III)	**14.** Rhos: οἱ Ῥὼς κατὰ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως μετὰ πλοίων χιλιάδων δέκα, οἱ καὶ Δρομῖται λεγόμενοι, οἳ ἐκ γένους τῶν Φράγγων καθίστανται. ➤ Περὶ ἐθνῶν of *Excerpta Const.*?[1]

Passage X	Passage X
Ps-Sym / Const.VII–Rom. I (746.16–747.1 = § 46)	**TC VI** / Rom. I (423.22–424.7 = § 39) [=Log B (Istrin) 60.32–61.3]
[The Rhos come close to Pharos at Hieron in the Euxine Pontus]	[The Rhos come close to Pharos at Hieron in the Euxine Pontus]
20bis. Pharos: πλησίον τοῦ ἐν τῷ Εὐξείνῳ Πόντῳ Φάρου ἐγένοντο (Φάρος δὲ καλεῖται ἀφίδρυμά τι ᾧ πυρσὸς ἐπιτίθεται πρὸς ὁδηγίαν τοῖς ἐν νυκτὶ παροδίταις. *Cf. supra* **Ps-Sym** nr. 20 (Passage III)	**15.** Pharos: πλησίον τοῦ Φάρου ἐγένοντο (Φάρος δὲ καλεῖται ἀφίδρυμά τι, ᾧ πυρσὸς ἐπιτίθεται εἰς ὁδηγίαν τοῖς ἐν νυκτὶ παροδίταις),

---

[1] R.J.H. Jenkins (ed.), Constantine Porphyrogenitus. De administrando imperio. Vol. II, Commentary. London 1962, 2–3, conjectured a work περὶ ἐθνῶν as the source of some of the chapters in the *De administrando imperio*. Németh, The Excerpta 62, note 180, connects this work with the volume of the same title attested for the Constantinian excerpts. The explanation of the name Rhos, in particular as transmitted in Ps-Sym 21 above, is tellingly absent in the *De administrando imperio*, although it would fit in perfectly with the chapters concerning this people in the work.

27. Euxine Pontus: Εὔξεινος δὲ Πόντος κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν καλεῖται· κακόξεινος γὰρ ἐλέγετο διὰ τὰς συνεχεῖς τῶν ἐκεῖσε λῃστῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιξενουμένους καταδρομάς, οὕς φασιν ἀνελὼν Ἡρακλῆς, ἀδείας τυχόντες οἱ παροδῖται τοῦτον Εὔξεινον ἐπωνόμασαν,

16. Euxine Pontus: οὗτος πρὸς τῷ τοῦ Εὐξείνου πόντου στόματι παρεδρεύων, ὃς κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν κέκληται· κακόξεινος γὰρ διὰ τὰς συνεχεῖς τῶν ἐκεῖσε λῃστῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιξενουμένους καταδρομάς, οὕς, ὡς φασίν, ἀνελὼν Ἡρακλῆς, καὶ ἀδείας τυχόντες οἱ παροδῖται, τοῦτον Εὔξεινον ἐπωνόμασαν,

19bis. Hieron: ἐν τῷ Ἱερῷ λεγομένῳ, ὃ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν εἴληφε διὰ τῶν τῆς Ἀργοῦς πλωτήρων ἐκεῖσε διερχομένων αὐτόθι ἀνιδρύσαι μὲν ἱερόν. *Cf. supra* **Ps-Sym** no. 19 (Passage III)

17. Hieron: ἐν τῷ Ἱερῷ λεγομένῳ ἀθρόον τούτοις ἐπίθετο, ὃ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν εἴληφεν διὰ τὸ τῆς Ἀργοῦς πλωτήρων ἐκεῖσε διερχομένων αὐτόθεν ἀνίδρυσαν ἱερόν.
➤ Περὶ οἰκισμῶν of *Excerpta Const.*?

ANALYSIS OF THE EVIDENCE

1) Ps-Sym and TC VI+Log B (Istrin) have 17 glosses on geographical names in common. There are 10 additional glosses in Ps-Sym which do not appear in TC VI nor in Log B (Istrin): five of these glosses refer to names mentioned in the narrative of both Ps-Sym and TC VI+Log B (Istrin), but the other five refer to names which do not appear in any of the three works.

