

Arrian's Events After Alexander in Photius

by

Paul McGilvery

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

at

Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia
August 2014

© Copyright by Paul McGilvery, 2014

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	iii
List of Figures.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
List of Abbreviations Used.....	vi
Acknowledgments.....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: The <i>Bibliotheca</i> of Photius.....	4
Chapter 3: Photius' Summaries of Extant Historical Works: Procopius' <i>Wars</i> , Theophylact's <i>History</i> , and Arrian's <i>Anabasis</i>	45
Chapter 4: The <i>Events After Alexander</i>	81
Chapter 5: Conclusions.....	104
Appendix 1: Photius' Summary of Arrian's <i>Events After Alexander</i>	108
Appendix 2: Photius' Summary of Dexippus' <i>History</i>	114
Bibliography.....	116

List of Tables

Table 1	Outline of Photius' summary of Arrian's <i>Events After Alexander</i>	87
Table 2	First distribution of the satrapies according to our surviving sources.....	89
Table 3	Sources preserving the titles given to Alexander's successors following his death.....	91

List of Figures

Figure 1	Comparison of the accounts of the marriages at Susa found in Arrian's <i>Anabasis</i> and Photius' summary of that work.....	55
Figure 2	Comparison of a digression on the Taurus Mountains in Procopius' <i>Wars</i> and Photius' summary of that work.....	65

Abstract

This study seeks to examine Photius' 9th-century summary of Arrian's *Events After Alexander*. The original work, which no longer survives, records the early history of the successors to Alexander's empire. While Photius' summary preserves some important details of the history, the unique context in which the summary is found (part of a collection of 280 summaries written by Photius, known as the *Bibliotheca*) means that a unique approach must be used when attempting to reconstruct Arrian's original work, or when comparing it to other surviving accounts of the period following Alexander's death. By examining and comparing other historical summaries found in the *Bibliotheca*, it will be shown that Photius' summaries are often extremely accurate at some points, but that they do not preserve the form or development of the summarized work, and focus on a diplomatic view of history indicative of Photius' Byzantine tastes.

List of Abbreviations Used

FGrHist Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker
Events Arrian's *Events After Alexander*

Acknowledgments

Firstly, I must thank Dr. Jack Mitchell for his patience, expertise, and constant support in supervising this thesis. His willingness to delve into the world of Byzantine historiography – a subject foreign to many a classicist – as well as his skilled guidance in all other avenues of study which were instrumental to this thesis was both encouraging and inspiring. My gratitude is also due to Dr. Emily Varto and Dr. Peter O'Brien for offering their talents as members of this thesis' examining committee. This work could not have been completed without their sound advice. Lastly, I acknowledge and extend my appreciation to the Killam Trusts, whose generous Izaak Walton Killam Memorial Scholarship made it possible for me to pursue this thesis and degree.

Chapter One: Introduction

This study is born out of the idea that classical historiography intersects with many fields of study, and that often our knowledge of even well-known Greek and Roman authors is contingent upon their transmission through the pens and minds of scribes and scholars over hundreds of years of history. I was fascinated when, early in my undergraduate career, I heard of Photius and the corroborating material he preserves from Xenophon's account of the Ten Thousand. From Photius' reputation, I envisioned a medieval Greek riding atop a camel to the library at Baghdad in A.D. 845, surely the only way he, at that time, could be exposed to the lost material of the pagan ancients. As it turned out, this daydream was almost completely false, but the sense of wonder it inspired at the complex methods by which our knowledge of history has been conveyed has never been extinguished. Photius, a learned Byzantine aristocrat and sometime patriarch of Constantinople, has preserved the accounts of more than four hundred ancient texts (many of them no longer extant) in a curious work called the *Bibliotheca*, which, as we shall see, deserves its own special consideration when being consulted as a source of fragments of lost texts. One of the most fascinating of these fragments is a lengthy summary of Arrian's *Events After Alexander*, a continuation of his famous *Anabasis*. Arrian lived in the 2nd century A.D., wrote about Alexander, who had lived five centuries earlier, and his *Events* is preserved only in Photius' 9th century *Bibliotheca*. Such are the wide gulfs in time one must navigate when dealing with classical fragments, and in this case our knowledge of the period of Alexander's successors in the 4th century

B.C. comes at two dim removes through Photius' fragment. The period covered by the fragment is brief (the first few years following the death of Alexander and the breakup of his empire), but its historical significance can hardly be overstated. This, combined with the conspicuous lack of ancient sources that can attest to the exact events of the period (and, in fact, the complete absence of any primary textual source), make fragments like Photius' summary as relevant as they are potentially subject to misuse. As we shall see, the *Bibliotheca* has many unique traits which can both positively and negatively affect reconstructions of the fragmentary texts it preserves.

The general aim of this study will be twofold: first, to explore the *Bibliotheca*, its method, idiosyncrasies, and textual traits conducive to its use as a source of fragments; second, we will examine its summary of Arrian's lost *Events After Alexander* in the wider context of the *Bibliotheca* as a whole. In order to do this we must undertake a historiographical study of the *Bibliotheca* itself, and although an examination of Photius' summary of Arrian's *Events After Alexander* will remain the chief goal of this study, it will only become possible once we have established a thorough understanding of the text in which it is found. Scholars have too often studied fragments from the *Bibliotheca* without focusing on their context, and in the case of the *Events After Alexander*, no previous studies of Photius' summary of that text have taken into account the complexities of the *Bibliotheca* as a whole. To this end, Chapter Two surveys the nature of Photius' *Bibliotheca*, its composition, authorship, and its intended audience, before passing to a study of some of the earliest secular historians (some extant and others not) mentioned by Photius and his varying treatment of their works, in order to better

understand his method of summarizing texts. In Chapter Three, we shall explore in greater detail three ancient historians whose works are still preserved in their entirety, and investigate how Photius' summaries reflect their work. This will enable us to assess the impact of the unique traits of the *Bibliotheca* on its role as a source of classical fragments. Only then will we be suitably equipped to explore the material of Chapter Four, which is a detailed analysis of Photius' summary of Arrian's lost *Events After Alexander*, its possible reconstruction, and its use and abuse in modern scholarship.

Chapter Two: *The Bibliotheca* of Photius

As a historical and literary figure, Photius of Constantinople has become highly instrumental in our perception of Byzantine theology, political history, and its reception of classical literature. His most famous work, the *Bibliotheca* (also known as the *Myriobiblon*) defies generic categorization. Even the nature of its composition remains puzzling, and its date of composition hotly debated.¹ The work is, on its surface, a collection of “book reviews”,² namely 280 summaries and epitomes of over 400 individual books written by authors ranging from Herodotus in the 5th century BCE to Sergius Confessor in the 9th century CE, who was a contemporary of Photius.³ The summaries are “book-ended” by a preface and postscript written by Photius which identify the work as a gift to his brother Tarasius. As we shall see, scholars have debated over whether or not these supplements are genuine.

The *Bibliotheca* retains its value not only as a Byzantine source, but also as a classical reference. In addition to its many summaries of ecclesiastical treatises and histories, hagiographies and biographies, oratories, apologetics and medical texts, the *Bibliotheca* preserves many secular histories written by both well-known and unattested classical authors. As such, Photius has long been used as a source for fragments of authors whose texts have been transmitted to us incompletely. He has summarized no less than 41 works of 30 secular historians and geographers, of which 16 are completely or in

1 The most complete treatment has been Treadgold (1980). For the most recent points of contention, compare Treadgold (2002, 1-17); and Maraglino (2007, 265-78).

2 Ives 1951, 285-289; Condit 1937, 564-76. Ives calls Photius' summaries “book reviews”, although Condit prefers to think of them as an early form of bibliography. In a sense, the *Bibliotheca* represents both.

3 Perhaps Photius' father, see Treadgold (2002, 2).

large part preserved elsewhere, 17 are fragmentary, and 8 are either lost or elsewhere unattested. In this chapter, I consider Photius as a preserver of ancient secular literature (“secular” as it would have occurred to Photius – that is to say, not ecclesiastical works in the late Classical or Byzantine tradition), and present a way to navigate his summaries in the *Bibliotheca* as fragments of lost works, while keeping in mind the unique context from which these fragments come. More specifically, by undertaking several case studies on Photius' treatment of classical historians and geographers from the 5th to 1st centuries BCE, I will attempt to shed light on any possible reconstruction of those works, and how the characteristics of their Photian summaries relate to Arrian's lost *Events After Alexander*. The summarized authors examined in this chapter include Herodotus, Ctesias, Theompompus of Chios, Agatharcides of Cnidus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Diodorus Siculus. As will be made clear, however, the quality of his summaries and the quantity of tangible historical data varies wildly from author to author.

Photius

Photius of Constantinople was born at the beginning of the 9th century to a wealthy and politically connected family.⁴ Although the date of his birth is still unknown, scholarship has agreed on a point no later than AD 820, but more likely ca. 810.⁵ Little is known about Photius' formal education. One of the only attestations we have is from the

4 Mango 1980.

5 The traditional birth date, upheld by Konrat Ziegler (1941) was ca. 820, with a *terminus ante quem* of 827 since Photius was consecrated as a bishop in 857, for which the minimum age was 30-35. Treadgold (1980) and Lemerle (1971) favour an earlier date, ca. 810. The earlier date is more intuitive, since we should assume Photius, a layman, was appointed as a bishop at an older rather than minimum age. Intuition aside, the fact that there was a minimum age for the consecration of a bishop proves that many who held the title were young indeed.

Chronicle of Symeon Logothetes (or “Pseudo-Symeon”, a Byzantine chronicler covering the period from the mid-9th to mid-10th centuries) which states that Photius renounced the cross in exchange for an education from a Jewish Magus.⁶ This work also records that his father, a pagan, abducted a nun from her convent, who would give birth to Photius and his siblings. Symeon Logothetes then relates that Photius, a product of this godless marriage, was the subject of a prophesy that he would come to wreak havoc on the Christian Church. In his 1941 contribution to *Pauly-Wissowa*, Konrat Ziegler suggests that the characters and saints mentioned in Symeon's story align themselves with Photius' chronology⁷ and that from this source we can, with caution, gain a rudimentary understanding of Photius' familial relationships. For instance, in Pseudo-Symeon's chronicle we find one of the only mentions of Photius' father's name (Sergius) and the fact that he was a *spatharios*. Since we know for certain that Photius had a brother named Sergius, it is reasonable to conclude that it was a familial name and that his father's bearing it was not fabricated.⁸ Another Byzantine chronicle known as *Theophanes Continuatus* (so-called because it records the material immediately following the chronicle of Theophanes Confessor) covers the period between A.D. 813-961, and records many more details on Photius' family. Like Pseudo-Simeon, it records Photius' father's name as Sergius, and gives us his exact relationship to the Byzantine royal family.⁹ With that and Pseudo-Symeon's anecdotal (and obviously hostile) evidence aside,

6 Pseudo Symeon, 670.15-16: “καὶ ἄρνησαι τὸν τύπον ἐν ᾧ Ἰησοῦν προσηλώσαμεν, καὶ δώσω σοι παράδοξον φυλακτόν” (“and deny the figure on which Jesus was nailed, and I shall give you incredible fame”).

7 Ziegler (1941) This assumes, of course, the chronology and birth date that Ziegler's own scholarship has assigned Photius.

8 Ziegler 1941: “Name Sergius für den Vater wird dadurch gestützt, daß auch ein Bruder des P[hotios] so hieß..”

9 His uncle, Arsaber the Patrician, married the sister of the Empress Theodora, wife of Emperor

however, disappointingly little is known about Photius' youth, his life, and the events immediately following his death. Regarding his two patriarchates in Constantinople, however, there is an abundance of evidence.¹⁰

Despite being a canonized saint in the Eastern Orthodox Church, Photius' hagiography (if it ever existed) has not survived. Also interesting is that, although he is a relatively famous Byzantine figure, our knowledge of his life is related only through the acts which he performed as patriarch and through the letters, treatises, and lexicography which he wrote. We know, for instance, that he was a scholar and layman, and that this infuriated his clerical rivals. He was also an instrumental figure in the conversion of Slavs into Christianity, facilitating the translation of Christian texts into Slavonic (an unorthodox move that was largely frowned upon by the papacy in Rome).¹¹ He earnestly competed with the Church in Rome for the conversion of Bulgaria from AD 866-867, and publicly reprimanded the Latin West for their perceived deviations from Orthodox Christianity (among which was the famous addition of *filioque* to the Nicene Creed). This caused a temporary mutual excommunication between himself and the Pope in Rome, though the schism was brought to an end when Photius was relieved of the patriarchate and replaced by Ignatius, a rival.¹² Although deposed as patriarch and condemned by the Eighth Ecumenical Council,¹³ Photius continued to teach at the royal court. He again gained favour with the papacy, in no small part due to the number of clergy who

Theophilus (829-842) of the Amorian dynasty. See Bekker (1838); cf. also Treadgold (1988, 436-7)
10 Ziegler 1941.

11 Herrin 2009, 134-5.

12 Herrin 2009, 127.

13 Only considered the eighth in the Western church - after Photius was reinstated as Patriarch, he separately held what he considered to be the official eighth Council.

remained loyal to him and who had done the legwork in converting the Bulgars.¹⁴ He became the tutor of the future Emperor Leo VI, and was eventually appointed to the patriarchate for a second time in 877 upon the death of Ignatius. His former pupil Leo would depose and exile him after becoming emperor in 886.¹⁵ Photius died at an uncertain date sometime thereafter.

As patriarch, Photius was without doubt an iconophile. He describes how his own family was anathematized during the iconoclastic movement under the emperor Theophilus in the 830's.¹⁶ Treadgold suggests that the story of his father's exile is preserved in the *Synaxarion* and *Menologion* (collections of hagiographies used as service books in the Eastern Orthodox church) under May 13, as well as in a hymn.¹⁷ These tell us that a certain "Sergius Confessor" was prevailed upon by the emperor to forswear the veneration of icons, and that when he refused, he and his family were sent into exile.¹⁸ Treadgold links this with Theophilus' edict of June 833, which "...ordered the confiscation of the property of any layman who gave refuge to an iconophile cleric."¹⁹ The circumstances seem to explain Photius' period of exile beyond much doubt, though its location is still not known. The story does account for Photius' iconophile upbringing, and complements what we do know about his own theological writing and patriarchal acts. During his second patriarchate, his seal displayed an image of the Virgin holding the Christ Child in a medallion (now known as the "Blachernitissa type") and in 866, he even inaugurated the Hagia Sophia's apse mosaic, which depicts the enthroned Virgin and

14 Dvornik 1970, 159-60.

15 Treadgold 1980, 3.

16 *Photii Epistolae*, II, epist. LXIV, P. G. Vol. 102, col. 877.

17 Treadgold 2002, 2.

18 Delehay 1902, 682; Minge 1860, 117.453c-d; Nikas 1973, 168-75.

19 2002, 2 (citing Treadgold 1988, 280-1 and n. 386).

Child (which can still be seen today).²⁰ He wrote in favour of the final abandonment of iconoclasm in an era when churches were alternately being lavishly decorated or whitewashed to suit the theological policies of each succeeding monarch.

State of Scholarship

Scholarship on Photius' works has been extensive and, in keeping with his varied career, has been carried out in many fields of study. Scholars in Religious Studies have examined his relationship with the Slavic church as well as the history of the Photian Schism.²¹ Scholars of Early Medieval history have come to identify him as a representative figure of the 9th century cultural revival of the Byzantine state and often point to the *Bibliotheca* as the crowning achievement of his contributions as a Greek polymath.²² In the field of Classics, he has been a widely cited but largely neglected author, though some early secondary sources on Photius and the *Bibliotheca* remain fundamental: Cardinal Josef Hergenröther's work on Photius' life is now largely outdated, but remains the fundamental and most exhaustive resource on the life of the patriarch.²³ Hergenröther was particularly interested in Photius' career and the history of the Schism, and authored the prefaces to many of Photius' texts in the *Patrologia Graeca*. The fundamental manuscript study of the *Bibliotheca* was published by Edgar Martini in 1911.²⁴ Martini identified manuscripts A and M of the *Bibliotheca* as the most authoritative, though he did not assess the merits of these, a task undertaken by Albert

20 Herrin 2009, 104, 113.

21 Fortescue 2001, 146-7; Dvornik 1970.

22 Treadgold 1979, 1245-66; Lemerle 1971, 177-204.

23 Hergenröther 1867-1869.

24 Martini 1911.

Severyns in 1938 as part of an edition of codex 239 (the *Chrestomathia* of Proclus).²⁵

Severyns found manuscript A more reliable, which may have influenced the decision of René Henry (his student)²⁶ to rely exclusively on that manuscript in his complete translation of the *Bibliotheca* in 1959-1977.²⁷

Today, A and M remain the two primary manuscripts of the *Bibliotheca*. A has been ascribed to the second half of the 10th century (or earlier), while M is ascribed to the 12th century.²⁸ These both found their way into the extensive library of Cardinal Basilios Bessarion before being presented (along with his other titles) to the Venetian Republic in 1468 and housed in the Marciana in Venice, where they remain. Both bear the marks and marginal notes of several correctors (in the case of A, of Cardinal Bessarion himself), and only A is complete (M has lost one folio containing the preface and some of the table of contents). Many other copies of A and M exist, as well as hybrids of the two, but A and M are understood to be the oldest copies of the *Bibliotheca*.

Emil Orth has presented an analysis on Photius' critical vocabulary,²⁹ and though some of its assumptions have been challenged, it remains useful when viewing Photius as a literary critic.³⁰ Tomas Hägg has presented a study on the various ways in which Photius structures his summaries, though the study only treats ten codices thoroughly.³¹ Along with Treadgold³² and Venance Grumel,³³ Hägg has also contributed substantial editing to

25 Severyns 1938.

26 Duffy 1980, 264.

27 Henry 1959 – 1977.

28 Diller 1962, 389.

29 Orth 1928.

30 See esp. Hägg 1999, 43-58.

31 Hägg 1975.

32 Treadgold 1980, *Byzantinoslavica*.

33 Grumel 1960.

Henry's translation.³⁴ Another major contributor to Photian studies has been Konrat Ziegler (see above, note 7), whose 1941 contribution to the *Pauly-Wissowa* crystallized the facts concerning Photius' life and work. More recently, Paul Lemerle, in his *Le Premier Humanisme Byzantin*³⁵ (an indispensable work on Byzantine cultural history) has helped to reintroduce Photius as a pioneer of cultural progress during an important era of enlightenment in Byzantium. He paints an intriguing portrait of the patriarch as a pragmatic yet proud layman, situating Photius' (and other scholars') contributions to Western thought during the Dark Ages apart from Arab influence, which he views as exaggerated. N. G. Wilson has also contributed to the English discussion of the *Bibliotheca*, going so far as to translate and publish selected codices in that language, ones for which he either found fault in Henry's translation or which he considered important enough to be made widely available in English.³⁶ Wilson conjectures, however, that Photius may have relied on an eidetic memory in composing his summaries,³⁷ a view promptly disproved by Hägg, distinguishes between those codices which seem to have required notes and those written from memory.³⁸

Hägg's work is intriguing and exceptional, but, as mentioned, he does not treat the *Bibliotheca* as a whole, and though his particular selection of codices provides illuminating insight, he omits the works of Arrian. This is disappointing, since Arrian represents the only secular historian for which we have a surviving work summarized by Photius (*Alexander's Anabasis*) as well as three summarized works which are now

34 Hägg 1976.

35 1971, 177-204.

