

UMBERTO ROBERTO

Research Prospects on John of Antioch

*Notes on the Edition by S. Mariev**

Some historical works have a surprising destiny. Judged by his historiographic interest, his complexity, the intertwining of sources, and the value of his political reflection, John of Antioch constitutes a major link in the sequence of authors that continue the great Greek historiographic tradition. Not by chance, John's sources include the works of Dio Cassius, Herodian, Eunapius, Priscus, Candidus Isauricus, and Zosimus. At the same time, the *Ἱστορία χρονική* fits into the current of Christian universal chronicles. This genre originates with the model of the *Chronographiae* by Julius Africanus and the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, and reaches a fundamental turning point with the *Chronographia* of John Malalas. As far as its historiographic set-up is concerned, John of Antioch's work is profoundly linked to Malalas's *Chronographia*. On the whole, therefore, we are dealing with a historiographically hybrid work, that combines the more significant aspects of classicizing history with the Christian universal chronicle.

As we know, transmission of the *Ἱστορία χρονική* is a difficult question. As confirmed by the fragments themselves, John concluded his work in the early years of the reign of Heraclius¹. Nothing certain is known about its transmission until the tenth century. What is certain, however, is that the *Ἱστορία χρονική* was rediscovered at the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, when the Emperor ordered a *σλλογή* made of historical texts, the *Excerpta Historica Constantiniana*. Indeed, one version of the work was available to the Constantinian *Excerptores* and provided *excerpta* for their volumes. Besides being employed by the author of the *Suda* lexicon, the sundry branches of indirect tradition about John rely mainly on the Constantinian rediscovery. The work then continues to be known and used up to the time of Maximus Planudes, who utilised it for a set of *excerpta* on the Roman Republican era. After Planudes, traces of any interest in John disappear.

The few studies in the Renaissance and modern period are linked to interest in the *Excerpta Constantiniana* and their tradition. Between 1870 and the first decade of the twentieth century, especially among German scholars, the possibility of a critical edition of the fragments appeared to be forthcoming: the First World War put an end to these blossoming studies. All of a sudden, from the very end of the twentieth century and the early twenty-first, studies on John of Antioch started up again with great vitality. Within a few years, two critical editions of the work appeared, published by the same publisher, fortunately in different series. My edition, which came out in 2005, is the outcome of eleven years of study of the work, as much from the philological point of view as from the historiographical. Toward the end of 2008, on the other hand, a critical edition appeared by S.

* Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta quae supersunt omnia, recensuit anglice vertit indicibus instruxit Sergei MARIEV (*CFHB* 47). Berlin – New York 2008.

¹ For the date of composition in the early years of Heraclius see Ioannis Antiocheni fragmenta ex Historia chronica. Introduzione, edizione e traduzione a cura di U. ROBERTO (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 154). Berlin – New York 2005, XI–XII. After my edition see W. TREADGOLD, The Early Byzantine Historians. London 2007, 311–329, 329 and Ph. BLAUDEAU's review of my edition in *Adamantius* 15 (2009) 587–590, 590. See also D. BRODKA's review of Mariev's edition: *H/Soz/u/Kult. Kommunikation und Fachinformation für die Geschichtswissenschaften* (may 2009) <http://hsozkult.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/rezensionen/id=12299&type=rezbuecher&sort=datum&order=down&search=Brodka>.

Mariev, based on the studies of Panagiotis Sotiroudis². The purpose of this paper is to point out the fundamental differences between the two editions and to indicate the most useful lines of research to continue studies on the 'Ιστορία χρονική.

A COMPARISON OF TWO EDITIONS: ROBERTO (2005) AND MARIEV (2008)

In an excessively critical discussion of my edition, S. Mariev belittles the results achieved by my studies, an attitude which persists throughout his work³. Judging most of my opinions to be misleading, Mariev does not deem it necessary to read my contributions of a philological and historiographic nature on the 'Ιστορία χρονική, nor does he even quote them in his bibliography, doubtless expedient for the rapid completion of his work, but hardly appropriate from a professional and scientific point of view. I shall return often to highlight this feature: Mariev shows a certain 'haste' to reach a result, which weakens the result itself, an attitude that I find also characterises his approach to the major study by P. Sotiroudis. While it is true that his work constitutes the completion of Sotiroudis's planned edition, the publication of my own volume should have counselled him to be more prudent in his judgements and take more time for reflection. It was not to be so. At the same time, Sotiroudis's *Untersuchungen* formed a fundamental scientific premise for my own work. Beyond any sharing in their results, the work of colleagues always deserves respect and reflection, if it is honest and accurate. Criticism is part of any ordinary scholarly debate. I have always motivated my disagreement with Sotiroudis's conclusions on scientific reason. Without laying any claim to having the last word on the matter, I made my criticisms and proposed my own theory, analysing exhaustively the proposals of scholars who had preceded me. On John of Antioch, moreover, there were not so many of us. Beyond his coarse and resentful opinion on the timeliness of the publication of my work, I feel that 'haste' – and, perhaps, some bad advice – led Mariev to ignore my critical and historiographical choices, or to reject them without any in-depth analysis.

The 'Ιστορία χρονική has come down to us through different collections of excerpts and fragments. The major difference between my edition and Mariev's lies in our approach to the various transmissions in the name of John of Antioch. Following the same procedure as the nineteenth century "Johanninische Frage", Mariev's work on the tradition aims at distinguishing what is "true" from what is "false" John of Antioch. Clearly, this is also my own aim. What differs, however, is our approach to the fragmentary material and the assessment of what has effectively come down to us about the 'Ιστορία χρονική. For Mariev (who here follows Sotiroudis) only the linguistic and lexical criterion is valid. Starting from the premise that the "true" John of Antioch is only what is transmitted in the *Excerpta Constantiniana* (or, rather, in one part of them), Mariev argues that he can divide the other traditions into those that are authentic and those that are spurious, solely on the basis of a presumed stylistic-lexical homogeneity of John's "true *Excerpta*".

The result, as we shall see, is a wholly reductionistic approach to the 'Ιστορία χρονική, which does not take into account its historiographic significance, the historical and cultural environment in which it was composed, or the complexity of the historiographic revision of works so important to the thousand years of Byzantine culture. Reflection on one fundamental point suffices: which "John of Antioch" did the *Excerptores Constantiniani* know? Did they possess an "archetypal" manuscript in perfect condition? Or rather, as seems more likely, was their text of reference already in less than perfect or even fragmentary conditions? Without considering the right problems, one

² P. SOTIROUDIS, *Untersuchungen zum Geschichtswerk des Johannes von Antiocheia*. Thessaloniki 1989.

³ See S. MARIEV, Neues zur „Johanneischen Frage"? *BZ* 99 (2006) 535–549.

risks, as in the case of Mariev's edition, simplifying them and reducing the importance and historiographical significance of the Ἱστορία χρονική⁴.