2) The difference in the sequence of the 17 common glosses in Ps-Sym from that in TC VI+Log B (Istrin) is due to their insertion in different places in the two texts, for Ps-Sym inserts many glosses without any connection in the text, especially in passage III. A special case is represented by the first two glosses which Ps-Sym inserts at the very beginning of the book on Basil I (passage I). If we consider this circumstance, the sequence order of both lists is not so different as it would at first appear.

This situation can be represented by the following table, where I have put in bold the names which appear in the same order in both lists, and I have added an asterisk to those glosses of Ps-Sym which are inserted into his text without any connection to the narrative. I distribute the glosses of Ps-Sym in three groups according to their correspondence—or not—with TC VI+Log B (Istrin) and their connection to the narrative.

Glosses of Ps-Sym (listed and numbered according to their order of appearance in the text)	Glosses of TC VI+Log B (Istrin) (listed according to order of appearance in Ps-Sym, but numbered according to their order in TC VI+Log B)
Group A	
1. **Adrianople**	10. **Adrianople**
2 + 2 bis. **Haimos**	11. **Haimos**
——————	——————
3. Tripolitans	1. Tripolitans
——————	————
4. **Aegean Sea**	3. **Aegean Sea**
5. **Strobilos**	4. **Strobilos**
——————	————
6. **Lampsakos**	6. **Lampsakos**
7. **Imbros**	7. **Imbros**
——————	——————

8. Hellespont
9. Kibyrra
──────────
10. **Thasos**
11. **Samothrake**
──────────
14. ***Mesembria**
18. ***Nikopolis**
──────────
19 + 19bis. *Hieron
20 + 20bis. *Pharos
21 + 21bis. *Rhos
27. Euxine Pontus

2. Hellespont
5. Kibyrra
──────────
8. **Thasos**
9. **Samothrake**
──────────
12. **Mesembria**
13. **Nikopolis**
──────────
17. Hieron
15. Pharos
14. Rhos
16. Euxine Pontus

GROUP B

12. *Laodikeia
15. *Medeia
16. *Selymbria
17. *Amathia
22. *Trikephalos

These place-names are not found in TC VI+Log B (Istrin)

GROUP C

13. Tenedos
23. *Rhadenos
24 + 24 bis. Chrysopolis
25. Chalkedon
26. Damalis

These place-names occur in TC VI+Log B (Istrin), but there are no glosses on them.

3) TC VI and Log B (Istrin) have exactly the same number of glosses and all of them are inserted into their texts in the same way and with the same wording. It is evident that they represent the same branch of textual tradition, whereas Ps-Sym is based on a different branch, for he has more glosses and, more importantly, the glosses common to both him and TC VI+Log B (Istrin) present a different wording and are inserted into the text in other passages, or in the wrong place in a passage. This is particularly true for glosses nos. 12 and 14–23 of Ps-Sym, all in passage III, which are inserted in the text several pages before the names which they explain occur in the narrative. Most of these glosses are, however, inserted in their proper place in the narrative of TC VI+Log B (Istrin).

4) There is a further group of 5 glosses in Ps-Sym (GROUP B) that refer to geographical names which are not mentioned at all in the narrative, neither in the place where the gloss is inserted nor anywhere else in the chronicle: 12 Laodikeia, 15 Medeia, 16 Selymbria, 17 Amathia and 22 Trikeph-alos. The explanation for this is surely to be sought in the source used by Ps-Sym, which appears to have been the same as that used by TC VI+Log B (Istrin), for all three versions add a very similar set of glosses to the original text of the chronicle of Log A, where there is no trace of them. All these glosses are also absent from Vat. gr. 163, which preserves a version of the text different from that transmitted by TC VI+Log B (Istrin).

5) All the glosses refer to geographical names (cities, islands, seas, mountains etc.) except for Ps-Sym nos. 3 and 21, which refer to peoples (Tripolitans and Rhos), and Ps-Sym no. 23, which explains a family name (Rhadenos). Nearly all the glosses follow the same pattern, giving an etymological explanation of given names, usually derived from eponymous persons and historical events connected with them. This is common procedure in geographical repertoires, as in Stephen of Byzantium, and also, more pertinently, in works of the imperial circle of Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos. Indeed, we have found a correspondence for some of the glosses in the *De thematibus*, either quoted in full, as in the case of Nikopolis (Europa 8) and Damalis (Europa 12, with the poem), or implicitly, as in the case of Mesembria + Selymbria (Europa 1) and Kibyrra (Asia 14). There are a few more correspondences in other contemporary works, which we have indicated with arrowheads in the table above. This small sample may not appear sufficient to prove a connection of the glosses with Constantine's circle, but we must not forget that Constantine's dossiers are lost and that works based on them, such as the *De thematibus*, used only a tiny part of the vast material assembled. It its therefore significant that most of the glosses collected here deal with the foundation of cities, as reflected also in the vocabulary used (numbering according to the list for Ps-Sym):