36 Wilson 1994.

37 Wilson 1968.

38 Hägg 1973.

fragmentary (*Events After Alexander; Bythinica; Parthica*). Since Hägg was attempting to gauge Photius' fidelity to the texts in question, it is curious that he omits an author for whom we have a lengthy control text as well as one of the the widest selections of lost texts that survive in summary. It should be noted, however, that Hägg's aim was to use only texts which have survived (Josephus, Plutarch, Procopius, etc.) in order to judge Photius' accuracy. He did not engage in the appraisal of fragmentary evidence, which would seem the next logical step, if (as in the case of Arrian) those fragments are being used to supplement existing texts.³⁹

Other texts which were not analyzed by Hägg seem to indicate that Photius had notes before him when he drafted the *Bibliotheca*. Summaries including numerical values (troop numbers and currency) are quite accurate, for example. In his summary of Arrian's *Anabasis*, Photius indicates an estimation of Persian troop numbers found in Book 1: “ἄγοντας δισμυρίους μὲν ἵππεῖς, πεζοὺς δὲ παρὰ μικρὸν ἴσους” (“indeed leading 20,000 horse and almost as many foot”),⁴⁰ and Arrian's surviving work gives the same number: “Περσῶν δὲ ἵππεῖς μὲν ἦσαν ἕς δισμυρίους, ξένοι δὲ πεζοὶ μισθοφόροι ὀλίγον ἀποδέοντες δισμυρίων” (“indeed the Persians had 20,000 cavalry and almost as many as 20,000 infantry, allies and mercenaries”)⁴¹ Also, Photius reproduces a number of infantry and elephants in Arrian's *Events After Alexander*, which is now lost, but which Diodorus Siculus gives as “πεζοὺς μὲν πλείω τῶν μυρίων, ... ἵππεῖς δὲ δισχιλίους, ἐλέφαντας δὲ τριάκοντα.” (“he had more than 10,000 infantry, 2,000 cavalry and 30 elephants”)⁴²

39 Sections of Photius' summaries of Arrian's *Events After Alexander* and Dexippus' *History* (which is generally thought to be an epitome of Arrian's work) are used as companions to much of Diodorus Siculus 18.

40 *Bib.* 91. 67b. 28-29.

41 *Ar. An.* 1. 14. 4.

42 18.40.7.

Photius' fragment of Arrian reads: "... Μακεδόνας ὀκτακισχιλίους καὶ πεντακοσίου, καὶ ἰππέας τῶν ἐτέρων ἴσους ἐλέφαντας δὲ τῶν πάντων τοὺς ἡμισέας ο' ,"⁴³ ("... he had 8,500 Macedonians, just as many cavalry, together with 70, or half of, the elephants,"). Again, in his summary of Theophylact's *History*, Photius transcribes passages in exacting detail:

Maurice made peace with the Avars, who a little time before had laid siege to Sirmium, and agreed to pay the barbarians 80,000 pieces of gold yearly in consignments of garments and money. The treaty was kept for two years, but was broken owing to the greed of the barbarians, who demanded 20,000 pieces of gold.⁴⁴

Comparing this to the original passage from Theophylact's surviving text, we see that Photius reproduces the numerical figures exactly:

The terms were most disgraceful to the Romans: for after such a monumental disaster, like a panel of judges in session, they gave the barbarians glorious gifts, as if a prize for excellence, and agreed to deposit with the barbarians each year eighty thousand gold coins in the form of merchandise of silver and of embroidered cloth. The treaty did not last longer than two years: for the Chagan of the Huns, as he is known, behaved arrogantly towards the Romans. ... Furthermore he demanded that, in addition to eighty thousand gold coins, he be paid by the Romans another twenty thousand annually as well.⁴⁵

Another line found in Theophylact's *History*, "τάδε σοι, Τιβέριε, τὸ τρισάγιον λέγει· οἱ τύραννοι τῆς ἀσεβείας ἐπὶ τῆς σῆς βασιλείας οὐ φοιτήσουσι χρόνοι."⁴⁶ is reproduced word for word by Photius in codex 65. The supposition that such accuracy is the work of an eidetic memory seems hard to believe. Given the numerous errors found in the *Bibliotheca*,⁴⁷ it should be concluded that parts were transcribed from reading notes, while others perhaps from Photius' (sometimes mistaken) recollection.

43 *Bib.* 92.72b.23-25.

44 Freese 1920, 76.

45 Whitby; Whitby 1986, 59.

46 1.2.2.2-4 ("The trinity says to you, Tiberius, that the despotic time of impiety shall not frequent your kingdom.") - a prophesy dreamed by emperor Tiberius II.

47 Studiously pointed out by Treadgold (1981, 67-80).

The Text

The format of Photius' work is perhaps its most perplexing attribute. Both published letters and epitomes were frequent in antiquity, the *Bibliotheca* seems to embody these two genres. Photius compiled a series of textual summaries, apparently for his brother Tarasius,⁴⁸ so that the latter could learn about books which he had not yet read. We assume this from details left behind in the preface and postscript of the manuscripts, which outline the author's intentions to assuage his brother during an absence from court:

ἤτησας τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἐκείνων τῶν βιβλίων, οἷς μὴ παρέτυχες ἀναγινωσκομένοις,
γραφήναί σοι
you asked that summaries of those books, which were read aloud when you were
not present, be written for you⁴⁹

The preface, which appears to have been written (or dictated) by Photius, tells us that he was chosen by royal appointment to attend an embassy to the “Ἀσσυρίοι.” Whither this envoy was destined is still unclear. For some time this ambiguous passage fuelled the myth among scholars that Photius had access to either Arab texts or the libraries in Baghdad and used these as a major source in compiling the *Bibliotheca*.⁵⁰ This interpretation served to explain the exceptional amount of valuable secular material

48 Some scholars have doubted that the title “ἀδελφός” was more than an affectionate term for a student or friend. Ives (1951, 285) intuitively that Tarasius was Photius' pupil and a member of his itinerant reading circle. Treadgold (1980, 22) stresses the now more popular belief that Tarasius was indeed Photius' brother by citing *Bib.* 280.545.8-9: “Σὺ δ' ὦ τῶν ἐμοὶ κεκοινωνηκότων μητρικῶν ὠδίνων ἐρασμιώτατε,” (“You, most beloved, who has shared with me a mother's labour pains,”)

49 *Bib.* p.1.3-4.

50 L. Condit (1937, 568), makes the assumption that Photius wrote his *Bibliotheca* abroad, and that “Moslem” libraries were instrumental in his collection of rare secular works. Although Greek manuscripts may have been found in Baghdad, Treadgold (1980, 26) reminds us that the “Assyrian” embassy was not necessarily an “Arabic” embassy. Beyond this, B. Hemmerdinger (1956) suggests that Photius read all the material for and published his *Bibliotheca* in Baghdad. This had been refuted already by Hergenröther (1868), and was so again by Wilson (1968), Zeigler (1941) and Treadgold (1980).

described in the *Bibliotheca* which was believed to have been marginalized by the church, in keeping with traditional views of Dark Age history. In reality, however, the catalogue represented by the *Bibliotheca* could not have been completed during a single embassy, nor need it have been; it is far more likely that the literature found among either Greek or Arab aristocracies was not mutually exclusive. Wilson suggests that a proper scholar living in Constantinople need not have travelled outside the city to procure even obscure texts.⁵¹ Treadgold has also suggested that the common opinion that Photius visited Baghdad is indefensible, since there was no seat of government there during Photius' career. Instead, he prefers one of two recorded embassies to Samarra, in the Abbasid Caliphate, either in 845 or 859.⁵² To bolster this claim, he uses Photius' summary of Procopius' *Wars*, in which Belisarius sends a general “among the Assyrians.”⁵³ In Photius' mind (as in Procopius') it was clear that this was the land east of the Tigris river.

Did Photius use Arab copies of Greek texts in composing his work? It is made explicit in the postscript that the works in the *Bibliotheca* represent the sum total of Photius' adult reading.⁵⁴ Also, in his preface, he makes clear that all widely known texts would be omitted from the work (after all, what purpose would it serve to send Tarasius a summary of something he had already read?). This explains why the *Bibliotheca* notably lacks summaries of canonical authors such as Plato, Aristotle, Pindar and Homer. These works had remained popular in Byzantium, unlike in the Latin West, where they would largely be forgotten until their 14th century revival (facilitated in large part by appointed

51 Wilson 1968, 454

52 Treadgold 1980, 34-5

53 Photius' “ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις πέμψας” mirrors Procopius' “ἐπὶ Ἀσσυρίας ἐκέλευεν”, both using the archaic form for the Abbasids and Sassanids respectively.

54 *Bib.* 280.545.1-4. More on this below, p. 18-19

Byzantine lecturers and Greek translators).⁵⁵ In the *Bibliotheca* we have little mention of these canonical authors, and Photius himself states that he devoted less time to well-known works with which Tarasius was likely already familiar.⁵⁶ In many of his summaries, Photius uses ancient authors (especially Thucydides) as the benchmark by which each text is judged.⁵⁷ Photius obviously did not require Arab copies of these canonical Greek texts. The main argument to be made for a dependency on Arab texts, however, is that the Christian Church curtailed the knowledge of the pagan ancients, in which case there is a possibility that Photius had limited access to more obscure texts that could not be found in Byzantium. The relationship between Byzantine and Arab scholarship should be approached with some caution. T. Conley⁵⁸ treats Photius' embassy to Baghdad as fact, and though he admits that nothing in the source material places him there explicitly, he censures Lemerle's *Humanisme* for denying any influence on Byzantium by Eastern learning. Another Near-Eastern scholar of note, B. Jokisch, has drawn a link between a certain “Fathyūn” (Arabic for Photius) and Photius of Constantinople.⁵⁹ Fathyūn lived in the Abbasid caliphate during the second period of iconoclasm, which was a popular destination for iconophile exiles (like the family of Photius). Fathyūn spent some time tutoring Ibn Kullāb,⁶⁰ a major Sunni theologian, and

55 Herrin 2007, xix.

56 *Bib.* 1. 32.

57 cf. 71. 35b.30-32; 82. 64a.17-20; 213. 171b: “Καὶ ζηλωτῆς μὲν ἔστι Θουκυδίδου ἔν τε τῇ τῶν δημηγοριῶν δαμιλείᾳ τε καὶ διασκευῇ, τῷ μεγαλείῳ δὲ μὴ δευτερεύων τοῦ λόγου τῷ σαφεὶ παρελαύνει τὸν ἄνδρα.” (And he is an emulator of Thucydides in both the abundance of his deliberative prose, and also its rhetorical construction, and indeed the man is not surpassed so as to be seen as second in regard to the magnificence and clarity of his work.).

58 Conley 1990, 37.

59 Jokisch 2007, 365.

60 A simplified title – his full name was Abu Muhammad Abdallah b. Sa'id b. Muhammad b. Kullab al-Qattan al-Tamimi al-Basri. He is seen as a forerunner to the Ash'arite school and some of his religious views align with Photius' brand of iconophilia.

instructed him in the doctrine of images. Jokisch maintains that this was indeed Photius of Constantinople since “Although there were many Christians bearing his name in ninth-century Islam, there is only one who 1) lived in Baghdad in the first half of the 9th century 2) was a Greek and 3) was familiar with moderate Orthodoxy.”⁶¹ To Jokisch, Photius' biographical link to occultism (e.g. Pseudo-Symeon's story of Photius' education by a Jewish Magus) is explained in that his formative education was carried out in the Caliphate. That Photius spent his life's first exile in an Islamic state (and perhaps among the libraries of Baghdad) is curiously an infrequent conjecture among Byzantine Scholars, who are silent about that period in Photius' life due to a lack of evidence. Like Conley, Jokisch admonishes Lemerle for arguing that Byzantine humanism was independent from Islam humanism.⁶² He uses the examples of Photius, Leo the Mathematician and John the Grammarian (all of whom may have lived their early lives in the Caliphate) to underline the importance of cross-cultural exchange during the 9th century; Islamic humanism was indebted to Byzantium, and Byzantine humanism was indebted to Islam. But it is difficult to believe that Photius required the texts found in Arab libraries to complete his *Bibliotheca*, in which we find few or no works on science, mathematics and philosophy, the genres that interested Arab scholars most and fuelled the translation of Greek authors like Aristotle, Plato, Theophrastus, Archimedes and Hero of Byzantium. The only exception we find is that Photius lists many medical texts among those found in the *Bibliotheca*, which likewise interested the Arab scholars who would translate Hippocrates, Galen and Dioscorides. It is unlikely that Photius required Arab

61 Jokisch 2007, 365.

62 Ibid (366).

translations of Greek texts to begin with (and, in fact, there is no evidence that he was familiar with the language), since there was so much Greek material available in the Near East. Hunain Ibn Ushaq, a 9th century scholar who appears to have lived in Baghdad, founded a school of translators who worked to copy texts into Greek, Syriac and Arabic. He remarks that it was possible to find Greek manuscripts all over the Islamic world, and says that he himself had searched for them in Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine and Egypt.⁶³ It is impossible to know the provenance of Greek texts in Byzantium at the time, though Mango has surmised that the 279 codices of the *Bibliotheca* made up a “...substantial proportion of all the books available in Constantinople in the ninth century.”⁶⁴ In his view, from AD 750-850 the majority of books were not located in centralized institutions like libraries, but rather in private collections and monasteries scattered throughout the empire (with the important exception of the patriarchal library, which likely did not house the secular works referred to by Photius).⁶⁵ The books were likely still available, even if they may not have been found in a central library. Arethas, the archbishop of Caesarea, is known to have owned an extensive and eclectic library (much like Photius' own reading), and several physical volumes from it still exist; of the authors he owned, Plato, Lucian, Euclid, Aristotle, Aristides, as well as some Christian writers still survive, and it seems he had also read Dio Chrysostom, Marcus Aurelius and Pausanias.⁶⁶ Evidently, Arethas commissioned many of his books from professional scribes (often monks in monasteries);⁶⁷ so it is possible that Photius could have held an ample supply of books

63 Wilson 1968, 49.

64 1975, 43.

65 Ibid.

66 Wilson; Reynolds 1968, 56

67 Ibid. Wilson (1975) also guesses that it was Arethas who originally edited the *Bibliotheca* for publication

from which to compile many of his summaries.

The dialect of Photius' writing (not only in the *Bibliotheca*, but also in his epistles and other published works) is notably Attic. The evolution of Greek from the 6th - 8th centuries AD is unclear, and our understanding of it is based on high literature like the *Bibliotheca* and the Byzantine titles which it summarizes.⁶⁸ It is reasonable to assume, however, that Photius would not have spoken as he wrote. There is, in fact, a tangible difference between the language of his epistles (which, such as survive, are addressed largely to members of the court, necessitating the use of elevated diction), his literary theses, and his *Homilies*. These last were meant as sermons to be delivered to public congregations. They are clear, flowing, and concise; they were composed to be listened to. By contrast, the epistles and theses, such as the *Bibliotheca*, are erudite, filled with participles and substantive adjectives, and circumlocutory; they were designed for an educated elite. Photius' use of elevated Greek, and the fact that he did not summarize the Attic prose of Thucydides, Xenophon, Demosthenes and Plato (or primary Classics like Homer) attests to his knowledge of those authors, whose works were likely canonical school texts in 9th century Byzantium. These “ὅσον ἐπιπολάζει” (“such as are common knowledge”)⁶⁹ were well-known to most educated aristocrats. Photius also states that he has omitted from his summaries common books and books that Tarasius is already likely to have read.⁷⁰ One of the most interesting aspects of Photius' summaries, then, is what he

68 Browning 1983, 55 states: “Our knowledge of Greek during the period 600-1100 depends almost entirely upon literary texts. Those composed in the purist literary language tell us nothing that we wish to know, except in so far as occasionally they embody a quotation of informal, living speech.”

69 *Bib.* 1. 32.

70 *Bib.* 1. 32-36: “Ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ ὅσον ἐπιπολάζει τῶν ἀνεγνωσμένων καὶ οὐδὲ τὰς σὰς διὰ τὸ πρόχειρον ἴσως διαπέφυγε μελέτας, οὐδὲ τούτοις τὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁμοίαν ἐθέμεθα φροντίδα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ἐκούσιον τὸ ἀκριβὲς αὐτῶν ὑπερώφη.” (“We, for our part, have not circumscribed with as much attention, as was afforded to others, those works which are common or which are so widely available

leaves out, since from this we have a clearer view of which classical authors were and were not obscure during his lifetime. An interesting example of the literary milieu of Photius' lifetime can be found in an excerpt from his summary of Theopompus (codex 176). Photius tells us that that Theopompus judged writers of his own time to be superior to more ancient authors, though Photius feels compelled to weigh in on the issue:

Ἀλλὰ τίνας λέγει τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις, οὐκ ἔχω σαφῶς συμβαλεῖν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ γε τολμῆσαι αὐτὸν ὑπολαμβάνω εἰς Ἡρόδοτον καὶ Θουκυδίδη ἀποτείνεσθαι, πολὺ καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν πολλοῖς ἐκείνων τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐλαττουμένου.
But I cannot distinctly figure out which of these older [authors] he is talking about; for I assume that he cannot be daring to reference Herodotus or Thucydides, certainly, since he himself was greatly inferior to those men.⁷¹

Here Photius nods in recognition of his literary predecessors and again identifies Herodotus and Thucydides as canonical *exempla*. This reveals two interesting pieces of information: 1) that the reason Photius' summary of Herodotus was so short was, in fact, because the *History* was somewhat in vogue among the Byzantines, and 2) that the idea of literary “progress” was not readily identified by Theopompus in the early Hellenistic era,⁷² marking a contrast between how Photius viewed his texts and how they were originally received.

How, then, did Photius come to read the texts which he includes as summaries in the *Bibliotheca*, and how did he undertake the actual act of reading them? Photius describes the summarized works as “ἀναγινωσκομένοις” (see above, p. 14), from the verb “ἀναγινώσκω”, a technical word meaning “to recognize,” “to discern, hence, to read,” or

that they cannot have escaped your scrutiny. Rather, acute attention these works has been purposefully remitted.)”

71 *Bib.* 176.121a.14-18

72 Wilson (1994, 161) points out that “While inventors are often praised, the idea of progress in Greek literature is rarer than might be expected.” This is in reference to (Edelstein 1967).

“to read aloud, hence to publish.”⁷³ This small detail conjures the idea that (at least some) of Photius' summaries were aural transmissions either overheard in a library or other public space, and that he might not have read them himself. Treadgold maintains that this is a myth due in part to the fact that Photius often refers to himself in the 3rd person.⁷⁴ The implication, however implausible, that Photius had not personally read each volume, should not be categorically excluded. He himself admits not to have read the subject material of every summary,⁷⁵ and in the ancient world (as also in Photius' lifetime) reading was a naturally aural endeavour.⁷⁶ The idea of a “book club”, which is sometimes taken as the context of the preface, should be disregarded. Treadgold, Wilson and Ziegler all assert that a section of the postscript proves the *Bibliotheca* to have been a composite of Photius' lifelong reading:

“Α μὲν οὖν φιλολογουμένοις ἡμῖν καθ' ἑαυτοὺς εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἐλθεῖν συνηνέχθη, ... ἀφ' οὗπερ τις αἴσθησις ἡμῖν ἀμηγέπη καὶ κρίσις λόγων ἐνεφύη μέχρι τῆς παρούσης”⁷⁷

The Greek here is somewhat elusive, and has plagued scholars for decades. Ziegler has provided the most influential translation, and renders the two clauses as:

“Was ich also bei meiner privaten wissenschaftlichen Beschäftigung in mein Gedächtnis aufgenommen habe ... seit der Zeit, da einige Fähigkeit, Literatur zu verstehen und zu beurteilen, einigermassen in mir erwuchs, bis zu der vorliegenden”⁷⁸

Henry, 36 years later, renders the passage thus, and perhaps more accurately:

73 Liddell; Scott; Jones 1940.

74 Treadgold 1980, 22.

75 Codices 165 and 268.

76 cf. *Bib.* 84.65a.30-31, in which Photius says of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' prose: “...καὶ ἔτι τῆ τε συνθήκη καὶ τῆ λέξει, ἠχώ τινα πέμπων, τραχύτερός πῶς ἐστι τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς προσφερόμενος.” (“...and yet the sound which is sent by [his] composition and style, is somehow rough when presented to the listener.”).