THE EXCERPTA CONSTANTINIANA AND JOHN OF ANTIOCH

The *Excerpta Constantiniana* certainly preserve the best tradition of the work of John of Antioch. The passages derived from the volumes *de Virtutibus*, *de legationibus* and *de insidiis*, and the passages of the *Suda* deriving from the *Excerpta*, are excellent quality fragments of the Ἱστορία χρονική. Consequently, any attempt at reconstructing the text of John of Antioch must be based on the *Excerpta de Virtutibus et vitiis* and on the *Excerpta de insidiis*. However, since after all we are dealing with *excerpta*, even the *Excerpta Constantiniana* present problems as compared to the assumed "original" of the Ἱστορία χρονική⁵.

Some of these problems derive from the methodology employed by the *Excerptores*. From the multitude of studies seeking to compare the *excerpta* with the original text of the excerpted author, it can be argued that the *excerptores* followed a common pattern in working on the original manuscripts. The following are general remarks:

- The *Excerptores* followed rigorous criteria regarding the conservation of the original text, as confirmed by any comparison of the original text of the historian selected for the collection with the excerpted texts in the *Excerpta Constantiniana*. Their respect for the text and philological rigour exclude any arbitrary interference or textual contamination by the *Excerptores*, even where the stylistic and linguistic level is not appropriate to the scholar's cultural level.
- Purely from a point of view of style and syntax, the *Excerptores* may have made slight alterations in the text in order to give narrative autonomy to each *excerptum*. Despite these interventions, the narrative kernel of each *excerptum* is exactly transcribed from the original. Apart from the introduction of ὅτι, the *Excerptor* occasionally intervenes at the beginning of the *excerptum*, usually providing names of persons or places, chronological data, sometimes even a short introduction to explain what precedes the *excerptum*. Many mistakes are liable to occur at this stage, concerning for instance names and dating. Beside these alterations, as a rule no personal remarks or possible forms of contamination from other sources occur⁶.
- Owing to the synthetic nature of their work, the *Excerptores* are extremely concise. They usually do not abridge, but simply delete whatever they deem unessential to the narrative structure of the *excerptum*. For example, they tend to eliminate quotations of sources from the excerpted text. Textual omission is the most common characteristic of the *Excerpta Constantiniana*⁷. Albeit infrequent, in some *Excerpta Constantiniana* from John of Antioch the text is evidently epitomized by the *Excerptor Constantianus*. See, for instance, the *excerptum de insidiis* 77 (frag. 277 Roberto) on the last period of the reign of Valens. At the end of

⁴ On this point see the forthcoming review of Mariev's edition by W. Treadgold in *Speculum*.

⁵ See now U. ROBERTO, Byzantine Collections of late Antique Authors: Some Remarks on the *Excerpta historica Constantiniana*, in: M. WALLRAFF – L. MECCELLA (Hrsg.), *Die Kestoi des Julius Africanus und ihre Überlieferung*. Berlin – New York 2009, 71–84. For a general approach to the *sylloge* see B. FLUSIN, *Les Excerpta Constantiniens*. Logique d'une anti-histoire, in: S. PITTIA (éd.), *Fragments d'historiens grecs. Autour de Denys d'Halicarnasse*. Rome 2002, 537–559. For similar comparison between Malalas's text and the *Excerpta Constantiniana* from his *Chronographia* see B. FLUSIN, *Les Excerpta Constantiniens et la Chronographie de Jean Malalas*, in: J. BEAUCAMP *et alii* (éd.), *Recherches sur la Chronique de Jean Malalas*, I. Paris 2004, 119–136, 123–124.

⁶ For the case of John Malalas see FLUSIN, *Les Excerpta Constantiniens* 124.

⁷ See P.A. BRUNT, *On historical Fragments and Epitomes*. *Classical Quarterly* 30 (1980) 477–494, 483–485; FLUSIN, *Les Excerpta Constantiniens* 542–543.

the *excerptum*, the epitome is so brief that the reference to the battle of Adrianople is almost incomprehensible⁸.

- The *Excerptor* kept to the narrative sequence of the original text, even when omitting much of that original, and the case of John of Antioch seems to confirm this interpretation. In fact, the narrative and chronological sequences of the *Excerpta de virtutibus* and *de insidiis* are identical. Similarities between the two different sets of *excerpta* thus allow us to restore the exact sequence of the entire work.

In general, composition of the *Excerpta Constantiniana* followed the same criteria used by most tenth century collections, including not only a respectful and conservative approach toward the ancient (or late antique) text, but also a selection of texts suited to the aims of the collection, together with a concern for brevity. As stated above, the *excerptor*'s work involved a large number of methodological and selective choices, choices to some extent personal, since the numerous problems the *excerptor* had to resolve in his work are fundamental to an understanding of the material. Such problems should be borne in mind in attempting to evaluate the importance of the *Excerpta Constantiniana* in the textual transmission of any author.

As far as John of Antioch is concerned, the *Excerpta Constantiniana* is indubitably the best set of texts that we possess for this historian. On the other hand, it is instructive to compare the *excerpta* with the long fragment in *Codex Athous* 4932, *i.e.* the sole fragment that has come down to us in a direct tradition. Correlation between the *Codex Athous* and the two *Excerpta Constantiniana* from the same text shows how relevant and drastic was the omission of text by the *Excerptores Constantiniani*. Indeed, if we had only the *Excerpta Constantiniana* to rely on, we would never have known that John of Antioch devoted at least two of his books to the period ranging from the creation of Adam to the Trojan War. For this reason, when reading John of Antioch, the *Excerpta Constantiniana* should be considered with prudence when attempting to restore the “true” narrative structure of the Ἱστορία χρονική.

Problems also derive from the material on which the *Excerptores* were working, first and foremost the quality of their manuscripts. We do not know how many manuscripts were used by the *Excerptores*, nor can we easily determine the state of the texts. It may be inferred from the *excerpta* (and the mistakes in them) that the related manuscripts were sometimes bad testimonia. By way of example, Polybius's manuscript was mutilated. It is very probable that the *Excerptores* used a mutilated manuscript (or even a florilegium of *excerpta*) for the section in Dio Cassius concerning books 21–35. Also in the case of the Universal History of Nicolaus Damascenus, the manuscript used by the *Excerptores* was mutilated. The *excerpta* from the *Chronographia* of John Malalas were also extracted from a fragmentary manuscript⁹.