Tripolitans 3: ἀποίκων
Lampsakos 6: θεμελιούντων
Samothrake 11: κατοίκων
Laodikeia 12: ἔκτισε
Mesembria 14: οἰκίσαντος
Selymbria 16: ᾤκισεν
Hieron 19 and 19bis: ἀνίδρυται, ἀνιδρύσαι
Pharos 20 and 20bis: ἀνιδρυμάτιον, ἀφίδρυμα
Chalkedon 25: κτισάσης

The foundation of cities was the subject of the volume *De fundationibus* (Περὶ οἰκισμῶν) to which we have referred in the table in cases where no correspondence of the gloss in TC VI was to be found. In itself, this is perhaps not enough evidence to postulate that the list of geographical glosses is connected with the redaction of the Constantinian dossier of *Excerpta historica*. But the connection has already been proven in the case of the first books of TC VI, where occasional use was made of citations taken from the volumes of the Constantinian excerpts[13].

INFERENCES AND WORKING HYPOTHESES

Based on this evidence we can make the following inferences and advance some hypotheses.

1) The first question to consider is the reason why Ps-Sym grouped together in passage III many glosses which TC VI and Log B (Istrin) inserted into the appropriate passages.

Aubrey Diller has suggested that the dossier of Ps-Sym in passage III, what he called "the great series of notices" was original, whereas the archetype of TC VI and Log B (Istrin) tried to make sense of it and "found places for some of them (i.e. the notices) further on in the chronicle", although "most of them remained quite irrelevant and were either omitted or accommodated by making a place for them". Moreover, he even suggested that the improbable route followed by the Byzantine admiral Himerios in order to face the attack of Leo of Tripoli, as described in TC VI (367.5–22), was "forged … in order to serve as a scaffold for part of the intractable historical notices in the great series in

---

[13] J. Signes Codoñer, The author of Theophanes Continuatus I–IV and the Historical Excerpts of Constantine VII Prophyrogenitus, in: Investigatio Fontium II. Griechische und lateinische Quellen mit Erläuterungen, ed. L. Horváth – E. Juhász (*Antiquitas – Byzantium – Renacentia* 30). Budapest 2017, 17–42.

Ps-Symeon 705–705"[14]. Both assumptions, however, imply that the author of the archetype of TC VI and Log B (Istrin) not only tried to make sense of—or put to intelligent use—the collection of random glosses of passage III (instead of getting rid of them!), but that he was even convinced that they were conceived for an underlying, lost narrative he tried to reconstruct. This is certainly a strange way of making sense of a dossier of glosses, but the main point is that he was successful in finding a place for some glosses in the later narrative. And this is to be explained not by a stroke of luck or as the result of his perseverance (the probability calculus is clearly against this), but because the glosses were in fact listed with the purpose of commenting on the geographical names that popped up in the chronicle, as the case of Rhadenos (no. 22 in Ps-Sym) clearly proves. Thus, the compiler of Log B did not look for a place to a random set of glosses, but rather, he inserted them in the right place, whereas Ps-Sym did not. Diller's interpretation is to be rejected.

On the other hand, the supposition that Ps-Sym is based on a text similar to the one transmitted by TC VI and Log B (Istrin) appears unlikely, for in that case we should assume that Ps-Sym first looked for geographical glosses further on in the text, then purposely extracted them from their corresponding passages and finally put them together in a separate list, inserting it into his narrative without any kind of explanation or introduction. This procedure does not work for several reasons. To begin with, there are geographical glosses in Ps-Sym's list that do not appear in TC VI and Log B (Istrin), namely nos. 12, 15, 17, and 22. Moreover, it is not only that the glosses, as copied in TC VI and Log B (Istrin), are not marked as such in their narratives (making it difficult to find them), but also that a separate list of geographical glosses, as transmitted in passage III in Ps-Sym, would have made sense if it had been copied separately, as a kind of dossier, as happens in many manuscripts, whereby coherence is not required, since antiquarian interest suffices to explain their compilation. This is, however, not the case, for the first geographical gloss, referring to the Tripolitans, is directly related to their mention in the passage, whereas those which immediately follow, mentioning the Aegean, Strobilos, Imbros and Hellespont, also have a connection with the expedition of Leo of Tripoli and are each introduced with forms like ὡσαύτως, ὁμοίως or a simple καί, betraying the copyist's intention to produce some kind of sequence. The other glosses, however, refer to names which do not appear at this point of the narrative and are copied after a simple δὲ or even without any connecting particle. If it was an autonomous list that the author or copyist of the text intended to produce, he would have marked it as such from the beginning.