77 *Bib.* 280.545.1-4.

78 Ziegler 1941, 688.

“Enfin, les ouvrages objets de mes préoccupations qui me sont revenus en mémoire ... à partir du moment où me sont venus en quelque sorte le goût et la faculté de juger en matière de lettres jusqu'à la présente”⁷⁹

This translation is more astute: Henry maintains a conceptualization of personal reading, without adding the sense of “private” study, where Ziegler's translation of “φιλολογουμένοις” into “privaten wissenschaftlichen Beschäftigung” is overreaching.

Wilson's translation (which appears in passing in a 1968 article) reads:

“The books which I chanced to commit to memory (record in my memory), ... from the time when my critical faculties developed up to the present.”⁸⁰

This translation lacks exactness, but conveys the general meaning of the passage, edified by Ziegler, upon which scholarship is now generally agreed. Treadgold adds (perhaps erroneously) an emphasis on Photius' singular lifetime, while retaining the Greek flavour in paraphrase:

“Those books, therefore, ... that it happened to come to our memory that we have studied by ourself during our life, from the time that any kind of perception and judgement of literature came to us up to the time of the present...”⁸¹

Treadgold's expression “during our life” is absent from the Greek. It is perhaps his way of reconciling English with Photius' verb “ἐμφύω” (“to grow, be rooted in”),⁸² for which Ziegler uses “erwachsen.”

Thus we may surmise that the *Bibliotheca* was indeed a collection of Photius' readings, but it should not be taken for granted that the readings were private; and that he overheard works being read (which summaries were later naturally shorter and less detailed) should not be excluded, given the aural nature of reading activity at the time.

79 Henry 1977, 214.

80 Wilson 1968, 452.

81 Treadgold 1980, 18.

82 Liddell, *et al.* 1940.

Most recently, Vanna Maraglino⁸³ has argued that the *Bibliotheca* was the product of a “reading circle”, and that if we interpret its composition in this way, “its lack of systematic organization, a clear scheme of composition or a coherent plan should come as no surprise.”⁸⁴ This lack of cohesion, however, is her only evidence for such a claim, and she seems to think that Photius' prefatory remark that he composed his work relying on his memory “ὄσας αὐτῶν ἢ μνήμη διέσωζε”⁸⁵ is at odds with the passage of the postscript discussed above. On the contrary, it is clear that the two statements do not conflict; Photius set out to write a digest of every book he had read, and compiled them in whatever order he could remember them. Maraglino also endorses L. Canfora's⁸⁶ suggestion that Photius carried on a “reading circle”, on the grounds that the 8th and 9th canons of the 4th Ecumenical Council in Constantinople (AD 869) mention that Photius had circulated some of his own writing, which contained secular content, to his followers. The evidence for Canfora's suggestion, which is scanty at best, has been critiqued by Treadgold:

But these writings (which may be the *Bibliotheca* itself) cannot have been reviewed in the *Bibliotheca*, because it reviews no works by Photius. Canfora seems unable to distinguish the unfounded myth that the *Bibliotheca* is a record of a reading circle from the undoubted fact (which, unaware of my book on the *Bibliotheca*, he thinks I deny) that Photius discussed books with his associates.⁸⁷

The idea of a Photian “reading circle” is indemonstrable, even if it helps us to understand how Photius was able to compose such a mammoth work as the *Bibliotheca*. He makes no mention of such a circle, and in any case it is not necessary in ascertaining *why* he

83 2007.

84 Ibid (278).

85 *Bib.* p.1.13-14; Maraglino, p. 265.

86 1998.

87 2002, 10, n. 35.

wrote the the work. If we take the preface of the *Bibliotheca* at face value, we will find that it states Photius' intentions clearly:

Χρησιμεύσει δέ σοι δηλονότι τὰ ἐκδεδομένα εἰς τε κεφαλαιώδη μνήμην καὶ ἀνάμνησιν τῶν εἴτε κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἀναλεξάμενος ἐπῆλθες, καὶ εἰς ἔτοιμον εὔρεσιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐπιζητούμενων, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς εὐχερεστέραν ἀνάληψιν τῶν οὐπω τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τῆς σῆς συνέσεως ὑπελθόντων.

Clearly, these summaries which have been written down for you will be useful in recollecting those works which, as it happens, you have already read – but they will also be useful in finding those works which you seek after, and also those which you have not yet read or have as yet escaped your scrutiny.⁸⁸

In this important passage Photius is addressing Tarasius, and explicitly defines the purpose of his summaries. Following this sentence, our surviving copies of the *Bibliotheca* continue with a series of 280 epitomes, although Photius himself puts the number at 279 (he had not actually read the work mentioned in cod. 268). These epitomes are sometimes pages long and sometimes only a few lines. Generally, they entail an early form of literary criticism, as Photius praises or condemns each author's command of Greek (which would seem to exclude that he read Arabic copies of Greek texts, although he may have read the original Syriac version of Evagrius' *Ecclesiastical History*).⁸⁹ Many times Photius truly epitomizes the work in question (that is, he writes a guided synopsis), but unfortunately with many other texts he only comments on the author's style and biography, or enumerates their other attributed works. This inconsistency is perplexing, and lends itself to the theory that the *Bibliotheca* was not meant for general consumption, and was only published incidentally.

As regards the authenticity of the preface and postscript, most modern scholars accept them to be genuine. This is an important assumption, since these portions of the

88 *Bib.* p.1.39-44.

89 *Cod.* 29.

text provide an account of nearly all the immediate circumstances surrounding its composition. Both the arguments for and against this assumption are highly speculative. Since there are no surviving manuscripts from Photius' lifetime, one must assume that either the preface and postscript are authentic, or that they are clever literary fictions designed to engage a reader in a work which is otherwise formless and without context. Thus the historical context established by the preface and postscript (i.e. that Photius had a brother named Tarasius with whom he regularly corresponded) may be understood either as autobiographical reality or as literary technique of epistolography. The argument that fiction in such a preface would serve no purpose is moot, since the goal of such fiction is not to deceive but to entertain: the spurious introductions to the books of Xenophon's *Anabasis* do not serve as deception at all, and false epistles like those in the *Alexander Romance* are meant to present a more entertaining narrative rather than to deceive gullible readers. Both classical epistolography (e.g. Pliny, Cicero, Marcus Aurelius) and the epistolary genre in the Christian tradition (typified by the works of Paul, or the account of Polycarp's martyrdom) established the broad standards by which Photius worked. Following these examples, the *Bibliotheca* may have been meant for publication even though it had a living dedicatee. The argument that the preface and postscript in this particular work conform to no known style of literary fiction is compelling enough, however one must remember that the *Bibliotheca* itself conforms to no known genre. It has never been suggested that the prose style of the preface and postscript differs from Photius' style in the main text. As Treadgold has studiously pointed out,⁹⁰ Photius addresses his brother in the second person 29 times in 9 of his

⁹⁰ Treadgold, 1980, 19. Treadgold also points out that codex 187 contains a section of comments addressed

codices, and such a running dialogue lends credibility to the authenticity of both the preface and postscript, addressed as they are to the brother, though of course a sceptical reader might view the address to the brother in the preface and postscript as having been edited to match the dialogues in the codices. In 1963, François Halkin put forward that the preface and postscript were false, since codex 252 (a *Life* of Saint Gregory by an unknown hand) can only have been written after A.D. 875.⁹¹ This chronology was accepted by Mango,⁹² and is based on the idea that the preface indicated an embassy slated for departure ca. 855. In 1965, however, Hélène Ahrweiler refuted this view and suggested that Photius had dictated the work abroad (in fact, in a Byzantine encampment in Asia Minor) using books and notes he travelled with, before departing on an embassy to the camp of an invading Abbasid army.⁹³ She draws attention to the fact that Photius (in his preface) says that he had trouble securing a scribe on short notice,⁹⁴ a concession that would be unthinkable in the trendy urban metropolis of Constantinople.⁹⁵ Wilson, however, draws attention to the fact that this argument is “little more than specious”⁹⁶ and that we know little about the supply and demand of the book trade in the Byzantine capital at that time. He also argues that the amount of precious writing material and sheer luggage space required for this task exceeded Photius' station and means (he was then only a layman diplomat).⁹⁷ Ahrweiler's conjecture was nevertheless adopted by Lemerle

to Tarasius, and that a well-placed καὶ indicates that it was likely not added after the codices that precede it (1978, 174).

91 Halkin 1963.

92 1975, 40.

93 Ahrweiler 1965.

94 cf. *Bib.* 1.1: “ὄψε μὲν ἴσως τοῦ σοῦ διαπύρου πόθου καὶ τῆς θερμῆς αἰτήσεως, θᾶπτον δὲ ἢ ὅσα ἄν τις ἄλλος ἐλπίσειε, τυχόντες ὑπογραφέως” (“Indeed, though later than suited your ardent desire and burning request, but more quickly than anyone might have expected, we happened upon a scribe”).

95 Ahrweiler 1965, 360.

96 Wilson 1968, 453.

97 *Ibid.* Wilson adds that to draft histories while on campaign might have only been possible for royalty,

in his *Humanisme*.⁹⁸ Perhaps more reasonable is Mango's hypothesis that Photius wrote more than one draft of the *Bibliotheca*, only to have it published in complete form later in his life.⁹⁹ This takes into account Halkin's claim that codex 252 was not written before 875. Treadgold,¹⁰⁰ however, prefers 845 as the date of composition, citing the Byzantine embassy to Samarra which occurred three years after Photius' exile ended. He also notes this date also falls well before Photius' appointment as patriarch in 858, and since he tells us that he was not chosen as an official diplomat, by rather accompanied the embassy, the date seems more applicable. Furthermore, Treadgold has noted that many of the iconophile theologians, as well as works he mentions in the *Amphilochia*, are absent from the *Bibliotheca*.¹⁰¹ Since the icons were restored only in 847, the earlier date of composition seems supported by the evidence. The question of Codex 252, however, and its *terminus ante quem*, remains a serious question. Maraglino¹⁰² has made the argument that this *Life* of Gregory the Great has a Greek and Latin biographical tradition that suggests John Hymmonides was the first source to discuss the episodes most prominent in Photius' summary. Since John is presumed to have written his *Vita Gregorii* between AD 873 and 876, she suggests that Photius cannot have read the *Life* he summarizes before then, and that this supports the idea that the *Bibliotheca* represents a lifetime of study. For this to be true, many more codices would have to suggest a later composition,

such as is attested by Anna Comnena (*proemium* 3.4) of her husband, which story may have served as the *exemplum gratum* for Ahweiler's supposition.

98 Lemerle 1971, 179-180.

99 Mango 1975, 42-3.

100 1980, 34-5; 2002, 11.

101 2002, 10-11.

102 2007, *passim*.

and suggestions by Mango¹⁰³ and Markopoulos¹⁰⁴ on the subject have been effectively refuted, in my opinion, by Treadgold.¹⁰⁵

Whether or not the work was written to be published is yet another question facing the modern reader of the *Bibliotheca*. If we accept its dedication to Tarasius, we can assume that Photius never intended his voluminous “letter” to be widely copied and shared. Taking into account the sheer scope and magnitude of the work, however, it becomes difficult not to believe that it was meant for publication in some sense. Many other texts ascribed to Photius are either letters or are works addressed to particular individuals: his collection of letters addressed to Tarasius and others; his *Lexicon*, which is addressed to a *protospatharios* who was his former student;¹⁰⁶ his *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit* is an indictment of the Latin *filioque* controversy aimed at an unnamed dedicatee;¹⁰⁷ two editions of his *Against the Manichaeans* are addressed to individual readers;¹⁰⁸ the *Amphilochia*, of course, is a collection of treatises addressed to Amphilochus of Cyzicus.¹⁰⁹ These works, which make up the most famous and lengthy portions of the Photian corpus, are all epistolary texts intended (on some level) for publication. One does not simply compile a *Lexicon* or create church dogma without aiming it at more than one reader. Codices 32, 86, 126, 138, 143, 159, 192b, 194 and 228 are themselves summaries or criticisms of epistolary texts (among them the classical examples of Isocrates), which

103 1975, 37-43.

104 1987. Markopoulos, however, seems not to have read Treadgold's 1980 book on the subject.

105 2002, 11, n. 38; Treadgold also proposes his own stemma for cod. 252 in *Nature* (1980, 30-31, n. 44).

106 *Phot. Pat. Lex.* 1.1 begins with: “Φώτιος Θωμᾶ πρωτοσπαθαρίῳ καὶ ἄρχοντι τοῦ Λυκοστομίου φιλάτῳ μαθητῇ χαίρειν.”

107 *Myst.* 1.1 begins with “Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ σὸν μεγαλοπρεπὲς καὶ θεοφιλέστατον σπούδασμα σύγοψιν τινα τῶν ἐλέγχων καὶ ὑποτύπωσιν ἐξητήσατο γενέσθαι.”

108 Astruc *et al.* 1970, 180-83. Not found in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* edition.

109 *Amph.* 1.1 begins with “ΤΙΡΟΣ ΑΜΦΙΛΟΧΙΟΝ ΟΣΙΩΤΑΤΟΝ ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΗΝ ΚΥΖΙΚΟΥ.”

he characterizes as “τοῦ ἐπιστολιμαίου τύπου”, “τοῦ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν χαρακτῆρος”, and “ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτῆρος.”¹¹⁰ So it is clear that Photius was aware of Byzantine epistolary approaches to literature, and George Kustas has noted that from his work one can “...extract a definite theory of epistolography.”¹¹¹ But was the *Bibliotheca* itself meant for wide publication, as many have assumed?¹¹² Certainly Photius writes with much the same transmission strategy during, before, and after his patriarchate, in that he makes use of the epistolary genre. Like other Byzantine authors, he built on a form in the rich classical tradition of Plato, Hippocrates, Cicero, Pliny, and Libanius, as well as the wealth of Christian epistolary literature, beginning with Paul of Tarsus and later including the works of bishops and patriarchs like Synesius, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus. By the 9th century, epistolography had become a fusion of Classical erudition and ecclesiastical style, a fusion reflected in Photius' own letters. Epistolary elements in the *Bibliotheca*, therefore, do not necessarily indicate that Photius intended his voluminous work only for a single reader. Given the lack of interest in secular material at the time (Treadgold¹¹³ has wisely pointed out that new works c. AD 850 were almost exclusively hagiographic or ecclesiastic), the exceedingly rough nature of the text,¹¹⁴ and its meagre manuscript tradition, it is much more likely that the work was designed to be circulated among a small number of Photius' or Tarasius' acquaintances.¹¹⁵

110 86.66a.9; 138.98a.19-20; 143.98b.34.

111 1960, 152.

112 cf. Maraglino 2007; Mango 1975; Wilson 1968.

113 (2002, 16).

114 Again, see Treadgold (1980, 52-80). Parts of the notes are in incomplete sentences or unintelligible, dozens of places are left blank for information that Photius never returned to insert, and sometimes the secretary seems to have misunderstood what Photius meant.

115 That it was later added to (without the bother of reworking the work as a whole) can account for codex

Early Historians Summarized by Photius: Ctesias, Theopompus, and Agatharchides

To elucidate the varying methods by which Photius summarizes authors in the *Bibliotheca*, I now pass to a brief summary of some of the works most related to Arrian's. As mentioned, the *Bibliotheca* contains summaries of works of many differing genres. Approximately half of these are works from secular authors, while the others are ecclesiastical. A large portion is reserved for secular historians like Arrian, though most were Byzantine authors who wrote well after him. The oldest secular historians reviewed by Photius are Herodotus, Ctesias, Theopompus of Chios, Agatharchides of Cnidus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Diodorus Siculus. With the exception of Herodotus, no complete works by any of these authors are extant. We have whole books of Dionysius' *Roman Antiquities*, and likewise the *Library* of Diodorus, but we have lost several volumes of each. Ctesias, Theopompus and Agatharchides exist only in fragments. Photius summarizes each author in different ways; some he merely criticizes for style, while others he epitomizes in full. From Agatharchides, he chooses to summarize *On the Red Sea*, ostensibly a history of the geographical area surrounding the Eastern coast of Egypt and the Western coast of Arabia. Of Theopompus, he summarizes one book of the voluminous *Philippica* – a history of Philip II of Macedon. Of Ctesias, he summarizes the fanciful geographical histories *Persica* and *Indica*. Of Herodotus, Dionysius and Diodorus, he naturally takes the *Histories*, *Roman Antiquities* and the *Library*, respectively.

Photius' summary of Herodotus (codex 60) is curt and uninformative. He is

252, and remains, in my opinion, an open question.

presented as an authority of the Ionic dialect, but is criticized for his preponderant digressions. Photius enumerates each Persian king upon whose reign Herodotus expounds, but does not enter into any detailed synopsis. He cross-references Herodotus' floruit with evidence from Diodorus Siculus,¹¹⁶ and recounts an anecdote in which a young Thucydides weeps during Herodotus' recitation of the *History*. The short length of Photius' summary may be due to the fact that the *History* was more common than other texts in Byzantium, and likely Tarasius was already familiar with it from the schoolroom. Ctesias, by contrast, who also wrote at times in Ionic Greek, receives a full and exhaustive epitome. Although Photius was not a great lover of the Ionic dialect, he recognizes its importance, and acknowledges Herodotus its chief purveyor.¹¹⁷ Recognition notwithstanding, he criticizes the style of both Herodotus¹¹⁸ and Ctesias¹¹⁹ (while maintaining that Herodotus is a better representative of the Ionian dialect) and completely omits the Ionic *Indica* of Arrian,¹²⁰ whose style he later nearly eulogizes.¹²¹ In summary, the length of Photius' codices cannot be seen to reflect his personal taste in history, and is more likely due to the availability of a given text.

Ctesias wrote (among other works) a history of Persia as well as a history of India from the Persian perspective. These two texts are no longer extant, but have been transmitted to us largely by Photius (codices 72-73). Although many authors in antiquity

116 *Library* 2.32.2.

117 In direct comparison to Thucydides, Photius writes in *Bib.* 60.19b.17-18 “Ἰωνικῆς δὲ διαλέκτου κανὼν ἂν οὗτος εἴη, ὡς ἄττικῆς Θουκυδίδης.” (“This man might well be the model of the Ionian dialect, just as Thucydides is of the Attic”).

118 *Bib.* 60.19b.20-25.

119 *Bib.* 72.45a.5-10.

120 *Bib.* 91.68b.40-41 Glosses over the entire book in one line: “Καὶ ὁ ἕβδομος ἀπαρτίζεται λόγος, ὃν ἐκδέχεται βιβλίον ἓν, ἡ Ἰνδική.” (“And the seventh book here is finished – it is succeeded by the *Indica*, in one book.”)