In the case of John of Antioch too, we can affirm that the *Excerptores Constantiniani* did not possess a complete copy of the Ἱστορία χρονική. Research I have undertaken over the past few years confirms the theory – already followed in the critical edition – that the manuscript available to the *Excerptores* was incomplete. After the fragments relating to the time of Anastasius, there is a gap covering the whole reign of Justinian. The narration continues with a few remarks about the era of Justin II, and then proceeds with a set of fragments about the last part of the reign of Mauricius and the reign of Phocas. The final part of the *excerpta* from the Ἱστορία χρονική appeared in a highly summarised form, its stylistic level clearly inferior to the quality of the work, whence the epitome-like nature of the material available to us. Loyal to their working methods, the *Excerpt-*

⁸ For a similar case in the tradition of John Malalas on Theseus (Io. Mal. IV 16, 18 [THURN] ~ *Exc. de Virt.* 4) see FLUSIN, *Les Excerpta constantiniens* 129.

⁹ In general: Th. BÜTTNER – WÖBST, *Die Anlage der historischen Enzyklopädie des Konstantinos Porphyrogenitos*. *BZ* 15 (1906) 88–120, 97–99; and *The History of Zonaras. From Alexander to the Death of Theodosius the Great*, Trans. by Th. M. BANCHICH – E. N. LANE, Introduction and commentary by Th. BANCHICH. London – New York 2009, 8–10. For the case of Malalas see FLUSIN, *Les Excerpta constantiniens* 129–133.

tores abstained from any intervention or correction at linguistic and lexical levels, but limited their scope to inserting the fragments, however incoherent in style and language as compared to most of the John of Antioch *Excerpta*.

For the *Excerptores* it was clear that, even if these texts derived from an epitome from a stylistic and lexical point of view, the aspects of their thought and historiographic tradition showed they belonged to the work of John of Antioch. Certainty that it was not due to any error in transmitting the manuscripts of the *Excerpta Constantiniana* is based on the fact that fragments from the age of Phocas and Heraclius are present both in the excellent codex of the *Excerpta de virtutibus* (*Turonensis* C 980, XI c.), and in the *Excerpta de insidiis*. It is consequently not the transmission that is corrupt or wrong.

In my opinion, the different quality of style and language of the *excerpta* reflects the complex situation of the specimen – or specimens – available to the *Excerptores Constantiniani*¹⁰. At the same time, these sets of *excerpta*, differing from each other stylistically and linguistically, are fully in line from the point of view of the themes selected, their political interest, and historiographic nature. On this basis, the fragments concerning the age of Phocas and Heraclius have to be accepted, without hesitating over the sole criterion of linguistics and style¹¹. On the basis of such criteria, however, Mariev – who follows the points raised by Sotiroudis – decides to expunge these *excerpta* (both those from *de insidiis*, and the only one from *de virtutibus*), and makes a serious mistake.

His revision of the *Excerpta Constantiniana* is not limited to this terminal section of the Ἱστορία χρονική. Still more arbitrary is the elimination of the other *Excerpta Constantiniana* attributed to John of Antioch by the manuscripts, performed by Mariev on the basis of the same presumed stylistic-lexical homogeneity of John's "true *Excerpta*". Doubtless, as a general rule, the *Excerpta Constantiniana* are extremely true to the original in language and style. At the same time, as we have seen, some *Excerpta* are very synthetic, making John's text almost unrecognisable: see e.g. the *excerptum de insidiis* 77 (frag. 277 Roberto = pp. 374–375 Mariev). Moreover, the need to create a homogeneous linguistic-stylistic bloc has led Sotiroudis–Mariev to a drastic criticism of the *Excerpta Constantiniana*. An investigation into their methodological premises suffices, however, to reject this approach. In the case of Sotiroudis, we are dealing with a basic theory: the scholar is, in fact, convinced that John cannot have followed John Malalas. Indeed, for Sotiroudis, John of Antioch ended his work with the age of Anastasius, i.e. well before John Malalas. Whenever the *Excerpta Constantiniana* make any clear reference to Malalas's *Chronographia*, they should consequently be eliminated, as being spurious¹². The arbitrary nature of such a procedure is evident. It is amazing that Mariev, as a rule so careful in analysing the texts, should have followed this line of Sotiroudis. These passages should be kept because of the reliability of the *Excerpta Constantiniana*. The problem is to investigate the relationship between John of Antioch and John Malalas.

JOHN OF ANTIOCH AND JOHN MALALAS

The manipulation of fragments in the work of Sotiroudis–Mariev on the *Excerpta Constantiniana* can be explained by a precise aim. The scholars start from the need to demonstrate that the "true" John of Antioch is only the one preserved in the *Excerpta Constantiniana* and, more particularly,

¹⁰ A different hypothesis is that the redaction in its present form can be attributed to the *Excerptor Constantinianus* himself, worried about the essentials of the text to be included in his volume *de insidiis*. He identified the importance of the texts from the thematic point of view, but for reasons of space, or haste, drastically contracted the narrative development of this section of the Ἱστορία χρονική. See on these last fragments TREADGOLD, *The Early Byzantine Historians* 311–312 and n. 4.

¹¹ Concerning this problem see U. ROBERTO, *The Circus Factions and the Death of the Tyrant: John of Antioch on the fate of the Emperor Phocas*, in: F. Daim – J. Drauschke (Hrsg.), *Byzanz – das Römerreich im Mittelalter*, I. Mainz 2010, 55–77.

¹² SOTIROUDIS, *Untersuchungen* 43–50 and 150.

in the sole set of texts covering the period up to the age of Anastasius. All that follows is to be deemed “spurious”, but herein lies a difficulty that does not escape Sotiroudis. Some of the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, especially the section relating to “Archaiologia”, show that they come from the *Chronographia* of John Malalas. How can one accept that John of Antioch lived during the age of Anastasius (or at the latest during the twenties of the sixth century) if fragments of Malalas’s *Chronographia* emerge in his work? The question of the dating and publishing of the *Chronographia* is complex. Based on the texts that have come down to us, scholars agree that the first edition of the work should be dated at the outset of the reign of Justinian, i.e. starting from 527–528¹³. The Sotiroudis–Mariev thesis clashes with this date. Consequently, the two scholars have to intervene on the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, eliminating the fragments that show they come from Malalas. The absence of any scientific criterion in this operation is evident and needs no further comment.

It is however a further clear indication that neither Sotiroudis nor Mariev has investigated the Ἱστορία χρονική from a historiographic point of view. This is another feature of Mariev’s work. He shows no interest in describing John of Antioch’s historical and cultural background. John of Antioch’s dependence on John Malalas is not merely a matter of language, style and choice of sources in a few fragments. This influence cannot be eliminated by deeming spurious some fragments most clearly linked to the *Chronographia*. To anyone devoting even a short time to studying the work against the wider background of the chronicles of late antiquity, it is immediately apparent that the whole set-up of the Ἱστορία χρονική rests on Malalas’ *Chronographia*. John of Antioch is indeed the author of a Christian universal chronicle, but his reconstruction of human history is based on John Malalas’s model. As in the *Chronographia*, so too John of Antioch utilises the outline by Africanus and his tradition in the first part of his work, the “Archaiologia”¹⁴. The story of mankind is thus narrated starting from Adam, and develops as an account of Biblical history – hence of the Hebrews – in perfect synchrony with the narration of the history of the Greeks, Persians and other Oriental cultures. In Africanus and his tradition, this model proceeds without alterations down to the Parousia of Christ (Frag. 93 Wallraff).