The fact that the text of the Parisinus 1712, f. 258v has the names of the glossed terms copied in the margin, in contrast with the manuscripts of TC VI and Log B (Istrin) where the glosses are not marked, also requires explanation. This might appear to be evidence of some kind of autonomous dossier or list of geographical names. However, the copyist of the Parisinus could have marked the terms as glosses in the margin when he detected the catalogue-like nature of the passage, or, alternatively, Ps-Sym could have copied them from his source, if this was already a dossier. This appears to me the most plausible explanation, for it would explain the strange procedure of Ps-Sym who started copying glosses on the terms mentioned in his narrative and then went on to produce a list of geographical glosses detached from the original textual context which had triggered their composition, without producing any coherent digression or dossier. It seems that Ps-Sym copied the list, uncritically and probably without much change, from a source other than the main historical source he used for his chronicle, that is, a version of the Logothete chronicle other than TC VI and Log B (Istrin). This list, then, had not already been inserted in the text of Ps-Sym's source at the point of the narrative where he copied it when mentioning Himerios' sea route through the Aegean to reach the fleet of Leo of Tripolis. Rather, this list—containing all 21 glosses of Ps-Sym for passage III, as well

---

[14] Diller, Excerpts 244.

as the other 6 glosses he inserted in the appropriate passages—must have been copied on a separate sheet added to the quires in which the version of the Logothete chronicle was copied and which Ps-Sym used as his source.

2) Why was this list made in the first place? Considering the learned content of the glosses and the requirements of antique historiography which we mentioned earlier, it appears that the list might have been made with the purpose of embellishing the bald narrative of the Log A chronicle. We might surmise that a person, perhaps related to Constantine's circle (see below no. 4) was charged to draw up from the narrative a list of proper names amenable to learned comments and to explain them with the corresponding historical glosses. He did so, copied the list on a sheet and probably marked with symbols in the text of the Logothete chronicle which Ps-Sym was using as his source the geographical or historical names where the corresponding glosses should be inserted. This resembles the three-stage procedure András Németh has established for the compilation of the Constantinian excerpts. Németh rules out for the *Excerpta Constantiniana* the direct transfer of notices from the source manuscripts to the final copies and assumes the intermission of a work phase where drafts were produced in which the original passage was adjusted into the form of the final excerpt[15].

Therefore, the idea advanced by Romilly Jenkins, that the notices or glosses were taken directly by Ps-Sym, TC VI and Log B (Istrin) from "a separate hand-book, an archaeological catalogue of names" is to be rejected. It makes no sense, for all the glosses shared by our authors refer to the narrative, that is, were collected specifically for their text and copied in the order in which the geographical (and also the personal names such as Rhadenos) appeared in the chronicle[16]. The same goes for Diller, who correctly pointed to the existence of various sources for the notices[17], but apparently did not consider any intermediary phase or draft between the sources and the texts of our authors.

In any case, Ps-Sym did not do a very good job when inserting the glosses from the draft into the narrative. He did not just copy from the list the glosses on the names of the islands and coastal cities of the Aegean where Himerios' fleet landed on his expedition against Leo of Tripolis, but he continued copying further glosses from the list which should have been inserted at a later stage of his chronicle. That is, he was not attentive to the content and did not realize that most of the names on the list belonged to other passages. One possible explanation for this apparent lack of attention is that Ps-Sym's chronicle was the product of teamwork.

3) If we accept this hypothesis, other peculiarities of the glosses of Ps-Sym can be more easily explained. First, the glosses on geographical names that do not appear in the text, either in passage III or later on in the chronicle, can be explained by their inclusion in the separate list. It is easily conceivable that whoever drew up the list of geographical glosses for the text of Logothete A added some extra names which were related to the ones mentioned in the narrative of the chronicle, for instance the reference to Selymbria (no. 16 of Ps-Sym, not mentioned in the chronicle) on account of its ety-

---

[15] NÉMETH, The Excerpta chapter 3, pp. 88–120. For collections of excerpts see also P. MANAFIS, Collections of historical excerpts: Accumulation, selection and transmission of history in Byzantium (Doctoral Thesis). Gent 2018. Manafis has written a review of Németh's book in *The Medieval Review* 19.06.04, online: https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/tmr/article/view/27409 (accessed 07.01.2020).