121 *Bib.* 92.72b.40-73a.30.

made reference to these works, and there are many small fragments elsewhere, they exist now only as abridged Photian summaries, and as large tracts of Plutarch's *Life of Artaxerxes*.¹²² Extensive study of Ctesias' fragments in Photius has been carried out by J. M. Bigwood.¹²³ Ctesias has gained an unfortunate reputation for embellishment and inaccuracy, but remains an important cross-reference for Persian history and a source for the Greek knowledge of India in the 5th century.¹²⁴

Photius' summary of Ctesias' *Persica* (codex 72) is quite long and almost episodic. It could be that he devotes more time to this work due to its comparative unavailability. He puts the total number of books in the *Persica* at 26, which agrees with the Suda.¹²⁵ According to Photius, they contained a history of the late Assyrian empire and of Persia, providing a detailed chronicle from Cyrus the Great's ascension to the intrigues of Artaxerxes (who was king during Ctesias' lifetime, and under whom Ctesias found work as a physician). Photius gives us a full account of each monarchy, but prefaces his summary by claiming that Books 7-13 (which correspond to the *Histories*) differ almost entirely from Herodotus' account. Ctesias, although he models his Ionic history after the fashion of Herodotus, also claimed that his predecessor had been a “liar ... a writer of fables.”¹²⁶ Ctesias' assertion is certainly questionable, and even treated with some caution by Photius. Though Herodotus' paradoxologies of foreign places, customs and animals – based on hearsay and secondary evidence – must indeed be

122 Bigwood 1983.

123 1989; 1976.

124 Bigwood 1978; 1993, *AJPh*; 1993 *CQ*; see also Xenophon's (1.8.26-27) and Plutarch's (*Art.* 1.4; 6.9; 13.7) distrust of Ctesias' account of Cunaxa, and of his sensationalism in general.

125 It should be noted here that the Suda entry may have been based on Photius' text.

126 *Bib.* 72.35b.41-42: “ἀλλὰ καὶ ψεύστην αὐτὸν ἀπελέγχων ἐν πολλοῖς καὶ λογοποιὸν ἀποκαλῶν” (“and labels him a liar in many [passages] and calls him a writer of fables.”)

treated as fables, Ctesias does little better in his fantastical *Indica*. Here too, is good evidence that Photius is working with texts or notes at his disposal: he punctuates his summary at times by referencing at which point a volume of Ctesias ends and a new one begins.¹²⁷ Because none of Ctesias' writings survive, we cannot develop an acute sense of his style or accuracy (except that which Photius supposes), and can tell only little of the sources he used in composing his histories; we can only reconstruct portions of his subject matter. As stated above, Bigwood draws the sound conclusion that, although its subject matter remains accurate, the summaries of Ctesias' texts found in the *Bibliotheca* are basically a collections of notes which piqued Photius' interest, and that the form of the original work is largely (if not totally) disregarded.¹²⁸ Bigwood also points out, however, that since Photius' summary is often very close to being a collection of excerpts, it preserves something of the manner in which Ctesias wrote. It is, however, “not a systematic summary of the whole.”¹²⁹ Thus we are left not with a typical ancient epitome, but rather a unique summary which transmits as much about Photius as it does about Ctesias. Within a broader context, and in relation to Photius' preservation of Arrian's works, we can see elements in this example that reflect Photius' own study (in this case of Herodotus). Like Photius' summary of Arrian's *Events After Alexander*, the summary of Ctesias' work is sizable and contains a kind of synopsis, however, the details it preserves are subordinate to Photius' interpretation and critical thought.

Photius' summary of Theopompus (codex 176), while not as lengthy as his fragments of Ctesias, consists of a proper epitome of one book of the *Philippica*, as well

127 *Bib.* 72.41b.36-37.

128 Bigwood 1989, 316.

129 *Ibid.*

as a good amount of biographical material on the author. Theopompus lived during the reigns of Philip II and of Alexander III of Macedon, and wrote on a variety of subjects. Other than the *Philippica*, a few fragments of a *Hellenica*¹³⁰ have survived. In addition, we possess a mysterious *Epitome of Herodotus*, which has been attributed to Theopompus both as an individual work¹³¹ and as part of the *Philippica*.¹³² Not many details of Theopompus' life are known, and in this instance Photius is one of our only sources for biographical information. He tells us that Theopompus was a student of Isocrates, though this is debated.¹³³ He also mentions that Theopompus originally came from Chios, but was exiled along with his father for supporting the Spartans. From Eusebius' claims of plagiarism in the 4th century¹³⁴ to the discovery of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* in the first half of the 20th century, for centuries scholars have debated the reliability of Theopompus as a historian. Rather than rehearsing this discussion, we turn to Photius' interpretation and his reliability in transmitting portions of the *Philippica*.

Today the *Philippica* exists as a series of hundreds of fragments in Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (hereafter *FGrHist*), one of which is from the *Bibliotheca*. Although the *Suda* puts the total number of books in the *Philippica* at 72, Photius tells us in his summary that he had access to 53 books in total, and that Books 6, 7, 30 and either 29 or 20 and 9 (the Greek “τὴν ἐνάτην καὶ εἰκοστὴν” is indistinguishable here) are missing. This would bring the number of volumes to 57 or 58. Photius also tells us that, although the *Philippica* aimed at chronicling the reign of Philip II, it developed

130 From what scholars can tell, a history mirroring Xenophon's work by the same title.

131 Shrimpton 1991, 6.

132 Christ 1993, 47.

133 Flower 1994, chs. 3, 4.

134 *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 10.3.

instead into many interconnected historical digressions and was later edited by Philip V into a different work of 6 books (called the *Acts of Philip*), simply by eliminating digressions that did not have to do with the acts of Philip II.¹³⁵ Photius had access to the original *Philippica*, but only provides a detailed summary of Book 12, which concerns the history of Egypt in the late 4th century B. C.

Photius' summary also presents an opportunity to observe Theopompus' writing style, which has been billed as a “history without heroes.”¹³⁶ It gives us a glimpse not only of Theopompus' digressive style, but also of his boisterous form which is also alluded to in the introduction of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities*.¹³⁷

Concerning Theopompus' fame, Photius tells us the following:

Ἔτι δὲ καὶ διότι οὐδεὶς ἐστὶ τόπος κοινὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὐδὲ πόλις ἀξιόχρεως, εἰς οὓς αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐπιδημῶν καὶ τὰς τῶν λόγων ἐπιδείξει ποιούμενος οὐχὶ μέγα κλέος καὶ ὑπόμνημα τῆς ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῦ κατέλιπεν ἀρετῆς.
[He says] also that there is no well-known place in Greece, nor any noteworthy city, in which he, visiting, was not rendered, for the exhibition of his works, both great glory and a memorial, left behind for his greatness in oratory.¹³⁸

However bold this might sound, it is supported by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who gives Theopompus' arrangement, methodology, and choice of subjects high praise.¹³⁹ Photius, in turn, praises Dionysius' style;¹⁴⁰ it is not illogical to assume that Photius enjoyed Theopompus' style as well, but he chooses to paint a more acerbic

135 *Bib.* 176.121a.35-40.

136 Connor 1967; Christ 1993.

137 Dionysius distances himself from Theopompus in *Rom. Ant.* 1.1, when he says: “...οὔτε διαβολὰς καθ’ ἑτέρων ἐγνωκῶς ποιῆσθαι συγγραφέων, ὥσπερ Ἀναξιμένης καὶ Θεόπομπος ἐν τοῖς προοιμίαις τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἐποίησαν” (“...nor [shall I] make slanderous accusations against other writers, just as do Anaximenes and Theopompus in their histories' prologues.”) Elsewhere, however, Dionysius gives Theopompus glowing praise (note 111, below), reminding us that it was natural in the 1st century to criticize and emulate the same author.

138 *Bib.* 176.121a.5-9.

139 *Ad Pompeium* 6.

140 *Bib.* Codex 83.

picture than does Dionysius. Perhaps this is owing to the hundreds of years which separated Photius from Dionysius, and which witnessed increasing abstractions of Theopompus' style. In any case, Photius seems to have had a well-developed caricature of Theopompus to work with when he describes his education by Isocrates: by Photius' account, the former rhetorician, though brilliant, was in need of money and so turned to hired sophistry; Theopompus became one of his more gifted students.¹⁴¹

Overall, Photius gives Theopompus a passing grade and even defends his writings, saying that his detractors have judged him unfairly.¹⁴² The reader of his summary, however, is left with no particular desire to read the volume in question, that is unless they are greatly interested in the subject of Egyptian history. If, as is attested by Photius (who claims to have still had access to many volumes of the *Philippica*), the slow disappearance of Theopompus' work was not due to Philip V's redactions, then it may simply have become unpopular, which is as likely a testament to his historical credibility as are the testimonies of any detractors. Photius' summary is nonetheless an important cog in Hellenistic history, as it elaborates upon Theopompus' life as well as his relationship with Alexander, which is the subject of a fragmentary eulogy written by him.¹⁴³ When we use this summary to reconstruct the larger work, however, we are met with difficulties. Photius' excerpts from the *Philippica* come at the expense of his own musings on Theopompus as an author, which take up roughly two thirds of his summary. When we compare this to Photius' summary of the *Events After Alexander*, which devotes far more space to a textual summary and less on an explicit analysis of Arrian, we must

141 *Bib.* 176.120b.30 – 121a.3.

142 *Bib.* 176.121a.41 – 121b.9.

143 *FGrHist* 115 F 252.

remember that the *Bibliotheca* is filled with the presumptions of its author and his own literary criticisms. And while it is obvious that Photius did not write in a vacuum, his summary of Theopompus provides a good example of how he emphasizes extracts that interested him (in this case from Book 12) and that his summaries are much more sophisticated than elementary epitomes.

Agatharchides of Cnidus, a geographer and historian who flourished in the 2nd century B.C., is lauded emphatically by Photius. Comparing Agatharchides with Thucydides himself, Photius says: “Καὶ ζηλωτῆς μὲν ἐστὶ Θουκυδίδου ἔν τε τῇ τῶν δημηγοριῶν δαυιλείᾳ τε καὶ διασκευῇ, τῷ μεγαλείῳ δὲ μὴ δευτερεύων τοῦ λόγου τῷ σαφεῖ παρελαύνει τὸν ἄνδρα.”¹⁴⁴ (“And he is an imitator of Thucydides, in the abundance of his prose as well as the manner in which he sets it in order; nor yet is he second to the man in grandiloquence, and might even surpass him in clarity.”) Photius reviews his *On the Red Sea* not once, but twice (codices 213 and 250), however readers will find no subject material whatsoever in the first review. Photius here restricts himself to a technical review of the author's prose style, which he calls “μεγαλοπρεπής” (“magnificent”) and “γνωμολογικός” (“sententious”). He elaborates on Agatharchides' vocabulary and fluidity in detail, using subjective grammatical language:

εἰς τροπὴν δὲ ὅ τι παρενήκεται, οὐδεμίαν λύπην δηλοῦσαν ἀφήισι. Ποιεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ τοῦτο μάλιστα οὐχὶ ἢ τῶν λέξεων αὐτῆ καθ' ἑαυτὴν μεταβολή, ἀλλ' ἢ ἀπὸ πραγμάτων ἐτέρων εἰς ἕτερα μετὰ τινος σοφῆς καὶ ἡρεμαίας μεταχειρίσεως μετάβασίς τε καὶ μετατροπή. Ἄλλὰ γὰρ ἀντιλαβεῖν μὲν ὄνομα ῥήματος, ἀμείναι δὲ τὸ ῥῆμα εἰς ὄνομα, καὶ λῦσαι μὲν λέξεις εἰς λόγους, συναγαγεῖν δὲ λόγον εἰς τύπον ὀνόματος, οὐδενὸς ἀνεπιτηδειότερος ὢν ἴσμεν.

But concerning figurative speech (which one might find misleading), he produces not one such visible transgression. And what mainly provides him with this is not the words which he puts down *per se*, but rather by changing some words for

144 *Bib.* 213.171b.9-12.

others, and also the passage of some words into others and their mutations by wise and delicate manoeuvring. For example, he holds back the verb's noun, thereby changing the verb into a noun and turning a phrase into an expression, drawing expressions together into a noun-pattern, which, as I see it, is not at all unserviceable.¹⁴⁵

In a fashion that becomes typical of many of Photius' shorter summaries, this description is useful in characterizing a summarized author's literary style, but preserves no actual textual evidence. Aside from his linguistic postulations, Photius also provides biographical information on Agatharchides, which remains the most extensive source on that subject (aside from direct fragments, which are often less helpful). In his short biography, Photius tells us that Agatharchides was a servant of Heracleidus of Lembos,¹⁴⁶ a figure who we can place historically through the Suda and Diogenes Laertius. Photius also lists other works by Agatharchides which were known to him, but not summarized. He says that these include a *History of Asia* in ten books and a *History of Europe* in forty-nine.

Photius' second summary of *On the Red Sea* preserves much more of the original text. In what Treadgold calls the “second part” of the *Bibliotheca* (codices 234-280), Photius duplicates many of the summaries which he has already written, often in a more paraphrasing style.¹⁴⁷ The existing fragments of Agatharchides' *On the Red Sea* exist now as excerpts from Diodorus Siculus,¹⁴⁸ Artemidorus of Ephesus,¹⁴⁹ and Photius' second summary in the *Bibliotheca*, all of which have been neatly compiled and translated into English by S. M. Burnstein.¹⁵⁰ Decades previously and in German, Dieter Woelk also

145 *Bib.* 213.171b.1 – 213.171b.9.

146 *Bib.* 213.171a.10.

147 Treadgold 1980, 37-38.

148 3.12-48.

149 16.4.5-10 (himself excerpting Strabo).

150 1989, xii, 202.

translated and commented on the fragments of *On the Red Sea* (albeit only from Diodorus and Photius) as part of his dissertation in Freiburg.¹⁵¹ While Photius' first summary (codex 213) preserves nothing of the original text, his second summary (codex 250) preserves 12 pages from Book 1 of *On the Red Sea* and 43 pages from Book 5. It was likely not a conscious duplicate of the first summary. As suggested by Treadgold,¹⁵² this second review is likely in the hand of a scribe utilizing Photius' notes while he was absent. This accounts for both the large number of minor errors between codices 234-280 as well as their excerpting style. Photius' *Amphilochia*,¹⁵³ which appears now as a large collection of edited letters may have been produced in a similar fashion; that work was likely “polished” from many individual *epistulae* which were not intended for publication (similar to the format of Pliny's letters, and others). That the *Bibliotheca* has some well-edited summaries and others that are rough and excerpting speaks to its imprecise organization, and suggests that it may not have been intended for wide circulation. Nevertheless, the excerpts transmitted in Photius' second summary of *On the Red Sea* remain a critical source for the texts of Agatharchides. In it we find examples of how directly Photius can preserve a summarized text and, in some cases, in what appears to be the author's own words:

Τὰ μὲν οὖν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν ἐκκειμένων πρὸς μεσημβρίαν, ὡς ἦν ἐφ' ἡμῖν, ἐν πέντε βιβλίοις ἐπιμελῶς ἱστορήκαμεν· ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν ἐν τῷ πελάγει νήσων ὕστερον τεθεωρημένων, καὶ τῶν ἐξῆς ἐθνῶν, καὶ τῶν εὐωδῶν ὅσα φέρειν συμβαίνει τὴν Τρωγλοδύτιν χώραν, ἡμεῖς μὲν παραιτησάμενοι τὴν ἐξήγησιν ἄρδην ἀπολελοίπαμεν, οὔτε τὸν πόνον τῆς ἡλικίας ὁμοίως ὑποφέρειν δυναμένης, πολλῶν ἡμῖν ὑπὲρ τε τῆς Εὐρώπης καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας ἀναγεγραμμένων, οὔτε τῶν ὑπομνημάτων διὰ τὰς κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἀποστάσεις ἀκριβῆ παραδιδόντων σκέψιν

151 1966.

152 1980, 38.

153 A collection of questions and answers on Biblical topics, addressed to Photius' friend Amphilocus. See above, p. 28.

These things, therefore, concerning the races having been cast out toward the South, such as it has been related to me, have I carefully chronicled in five volumes; also having been speculated upon are those islands located farther in the sea, their respective races and also those spices, such as are born and exist in the land of the Troglodytes. But I, begging your pardon, must abandon this narrative all at once, not being able to bear the toil (which is more suited for a younger man), myself having already published much about both Europe and Asia, and yet also I must forgo perusal of public records, owing to the keen unrest in Egypt¹⁵⁴

This text, which appears to be a postscript written by Agatharchides, is not only narrated in the first person (a feature not normally preserved in Photius' summaries), but also is written in a much simpler Greek than in earlier codices of the *Bibliotheca*. It is likely that this, and the other fragments in codex 213, represent either the actual text of *On the Red Sea*, or perhaps Photius' own epitome and reading notes, which he naturally did not bother to record in an affected classical dialect. Thus the *Bibliotheca* at times captures both Photius' own developed literary criticism and at times much simpler excerpts, which must often be reconciled in reconstructing the works he preserves.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (codex 83) and Diodorus Siculus (codex 70) receive only the briefest of mentions in the *Bibliotheca*. Photius does not carry out any protracted synopses and does not include excerpts from these authors. Instead, he summarizes their prose style, presents some brief biographical information, and provides a general overview of the multiple volumes in question. This, while not at all useful in reconstructing the lost volumes of the *Library* and *Roman Antiquities*, is a somewhat trustworthy source in enumerating those books which have not survived. Photius reaffirms, for instance, that in the Byzantine period there were still 40 books in the *Library* and 20 books in the *Antiquities*. Photius encapsulates many of the now missing

154 *Bib.* 250.460b.3-13.

volumes in his summaries, often filling in large blanks: he states that Dionysius' work ends in the 128th Olympiad, or roughly where Polybius begins his history. Since the last books of the *Antiquities* are lost, this information becomes vital in placing Dionysius in the context of other authors who cite his material. Photius does not provide enough detail to allow us to appraise the contents of Diodorus' missing books (6-10 and 21-40), but does mention that it ended with the beginning of Julius' Caesar's conquest of Gaul (as Diodorus promised it would at the onset of his work). Though the summaries are short, a reasonable conclusion to draw would be that these texts were still widely available in Byzantium and that Tarasius either may have already read them by the time Photius finished his *Bibliotheca*, or was more likely to read them than some of the more obscure texts mentioned. On the other hand, Photius was certainly not compelled to engage in exacting detail on works of so many volumes.

It should be mentioned that Dionysius, unlike Diodorus, wrote many other works of which we still have accounts, if not fragments. Interestingly, of those, Photius only summarizes Dionysius' own epitome of *Roman Antiquities*. Apparently, Dionysius (or possibly a student?) was able to boil the *Antiquities* down to 5 volumes. This epitome has not survived, but Photius labels it as “κομψότερος μὲν, ἀφηρημένος δὲ τὸ ἡδῦνον” (“more refined, but lacking pleasantness”). This is the only instance in which Photius consciously summarizes the same work twice. It is possible that Photius, who recognized the difference in prose between the two authors, implicitly nodded but did not outwardly acknowledge that the epitome's publication was eponymous. Publishing under a well-known name was commonplace among Photius' scholarly predecessors, and might not

have elicited more than passing literary criticism on the part of the patriarch.

Summary

The *Bibliotheca* was one of the essential texts in Karl Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (1841-1870) and then in Felix Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (1923-1959). Determining the accuracy of this corpus of fragmentary evidence, however, is as important as using the textual evidence it presents. As with many authors of fragments, Photius is often referred to without being named directly. For instance, the Loeb edition of Diodorus Siculus¹⁵⁵ cites Photius' fragments of Arrian only as a larger part of the *FGrHist*. Thus, many of Photius' modern readers remain unaware that they are indeed reading Photius. While the use of fragmentary evidence itself provokes a “reader beware” attitude, the trustworthiness Photius' treatment of each individual author is negated by works which cite Jacoby wholesale. Byzantine studies are fortunate to have received a boost in popularity in recent decades, and scholarship on the *Bibliotheca* has enjoyed a mild resurgence as a result. Much work has been carried out in realizing Photius' potential as a historian and secondary source, however frustrated by errant questions of context. We have observed that the preface and postscript (the only sources for the circumstances of the *Bibliotheca's* composition) have received much attention over the decades. Burning questions over the legitimacy of their words have left scholars divided. Some maintain that they are elaborate fictions, while most agree that they are honest, implicit addenda left behind by Photius for his brother and all those who might read his eloquent summaries. In approaching this imbroglio, it

155 Geer 1947.

may be important to remember that this type of polarized debate is typical in historiography, and that there is no reason why the preface and postscript cannot (or should not) be viewed as literary fictions written by Photius himself. If the *Bibliotheca* was meant for publication, which it patently was, some kind of addenda was surely in order.