In Malalas there is a major deviation from this canonical outline. Firstly, he does not follow the chronological model of Africanus. Indeed, the reign of King David is synchronised with the War of Troy (Io. Mal. V 1 Thurn). Starting from this point, Malalas abandons the account of Hebrew history and, using the flight of Aeneas, replaces it with a Rome-centered perspective. The books of the *Chronographia* subsequent to the fifth book are split into an account of events from Aeneas to Romulus (books 6–7), and from the Roman *Consules* to Justinian (books 8–18). In these books, information about Hebrew history becomes increasingly marginal. The historical narration proceeds as an account of the Roman *basileia*¹⁵.

Such is the historiographic and narrative structure of John Malalas’s *Chronographia*. Prior to his work, we have no evidence for such a distance from the model of Africanus and Eusebius¹⁶. Mala-

¹³ E. JEFFREYS, The Beginning of Byzantine Chronography: John Malalas, in: G. MARASCO (ed.), Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity. Leiden 2003, 497–526. Quotations from Malalas, *Chronographia* according to the edition of Thurn.

¹⁴ Quotations from Africanus’ *Chronographiae* are according to the new edition: Iulius Africanus, *Chronographiae*. The Extant Fragments, ed. by M. WALLRAFF with U. ROBERTO and, for the Oriental Sources, K. PINGGÉRA. Translated by W. ADLER (GCS N.F. 15). Berlin – New York 2007.

¹⁵ For Malalas’s information about Hebrew history see R. FISHMAN-DUKER, The Second Temple Period in Byzantine Chronicles. *Byz 47* (1977) 126–156, 141–146; and recently J. BEAUCAMP, Le passé et l’histoire juive: la version de Jean Malalas, in: S. AGUSTA – BOULAROT – J. BEAUCAMP – A.M. BERNARDI – E. CAIRE (éd.), Recherches sur la Chronique de Jean Malalas, II. Paris 2006, 19–31. On the structure of the *Chronographia* see E. JEFFREYS – B. CROKE – R. SCOTT (eds.), *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney 1990.

¹⁶ Unfortunately we do not have enough text to understand the structure of Eustathius of Epiphaneia’s Chronological Epitome. See TREADGOLD, The Early Byzantine Historians 114–120, 316–329 and D. BRODKA, Eustathios von Epiphaneia und das Ende des Weströmischen Reiches. *JÖB 56* (2006) 59–78.

las however soon becomes the historiographic model to be imitated, and so John of Antioch lays out his work following its structure precisely. Malalas is his source for the “Archaiologia”: in the Trojan War, David and Priam are synchronised (frag. 42.1 Rob.)¹⁷; through Aeneas, the narration shifts to the history of the origins of Rome, and from Romulus proceeds without interruption up to Heraclius.

There are, however, other analogies between John of Antioch and Malalas. In profound syntony with the presentation of Malalas is John’s silence on Christianity and extremely few mentions of Jesus and Church history. It is interesting to note that the little information that John of Antioch borrows from John Malalas on the imperial age concerns Christians. The reliance of the Ἱστορία χρονική on Malalas’s structure is very clear. John of Antioch’s historiographic independence emerges significantly in his profoundly innovative narrative and historiographic choices. For Malalas, the history of Rome is first and foremost the history of its *basileia*. First comes a description of the archaic monarchy, from Romulus to Tarquinius Superbus (book 7). Then, after the expulsion of the Tarquinius, the account runs rapidly up to Julius Caesar, the new founder of the Roman monarchy. It is interesting to note that book 9 on the history of the consuls is in actual fact devoted to the civil wars and the ascent of Caesar. The history of Rome then continues as a succession of *Augusti* down to Justinian. In John of Antioch, this model is transformed by a significant shift: indeed, after the expulsion of the Tarquinius, John inserts at least five books devoted to the consuls, i.e. to the Roman Republic. Thus, in his opinion, this stage of Roman history is fundamental, and should even be set against the subsequent stage, in an overview of Roman power that comes into being and is fully manifest in the Republican Age¹⁸.

In this connexion, a passage taken from fr. 150.1 (Roberto) is of great historiographic relevance. In introducing the events of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, John states: μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ Κράσσου συμφορὰν ὁ πολιτικός διεδέξατο πόλεμος, ἐπάρατός τε καὶ πολλῶν δακρύων γεγωνῶς αἴτιος ὅτι δὴ πρὸς ταῖς ἄλλαις ταῖς κατ’ αὐτὸν συμβεβηκυίας συμφοραῖς καὶ ἡ τύχη τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων ἐκ τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ μετέστη πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον¹⁹. John’s source is certainly a passage from Eutropius VI 19, 1: *Hinc iam bellum civile successit exsecrandum et lacrimabile, quo praeter calamitates, quae in proeliis acciderunt, etiam populi Romani fortuna mutata est*. John’s working method and historiographic trend are clear from his reworking of this short Eutropean passage. Whereas Eutropius provides a neutral mention of the changing *fortuna* of the Roman *populus*, John is much more explicit. The destiny of the Roman *populus* changes from a status of hegemony in the State to one

¹⁷ This fragment comes from the so-called Wiener Troica in the Codex Vindobonensis hist. Gr. 99 ff. 8^v–14^v. This group of *excerpta* deal with the Trojan War. The comparison with the *Exc. Constantiniana* and the *Exc. Salmasiana* from John of Antioch, and the constant use of John Malalas and Dictys of Crete as sources, has allowed me to attribute these *excerpta* to John of Antioch. See ROBERTO, Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta CXVII–CXXII. Unfortunately, Mariev does not consider these important *excerpta* as genuine. Therefore he excludes them from his edition (Introduction 16*). To understand his editorial choice see SOTIROUDIS, Untersuchungen 30–37. Both Sotiroudis and Mariev consider spurious even the *Excerpta Constantiniana de virtutibus* of John of Antioch which deal with the Trojan war, “aus sprachlichen Gründen” according to Sotiroudis.