[16] R.J.H. JENKINS, The supposed Russian attack on Constantinople in 907: evidence of the Pseudo-Symeon. *Speculum* 24 (1949) 403–406, here 405. Jenkins suggested that a lost story of the Russian attack on Constantinople lay behind some of the names listed by Ps-Sym in passage III, namely nr. 14–22. But he did not notice that most of these names appeared in the later narrative of TC VI in connexion with events that had nothing to do with the Russian attack. However, he could be right in suggesting that the mention of Trikephalos in nr. 22 "may indicate that the invaders, as in 941, gained a footing also in Bithynia".

[17] DILLER, Excerpts 405.

mological connection to Mesembria; or the name of a mountain such as Trikephalos in Opsikion (no. 22 of Ps-Sym, also not mentioned in his chronicle) on account of its relation to other mountains beside the Hellespont (Haimos in nos. 2 and 2bis of Ps-Sym)[18]. In other cases, we might posit that the compiler of the list used a (more detailed?) version of the chronicle which differed from Ps-Sym's final text, or that he expanded the list with references found in other sources. For instance, the fact that Laodikeia (no. 12 of Ps-Sym) is mentioned in the *De cerimoniis* in the context of the Himerios' expedition might possibly explain its presence in the list.

In any case, it was up to the compiler to select from the list the glosses to be inserted at the relevant places in the narrative. Whereas TC VI and Log B (or their common source) did a fine job, Ps-Sym did not, but inserted glosses in passages to which they had no direct relation.

There are also other problems in the text of Ps-Sym which are easily explained by this hypothesis and thus corroborate it. As we have seen, there are glosses in Ps-Sym to names that only appear in TC VI and Log B (Istrin): Mesembria and Nikopolis each get a gloss in Ps-Sym (nos. 14 and 18) though they are not mentioned in his text, for the later passage where they were mentioned was either suppressed by Ps-Sym or else retained but without reference to the name. It is only because we have both names in TC VI and Log B (Istrin) in passages VII and VIII that we understand why Ps-Sym inserted two glosses on these two cities that receive no mention at all in his text.

There are also some proper names which have glosses in Ps-Sym but are mentioned without any comment in TC VI and Log B (Istrin), for instance Chrysopolis, Chalkedon and Damalis (passage V) or Rhadenos (passage VI). TC VI and Log B (Istrin) simply did not insert any gloss in these passages from the existing list because they forgot to do so or they thought it unnecessary.

In other cases, glosses inserted in passage III of Ps-Sym are repeated, occasionally with different wording or complementary information, when the pertinent geographical name appears again later in the text (nos. 19bis, 20bis and 21bis). This would appear to indicate that the compiler (or the copyist!) resorted again to the list of geographical glosses, forgetting that he had already inserted these same glosses before. This repetition would be more easily understood if the text was compiled by several hands.

4) In view of the previous considerations it is safe to conclude that Ps-Sym worked on a version of the Log A chronicle which was used as a working copy for creating a new version of the text and was expanded with new sources and materials, such as our list of geographical glosses. Considering the learned content of the glosses, their connection with Constantine's historical team seems very likely. Whether this occurred during Constantine's reign after the banishment of Romanos I (945–959) or even after his death by some of his partisans (for instance, Basil Lekapenos) is for the moment impossible to ascertain through the evidence at hand (see below). But the fact that Genesios, who dedicated his history to Constantine VII, used a very similar set of geographical glosses, listed by Aubrey Diller[19], would suggest that he had a common background with the authors of the revised version of the Logothete. Diller also remarked that Ps-Sym and Genesios share three geographical glosses inserted in the narrative of the reigns of Michael II and Theophilos[20], which makes the connection of Logothete B and Ps-Sym with the Palace team and dossiers all the more probable.