It remains an exhaustive task for English language historians to gain a full picture of the field of Photian studies, since so much of the work has been carried out in German and French. Treadgold and Wilson have done the most to open an English dialogue concerning the *Bibliotheca* and its textual nature, while Henry must still be given due credit for completing the only published translation of the work in a modern language. More publications in English, and (if possible) more translations of the *Bibliotheca* in that language would certainly not be detrimental to its study.

Photius becomes a crucial Byzantine source for Classical literature, whether we seek to view the muddy reflection of Hieronymus of Cardia's first-hand account of the wars between the Diadochi, transmitted through the lost texts of Arrian and finally arranged in a summary by Photius, or whether we seek to verify Xenophon's account of the ten thousand. He had at arm's length so many of the ancient texts which did not survive centuries of Darwinian ablation. In the handful of his most antiquarian texts, reviewed here, we see elements of the authors' original styles, vital biographical information (which is at the very least indicative of crystallized Byzantine literary views), and in some cases epitomes of lost material which would otherwise have been lost to time. His book summaries, however, do not present themselves without flaw or

reasonable doubt. In many cases, we find more questions than answers. But at the core of the work we find contemplations (sometimes Photius' own, sometimes once or twice removed) on the wisdom of texts which have not survived. Perhaps this is just as important as our own reflections on existing primary sources – the study of history, and of literature in particular, is the pursuit of knowledge and ideas, not just facts.

Chapter Three: Photius' Summaries of Extant Historical Works: Procopius' *Wars*, Theophylact's *History*, and Arrian's *Anabasis*

Like many large sources for fragments, the summaries in the *Bibliotheca* are often read without consideration for the author who recorded them (Photius). In the case of his summary of Arrian's lost *Events After Alexander*, several texts which follow the same subject and chronology are often held in comparison without regard for how they compare to the *Bibliotheca* itself, which has a very unique context. These include books 18 and 19 of Diodorus Siculus, Book 10 of Quintus Curtius and Book 13 of Justin. It is therefore important to assess the style and validity of Photius' summaries, especially since the nature of his *Bibliotheca* is unique among ancient sources. It need not be said that Photius, an educated Byzantine layman of the 9th century, would not have had the same kind of exposure to literature as a modern reader, and neither would his analysis of a text (and the potential biases therein) reflect modern attitudes. But the major themes of Photius' summarized works – as well as their characters, story arcs and general typography – doubtless remain as distinct for us as they did for him. The reader of fragmentary sources such as the *Bibliotheca* must be attentive to the discrepancies between fragments and their original texts, and to that end Photius' methods and habits will be briefly explored in this chapter in order to gain insight into just such potential discrepancies. As the previous chapter has shown, even lengthy fragments from the *Bibliotheca* do not necessarily preserve the summarized author's original intent or the overall form of their work; a caveat which can be misleading since much of the *Bibliotheca* reads as a series of epitomes. It will be the task of the present chapter to

compare some of Photius' more extensive summaries with their extant original texts, in order to gain a sense of his method as a reader, critic, and summarizer. By comparing extant works with Photius' summaries of them, we may gain a better understanding of how he approached the *Events* in his own study, and thus we may more accurately characterize its transmission in the *Bibliotheca*. Arrian's *Anabasis* and Photius' summary of it, as well as two more summaries which are of more considerable length will be analyzed. All are of the same genre and literary style, and have survived in their complete forms. It will be seen that, although Photius reproduces some material with great precision, his summaries do not reflect the form, development, or historical focus of the original works.

Arrian's Anabasis Alexandri

The *Anabasis* is a military and geographical history written in the classical style of Thucydides. Arrian, who was himself a Roman legionary commander, crafts a story that focuses mainly on martial exploits, punctuated by digressions on the topography of regions foreign to the average Greek. It is natural that any history of Alexander would focus on battles and overland campaigns at least to some extent, but it is important to note that Arrian sets out to transcend these themes, and to write a history that has hitherto “οὐδὲ ἐξηνέχθη ἐς ἀνθρώπους ... ἐπαξίως”¹ (“not been published to mankind in a worthy manner”). He nevertheless prefaces his work by reminding his audience that Alexander's life has already been the object of extensive written observation, and even anticipates that

1 Arrian, *Anab.* 1.12.2.4-5.

readers may be surprised that he has chosen this exhausted topic at all.² Yet his approach is very distinct. It is not biographical like Plutarch (his contemporary, and a biographer of Alexander), and likewise it does not dwell long on matters of moral philosophy. Nor is Arrian as broad in his scope or as annalistic in his structure as Diodorus Siculus, whose fragments account for large tracts of our knowledge of Alexander's life, and who flourished a century before Arrian's birth. Much more source material was available to Arrian than to modern readers (although he seems not to have even read – or at least does not discuss – the histories of Quintus Curtius or Pompeius Trogus³), in his own historiographical consideration Arrian gave pride of place to the histories of Ptolemy I and Aristoboulos, whose first-hand accounts he considered most trustworthy.⁴ Once again, however, his style and purpose were likely very different. To elucidate his intentions, he explicitly compares his work with Xenophon's *Anabasis*,⁵ explaining that this author had immortalized the exploits of the Ten Thousand in Greek history, as well as his own role in the expedition. This is the genre (if “genre” it can be called) that Arrian is emulating, and his *Anabasis Alexandri* mirrors Xenophon's work. We shall dwell more on his authorial intent, but, in order to situate Arrian's Alexander project, we must first briefly recall the textual tradition of the Alexander story during Arrian's lifetime.

Lamentably enough, the only extant accounts of Alexander's life come from hundreds of years after his death. For the purpose of describing Arrian's own sources on

2 1.p.3.4-7.

3 Curtius and Trogus, who flourished in the 1st centuries AD and BC, respectively, wrote our surviving Latin accounts. Arrian, a Roman commander and Consul, was most certainly bilingual, though there is no reason to expect he was familiar with these accounts, which would have been published only recently by his lifetime. Trogus' full account (a *Historiae Philippicae* in the style of Theophrastus) was an encyclopaedic 44 books long, and has only survived as an epitome.

4 *Anab.* 1.p.1.1-1.p.3.7.

5 1.12.3.1-4.1.

Alexander, however, it is fortunate that the five surviving biographies⁶ were written within 150 years of each other, from the 1st century B.C. to the 2nd century A.D.; their authors were likely separated by only three generations under Roman rule.⁷ Arrian himself wrote in a cultural context that saw the emergence of a “Second Sophistic” age, one informed by the politics of Roman hegemony, in which the concept of literary individualism (exemplified in an early form by his model Xenophon) was in full flower. He also would have had largely the same sources available to him as his immediate predecessors, although each preferred (and preserved) different textual authorities on occasion.⁸ His writing was no doubt influenced to some extent by his contemporaries as well, and some overlap between authors was only natural. For example, both Arrian and the older Plutarch had published *Lives* of Dion and Timoleon.⁹ Both Arrian and Crito of Pieria had written histories of Parthia,¹⁰ and it is likely that Dio Cassius (born just a few years after Arrian's death) found one or the other of these sources useful when writing *On the Reign of Trajan*, since the Suda attributes to him a *Life of Arrian the Philosopher*,¹¹ we might safely deduce that he had read Arrian's works. Indeed, there was much intertextuality among the 2nd century authors which we can still identify today, a trend would surely not have been lost on such an erudite scholar as Photius. Given the scope of

6 Although only three can exactly be called “biography”: Arrian's *Anabasis Alexandri*, Quintus Curtius' *Historiae Alexandri Magni*, and Plutarch's *Life of Alexander*. Another two are surviving fragments of much larger works: an epitome of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*, and book 17 of Diodorus Siculus' *Library*. There are various smaller fragments elsewhere, of course, as well as mythical *Romances* written in Greek and Syriac, which I do not include here.

7 Only approximate dates are known for Trogus and Diodorus, who probably flourished in the mid-1st century B.C. Curtius flourished during the mid-1st century A.D., Plutarch a few decades later, and finally Arrian, who died c. 160.

8 Most notably Ptolemy and Aristoboulos, as mentioned above. He frequently cites the accounts of these two authors (3.3.5; 5.7.1; 5.14.3; 6.11.5).

9 Arrian's *Lives* are attested in Photius, *Bib.* 93 and Lucian, *Alex.* 2.

10 Suda, K, 2453 (Κρίτων, Περιώτης); Phot, *Bib.* 53.

11 Suda, Δ, 1239 (Δίων, ὁ Κάσσιος χρηματίσας) Here Dio is obviously emphasizing Arrian's Stoicism.

his *Bibliotheca*, it is clear that he had access to many of the same texts as we have, and yet more which we no longer possess. If anything, Photius was even more aware of the influences between authors and he often compares one to another linguistically, if not subjectively.¹² That he chose to summarize the *Anabasis Alexandri* is, as has been mentioned in the previous chapter, a testament to the work's relative obscurity (which is not to say that it was not still widely available), but also to the interest it piqued in Photius.

The survival of ancient texts was a Darwinian process, and in order to survive hundreds of years of attrition, a text must appeal to an audience. Perhaps Arrian's text appealed to Photius for the same reasons that it appeals to us; the Alexander Romance, as well as the bare facts of the young king's life, has been a compelling story for many different generations of readers. The story must still have been alive amid the literary culture of Byzantium in the 9th century (which produced very few secular texts to begin with), as it was in the 2nd. In addition to Arrian's *Anabasis*,¹³ we know that Photius had read Diodorus' *Library*,¹⁴ as well as Plutarch's *Lives*.¹⁵ It is unlikely that he had read Troilus or Curtius, although he does mention a certain "Rufus"¹⁶ who had written a *Roman History* and a *Musical History*. In addition, he had read two other works from the 2nd century on Alexander, which are now lost to us. These were the *Erato*¹⁷ of Cephalion, and *On Alexander*,¹⁸ by Amyntianus. Cephalion (whose fragments survive as well in

12 For example, his comparison of Agatharcides to Thucydides, mentioned earlier (*Bib.* 213.171b.9-12).

13 Cod. 91.

14 Cod. 60.

15 Cod. 245.

16 *Ibid.*, almost certainly not the same author, though too little is known of either to exclude the possibility.

17 *Ibid.*, (again in summary by Sopater).

18 Cod. 131.

Eusebius and in the Byzantine chroniclers George Syncellus and John Malalas) had also written a *Historical Epitome*¹⁹ ending with the reign of Alexander the Great, which Photius had also read. If we should hesitate to use Photius' collection of summaries to represent Byzantine tastes (Photius' text was, like his life, quite unique) we might at least propose, given the examples of extant authors as well as those mentioned in the *Bibliotheca*, that there was some ethos in the 2nd century that fostered a retelling of the Alexander narrative, whether through the spirit of its subject matter or the perceived σοφία of its historical enquiry. Among the authors engaged in this pursuit, Arrian evidently found a way to make his own work relevant and exclusive enough to warrant his readers' attention, since otherwise it would not have long survived beyond the 2nd century.

Arrian makes the purpose of the *Anabasis* quite explicit – it is to be the definitive history of Alexander the Great – and relates this to his reader on several occasions.²⁰ This was both a *topos* and a formality, and in his proem Arrian also remarks on his method, his own pedigree, and the importance of the work at hand. These kinds of prefatory remarks had been typical in *historiae* from as early as Herodotus and Thucydides, and were still used by Byzantine authors whom Photius had summarized and imitated. Interestingly though, Arrian departs from the typical historical proem²¹ by intentionally omitting his own name from the work. In a curious passage at 1.12.5 he makes it clear to the reader that the work ahead is more than a traditional enquiry:

I need not declare my name – though it is not unheard of in the world; I need not

19 Cod. 68.

20 Preface; 1.12.2-5; 7.30.

21 As exemplified, at least, by Thuc. 1.1-23.

specify my country or family, or any official position I may have held. Rather let me say this: that this book of mine is, and has been from my youth, more precious than country and kin and public advancement – indeed for me it is these things. And that is why I venture to claim the first place in Greek literature, since Alexander, about whom I write, held first place in the profession of arms.²²

Arrian makes this claim at the point in his narrative at which the Macedonians have disembarked from Troy, just after Alexander has lamented that, unlike Achilles, he will have no Homer to sing his immortality. Arrian thus takes up the role of the bard; the reader is aware from this moment that the work will not be so much a history of the Macedonian campaign as a narrative focused on Alexander. In this way Arrian separates his work from those of his predecessors, whether they were moralizing (like Plutarch, for whom Alexander becomes a moral avatar) or longer chronicles (like the *Library* of Diodorus Siculus), and even presumably from those works from which his history is taken (namely Ptolemy and Aristobulus, although one can only speculate as to their form and nature, which can only be determined from Arrian's present work).

P. A. Stadter has remarked that Arrian's *Anabasis* is a work concerned with a history of Alexander's deeds, encapsulated in literature of the highest excellence (Arrian compares it directly to Pindar, Xenophon and Homer at 1.12.2-3), and that what the author has called for is a new work in which “reliability and literary merit would be on par with Alexander's deeds.”²³ When reading the work with this in mind (as perhaps Photius, too, would have read it), one is compelled to view it as a rather narrow journey: it begins and ends with Alexander, it follows his march during the campaign (mentioning but largely ignoring the large contingents that he detached from his direct command), and

²² I have only here used Sélincourt's 1958 translation, since this prefatory remark has been the source of much discussion (Moles 1985; Marincola 1989; Gray 1990). This will be explored in greater detail in the next chapter.

²³ Stadter 1980, 63.

speaks only to his own administrative ordinances. Indeed, Arrian almost entirely leaves the history, politics and famous personalities of Greece and Macedon to the imagination of the reader as Alexander journeys farther from his father's realm. For instance, Agis III of Sparta is introduced in 2.13.4-6 requesting aid from the Persian fleet in 333 B.C. in order to launch a Greek revolt, but the revolt itself (which occurred nearly two years later) goes unmentioned by Arrian. By then Alexander's path had gone in a different direction – he had taken control of Egypt and the Persian coast, and was proceeding inland. Though the revolt was not an insignificant event, Macedon and its garrisons were now on Alexander's periphery, and not a concern in his immediate personal *anabasis*. The entire work (unlike our other surviving accounts of Alexander's life) borders on the encomiastic while eschewing an outward encomiastic form. But this follows from Arrian's proposal at the text's beginning. In form, the *Anabasis Alexandri* is true to its 5th century roots, notwithstanding its focus on the deeds of only one individual. Like his predecessors in historical enquiry, Arrian records the diplomatic, political and military events of Alexander's campaign. As the narrative unfolds, it naturally follows Alexander from region to region, breaking to inform the reader of the administrative instructions given by the Macedonian king, as well as the major battles and skirmishes in which he fought. With these details out of the way, the narrative continues by following Alexander to a new location, where the cycle repeats itself. Arrian's longest digressions take the form of geographical descriptions, and he seems to have been particularly fascinated by the mountain ranges and watersheds of the far East.²⁴ Less frequent are his digressions on Alexander's behaviour and morality, but these give the reader a strong impression of

²⁴ Most notably *Anab.* 5.4-6; also 3.30.7-9; 5.9.4; 6.14.5; 7.16.3.

Arrian's overall goal, which was Alexander's lionization. The work is not without examples of Arrian's own developed sense of literary criticism – he often calls attention to the many existing *legomena* regarding Alexander's life, which he compares analytically to his preferred sources (namely, Ptolemy and Aristobulus) or even dispels outright as common fancy.

Having situated Arrian's work within the context of Alexander-oriented historiography of the period, I shall now begin a comparison with Photius' summary of the *Anabasis*. The first natural point of comparison between the two is in terms of the work's overall structure. The seven books that make up our existing version of the *Anabasis* have clear divisions between them, both in terms of political development and in terms of geographical narrative, and are neatly separated:

- I *Alexander's campaign in Greece and against Northern tribes, crossing the Hellespont, and his campaign in Persia as far as Gordium. (Autumn 336 – Spring 333)*
- II *March through the Levant including the battle of Issus and siege of Tyre. Book ends after Alexander seizes the city of Gaza, near Egypt (Spring 333 – Autumn 332)*
- III *Travels in Egypt, and the campaign into Media, culminating in the battle of Gaugamela. Alexander then begins a new campaign in Bactria (Winter 332 – Spring 329)*
- IV *Campaign in Bactria/Sogdiana, and an insurgency there under Spitamenes. Ends as Alexander crosses the Hindu Kush (Summer 329 – Spring 326)*
- V *Campaign in India, including the battle of the Hydaspes against king Porus. Ends as Alexander is forced by his soldiers to end his campaign at the Hyphasis river. (Spring/Summer 326)*
- VI *Alexander travels down the Indus and returns to Persia through the Gedrosian desert. Ends at the palace at Pasargadae. (Autumn 326 – Winter 325)*

VII *Alexander mounts expeditions to explore the Tigris and Euphrates. Troops mutiny for the second time at Opis, and Alexander returns to Babylon. Book ends with his death and Arrian's personal reflections.*

Photius seemed to have been aware of these book divisions, and indicates the ends of Books 5 and 7 at precisely the same point as they appear today.²⁵ Given that at least some of the divisions were preserved in the 9th century (and taking into account their natural stopping points), it is reasonable to imagine that they were of Arrian's own invention.

One of the more intriguing points on the form of Arrian's work is the space he devotes to Alexander's late campaigns in Sogdiana and India. Of his eleven year journey across Persia, Alexander spent only four years in these regions, yet they account for Arrian's narrative from Books 3.28-6.28. This is perhaps indicative of Arrian's fascination with the Far East, and indeed, he devotes an entire book to the study of India and Nearchus' naval journey thence back to the Tigris.²⁶ Photius seems to preserve this chronological imbalance in his summary by devoting more space (37 lines)²⁷ to these particular books, and by quickly glossing over the first three (18 lines),²⁸ which chronicle Alexander's campaigns in Greece, Anatolia, the Levant, Egypt and the Persian heartland (in fact the lion's share of his conquests, and the most important administrative centres of the Persian empire). The remainder of Photius' summary, which is admittedly only a brief 100 lines,²⁹ recounts more detailed anecdotes and events from Books 4-7, including an unusually thorough list of the political marriages made between Macedonians

25 Cod. 91, lines 68a.28; 68b.41.

26 Phot. 92.68a.41-68b.1.

27 In this case, I have used Bekker's edition. These lines amount to a little more than one Bekker page.

28 Almost half a Bekker page.

29 The size of Photius' "summaries" range from just a few lines to near book-length (such as his summary of Ctesias' *Persica*, though summaries of this length are far fewer in number than most). His summary of the *Anabasis Alexandri*, it is fair to say, is of approximate average length.

commanders and Persian aristocrats at Susa in 324 BC. This event, which takes up relatively few lines in Arrian's work (20 to Photius' 13) is also recounted by Athenaeus,³⁰ whom we know Photius had read.³¹ The only apparent reason for this break in the summary's otherwise concise nature is that the account was one of interest to Photius himself. In this way our surviving summary, as it stands, is both encouraging and discouraging, since it seems to preserve the general measure of Arrian's work, but for this one inconsistency. In fact, Photius' account of the marriages at Susa, for all of its detail, does not quite match Arrian's:

<u>Arrian</u>	<u>Photius</u>
<i>Alexander → Barsine, Parysatis, Roxane</i>	<i>Alexander → Arsinoe, Parysatis, Roxane</i>
<i>Hephaestion → Drypetis</i>	<i>Hephaestion → Drypetis</i>
<i>Craterus → Amastrine</i>	<i>Craterus → Amastrine</i>
<i>Perdiccas → d. of Atropates</i>	No mention of Perdiccas
<i>Ptolemy/Eumenes → Artacama/Artonis (ds. of Artabazos)</i>	<i>Ptolemy/Eumenes → Artacama/Artonis (ds. of Artabazos)</i>
<i>Nearchus → d. of Barsine/Mentor</i>	<i>Nearchus → d. of Barsine/Mentor</i>
<i>Seleucus → d. of Spitamenes</i>	<i>Seleucus → d. of Spitamenes</i>

Figure 1 Comparison of the accounts of the marriages at Susa found in Arrian's *Anabasis* and Photius' summary of that work.