¹⁸ See U. ROBERTO, L’immagine di Roma repubblicana nella *Historia Chroniké* di Giovanni Antiocheno, in: I. MAZZINI (a cura di), La cultura dell’età romanobarbarica nella ricerca scientifica degli ultimi 20 anni. Bilancio e prospettive. *Romanobarbarica* 18 (2003–2005) 351–370 and IDEM, Alessandro Magno e la repubblica romana nella riflessione di Giovanni di Antiochia, in: T. GNOLI – F. MUCCIOLI (a cura di), Incontri tra culture nell’Oriente ellenistico e romano. Atti del Convegno di studio, Ravenna, 11–12 marzo 2005. Milano 2007, 199–214. For the decline of the Roman Republic according to John of Antioch: F.R. WALTON, A neglected historical Text. *Historia* 14 (1965) 236–251; L. ZUSI, L’età mariano-sillana in Giovanni Antiocheno. Padova 1989 and U. ROBERTO, Giovanni di Antiochia e un’interpretazione etrusca della storia, in: B. AMATA – G. MARASCO (a cura di), Storiografia e agiografia nella tarda antichità. Alla ricerca delle radici cristiane dell’Europa. *Salesianum* 67 (2005) 949–975.

¹⁹ Translation by MARIEV 159: After the disaster of Crassus the accursed civil struggle followed, which caused many tears because in addition to the other adversities it also brought about a change of fortune for the Roman people, whose sovereignty was reduced to submission.

of subjugation and subjection under the monarchy of the Caesars²⁰. This is the sense of the degeneration caused by the assumption of power by Caesar and then Augustus, destroyers of liberty, arrogant and brutal in John's portrayal. This is a singularly shrewd line of thought in a political and historiographic scenario now inclined to exalt the charismatic *basileia* and to legitimise its autocratic drift. From this point of view, it is highly interesting to note that John's stand on the *basileia* and its degeneration into tyranny is a constant theme of the Ἱστορία χρονική. It concerns the outcome of the advent to power of Caesar and Augustus, as also the terrible season of Phocas's tyranny. The comparison between the tyrant Phocas and the new βασιλεύς Heraclius from this standpoint is the point of all John of Antioch's reflections. The fact that these fragments of the *Excerpta Constantiniana* derive from an epitomized transmission of the work in no way reduces the fact that they clearly reflect the attitude of John of Antioch. From this point of view, the *Excerptores Constantiniani* were more far-sighted than Sotiroudis and Mariev²¹.

By way of conclusion, John of Antioch used Malalas not only as a model for his universal chronicle, but also as a source for numerous passages, especially in the books on "Archaiologia". Even for the Imperial Age, the presence of Malalas can be borne out, particularly in references to Christian history. Any attempt to eliminate every trace of Malalas from John of Antioch merely by expunging the *Excerpta Constantiniana* closest to the texts of the *Chronographia* – in accordance with Sotiroudis' indications, accepted by Mariev – is a crude hotchpotch, revealing more than anything a superficial familiarity with the Christian universal chronicle and its historiographic development in Late Antiquity and Byzantium²².

JULIUS AFRICANUS AND JOHN OF ANTIOCH: REMARKS ON FRAG. 1 MARIEV

The problem of John of Antioch's familiarity with Malalas is also central to the debate on the relationship between John of Antioch and Julius Africanus. This question concerns the assumption that frag. 1 Mariev = frag. 1 Müller belongs to the Ἱστορία χρονική. Fragment 1 derives from a set of *Excerpta Salmasiana* transmitted under the name of John of Antioch. In fact, there are two sets of *Excerpta Salmasiana*: those contained in frag. 1 and those coming from (as several manuscripts indicate) a different "Archaiologia". In his corpus, Müller rightly rejected the hypothesis that this fragment 1, comprising a brief set of *excerpta*, could belong to the work of John of Antioch. On the contrary, this collection of *excerpta* derives from the *Chronographiae* by Julius Africanus. Ignoring Müller's indications, and following rather Sotiroudis's ideas, Mariev has decided to consider these *excerpta* as effectively belonging to the work of John of Antioch. On this point, I have already presented arguments on other occasions – of which, obviously, there is no reference in the bibliog-

²⁰ On John's reworking of Eutropius see U. ROBERTO, Eutropio, Capitone Licio e Giovanni Antiocheno. *MEG* 4 (2003) 241–270. On the relationship between John and Eutropius' tradition see also A. CAMERON'S review to my edition, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2006.07.37 and F. PASCHOUD, Chronique d'historiographie tardive. *Antiquité Tardive* 14 (2006) 325–344, 334–335.

²¹ See ROBERTO, Byzantine Collections 82–83.

²² Mariev rejects the fundamental relationship between John of Antioch and John Malalas. On the one hand, he does not consider him as a source in his introduction, see 32*–41*; on the other hand, he prefers to indicate "*fontem non inveni*" for the texts of John of Antioch which clearly derive from Malalas's *Chronographia*. See, e.g., frag. 136 Mariev = frag. 193 Roberto which depends from Io. Mal. XI 5. For the relationship between John Malalas and John of Antioch see also TREADGOLD, The Early Byzantine Historians 312–329: parallels between John of Antioch and John Malalas result from their both copying a third author, Eustathius of Epiphania. Treadgold affirms: «Consequently the *Chronological Epitome* of Eustathius of Epiphania is not a truly lost text, but largely survives in the fragments of the *Chronological History* of John». I agree with Treadgold on the possibility of a stronger relationship between John of Antioch and Eustathius, even if the evidence is rare. Unfortunately, Eustathius' original text is almost entirely lost. On the other hand, I can not accept the hypothesis that John of Antioch copied Eustathius's text almost verbatim. On this point see my forthcoming discussion of Treadgold's book in *Mediterraneo Antico* 12 (2009).

raphy of Mariev²³. The initial assumption for any analysis of the material contained in frag. 1 Mariev = frag. 1 Müller is that John of Antioch was not directly familiar with the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus, but only through the *Chronographia* of John Malalas. There are several reasons justifying this statement:

- Firstly, the synchrony of David and Priam belongs to Malalas's chronological scheme and not that of Africanus. Indeed, the gap between David's reign and the Trojan War in the *Chronographiae* is a few decades. Malalas is the reference model for John of Antioch's "Archaialogia". Together with another unknown Christian chronicle, Malalas is actually the main source for the reconstruction given in the "Archaialogia" in the first two books of the Ἱστορία χρονική. Of particular importance is the organization of the universal chronology using the Trojan War as the turning point in the narrative. Like Malalas, John of Antioch also departs from the outline of Africanus in abandoning the account of Hebrew history and, on the contrary, adopts an evident Romano-centric structure.
- Quotations from Julius Africanus in John of Antioch are passages copied accurately from John Malalas. In no other fragment by John of Antioch do we find direct or indirect quotations from Julius Africanus that are independent of Malalas's transmission²⁴.
- One of the ways used to identify the impact of Julius Africanus on subsequent authors is to check whether Africanus's chronological system is employed. None of the few chronological indications used by John of Antioch match those known from Julius Africanus.