However, it appears that this working copy of Log A was also used by others. The list of glosses was inserted into the text by the copyist of Log B (Istrin), who revised the text of Log A but did not continue it, for it stops at 948, with Romanos I's death (four years after his overthrow in 944). TC VI is based on a version of this text, for, as we have said, the glosses are inserted in exactly the

---

[18] See however supra note 17 for Jenkins's suggestion.
[19] DILLER, Excerpts 246–248.
[20] DILLER, Excerpts 246.

same passages and with the same wording as in Log B (Istrin), unlike the case of Ps-Sym. But TC VI continued the chronicle down to the death of Romanos II in 963, and for this he necessarily used a complementary source. The tradition represented by Vat. gr. 163 could have been this source, for it contains an extended version of Log B that ends in 963. However, as Vat. gr. 163 does not contain any of the glosses, its tradition could not have provided the model for TC VI for the period 886–948. If we connect the text of TC VI with the branch represented by Vat. gr. 163 for the period 944–963, then the possibility of contamination must be examined, unless we suppose that the continuation for 944–963 was transmitted independently of the previous version of Log B, which would require further evidence.

On the other hand, as the text of Ps-Sym also ends in 963 and preserves the Continuatio, a question immediately arises: if Ps-Sym used his source *before* the glosses were properly inserted in their context, a task performed by the branch of the tradition represented by Log B (Istrin) and TC VI, how could it be that Log B (Istrin) ends in 948? Obviously, had the copyist of Log B (Istrin) used a source containing the Continuatio, he would have copied it, but this was not the case. This leaves no other apparent option than to suppose that the copyist of Ps-Sym copied from its source *after* the glosses had been incorporated in the model of Log B (Istrin), when no Continuatio for the period 944–963 was yet written. This would mean that both Log B (Istrin) and Ps-Sym consulted the same source with the glosses written on a separate sheet, but used them in a different way.

Ps-Sym has occasional material found only in his text[21], a circumstance which, along with the heavily abbreviated nature of his text, puts the chronicle at the very end of the transmission process. But Ps-Sym also contains some passages, even for the period before 948, common to him and TC VI but unknown to Log B (Istrin)[22], which again speaks for contamination in TC VI, as we have established that TC VI depended on the tradition of Log B (Istrin) for the period 886–948.

The model of Vat gr. 163 which brings the chronicle down to 963 will have been copied from the same source as Ps-Sym. and Log. B, probably also *after* the model of Log B (Istrin) and Ps-Sym had incorporated the glosses. There are two main reasons for this supposition:

1) because Vat. gr. 163 has no trace of the glosses (either because the copyist did not use the list on the separate sheet or because this list had been lost);

2) because the Continuatio of Vat gr. 163 is much more detailed than that of Ps-Sym (and coincidental with the one of TC VI), and it seems unlikely that even so a clumsy and hasty compiler as Ps-Sym did not use much of the historical material collected in Vat. gr. 167.

To be sure, we are here entering slippery territory, for we would need examples to demonstrate the differences in the text of Continuatio between TC VI (= Vat. gr. 167), Vat. gr. 163 and Ps-Sym (= Paris. gr. 1712), and this would require much more space and time than we have in the present article. The fact, however, that Ps-Sym has the shortest version of the Continuatio, Vat gr. 163 a more detailed one and Vat. gr. 167 the longest, speaks at first sight for a process of increasing expansion of their common source. This common source appears to have been a kind of dossier, a working copy based on Log A (or perhaps on the dossier made for the composition of Log A?) that we might call the "Old Logothete dossier" (OLD), which would have incorporated a heterogeneous array of texts conceived as an amplification of the original narrative, such as:

1) the list of geographical glosses, used by Log B (Istrin), TC VI and Ps-Sym;

---

[21] See for instance Ps-Sym 703.6–7, 713.13–715.6, 775.5–10 or 755.20–22.

[22] Ps-Sym 716.8–14 = TC 378.10–17 (with explicit and laudatory mention of Emperor Nikephoros II and accordingly written post 963) or Ps-Sym 740.4–10 = TC 411.17–412.2.

2) ceremonial reports and notices about the buildings of the Palace, taken from Constantine's dossiers and mainly used for the composition of TC VI, probably at the time of Basil Lakapenos, as already demonstrated by Michael Featherstone[23];

3) notices of events for the period of 948–963, unknown to Log B (Istrin), but used by Ps-Sym, Vat. gr. 163 and TC VI to different degrees for the *Continuatio*.