Confusing the name of Barsine (whom our other existing authors also call

30 12.538b-539a, however this is itself a description of Chares of Mytilene's *History of Alexander*, which does not survive.

31 Cod. 161.

Stateira, but never “Arsinoe”) is a very minor mistake, and indeed may have been the error of a later copyist. This provides a clear example of how Photius' text may make omissions and errors, even when describing narrative details in which he seems to have taken an interest, and is especially relevant in examining events of the late 4th century for which we have only Photius' fragments of Arrian to account.

The rest of the summary is quite faithful to Arrian, and even records other details with remarkable accuracy, such as the Persian troop strength at the Granicus³² and an enumeration of Alexander's wounds.³³ Given its limited size, however, it is difficult to draw conclusions on Photius' method. For example, his summary does not account for the geographical digressions of which Arrian was so fond. Nor does it reflect the military and strategical acumen of its author. This is hardly to be expected in a mere hundred lines of summary, but these considerations become much more palpable when we reflect on how Photius has treated Arrian's longer work, *Events After Alexander*, which is quite lengthy, and provides many crucial historical details on the early wars between the Diadochi which have not survived in any other fragments.

Procopius' *History of the Wars*

I turn now to a second example of a summary by Photius of an extant historical work, and in this case the summary is of comparable length to the summary of Arrian's *Events After Alexander*. Writing in the 6th century AD, Procopius of Caesarea is now our most eminent literary source for the reign of Justinian I. What little we know of him is

32 Photius cites Arrian's 20,000 horse, though omits the mercenary contingents described.

33 Seven in total, although the number varies between our other sources. For the fullest account (though likely an epideictic exaggeration) see Plutarch, *Moralia*, 341a-d.

found largely in his own work, besides one entry in the Suda. A barrister by trade, Procopius was promoted to the position of legal secretary to general Belisarius, and recorded his account of the wars fought between Byzantium and its foes from 527-551. The account predominantly follows Belisarius' campaigns in Persia, North Africa and Italy. He describes sieges and campaigns fought by many of Justinian's other generals; however, it is Belisarius whom Procopius has preserved for posterity as the most famous general produced by the Eastern Roman empire. The *Wars* is heavily influenced by the author's Classical education, and contains learned digressions, speeches, caricatures and often imitates Thucydides and Herodotus quite openly.³⁴ Its prose is elevated and Atticizing, and even goes to lengths to explain words which were not part of 5th century Athenian vocabulary.³⁵ It was certainly not written in the spoken Greek of Procopius' lifetime, and, although it was Justinian's reign that oversaw widespread suppression of pagan doctrine and even the closure of the Academy at Athens, the literary tradition of the Classical past still provided the compass by which the affluent learned letters and the finer points of rhetoric before embarking on legal or political careers. The elite *litterati* would be expected to form their thoughts and words with all the acumen of their Classical models, while at the same time eschewing their "Hellene" impiety. One example of this curious fusion can be found in the *De Actibus Apostolorum* written by Aratus (c. AD 544), which is a history of the Apostles written in Vergilian verse. In the East, and for some time in the West as well, an ecclesiastical education would not diminish the importance of training in the liberal arts. This was apparently a criterion fit

34 The two most notable examples of this are Procopius' plague narrative (2.22.1.1-21) and his artistic use of a large digression to end the 8th book of the *Wars* in a manner reminiscent of Artembares' proposal to Cyrus in book 9 of Herodotus.

35 Mostly administrative titles, for which he always gives a Greek translation of the original Latin.

to be included in the Theodosian Code, which preserves an edict given by Constantius II in 357 concerning a liberal education:

Where it concerns the orders of the Decuriae,³⁶ and he who is either a clerk, treasurer or censor, no one at all shall obtain a place of the highest rank unless he is known to be strong in the use and exercise of liberal studies, and thus is refined enough in his letters that words proceed from him without the offense of error: something we wish everyone to be well-versed in. Also, lest gifts be denied to literature (which is the highest of all virtues), he, who by study and eloquence seems worthy for a high rank, our provision will make more distinguished in elevation ... or, if you will, in the indication of his titles, in order that we may decide which dignity ought to be bestowed upon him.³⁷

This law is telling, since Constantius was well-known for promoting Christianity throughout the West (by legislative means, at least), and since Theodosius would finally establish Nicene Christianity as the official state religion of the entire empire in 380.³⁸ One and a half centuries later, though Justinian would rail against pagan philosophers in the his own law code,³⁹ this had no effect on what material was used in Roman schools. This has led J.A. Evans to suggest that Justinian's objections were not to pagan texts, but rather to their pagan teachers, who might defend their own heretical religion. Evans surmises that “Cultivating the 'greatest of all virtues'⁴⁰ meant a sound knowledge of the classics. That they were a survival of the pagan world made no difference. In fact, the exercise books used by schoolboys in the fifth century are not substantially different from those used two centuries earlier.”⁴¹ The old Roman method of education, with its sophisticated pagan texts and highly developed systems, would survive if for no other

36 These Decuriae were imperial administrative bodies, whose task it was to serve as clerks, copyists, attorneys and revenue agents – in short, the bureaucratic core of the empire.

37 Cod. Theo. 14.1.1.

38 Cod. Theo. 16.1.2.

39 See esp. Cod. Just. 1.5.18.

40 “omnium virtutum maxima” – he refers to line six of Constantius' law, quoted above.

41 Evans 1972, 22.

reason than that there was no Christian method to replace it. Photius produced his writing and chose his own samples of both pagan and Christian literature under just such a system, and it would not be until monastic and episcopal schools replaced old curricula in the 10th century (and the Patriarchal School in Byzantium in the 12th) that the Eastern empire would have an essentially Christian system of education.

Procopius, in rigid keeping with his classical models, does not dwell often on points of Christian theology, but they appear in the *Wars* all the same. Often he uses the trappings of Thucydidean historiography to veil his political criticisms, and frequently couches them in the speeches of his stories' antagonists. These clever artifices may have been exceptional, and M. Maas has suggested that Procopius' classicizing history was not representative of the widely held beliefs of the 6th century, citing instead the chronicles of John Malalas and Count Marcellinus.⁴² On the other hand, as regards the writers of Procopius' distinct genre, P. Sarris has pointed out that "It is striking that no Greek author writing in the 'High Style' – the Atticizing Greek of the Roman Second Sophistic – took an explicitly Christian line on anything until the seventh century."⁴³ Whatever the case, Procopius' history of the *Wars* piqued Photius' interest, and it must have been somewhat obscure by the 9th century for him to have included the work in his summaries.

It is worth noting that Procopius' three surviving works are peculiarly balanced. His *Wars*, in eight books, was the foundation of his literary fame, but he also wrote a panegyric for the emperor Justinian, known as the *Buildings*,⁴⁴ and a scathing invective against him, known as the *Anecdota*.⁴⁵ These three works in order reflect Procopius'

42 Maas 2005, 18.

43 Sarris 2007, xiv.

44 A catalogue and series of *ekphraseis* of the building projects Justinian completed in Constantinople.

45 Certainly published after Procopius' death, this work contained libels that would have had him

growing disillusionment with Justinian and Belisarius, his deft cooption of different literary approaches, and the complex nature of his personal experience in the Byzantine state. Read together, the three works provide a much much richer illustration of Procopius' life and history than any one can do alone. Yet Photius only ever mentions the eight books of the *Wars*. It is possible that he did not have access to Procopius' other works, or even that he was unaware of their existence. What confuses matters somewhat is that the *Suda* – presumably compiled only a century after Photius lived – introduces the *Anecdota* as the ninth book of the *War*, which designation its own proem would suggest. It is perhaps more probable, however, that this is an indication of Photius' interest in authors of history: he had read and summarized at least two other works by Theophanes⁴⁶ and Evagrius Scholasticus⁴⁷ whose works likely bore heavy influence from the subject material of Procopius' *Wars*,⁴⁸ and indeed Photius seems to have been a 5th/6th century history buff, given that most of the ecclesiastical histories he summarized fall between the reigns of Theodosius and Justinian.⁴⁹ Procopius' *Wars* would have been a natural choice for any reader interested in this period, but his *Anecdota*, which thoroughly vilifies an influential orthodox and Christianizing emperor, may not have been as compelling to Photius, who even scorned ecclesiastical history written by Arians.⁵⁰ Likewise, the *Buildings* may not have suited Photius' interest in the period, which seems to have been stirred more by political and ecclesiastical history than by architecture or panegyric.

As happens occasionally in the *Bibliotheca*, Photius only summarizes the first two

incarcerated (or perhaps executed) by Justinian.

46 Cod. 64.

47 Cod. 29.

48 Whitby 2000; Mango; Scott 1997.

49 Cods. 28-31, 41-2.

50 Cod. 40, an *Ecclesiastical History* by Philostorgius.

books of the *Wars*, though he does mention that he had read all eight. This is not an unnatural stopping point, as Procopius had structured his books by campaigns, and not by chronology:

I-II *Wars against Persia*

III-IV *Wars against the Vandals in North Africa*

IV-VII *Wars against the Goths in Italy*

VIII *Written after the first seven had been published, finishes the narrative of the campaigns in Persia and Italy.*

Each section covers the same time period (~ AD 527-560), but involves different geographical locations. The first two books in the volume deal with Byzantium's relationship with the Sassanid empire (whom Procopius calls “Persians”, in keeping with his classical style). This narrative may have resonated most with Photius, who after all lived in Constantinople and had traveled East into what had by then become the Abbasid caliphate.⁵¹ Procopius describes the fluctuating borders between the two states, as well as the diplomatic and military maneuvers which would shape the political landscape of Photius' time. As for why he did not include the remaining books in his summary, we can only speculate. The subject matter was farther removed from 9th century Byzantium, and most of the provinces in Italy and North Africa which Justinian had conquered had long since been lost. Time and the cost of parchment may also have been a contributing factor, given the great length of Procopius' work. Photius had abbreviated his summary of Josephus' *Antiquities*⁵² in the same way, as well as Appian's *Roman History*.⁵³ From

51 If we are to take the *Bibliotheca*'s preface as fact.

52 Cod. 76.

53 Cod. 57.

Josephus' 20 books, he focuses on salient points on the high priesthood and major political events of the 1st and 2nd centuries BC. Also included in the later parts of the *Bibliotheca* is a more detailed epitome of Books 14-20 of the *Antiquities*, which, as discussed above, are likely either reading notes or the work of a scribe. From Appian's 24 books, he focuses on the genealogy of Aeneas' descendants down to Romulus and Remus (which Photius tells us is from the first book, although his fragments are some of the largest remaining for this section of Appian), although he does mention, with a phrase or two, the general subjects covered in each book. It seems that Photius did not hold himself to giving an account of every book in each work he summarized, but rather focused at times on the details he found most stimulating or worthy of description. As we have seen, however, he does mention when he had not actually read the work in question, and he seems willing to admit whether he had only read some sections and not others. Although it resembles more the expanded reading notes in the later parts of the *Bibliotheca*, his summary of Memnon's *History of Heraclea*⁵⁴ explicitly states: “Ἀνεγνώσθη βιβλίον Μέμνονος ἱστορικόν, ἀπὸ τοῦ θ' λόγου ἕως ζ' καὶ ι'.”, whereas other more detailed epitomes in the later sections of the text simply mark which section is being expounded upon, as in Cod. 244:

Ἀνεγνώσθη τῆς Διοδώρου βιβλιοθήκης ἄλλοι τε λόγοι καὶ ὁ λβ' καὶ λδ', καὶ ὁ μ' καὶ ὁ λη', καὶ ὁ λα' καὶ ὁ β' καὶ δ', καὶ ζ', καὶ ὁ λζ' καὶ ὁ λη'. Ὡν ἐκλογὴν ἡ παροῦσα ἔκδοσις περιέχει.

Read from the Library of Diodorus, among other books, number 32 and 34, number 40 and 38, number 31, 2, 4, 6, 37 and 38, from which the following publication is an excerpt.

or Cod. 238 (a second epitome of Josephus' *Antiquities*):

54 Cod. 224.

Ἀνεγνώσθη Ἰωσήπου ἡ ἀρχαιολογία· ἧς ἡ ἐκλογὴ ὅσα τε ἱστορεῖ περὶ Ἡρώδη καταλέγει, τὴν τε ἀνοικοδομὴν τοῦ ναοῦ, ὅπως τε τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν ὑπεισηλθε βασιλείαν, καὶ ὅπως αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν οἱ ἐκ γένους διεδέξαντο, ὅπως τε αὕτη εἰς ἀριστοκρατίαν καταλέλυται, τὴν προστασίαν τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἀναδεξαμένων, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τούτοις συνδιαπλέκεται.

Read the Antiquities of Josephus; of which this excerpt lays down the history concerning Herod, the restoration of the temple, how he usurped the Jewish throne, how they from his descendants received this sovereignty, and how it was dissolved into an aristocracy when the arch-priests took the authority away from the people, and such else as is connected with these things.

What is perhaps most disappointing with Photius' short selection from Procopius is not so much that it omits many important historical details of the 6th century, but that it does not furnish the reader with Procopius' increasing sense of disillusionment and vexation with the imperial court,⁵⁵ which becomes more pronounced in each book he writes. Recording the complexities of each author's thought is not always Photius' custom; nevertheless, were we without the surviving text of the *Wars*, the fragments he provides would be some of the few brought to bear on an understanding Procopius' other works (which would be, confusingly, a panegyric and a satire of the same imperial regime). This is the case for Arrian, whose few surviving works (and especially where they concern Alexander) are frequently compared to numerous fragmentary texts in order, as one scholar points out, “to toss one more gram of evidence onto the scales in promoting a tricky solution to a problem.”⁵⁶ In contrast to Procopius, however, it would seem from the *Anabasis Alexandri* that Arrian's style is far more deliberate and inelastic, in that he does not couch state criticism in elaborate artifices, nor has he to deal with the difficulty of reconciling state Christianity with Hellenic literary style. He uses far fewer speeches, digressions,

55 Over Justinian's reign, his many wars, taxation, and even his former hero and supervisor, Belisarius. This is a theme commonly pointed out, and helps to make sense of Procopius' other works. Cf. Evans 1972, 52, 55, 74; Kaldellis 2004, 118-59; Brodka 2004, under “Prokopios von Kaesareia”.

56 Wheatley 2013, 17.

and even considering that the *Anabasis* is a work focused on the individual of Alexander, his character receives far less development than Procopius' Belisarius, Justinian or even a bevy of other more minor characters. The *Anabasis*, Arrian's only surviving history, focuses on battles, troop movements, itemizing generals and kings, and other points which fit well into Photius' framework. As for this kind of explicit subject material, Photius provides an accurate account of Book 1 of the *Wars*, as well as for what he does preserve from Book 2. He keeps especially good track of generals' and ambassadors' names, though this is perhaps not surprising, since he was himself presumably an ambassador to the Abbasid caliphate. Where he is compelled to provide a number, either of funds or of people, his figures are identical to the originals. For example, he gives the names of the generals dispatched by emperor Anastasius to fight the Persians in AD 503:

Ἵτι πολιορκουμένην Ἀμίδαν μαθὼν Ἀναστάσιος στράτευμα πλῆθος λίαν κατὰ Περσῶν ἔστειλε, στρατηγούς ἐπιστήσας Ἀρεόβινδόν τε τὸν Ἐώας στρατηγόν, ὃς ἦν Ὀλυβρίου κηδεστής τοῦ μικρῷ πρόσθεν τῆς Ἑσπέρας βασιλεύσαντος, Κέλερά τε τὸν μάγιστρον Πατρικίον τε τὸν Φρύγα καὶ Ὑπάτιον τὸν οἰκεῖον ἀδελφιδοῦν. Anastasius, upon learning that Amida was under siege, dispatched quite a large force against the Persians, having appointed as generals Areobindus (who was general in the East, and son-in-law of Olybrius, who was emperor in the West not long before), Celer the magistrate, Patricius the Phrygian, and Hypatius, his own nephew.⁵⁷

And here, the original:

Τότε δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἀναστάσιος πολιορκεῖσθαι μαθὼν Ἀμίδαν στράτευμα κατὰ τάχος διαρκῆς ἔπεμψεν. ἄρχοντες δὲ ἦσαν μὲν κατὰ συμμορίαν ἐκάστων, στρατηγοὶ δὲ ἅπασιν ἐφεστήκεσαν τέσσαρες, Ἀρεόβινδός τε, Ὀλυβρίου κηδεστής, τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἑσπερία βεβασιλευκότος ὀλίγω πρότερον, τῆς ἑώας δὲ τότε στρατηγὸς ἐτύγχανεν ὢν· καὶ τῶν ἐν παλατίῳ ταγμάτων ἀρχηγὸς Κέλερ (μάγιστρον Ῥωμαῖοι τὴν ἀρχὴν καλεῖν νενομίκασιν)· ἔτι μὴν καὶ οἱ τῶν ἐν Βυζαντίῳ στρατιωτῶν ἄρχοντες, Πατρικίος τε ὁ Φρυξ καὶ Ὑπάτιος ὁ βασιλέως ἀδελφιδοῦς· Emperor Anastasius, when learning that Amida was being besieged, immediately sent an ample force. There were commanders for each company, and four generals

⁵⁷ Cod. 63.22b.1-5.

had had responsibility for them all: Areobindus (at that time general in the East, and son-in-law of Olybrius, who had a short time ago been emperor in the West), Celer, commander of the palace guard (the Romans are accustomed to call this position “magister”), and also the commanders of the forces in Byzantium, Patricius the Phrygian and Hypatius, nephew of the emperor.⁵⁸

When these passages are compared, it is clear that Photius is not simply transcribing the text word for word, but is either working from notes or flexing an impeccable memory for mundane details (mundane in that these generals do not play a central role in the book, and are never mentioned again after this chapter). However it seems that Photius *is* at times copying the text outright, as in a digression on the Taurus mountain range at 63.22b.17-39, which corresponds to *Wars* 1.10.1.1-9.1:

<u>Procopius</u>	<u>Photius</u>
<p>Τὸ Κιλικῶν ὄρος ὁ Ταῦρος ἀμείβει μὲν τὰ πρῶτα Καππαδόκας τε καὶ Ἀρμενίους καὶ τῶν Περσαρμενίων καλουμένων τὴν γῆν, ἔτι μέντοι Ἀλβανούς τε καὶ Ἴβηρας, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἔθνη αὐτόνομά τε καὶ Πέρσαις κατήκοα ταύτῃ ὄκηνται. ἐξικνεῖται γὰρ ἐς χώραν πολλὴν, προϊόντι δὲ ἀεὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο ἐς μέγα τι χρῆμα εὖρους τε καὶ ὕψους διήκει. ὑπερβάντι δὲ τοὺς Ἰβήρων ὄρους ἀτραπὸς τίς ἐστὶν ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ πολλῇ, ἐπὶ σταδίου πεντήκοντα ἐξικνουμένη. αὕτη δὲ ἡ ἀτραπὸς ἐς ἀπότομόν τινα καὶ ὄλως ἄβατον τελευτᾷ χώρον. δίοδος γὰρ οὐδεμία τὸ λοιπὸν φαίνεται, πλὴν γε δὴ ὅτι ὡσπερ τινὰ χειροποίητον πυλίδα ἐνταῦθα ἡ φύσις ἐξεῦρεν, ἡ Κασπία ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἐκλήθη. τὸ δὲ ἐνθένδε πεδία τέ ἐστὶν ἰπηλάτα καὶ ὑδάτων πολλῶν ἀτεχνῶς ἔμπλεα, καὶ χώρα πολλὴ ἰπόβοτός τε καὶ ἄλλως ὑπτία. οὗ δὲ τὰ Οὐννων ἔθνη σχεδόν τι ἅπαντα ἰδρυταὶ</p>	<p>Ἵτι τὸ Κιλικῶν ὄρος ὁ Ταῦρος ἀμείβει μὲν τὰ πρῶτα Καππαδόκας καὶ Ἀρμενίους καὶ τῶν Περσαρμενίων τὴν γῆν, εἶτα Ἀλβανούς καὶ Ἴβηρας, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα αὐτόνομα ἔθνη καὶ Πέρσαις κατήκοα ταύτῃ ὄκηνται.</p> <p>Ἵπερβάντι δὲ τοὺς Ἰβήρων ὄρους ἀτραπὸς ἐστὶν ἐν στενοχωρίᾳ πολλῇ ἐπὶ σταδίου πεντήκοντα ἐξικνουμένη, αὕτη τε ἡ ἀτραπὸς ἐς ἀπότομόν τινα καὶ ὄλως ἄβατον τελευτᾷ χώρον· δίοδος γὰρ οὐδεμία φαίνεται, πλὴν γε δὴ ὅτι ὡσπερ τινὰ χειροποίητον πυλίδα ἐνταῦθα ἡ φύσις ἐξεῦρεν, ἡ Κασπία ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἐκλήθη. Τὸ δὲ ἐνθένδε πεδία τέ ἐστὶν ἰπηλάτα καὶ ὑδάτων πολλῶν ἀτεχνῶς ἔμπλεα, καὶ χώρα πολλὴ ἰπόβοτός τε καὶ ἄλλως ὑπτία, οὗ δὲ τὰ Οὐννων ἔθνη σχεδόν τι πάντα ἰδρυταὶ ἄχρι ἐς τὴν Μαιῶτιν διήκοντα λίμνην. Οὗτοι δὲ ἦν</p>

58 1.8.1-2.

<p>ἄχρι ἐς τὴν Μαιῶτιν διήκοντα λίμνην. οὗτοι ἦν μὲν διὰ τῆς πυλίδος, ἧς ἄρτι ἐμνήσθην, ἴωσιν ἐς τὰ Περσῶν τε καὶ Ῥωμαίων ἤθη, ἀκραιφνέσι τε τοῖς ἵπποις ἴασι καὶ περιόδῳ τινὶ σὺδαμῇ χρώμενοι οὐδὲ κρημνώδεσιν ἐντυχόντες χωρίοις, ὅτι μὴ τοῖς πεντήκοντα σταδίοις ἐκείνοις, οἷσπερ εἰς τοὺς Ἰβηρίους ὄρους, ὥσπερ ἐρρήθη, διήκουσιν. ἐπ' ἄλλας δὲ τινὰς ἐξόδους ἰόντες πόνῳ τε πολλῷ παραγίνονται καὶ ἵπποις οὐκέτι χρῆσθαι τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἔχοντες. περιόδους τε γὰρ αὐτοὺς περιεῖναι πολλὰς ἐπάναγκες καὶ ταύτας κρημνώδεις. ὅπερ ἐπειδὴ ὁ Φιλίππου Ἀλέξανδρος κατενόησε, πύλας τε ἐν χώρῳ ἐτεκτίνατο τῷ εἰρημένῳ καὶ φυλακτήριον κατεστήσατο.</p>	<p>μὲν διὰ τῆς πυλίδος, ἧς ἄρτι ἐμνήσθην, ἴωσιν ἐς τὰ Περσῶν καὶ Ῥωμαίων ἤθη, ἀκραιφνέσι τοῖς ἵπποις ἴενται</p> <p>μόνοις γὰρ τοῖς εἰρημένοις πεντήκοντα σταδίοις τῆς δυσχωρίας ταλαιπωροῦνται, οἷπερ ἐς τοὺς Ἰβηρίας ὄρους, ὥσπερ ἐρρήθη, διήκουσιν. Ἐπ' ἄλλας δὲ τινὰς ἐξόδους ἰόντες, πόνῳ τε πολλῷ καὶ μόλις ἐς τὰ Περσῶν καὶ Ῥωμαίων ἤθη παραγίνονται.</p> <p>Ὅπερ ἐπειδὴ ὁ Φιλίππου Ἀλέξανδρος κατενόησε, πύλας τε ἐν χώρῳ τῷ εἰρημένῳ ἐτεκτίνατο καὶ φυλακτήριον κατεστήσατο.</p>
--	---

Figure 2 Comparison of a digression on the Taurus Mountains in Procopius' *Wars* and Photius' summary of that work

With the exceptional reversal of a few words, the emboldened, underlined portions of each text represent an identical analogue, which, quantified, amount to a word match percentage of 83%. It could be that Photius copied passages which interested him most, though these blend into his summary without definite indications, although there are some clues. In this case, Photius' change in paragraph coincides with a new chapter in our editions of Procopius. More than that, the narrative switches from the perspective of the summarizer to one that reflects the text more directly, a peculiarity that often occurs in his more lengthy codices. For example, in his summary of Nonnosus' *History*,⁵⁹ Photius organizes his summarized material into ὅτι clauses (most accompanied by “φησι”). One small but decidedly more detailed passage begins with a new sentence structure (Χρῆ δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς κράσεως τῶν ἀέρων εἰπεῖν,”), which does not follow the normal flow of

⁵⁹ Cod. 3.

the summary. Likewise in his summary of the *Wars*, Photius breaks completely from the preceding narrative to form what appears as a digression of his own on the Taurus mountains. Unlike Nonnosus, however, whose only fragments survive through Photius, we can see that the summary of Procopius' text matches more exactly than it perhaps would if Photius had been using memory alone.⁶⁰ Syntax aside, his summary of Book 1 of the *Wars* is remarkably exact in its detail. All numbers and figures (such as ransoms, indemnities, or the number of those slain during the Nika riots in Constantinople) are identical in the original text. For example, when Photius writes of a war indemnity paid to the Persians in AD 532 he not only records the correct number, but also the particular currency Procopius describes.⁶¹ Elsewhere, both Photius and Procopius give monetary values in weight and metal, but the original author here takes an opportunity to introduce his "Athenian" audience to the Byzantine gold standard, and this is transmitted through Photius as well. Although this passage as well as many others are remarkably exact, they tend to withhold the context in which they occurred. In the example above, for instance, Photius preserves a treaty transaction without mentioning any of the political reasons for it. Photius occasionally adds his own textual notes, however they rarely help to contextualize the source material. At 63.25a.34-9 of his summary, he elaborates on Procopius' mention of the splinters of the holy cross stored in Apamea. Procopius, in the original text and in keeping with his classical style, had not alluded to the miracle whereby the cross would illuminate when removed from its storage chest.⁶² Photius, without including any details, simply provides a brief description of Apamea, "Ἐν ᾧ καὶ

60 See Hägg (1975) for more examples of Photius' exact reproductions of texts.

61 "Centenars", in *Wars* 1.22.3; *Bib.* 63.24a.28.

62 Henry 1959, 1.74, n. 4.

περὶ τῶν τιμίων καὶ ζωοποιῶν ξύλων τεθαυματούργηται.”⁶³ Whereas Procopius assumes implicit knowledge of the miracle itself, Photius prefers only to leave the particulars of the θαυμάσιον ἔργον implicit, but adds a religious pretext that would be difficult to distinguish from the original, were we without Procopius' surviving text. In any case, the context of the miracle is passed over, and one cannot tell from the summary whether the description was a digression or an important development in the narrative.

Despite the precision of what Photius does record, the shortcomings of his summary become apparent if we take into account what he does not. There is no indication whatsoever of Procopius' style, method or any of the traits which make him unique as an author. This is not always so, and often Photius' summaries contain nothing but remarks on an author's style, syntax, whether he is given to digressions, and whether Photius even enjoyed his writing, as we have seen in the previous chapter. His summary of Procopius, though exact in the details it records, make no such indications. This is unfortunate since, as mentioned, Procopius' style (especially when compared to Arrian) is rich with speeches, ethnographies of foreign cultures, court scandals, administrative reforms and Herodotean anecdotes. Photius even omits any mention of the empress Theodora, whose stirring speech addressed to Justinian during the Nika riots⁶⁴ has helped shape our modern view of her as one of the most powerful women of the time.

The summary of Book 2 is incomplete. Photius correctly identifies the point in the narrative at which Book 1 ends and Book 2 begins, but cuts short his summary of the latter by ten chapters.⁶⁵ It seems unlikely that this would present itself as a natural

63 63.25a.38-9.

64 *Wars* 1.24.33-7.

65 As they have been edited for us – roughly a third of the book is missing from his summary.

stopping point for a reader who had the full volume available to him. It leaves a second war between Byzantium and Persia unresolved, and forsakes one of the best known parts of Procopius' work: a Thucydidean plague narrative of the bubonic outbreak in 541. On the other hand, one might argue that Procopius left the end of Book 2 unresolved anyway, having published the first seven just as a five year truce between the two powers had expired, and after the Persians had invaded the Byzantine client state of Lazica. The bubonic plague may not have had as great a significance for Photius as for modern readers, since it was the first recorded incidence of a pandemic which would not resurface until the 14th century (when it would become even more virulent and synonymous with the “Black Death”). In any case, Photius' summary ends prematurely, it seems, with no indication as to whether he believed the volume ended there, or had just run out of time and interest. My guess would tend toward the latter, since the *Wars* was extremely popular during its time, and would remain influential thereafter.⁶⁶

It is perhaps more important to understand why Photius took an interest in the first two books of the *Wars* in the first place. Andrew Gillett has suggested⁶⁷ that in the East, unlike in the West, historiographical focus shifted in the 5th and 6th centuries from warfare to diplomacy,⁶⁸ and guided Byzantine authors like Priscus, Malchus, Menander Confessor,⁶⁹ and even Photius, to identify the history of interstate relations and diplomacy as the core of a historical work.⁷⁰ Gillett points out, too, that Photius “...had a personal

66 Obscure enough to include in the *Bibliotheca*; however, this does not preclude his far-reaching influence (much like Herodotus, Cod. 60). Procopius has been well-cited by later authors ranging from his immediate successor, Agathias of Myrina, to later historians such as Gibbon.

67 2003, 31-2.

68 Greatrex 1998; Lee 1993; Blockley 1985.

69 All preserved by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in his 10th century *Excerpta Historica*, in two sections fittingly titled “Excerpta de Legationibus Romanorum” and “Excerpta de Legationibus Barbarorum.”

70 Evans (1972, 38) has even suggested that secular history itself was a “bi-product of the Christianization

and professional interest in embassies, which affected his presentation of earlier historical works....”⁷¹ True enough, Photius was presumably preparing for an embassy just as he compiled the *Bibliotheca*, as we have explored above, and may have had both a methodological and personal compulsion to record geographies and geopolitical affairs. If this were the case, it may explain why he omitted the six books of Procopius' *Wars* which deal with events outside of Byzantium's immediate borders and the areas under its traditional purview. Only Books 1 and 2 of the *Wars* deal with the political realm in which Photius himself was active. Within the *Bibliotheca*, one can find many medical texts, theological treatises, rhetorical discourses and other works which would not have so easily satisfied such a predilection for travel and statecraft, and yet within the histories which are summarized, there is a distinct sense that they were read with the eye of an envoy and tourist. Two of his largest summaries are, of course, Ctesias' *Persica* and *Indica*,⁷² which are travel texts and works of paradoxography. Another example is his summary of Nonnosus' *History*,⁷³ written by an ambassador about his delegations to the Saracens, Amerites and Aethiopians. This work receives a generous 775 words in the Greek, and, as René Henry points out in his translation, marks the “premier échantillon de la curiosité de Photius pour les histoires extraordinaires et les relations de voyages.”⁷⁴

Overall, then, Photius' summary is reliable, but only in recording prosaic details concerning geography, names and figures. The scope of the summarized portion of the work likely results from a predilection toward diplomatic history. This might be

of the empire”, which gave rise in the 4th century to a polarization between early ecclesiastical history and history dominated by late pagan authors.

71 Gillett 2003, 31.

72 Combined in cod. 72.

73 Cod. 3.

74 1959, 1.4, n. 2.

interpreted as either a strength or a source of bias, depending on how a particular fragment from the *Bibliotheca* is used and interpreted. In the case of Arrian, who seems to record history with the acumen (but sadly, also the stodginess) of a military official, details on envoys, battles and marching armies may well be lovingly preserved by Photius. On the other hand, we have also seen that Photius fluctuates between paraphrasing and copying, with subtle indications separating the two methods. As described above, these indications can sometimes be clear, as in a change in reported speech, or ambiguous, as in a digression from the main narrative. Perhaps more difficult would be separating Photius' own asides from the original text, though these neither compete with nor distort the static details which Photius seems to have taken from his own reading notes. The most apparent and natural shortcoming in Photius' summary of Procopius' *Wars* is that it neither retains the form of the original work, nor indicates the complex intentions of the original author.

Theophylact Simocatta's *Universal History*

I turn now to a third extant historical work summarized by Photius, and here again the summary is comparable in length to that of Arrian's lost *Events After Alexander*. Living under emperor Heraclius in the early 7th century, Theophylact is generally viewed as the last traditional historian of late antiquity, and used a classicizing style similar to Arrian, Procopius and Photius.⁷⁵ This style stands in sharp contrast to that of his immediate Byzantine literary successors (notably Theophanes Confessor and Syncellus), who wrote chronicles and ecclesiastical histories. The subject of Theophylact's

⁷⁵ Whitby; Whitby 1986, xiii.

Universal History is the reign of emperor Maurice in the late 6th century. His focus was on political and military developments in the late Roman empire, though his style allowed for the same types of speeches, digressions and intertextuality as those of any classicizing historiographer. That said, his prose is distinctly ostentatious and often bombastic in its imitation of its classical models, often substituting periphrastic and elevated prose for literary substance. This has led Michael and Mary Whitby⁷⁶ to suggest that Theophylact uses a more opaque, extravagant style when his narrative reaches junctures for which he lacked adequate source material. Such as it is, Theophylact's *History* is quite difficult to read in the Greek, which is often vague in places; it jumps non-sequentially between military actions, and has an unclear sense of geography. This difficulty is obviously compounded by the fact that the author was synthesizing texts and oral accounts from 30 to 60 years before he was born, although he remains our most comprehensive authority for the period he which treats. In particular, this includes the wars fought by Rome in the Balkans against the Avars and their chief (whom Theophylact only refers to as “the Chagan”), and in the East against the Sasanians under several different Shahanshahs.

Three other works survive by this author, though they are much shorter in length. His *Ethical Epistles* are a set of 84 fictitious letters between well-known characters of history and myth, and discuss questions of moral philosophy. His *Problems of Natural History* is a work of paradoxography in the form of a Platonic dialogue. It has been suggested either that Theophylact wrote these two works as a young man,⁷⁷ or that they

76 1986, xxii.

77 Brodka 2004, 193.

constituted literary exercises.⁷⁸ In any case, they are far less substantial than the *Universal History*. The third minor work ascribed to Theophylact is one of moral theology, known as *De Vitae Termino*, or *On Predestined Terms of Life*. It asks, in the form of a *controversia*, whether God determines the length of a person's life from its outset. The work showcases Theophylact's knowledge of biblical doctrine, and acquaints his reader with the Christian theology which is present in most of his work. Certainly the *History*, though written in a stylized Attic that avoids ecclesiastical vocabulary, is much more influenced by Christian sentiment than Theophylact's better known literary predecessors, Procopius and Agathias of Myrina.⁷⁹ Aside from Christian motifs, the *History* presents us with a style that is categorically different from near-contemporary Greek texts which comment on the same material. These include fragments from Menander Protector and John of Epiphania, Maurice's *Strategicon*, and the ecclesiastical history of Evagrius.⁸⁰ We know that Photius had read Evagrius,⁸¹ and that he had found that author's knowledge of religious doctrine one of his only redeeming qualities. His summary of Theophylact's *History*, however, is quite thorough and epitomizes each of its eight books.

Unlike his summary of the *Wars*, Photius' summary of Theophylact does not appear to include any lengthy quotations from Theophylact's texts, apart from one brief exception.⁸² He does include a short examination of the author's style, however, and begins his discussion by censuring Theophylact's figurative prose, which he calls

78 According to M. and M. Whitby (1986, xv), they were *juvenilia*.

79 cf. Brodka 2004, 195; Whitby, 1986, xvi.

80 Actually written during the reign of Emperor Maurice, and from which M. & M. Whitby posit Theophylact gathered much of his material on the Persian and Balkan wars.

81 Cod. 29.

82 Tiberius' dream at 65.27a.32-4, discussed in the previous chapter.

“ψυχρολογία”, “νεανική” and “ἀπειροκαλία.”⁸³ A modern reader may well agree, since the circumlocutory prose of the *History* often obscures the kind of historical criticism (often identified in ancient authors, though at times anachronistically) by which we often weigh the historiographical value of texts. M. & M. Whitby have suggested that Theophylact was attempting to imitate Christian rhetoric, “which provided a stylistic ideal to be set alongside the Greek of Classical authors.”⁸⁴ If this conjecture is true, he most certainly failed; Photius' disgust at the author's prose style is in implicit comparison with the myriad works of Christian rhetoric which he had reviewed positively in the *Bibliotheca*. Photius also omits mention of the short dialogue between Philosophy and History which immediately precedes the work's proem. Though not unlike the introduction to Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, this rare exercise has no parallel in historical Byzantine literature.⁸⁵ It is unlikely that Photius was missing this part of the text, or that it was a later edition, given both its unique style and its fundamental relationship with the rest of the text. One might simply skip over it, however, since History and Philosophy do not resume their dialogue in the rest of the work, unlike in the *Consolation*. The omission, though small, may alter the transmission and perception of the original text. J. D. Frendo⁸⁶ has made a convincing case for reading the *Universal History* as “a historical work intended in part for recitation before an audience and designed to fulfill the requirements of imperial panegyric and contemporary political propaganda.”⁸⁷ He calls specific attention to the use of the dialogue at the beginning,

83 65.26b.18-19, “nonsense”, “childish” and “tasteless.”

84 1986, xxviii.

85 Hunger 1978, 314.

86 1988.