In conclusion, as already affirmed by Müller – and restated by recent editors of Julius Africanus's *Chronographiae*, M. Wallraff and myself – the *excerpta* in Müller frag. 1 do not belong to John of Antioch. However, even if we assume that they belong to the Ἱστορία χρονική, we should note a significant contradiction in Mariev. Firstly, if Müller frag. 1 were by John of Antioch, it would really be almost incomprehensible and Mariev's edition of the text would be inconsistent.

We shall consider the nature of the *excerpta*. They are clearly a collection of passages, arranged according to theme. Let us follow the numbering given by Mariev, comprising 39 *excerpta*:

- *Excerpta* 1–3 synchronise the Exodus of Moses and the reign of Ogygus, basic to the view of Africanus, and come from the initial part of Book 3 of the *Chronographiae*.
- *Excerpta* 4–24 and 34 on mythical pre-history and Greek history feature a consistent tendency to rationalise the myth and synchronise Hebrew history with Greek mythical pre-history. This approach is followed by Africanus in his reflection on myth.
- *Excerpta* 25–32 and 39 on Egyptian and Oriental history derive from Julius Africanus's *Chronographiae*. These texts are largely extrapolated from a version of the list of pharaohs by Maneton, reworked in a Hebrew context. The said list is found in just two sources: Julius Africanus and, with some variants, Eusebius of Caesarea.
- *Excerpta* 35–38 are taken from the list of Olympic champions, preserved in Eusebius, but attributed to Julius Africanus as a result of Scaliger's studies. After careful study, this attribution has been confirmed in the recent edition of the *Chronographiae* (cf. F65 Wallraff). In this section, the presentation follows a strictly chronological criterion.

²³ See U. ROBERTO, Gli Excerpta Salmasiana di storia greca e orientale dello Ps. Giovanni di Antiochia e le Chronographiae di Giulio Africano, in: R.M. PICCIONE – M. PERKAMS (Hrsg.), Selecta colligere, II. Beiträge zur Technik des Sammelns und Kompilierens griechischer Texte von der Antike bis zum Humanismus (*Hellenica. Testi e strumenti di letteratura greca antica, medievale e umanistica* 18). Alessandria 2006, 253–293; Iulius Africanus, Chronographiae, XL–XLII (WALLRAFF).

²⁴ See, e.g., Io. Ant. fr. 23.1 Roberto which derives from Io. Mal. III 11. On this text see U. ROBERTO, Ogigo re dell'Attica. Sul testo di Giovanni Malala III 11 (p. 44, 91–96 Thurn). *MEG* 7 (2007) 249–260. For the Codex Paris. 1630 and the transmission of John of Antioch see E. M. JEFFREYS, The Chronicle of John Malalas, Book I: a Commentary, in: P. ALLEN – E.M. JEFFREYS (eds.), The Sixth Century. End or Beginning? Brisbane 1996, 52–74, partic. 53–54; ROBERTO, Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta XLV–LIII. According to MARIEV, Introduction 25*, only two *excerpta* from the Codex Paris. 1630 belong to the "genuine" corpus of John of Antioch. His opinion derives from SOTIROUDIS, Untersuchungen 19–25.

- The single *exc.* 33 concerning the Ps.-Seleucus comes from a tradition relating to the kings of Syria.

The heterogeneous nature of the texts raises an immediate objection to Mariev's editorial decision. If the 39 *excerpta* really come from John of Antioch's Ἱστορία χρονική, why does Mariev publish them all together, in a single bloc? The editor's task in a fragmentary work is not only to identify the author's authentic texts, but is also – as a rule neglected by Mariev – to reconstruct, if possible, the organisation and arrangement of the work. Mariev makes no attempt to arrange in any thematic order the texts he considers as frag. 1 Müller. In his view, they belong to John of Antioch's "Archaialogia", to which fragments 2–9 of his edition (pp. 12–19) also belong, relating to the history of the kings of Israel and the history of Achaemenid Persia. That Mariev was unable to place the texts concerning the Exodus of Moses and Greek mythology is understandable, in a work with an extremely fragmentary beginning, but what explanation can there be, in a work based on a precise chronological order – its title, not casually, is Ἱστορία χρονική – for his inserting the fragments relating to the Olympiads (including victors in Roman times) and to the Seleucid dynasty *prior* to events such as the monarchy of Saul and David, which occur even before the first Olympiad in 776 B.C.? Why did he not attempt to disentangle the *excerpta* of the frag. 1 Müller and the *Excerpta Constantiniana*?

Even though Mariev provides no explanation of the problem – and it appears that, perhaps, he was not even aware of it – the reason for the impossibility of such an operation is fairly simple. Indeed, from Mariev's arrangement of the fragment's data, we should conclude that John of Antioch's work – an Ἱστορία χρονική, i.e. a universal chronicle starting from Adam, whose structure can be reconstructed on the basis of numerous statements from Late Antiquity and from the Byzantine period in general – in the part between Adam and the tale of Samson (p. 12 Mariev) contains *excerpta* from a list of pharaohs by Manetho, as well as pharaohs more recent than the Saul and David era, such as Bocchoris, from the 30th dynasty.

Still more difficult appears to be his inclusion in the chronological interval between Adam and Samson of *excerpta* deriving from the list of Olympiads found in Julius Africanus. Once again, these *excerpta* are not absolutely in line with the chronological structure of the Ἱστορία χρονική, since they also refer to winning athletes starting from the 157th Olympiad. On the other hand, it is in my opinion impossible to theorise that these *excerpta* were placed at the beginning of the Ἱστορία χρονική and thus presented an alternative compositional structure to the model of the Christian universal chronicle, as seen for example in Malalas's *Chronographia* (John of Antioch's source). The very *Excerpta Constantiniana*, under the name of John of Antioch – according to the order preserved by Mariev in his edition – progress chronologically from the creation of Adam to the chronicler's own times.

It is not feasible to consider that the work opened with a section containing information about the Olympiads of the imperial age or of the later part of the Seleucid dynasty, and then returned confusedly to the era of Samson and the kings of Israel (p. 12 Mariev). It is clear that the *excerpta* in Müller frag. 1 do not come from John of Antioch. They are fragments from an anonymous excerptor and from Africanus's *Chronographiae* – or its tradition – which have been welded in transmission to *Excerpta* coming, on the contrary, from a "hetera archaialogia", that of John of Antioch.

In conclusion, on the basis of experience acquired in the critical edition of Africanus's *Chronographiae*, I can reaffirm that John of Antioch did not utilise Julius Africanus directly. Everything that John of Antioch knows from this author is taken from John Malalas. As indicated by Müller, the first part of the *Excerpta Salmasiana* (= frag. 1 Müller) does not belong to John of Antioch. On the contrary these *excerpta* come directly from the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus. The inclusion by Sotiroudis–Mariev of these *excerpta* in the tradition of John of Antioch is consequently a

serious error that takes no account of the work's narrative arrangement and the author's historiographic selection.²⁵

FRAGMENTA QUAE SUPERSUNT OMNIA?