If OLD was used by both TC VI and Ps-Sym this would also eliminate the need to postulate contamination in the case of Ps-Sym for the period of 912–963 as it is already proved that Ps-Sym used both TC VI and Genesios as a source for the period of 815–886. If our hypothesis is correct, Ps-Sym would have used OLD as a source rather than TC VI itself for the later part of his chronicle. But then, it must be explained why certain passages common to TC VI and Ps-Sym do not appear in Log B (Istrin) or Vat. gr. 163, which seem also to be derived from OLD. Would successive additions to OLD explain the differences?

PERSPECTIVES AND RISKS

It is quite a complicated panorama that emerges from all these considerations which will be fully understood only after the corresponding critical editions have been completed. But it appears that concepts such as "dossier" and "contamination"[24] play a fundamental role in every attempt to draw a stemma of the textual tradition of Logothete B. This is the reason why I think that Wahlgren's stemma for the Logothete B must be revised, for it does not consider either of these concepts which are crucial to the understanding of the dynamics of the composition[25]. In fact, Wahlgren postulates a common archetype for all the witnesses of Log B—that is, Log B (Istrin+Holkham), TC VI and Vat gr. 163—except for Ps-Sym, but this leaves unexplained both the absence of the glosses in Vat. gr. 163 and of the Continuatio in Log B (Istrin+Holkham).

"Dossiers" have been frequently denied as the working method of the Imperial court during the reign of Constantine VII. Recently Warren Treadgold, who tends to reduce the lost copies of historians to a minimum[26], has even questioned the existence of such dossiers on account of the cost of writing materials[27]. Hopefully, the recent book of A. Németh will definitively put an end to such doubts, for he establishes with a high degree of certainty the working method of the imperial literary circle mainly on the basis of the compilation of the Constantinian excerpts, although his conclusions also apply to other works, such as the *Suda*, TC VI and Genesios.

---

[23] M. Featherstone, Theophanes Continuatus VI and De cerimoniis I,96. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 104 (2011) 115–123; M. Featherstone, Theophanes Continuatus: a history for the Palace, in: La face cachée de la littérature byzantine. Le text en tant que message immédiat, ed. P. Odorico (*Dossiers byzantins* 11). Paris 2012, 123–135; M. Featherstone, Basileios Nothos as compiler: The De cerimoniis and Theophanes Continuatus, in: Textual Transmission in Byzantium: between Textual Criticism and Quellenforschung, ed. J. Signes Codoñer – I. Pérez Martín (*Lectio. Studies in the transmission of texts and ideas* 2). Turnhout 2014, 353–372; M. Featherstone, Further evidence for the extent of missing folia in Vat. gr. 167 at the end of Theophanes Continuatus, in: Scritti per Mgr. Paul Canart. Vatican State 2020 (in press).

[24] I use here the term 'contamination' without any negative connotation to refer to the conflation of readings between different branches of a given work, probably as a result of teamwork or combined use of sources and versions of the same text. The traditional concept of archetype, from which the tradition deviates, does not apply here, for the historical texts were subject to changes and additions that meant an improvement of the original in the eyes of the writers or copyists.

[25] Wahlgren, Symeonis Magistri (see n. 8), 139*.

[26] See my review of W. Treadgold, The Middle Byzantine Historians. Houndmills. Basingstoke 2013. in *JÖB* 66 (2017) 222–226.

[27] W. Treadgold, The lost Secret History of Nicetas the Paphlagonian, in: The steppe lands and the world beyond them. Studies in honor of Victor Spinei on his 70th birthday, ed. F. Curta – B.P. Maleon. Iasi 2013, 645–676, here 666–667, quoted with approval by C. Zuckerman, Emperor Theophilos and Theophobos in three tenth-century chronicles: discovering the 'common source', *REB* 75 (2017) 101–150, here 103–104.

"Contamination", on the other hand, would appear to be the inescapable conclusion of teamwork and the confection of dossiers, where the fine dividing line between direct and indirect transmission is blurred. The fact that Log A presents a homogeneous tradition despite the many manuscripts transmitting this version[28], whereas the Logothete B complex—including TC and Ps-Symeon—is transmitted in a handful of manuscripts with enormous variations in content is to be explained, I think, by contamination between the few different versions produced in the Palace milieu during a short time span and as result of a teamwork. The search for authors in the Logothete B complex seems an impossible mission.

Certainly, there have been abuses in the previous usage of the concepts of "dossier" and "contamination", especially in the later works of Paul Speck, who nevertheless produced very innovative research in his first publications. But it is time to find a balanced approach and allow both concepts a permanent place in the editions of the Macedonian period, especially for those texts produced at court in a period which has been given various names—at present the concept of "sylloge culture" as advanced by Paolo Odorico has gained some ground[29]—, but which is certainly defined to a great extent by the compilation and excerpting of sources of every kind.

Establishing the exact relationship of the various versions of the Logothete B complex cannot be achieved solely through the detailed study of variant readings, which to a great extent occupy the careful and detailed introduction of Wahlgren in his edition of Log A. Other aspects must also be taken into consideration, which will help us to understand the interests of the copyists-authors and their working methods. In particular, it seems essential to consider structures and to identify the thematic units that make up the chronicle, that is, the chapters and paragraphs into which the narrative is usually divided in our editions, for these are the working units of the compilers and explain the exchanges in the collected dossiers. M. Featherstone and I shall pay much attention to this aspect in our future edition of TC VI. A single edition of all the versions of Log B would undoubtedly put the process of composition of these versions in the shade.

There is also risk in comparing isolated passages and drawing conclusions from them without careful examination of the whole complex. In a recent study C. Zuckerman has compared four unrelated passages of TC VI, Genesios and Ps-Sym and concluded, wrongly in my view, that Ps-Sym had direct access to the common source of TC VI and Genesios for the books I–IV. The textual evidence supporting his views is based on mistakes in Ps-Sym in consequence of his combination of the narratives of Genesios and TC VI, whose wording he follows closely without adding any new information[30]. It is a preconception of what actually happened that guides Zuckerman's analysis of the texts[31].

---

[28] However, as DILLER, Excerpts 243, already noticed, Parisinus gr. 854 (*Diktyon* 67485), a witness of Logothete A, contains the geographical gloss on the city of Adrianople which we included above in the table with no. 1. This gloss, which apparently does not appear in any other manuscript of Logothete A, is reproduced by WAHLGREN, Symeonis Magistri in his apparatus criticus on page 260, although he does not refer to the problem in his introduction. For the value of Parisinus gr. 854 see also D. SERRUYS, Recherches sur l'Épitomé (Théodose de Mélitène, Léon le Grammarien, Syméon Logothète etc.). *BZ* 16 (1907) 1.51, with reference to the gloss on Adrianople at p. 14. For editions of the manuscript see WAHLGREN, Symeonis Magistri 132*–133*.

[29] See NÉMETH, The Excerpta 13–14.

[30] For instance, Ps-Sym 627.3–4 states that the Persian Babek was the husband of a Constantinopolitan wife who gave birth to Theophobos. In fact, Theophobos's father was a noble Persian known to the Persian rebels led by Babek. On this subject, Zuckerman, who considers Ps-Sym closer to the common source, states only (p. 118) "Curiously, his late father of royal race is identified as Babak in person".

[31] As there is no space here to refute in detail some of his arguments, I simply refer to J. SIGNES CODOÑER, El periodo del segundo iconoclasmo en Theophanes Continuatus: análisis y comentario de los tres primeros libros de la crónica. Amsterdam 1995, where a systematic comparison of both works, especially concerning the episode of Theophobos, is carried out. Zuckerman does not discuss in his article the arguments presented there.

Similarly, we should try here to avoid generalizations from the above statements, for the use of sources in the various versions of the Logothete B complex may change from one section to the next, according to the needs of the redactors and the work in progress. What I propose here is a reconsideration of the methodological basis on which the study of these chronicles has until now been carried out, in order that systematic consideration of teamwork, compilation of dossiers, "contamination" and, not least, historical context should be the rule along with text-critical analysis of variant readings. More contributions will follow in which we shall try to shed more light on the Log B complex, considering aspects such as the changing sequence of episodes, the chronological frame, levels of language, and, not least, the connection of passages added in some versions to the historical context and particular interests of the commissioner, precisely the line followed by Michael Featherstone in several publications[32]. Hopefully, the overall picture gained at the end will confirm the provisory conclusions advanced in the present article.

---

[32] Besides the articles mentioned above, see now M. FEATHERSTONE, Iterum Theophanes Continuatus VI, in: Constantinople: Queen of Cities. Festschrift for Paul Magdalino, ed. D. Smythe – Sh. Tougher. Leiden (in press), who notes the relevance of the Kourkouas family has in several episodes added to the narrative of TC VI and connects this with the importance the family had as a supporter of Emperor Nikephoros II, during whose reign the dossier of TC VI was most probably compiled by order of Basileios Lakapenos.