A last remark on the title: for his new critical edition, Mariev has decided to use an historiographically and philologically weighty title: *fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*. The question of the title is not a negligible one. In the case of an author like John of Antioch, research must continue to enrich our knowledge of those fragments that can with certainty be attributed to him. This aim can be achieved by working on a philological and historical commentary and a lexicon of the work. For some time, I have been working on such an undertaking, essential for a more appropriate understanding of John of Antioch, but such work is a long-term commitment and will take time²⁶.

At the same time, as already indicated by scholars in the past, the importance of John of Antioch in Byzantine universal chronicle studies is enormous. John has been defined as the “Livy of the Byzantines” and some scholars argue that much of later authors' knowledge of Roman history derives from his *Ἱστορία χρονική*²⁷. There is still much that can be done on the history of this work, and new fragments may be identified in future. From this point of view, the range is vast. In contrast, Mariev's declaration he has included *all* the surviving fragments of John of Antioch (*omnia*, i.e. the only authentic ones) appears open to question and, according to my own experience in studying the fragments of authors, imprudent.

Open to question, since on the basis of arbitrary hypotheses, which to a certain extent carry Sotiroudis' positions to an extreme, Mariev eliminates from John of Antioch's tradition a good number of authentic *Excerpta Constantiniana*. I refer to fragments deemed “awkward” because they evidently come from John Malalas's *Chronographia*, on the one hand; on the other hand, to those that are decisive for placing the author, relating to the reigns of Phocas and Heraclius, texts that may certainly be attributed to the *Ἱστορία χρονική* historiographic tradition.

Imprudent, since the aim of this research is to augment our knowledge of the text and character of John of Antioch. Merely to demonstrate the serious inadequacy of the title *fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, I will present the results of some more general research I am carrying out on the relationship between John of Antioch and the tradition of Ps.-Symeon and George Cedrenus. As we know, publication of the edition of Ps.-Symeon – based on the single Codex Parisinus gr. 1712 – was announced by A. Markopoulos long ago in 1978. While awaiting this edition of Ps.-Symeon, my remarks are based on the existing text by George Cedrenus²⁸.

Starting from a basic observation, in some sections devoted by George Cedrenus to Roman history of the archaic and imperial ages it is possible to identify the use of a very careful translation of Eutropius's *Breviarium*. On the basis of my research, we may state that:

- the translation of Eutropius's *Breviarium* was known to Cedrenus through John of Antioch's *Ἱστορία χρονική*. Consequently, Cedrenus does not use Eutropius directly. Wherever we have the matching fragments of John of Antioch, we can ascertain that Cedrenus quotes passages from Eutropius only by copying John of Antioch's text word for word.

²⁵ Iulius Africanus, *Chronographiae* XXXIX–XL.

²⁶ After criticism of my editorial choice, I feel that a further investigation on the *Excerpta Salmasiana II* (which in my opinion belong to an epitome of the tradition of John of Antioch) and their tradition in Byzantine historiography is an urgent need. See, for instance, B. BLECKMANN's review of my edition in *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 9 (2006) 1071–1075.

²⁷ See, e.g., E. GERLAND, *Die Grundlagen der byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung*. *Byz* 8 (1933) 93–105.

²⁸ On the relationship between John of Antioch and Ps.-Symeon see SOTIROUDIS, *Untersuchungen* 15–19.

- Very often, the passages from John of Antioch that have come down to us show contamination between Eutropius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a contamination that is also perfectly preserved by Cedrenus in the related passages²⁹.
- The above leads to two conclusions: whenever Cedrenus utilises a translation of Eutropius, it is possible to state that he is copying the Ἱστορία χρονική. When the Cedrenus passage shows contamination between Eutropius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, provenance from John of Antioch is even more certain: such passages were constructed historiographically by the Antiochene and copied by Cedrenus.

Among various instances, at least two passages can be identified that may be considered as *ad-denda* to the existing corpus of John's fragments. The text at Cedrenus 259, 14–17 deals with the reign of Numa Pompilius: πόλεμον μὲν οὐδένα πώποτε διωκήσατο, τὰ δὲ κατὰ πόλιν εἰς τὸ ὠφελιμώτερον διεκόσμη, νόμους ὅτε καθιστὰς πολιτικούς καὶ ἡμέρους, δι' ὧν ἀστείους τε καὶ φιλανθρώπους τοὺς πολίτας ἀπειργάζετο. This passage contains a fairly accurate translation of Eutropius III 1: *Postea Numa Pompilius rex creatus est, qui bellum quidem nullum gessit, sed non minus civitati quam Romulus profuit. Nam et leges Romanis moresque constituit, qui consuetudine proeliorum iam latrones ac semibarbari putabantur.* Since, for the passages derived from Eutropius found in Cedrenus, derivation from John of Antioch can be verified for the surviving fragments, I consider that it can also be proven that this passage derives from the Ἱστορία χρονική.

Another passage that can be attributed to the tradition of John of Antioch is found in Cedrenus 260, 18–22. This fragment concerns Tarquinius Priscus: Πρίσκος Ταρκύνιος Ῥώμης ἐβασίλευσε μετὰ τοῦτον, ὃς τὴν Ῥώμην τείχει μεγάλῳ ὠχύρωσε, περιγραφὴν τινα μόνην τοῦ προτέρου ἐπισημήνας. καὶ τὰς ὑπόνομους τάφρους δι' ὧν ἐπὶ τὸν Τίβεριον τὸ ἐκ τῶν στενωπῶν ὕδωρ ὀχετεύεται, ἔργον ἐς τὰ μάλιστα τῇ πόλει χρήσιμον, κατεσκεύασεν. As far as the sources are concerned, at least two different authors can be identified. From Eutropius's *Breviarium* I 6, 2, we know that Tarquinius Priscus: *Muros fecit et cloacas, Capitolium inchoavit.* This information is overlapped by the passage in Dionysius of Halicarnassus III 67, 4–5: καὶ τὰ τεῖχη τῆς πόλεως αὐτοσχέδια καὶ φαῦλα ταῖς ἐργασίαις ὄντα πρῶτος ὠκοδομήσατο λίθοις ἀμαξιαίοις εἰργασμένοις πρὸς κανόνα. Ἦρξατο δὲ καὶ τὰς ὑπόνομους ὀρύττειν τάφρους, δι' ὧν ἐπὶ τὸν Τέβεριον ὀχετεύεται πᾶν τὸ συρρέον ἐκ τῶν στενωπῶν ὕδωρ, ἔργα θαυμαστά καὶ κρείττω λόγου κατασκευασμένως. As shown, the fact that the Cedrenus passage matches that of Dionysius of Halicarnassus refers us directly to the Ἱστορία χρονική. As in other cases, Cedrenus knows Dionysius of Halicarnassus only through John of Antioch. The passage should consequently be considered as another fragment belonging to the historical tradition of John of Antioch. Certainty is lent to this hypothesis by the fact that, in Cedrenus, the passage follows a text that matches *Exc. de Insidiis* 7 = Io. Ant. 65 Roberto (p. 24 Mariev) perfectly. For this part of Roman history, Cedrenus utilises John of Antioch.

Research to recover passages by John of Antioch must not be limited just to the case of the Ps.-Symeon/Cedrenus tradition. In my opinion, there is much work to be done – with the possibility of interesting results – in analysing relations between John of Antioch and other Byzantine authors, as, for instance, Zonaras and Constantine Manasses³⁰.

²⁹ See M. CAPOZZA, Giovanni Antiocheno frg. 44, 47, 61 Müller. *Historia* 26 (1977) 385–414; ROBERTO, Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta CXXXIV.

³⁰ See Alan CAMERON's Review of my edition, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2006.07.37. Further research should investigate the possible relationship between John of Antioch and John the Lydian, on the one hand; and Petrus Patricius, on the other hand (see e.g., Petr. Patr., *Exc. de sententiis* 28 Boissevain = Io. Ant. 162.2 Roberto from the *Excerpta Salmasiana*; and Petr. Patr., *Exc. de sententiis* 16 = Io. Ant. 159.1 Roberto from the *Excerpta Constantiniana*). Under the supervision of C. Sode, Mrs. D. Rafiyenko (Cologne-Bergen) is preparing a new critical edition of Petrus Patricius's fragmentary *Roman History* which will allow us to investigate better this relationship. See on this point criticism by BLECKMANN 1073.

CONCLUSIONS: WHO IS JOHN OF ANTIOCH?

In presenting his critical edition of the fragments of the *Ἱστορία χρονική*, Mariev has totally refrained from making any in-depth study of the character and historiographical ideas of John of Antioch. As far as dating the author is concerned, his analysis appears to follow the thesis of Sotiroudīs, but with an interesting variation. In actual fact, he makes a single mention of the possibility of dating the author: “In accordance with these observations, the composition of the main part of the historical narrative is dated to the first half of the sixth century AD” (p. 8*). Mariev appears to extend the dating proposed by Sotiroudīs by at least two decades. Evidently, various signals have clearly made him aware that John of Antioch cannot have lived prior to Justinian and that period of intense cultural activity³¹.

There remains the problem that Mariev makes no effort to comprehend the complexity of a work that in fact appears to be of major importance for its ancient and modern readers, from the *Excerptores Constantiniani* to Planudes and C. Müller. Mariev’s approach to the *Ἱστορία χρονική* is strictly philological, and therefore inadequate for editing a fragmentary work. He does not show interest in historiographic, cultural and political aspects of the composition. Even the general background of the work is neglected. His edition of John of Antioch’s *Fragmenta omnia* is a hasty collection of texts without any effort at historical interpretation. On the contrary, a study of the character and historiographic views of John of Antioch is also a necessary development for studies on this major source. The fundamental coordinates for such a study are given below, in accordance with my interpretation of the *Ἱστορία χρονική* fragments.

- John of Antioch is the author of a Christian universal chronicle, ranging from Adam to the ascent of Heraclius. John Malalas’s *Chronographia* and the *Breviarium* of Eutropius provide the narrative model for a work characterised by a strong tendency toward political reflection. As indicated by its title, the *Ἱστορία χρονική* is, in actual fact, a synthesis of chronicle writing and classicising historiography in Late antiquity. Even its stylistic and lexical level and its selection of sources (Dio Cassius, Herodian, Priscus, Zosimus) are indicative of this hybrid character.
- Despite the author’s Antiochene origin, the work was written in Constantinople, which becomes the focus of the narration in the fragments of the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries. Judging from the focal interests of his fragments, John was probably a member of the imperial administration or a high-ranking secretary in one of the capital’s more important institutions, if not a personal aide to an influential member of the imperial court. Even the selection of fragments in the two volumes *De virtutibus et vitiis* and *de insidiis* indicates that discussion of the nature of power – legitimate and tyrannical – was at the centre of John of Antioch’s reflections. He is writing at a time afflicted by a crisis in the imperial institution, which after the murder of Mauricius had degenerated into the tyranny of Phocas. Such interests are clearly shared by his audience³².
- The final section of the fragments, especially from Mauricius to Phocas, is especially of enormous interest for an in-depth study of John and his historical view. This section deals with the liberation of Constantinople and the Empire by Heraclius, who bravely challenged Phocas’s brutal tyranny. John’s presentation, furthermore, highlights many original aspects as compared to the sources for the event. Whereas other historians describe Heraclius as the author of the liberation and punishment of the tyrant Phocas, in John’s text, Heraclius’s action in the prov-

³¹ SOTIROUDIS, Untersuchungen 150, dates John to 520–530 and identifies him with “John the Rhetor”. This hypothesis is evidently wrong. For this reason, perhaps, Mariev extends the date for John of Antioch till AD 550.

³² TREADGOLD, The Early Byzantine Historians 312: «John was evidently a monk», see also 320. We do not have evidence for it. On the problem see also B. LUISELLI’s review of my edition, *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura religiosa* 43 (2007) 345–350 and BLAUDEAU 590.

inces is inspired and supported by the Senate, led by the *patricius* Priscus, and popular factions in the capital. Thus, when Heraclius arrives at Constantinople, the city has already been liberated by the Senate and local populace, the very groups who hand over both the power and the captive usurper to Heraclius. As underlined in the rapid and short-tempered dialogue between Heraclius the victor and the defeated Phocas, it is hoped that the *basileia* will be re-founded on criteria of justice and participation in governing the Empire³³.

³³ Deference to Rome's past is a strategy for the Heraclian family to claim legitimacy in the revolt against Phocas. It is very important to stress that at the beginning of the revolt (608), Heraclius the Elder and his son proclaimed themselves *consules* in evident opposition to the cruel tyrant Phocas. See C. MORRISSON, Du consul à l'empereur: les sceaux d'Héraclius, in: C. SODE – S. TAKÁCS (eds.), *Novum Millennium: Studies on Byzantine History and Culture Dedicated to Paul Speck*. Aldershot – Burlington 2001, 257–265; G. RÖSCH, Der Aufstand der Herakleioi gegen Phokas (608–610) im Spiegel numismatischer Quellen. *JÖB* 28 (1979) 51–62. In my opinion, there is a clear link between Heraclius's political strategy against Phocas and the interest of John of Antioch in the Roman Republic.