87 156.

references to audience and narration that distinguish it from other surviving works of the period, and also its elevated diction throughout, which may well have served an epideictic purpose, but which Photius and other scholars have tended to disparage.⁸⁸ Frendo posits that Theophylact identifies himself with a personified History in his proem, both linking his narrative style with the preceding dialogue and including the “assumption of the role of one addressing an audience.”⁸⁹ Whether or not Photius understood any connection between the dialogue, proem and the rest of the work, his remarks at the beginning of his summary provide a clear example of how he wrote: his interest in Theophylact hinged on the political and historical data which he recorded. In Photius' summary we can find no discernible link between his judgment of Theophylact's style and the material he recorded from the *History*. Yet the absence of such a thematic evaluation⁹⁰ gives way immediately to one of Photius' greatest strengths as a summarizer, which as we have seen lies in the exactitude and replication of what he chooses not to omit. He was meticulous in recording accurate names, figures and any item that reduces the work in question to an inventory of critical details. As far as fragmentary sources are concerned, this is often a desirable quality, but it cannot be trusted without the caution necessary in discerning why an author may have chosen to preserve certain portions of a text and not others.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, Photius preserves some of the *History*

88 The most striking example, dated but influential, comes from H. van Herwerden (1889): “Non potest enim cogitari rhetor ineptior quam est Simocatta, quem inflato ac tumido scribendi genere, eoque saepe tam egregie absurdo et obscuro ut quid voluerit vix et ne vix quidem intellegas, a nullo umquam scriptore superatum esse crediderim.”

89 1988, 147.

90 We know Photius was quite capable of writing such thematic evaluations, given his commentaries on New Testament scripture, as well as the penetrating philosophical and literary analyses in the *Amphilocia*.

with impeccable accuracy. All names, figures and locations he mentions correspond to those found in the original text. He focuses on the actions of each book's major characters (as well as many minor ones), but avoids geographical or martial details. Once again political diplomacy is a major theme in his summary. A specific example can be found at 65.30b.13-21, when Photius describes an embassy sent by the Franks to the Romans. His account comprises a surprising 53 words and is quite complete, whereas Theophylact's original 84 word description reads as an interesting footnote within the general narrative.⁹¹ At many points Photius also omits certain details and is attracted to others, providing a sense of what he considered more significant. For example, his summary of Book 1 records a peace treaty violation between Rome and the Avars,⁹² for which Theophylact had originally given two reasons: the first was that the Avars had pressured client Slavs to invade Roman territory, and the second was that a priest named Bookolabra slept with one of the Chagan's wives, was caught, and fled for refuge in Rome. Both reasons are given equal weight in the text, but Photius only records the second, more exotic pretext. Again in the second book, Theophylact describes how the Romans prepared for a battle at Salah⁹³ by carefully choosing a camp toward which the Sasanians would have to march a day without access to water. The geography of the site is explained in detail;⁹⁴ however, Photius chooses to focus on a much shorter preparation scene in which the Roman general displays an image of God Incarnate to inspire his troops. This focus on religious anecdote is common in the *Bibliotheca*, but naturally more

91 *Hist.* 6.3.6.1-8.4.

92 *Hist.* 1.8 and *Bib.* 65.27b.19-20.

93 The modern site, but according to Theophylact, the plane of Solachon on the Arzamon river. Photius simply records the Arzamon.

94 *Hist.* 1.1.1-4.

frequent when Photius is summarizing Byzantine histories. What examples like this demonstrate, however, is that although Photius painstakingly records the missions and names of diplomats, as well as the battles fought between Rome and her enemies, he often withholds their political and military context, as we have already seen in the case of Procopius.

Theophylact's *History* is a difficult text, not just with regard to its baroque language, but also to its factual errors, inconsistencies and chronological disorder.⁹⁵ Unlike Procopius, Theophylact was not an eyewitness to the events he narrated, and had to combine several different sources, each with their own bias and agenda. At times this leads to moments of disparity within the narrative, as Theophylact switches between his source texts.⁹⁶ Naturally, Photius preserves these idiosyncrasies,⁹⁷ and he rarely, if ever, attempts to make obvious historiographical corrections to this or any other historical work. While for primary accounts like Procopius' *Wars* this behavior holds little relevance, to secondary works like the *History* or the *Anabasis*, it preserves a dim reflection of the different sources used by their authors. In Photius' summary of the *History*, for example, a negative characterization of Roman general Comentiolus is apparent, and contrasts with positive views of generals Heraclius and Priscus. This bias is readily apparent in Theophylact's original text, and has led M. and M. Whitby to postulate an unnamed "Heraclius source" and "Priscus source", both used by Theophylact in compiling his material.⁹⁸ If this is true, the source bias has been retained in the

95 Whitby; Whitby 1986, xxv-vii.

96 As when he switches between narratives of the Persian campaigns and Balkan campaigns (3.10.1; 6.3.9; 6.6.2).

97 *Hist.* 7.15.13 and *Bib.* 65.31b.31-32a.1; *Hist.* 6.3.9 and *Bib.* 65. 30b.27-8.

98 1986, xxiii-iv. M. & M. Whitby note discrepancies in Theophylact's text when compared to Evagrius.

Bibliotheca, in which Photius makes no attempts to reconcile Theophylact's depiction of Priscus with that of Evagrius.⁹⁹

Photius' summaries of the *History*'s individual books resembles somewhat the table of contents which Theophylact had included after his dialogue, but before his proem. The table lists the significant events of each book, and most of these are mirrored in Photius' summary. It does not appear that Photius was simply copying these tables – he includes and excludes different episodes far too often – nor has any doubt been cast as to their authenticity.¹⁰⁰ Perhaps the most interesting observation is just how loosely the tables match the contents of each book. They avoid the sort of geographical and chronological information that would be found in a modern gazetteer or index, and reflect memorable political developments instead. Like Photius' summaries, the table reflects a distinctive historiographical approach – one which prefers prosopography, diplomatic accounts, and state history, and which could already be observed in Theophylact's sources, Menander and Evagrius. It is in this spirit that Photius writes two centuries later, influenced by the historical method prevalent during his lifetime. He seems to have been drawn to the more anecdotal, religious and diplomatic passages in secular works, and was certainly less interested in recording military minutia (for which Arrian shows excessive fondness). Nowhere in his summaries of Arrian, Procopius and Theophylact does Photius preserve troop dispositions or chronology, and in most cases he provides exact political and military data without its strategic context. Likewise, when geography becomes a focus, it is described in detail, however not in relation to other locations, and not in terms

99 Whom he had also read, see p. 60, n. 47.

100 Between the 2nd and 4th centuries, as the medium for literature slowly switched from the papyrus roll to the paper or parchment codex, lists of contents began guarding texts from forged interpolations and other types of interference. See Wilson; Reynolds (1968, 30).

of direction of travel. Photius focuses instead on identifying the characters¹⁰¹ in each history, transmitting his own Byzantine preferences for political development, court intrigue and administrative history. We have seen that Photius emphasizes embassies and the exploits of their ambassadors, which, although useful, may obscure details that held more relevancy to the original author of a work.

General Conclusions

It is no surprise that Photius' summaries of these three histories contain only the parts he found most interesting, and give little sense as to the form of the summarized work. In composing his summaries, he is concerned with subject material only.¹⁰² This is the case with his lengthy summary of Ctesias' *Indica*, and J. M. Bigwood observes that Photius often fails to “indicate such matters as whether information is drawn from a digression or from the main narrative, how digressions are connected with the primary description, and where they end.”¹⁰³ Although the subject matter remains accurate, it disregards literary form in favour of a “...collection of notes of material which Photius found interesting.”¹⁰⁴ Bigwood uses this conclusion to defend Ctesias' work from the criticism of scholars (and rightfully so, since Ctesias' prose exists now only through the summaries of Photius). The encyclopaedic precision of the items included in each summary, on the other hand, is somewhat astonishing. Though the *Bibliotheca* is not without errors, the texts examined in this chapter provide good examples of the kinds of

101 Many of whom play only small roles in advancing the narrative, as we have seen in his summary of Procopius' *Wars*.

102 Bigwood 1989, 311.

103 Ibid

104 Ibid, 316.

minutiae which Photius seems to have copied directly from his reading notes. The form of the *Anabasis* would be similar but for a lengthy account of the marriage at Susa and its lack of military or geographical items. In his summary of Procopius' *Wars*, we find an insensitivity to the summarized author's stylistic development, even if this is naturally a result of the number of books Photius chose to summarize. At times we are capable of identifying the different source material of the summarized work, which we can still partly see in Photius' preservation of Theophylact's treatment of campaigning generals, and of Arrian's encomiastic approach to the Alexander legend (which no doubt eliminates many Attidographers or Hellenic historians as primary sources, and suggests the use of Ptolemy, Aristoboulos, and other pro-Macedonian sources). As we have seen, Photius obviously had a preference toward civic history, one which may reflect principally Byzantine historiographical practices or perhaps his own professional experiences. Though we can never account for the omissions he makes in his summaries, we can safely say they that Photius is not apt to exclude diplomatic material, or even Christian material (though the latter would be easier to find in one of his summaries of a Byzantine historian). He often preserves information that, while useful, is removed from its strategic or political framework. He may write that a battle was fought and won by the Romans, for instance, but not how it was won or why it was fought. The same context-free approach is true for many of the diplomatic resolutions he reports, though he copies the names and figures accurately. Such are the historiographical habits of mind and literary tastes of Photius as a summarizer of historical sources, ones that we must now bring to bear on the *Events After Alexander*.

Chapter Four: The *Events After Alexander*

The title “τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον” is a designation used only by Photius for Arrian's ten books narrating the early wars between the Diadochi. In fact, we do not know if this reflects its original title, or even if the work was a complete whole or unfinished. What Photius read seems to have been a remarkably detailed account of the three years following the death of Alexander. If we compare the seven books of the *Anabasis*, which covers a period of thirteen years, to the ten books of the *Events*, it appears that Arrian either had much more material to synthesize for the history of the early successors, or treated what he did have in more detail. W. J. Goralski calls attention to this disparity, suggesting that the size of each book in the *Events* may simply have been much smaller or that the answer may be a combination of the reasons above.¹

The *Events* survives in several fragmentary forms, the largest of which is Photius' summary. In the summary, Photius also briefly summarizes the *History* of Dexippus² (fl. AD 254-278), which seems to have been largely based on Arrian's *Events*. The points which Photius summarizes from Dexippus seem to match the contents of Book 1 of the *Events*, and cover the division of the satrapies immediately following Alexander's death. A short papyrus fragment of the *Events* has also been found,³ from the late 2nd century, which Bosworth has suggested is in Arrian's own words, and which gives a description of a battle between Eumenes and Neoptolemus in 321 BC.⁴ A larger Greek “Vatican

1 1989.

2 Cod. 82.

3 PSI XII.1284.

4 1978, 227, 234.

Palimpsest”⁵ also exists which preserves fragments from Book 7 in two separate 10th-century folia. These excerpts provide details on Perdikkas' preparations for an ill-fated expedition against Ptolemy in Egypt, which occurred in the same year as Eumenes' battle with Neoptolemus. While the Vatican Palimpsest has been known since 1886, a newer palimpsest was discovered in 1977 by Jaques Noret in the university library at Göteborg.⁶ This also contained two folia preserving parts of the *Events*, likely dating from the 9th or 10th century, and has been shown to share a common origin with the Vatican Palimpsest.⁷ It seems to preserve excerpts from Book 10 of the *Events* (in any case, no earlier in the narrative than the partition at Triparadeisos in 321 BC⁸), and provides more information on how Eumenes handled his forces and diplomatic exchanges after the death of Perdikkas, his patron.

Another important historical fragment of the early wars between the successors is found in Codex Palatinus Graecus 129, a 13th century Byzantine collection of epitomes (not unlike Photius'). This 141 page text was penned by an unknown hand, but contains summaries of authors from the 6th century B.C. to the 12th century A.D., including works by Theognis, Aeschylus, Josephus, and Eustathius.⁹ Beginning on sheet 137 are four short excerpts from a lost history which follow the same narrative as Arrian's *Events*. These excerpts are now known as the “Heidelberg Epitome”, since their place of residence has been the Palatine Library of Heidelberg since the 16th century.¹⁰ Jacoby has edited the text and listed it in the *FGrHist* as number 155, and the excerpts themselves chronicle the

5 *Cod. Vatic. Graec.* 495, fol. 230/235. The best edition can be found in Roos 2002, 277-84.

6 Dreyer 1999, 40-1.

7 *Ibid.*, 44.

8 Schröder 1988.

9 Wheatley 2013, 21-2.

10 *Ibid.*, 21.

intrigues among the Diadochi from 323-316 B.C. Its significance here is that it is often used in comparison with Photius' summary of Arrian, and they are both thought to reflect Hieronymus as a main source,¹¹ though the authorship and pedigree of the Heidelberg epitome remain intractably nebulous.

At this point, a word on the chronology of the period is in order. There is as yet no consensus on the dates for the events following the death of Alexander in 323 BC to the death of Antipater in 319 BC. The problem lies with Diodorus' account, which provides the only consistent chronology for the period, but which is faulty. Diodorus typically organizes his history into campaign seasons (which lasted from Spring to Winter), but also records the eponymous archons at Athens (who held office from July to June). He often combines the two different systems to confusing effect; however, he does not mention the two archonships for 321/320 BC or 320/319 BC and incorporates all the events from these two years into a single narrative. Accordingly, some scholars have adapted a "high chronology", which places Perdiccas' death and the partition of Triparadeisos in 321 BC,¹² while others have preferred a "low chronology" that places the same events in 320 BC.¹³ This problem has less relevance here than in other historiographical studies, and I have used the "high chronology" in this study for no other reason than that it seems to appear more frequently in secondary literature.¹⁴

Arrian's Sources

11 For its influence on the Heidelberg epitome, see Wheatley 2013, 25-6.

12 Most notably Bosworth 2002; Wheatley 1998; Hauben 1977.

13 Most notably Anson 2002; Heckel 1988.

14 Bosworth 2002; 1988; Hammond 1988; Smith 1961; Briant 1973; Boiy 2007 has adopted a hybrid of the two chronologies.

Though it is not known precisely what texts Arrian used in composing the *Events*, it is generally agreed that Hieronymus of Cardia was a major source. Hieronymus was a Greek soldier and writer born some time in the mid-4th century B.C., and a fellow countryman of Eumenes of Cardia, who would become an important general among the successors to Alexander's kingdom. He would later become an administrator for Antigonus Monophthalmus, then later Demetrius, and still later Antigonus Gonatas. The Suda attributes to him only one literary work, which it identifies as “τὰ ἐπ' Ἀλεξάνδρῳ παραθέντα”¹⁵. According to a fragment from Agatharchides quoted in Pseudo-Lucian's *Macrobioi*,¹⁶ Hieronymus lived to the age of 104, which places him well within the lifetime of Pyrrhus, whose exploits presumably formed the end of his lost history. The text of the *Macrobioi* cannot itself provide conclusive evidence of Hieronymus' long life or the breadth of his work, however he is named by Plutarch as a source for the *Life of Pyrrhus*,¹⁷ and was also certainly consulted in that author's *Lives* of Eumenes and Demetrius. Although he does not name him as a source, it is also likely that Nepos used Hieronymus' text in composing his biography of Eumenes.¹⁸ Hieronymus is never mentioned by any Latin author, and his history, though cited not infrequently by Greek Hellenistic authors, seems to have diminished in popularity by the late 2nd century A.D.¹⁹ Photius had not read Hieronymus, though he must still have been known during his lifetime to have been mentioned in the Suda. It is unclear how long Hieronymus' history was, though it must have covered the years from Alexander's death to Pyrrhus' campaigns

15 I, 201 (Ἱερώνυμος).

16 *FGrHist* 154 TT2 6-8.

17 17.4.

18 Hornblower 1981, 154.

19 Asheri (2006) notes that the last authors who mention Hieronymus are Athenaeus and Lucian.

(~323-272 BC). It seems unlikely that Arrian used only this text to write his history of the Successors, which spans only 323-320 BC. He must have found Hieronymus a valuable source, however, especially concerning the exploits of Eumenes in those turbulent few years.

Many other authors must also have been available to Arrian, and of them we are aware of mainly 3rd century Attidographers. Diyllus wrote a universal history that chronicles affairs in Greece (and Athens in particular). He is named by Diodorus,²⁰ and wrote 26 books covering the period from 340-297/6 BC, beginning with the sack of Perinthus by Philip II and ending with the death of Philip IV (the son of Cassander). Diodorus also likely used Hieronymus in composing Book 18 of the *Library*, and we can see a clear example in of this in his detailed description of Alexander's funeral hearse,²¹ which Moschion of Phaselis writes Hieronymus was famous for.²² It also seems that much of Book 18 is aligned with Hieronymus' lost history. Another 3rd century Attidographer, Philochorus, wrote his history of the city in 17 books from its beginnings to 262 BC, just one year before it was besieged and captured by Antigonus Gonatas.²³ Demosthenes' nephew, Demochares, also wrote a history of Athens in a more dramatic style, which Cicero called “non tam historico quam oratorio.”²⁴ Although histories of Greece and Athens will not account for all of the material in Arrian's *Events*, it is likely that in their authors he found much information for the Lamian War, which broke out in Greece in 323, and which was of particular interest to the Athenians. N. G. L. Hammond

20 16.14.5 and 16.76.6.

21 18.28.

22 *FgrHist* 575 F2: a fragment of a larger work on Micron II of Syracuse, found in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* (5.40).

23 *FgrHist* 328.

24 *Brut.* 83.

has shown that Diyllus is a probable source for later Alexandrian historians writing on this period, and especially for Book 17 of Diodorus.²⁵ Duris of Samos also wrote a historical work which treats the years 370-281 BC. From the fragments that survive, it seems that this text could have been an important source for Arrian; however, of its 28 books, only 10-14 are presumed to have covered the period of the *Events*.²⁶ The fragments of Duris' history are also poorly understood in terms of the author's national bias, and the work is alternately called the *Macedonika* or the *Hellenica*, depending on how one interprets the surviving text. We are not even certain whether Duris was a Greek. R. B. Kebric has argued that his history was anti-Macedonian,²⁷ although the opposite view has also been argued with just as much authority (given the paucity of data on which to base our conclusions).²⁸ The well-read Plutarch apparently found Duris a poor source, and thrice censures him for unreliability.²⁹ Photius himself had read his work as well, and likewise found him an inferior writer.³⁰ In any case, Arrian would have needed more than his history to complete such a detailed narrative of 323-320 BC in ten books.

The Text

Below is a brief outline of the *Events After Alexander*, as Photius preserves it. For the entire text in Goralski's translation, see Appendix 1. Included is a rough time line corresponding to the summary's main topics of discussion.

25 1983, 74.

26 Kebric 1977, 52.

27 Ibid, 21-2, 47.

28 Pédech 1989, 347-8.

29 *Eum.* 1.2; *Alc.* 32.2; *Per.* 28.1-3.

30 Cod. 176.

Table 1 Outline of Photius' summary of Arrian's *Events After Alexander*.

Approximate year (High Chronology)	Events Recorded in <i>Bibliotheca</i> , Cod. 92
323 B.C.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Proclamation of Arrhidaeus as king following Alexander's death (he is renamed Philip III). Sedition among the troops, redistribution of royal titles and satrapies of the empire (92.69a.2-69b.15)</i> 2. <i>Roxane gives birth to Alexander IV, who is proclaimed co-ruler with Arrhidaeus. Disturbances and revolts in the empire. Leonnatus and Lysimachus killed, Ariarathes capitulates Cappadocia to Perdiccas and Eumenes. Fifth book ends (92.69b.16-33)</i> 3. <i>Demosthenes and Hyperides sentenced to death and flee Athens. Demades, their opponent, executed in Macedon by Cassander. (92.69b.34-70a.10)</i>
322 B.C.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. <i>Thibron the Lacedaemonian kills Harpalus (who had stolen the Macedonian treasury) and takes his money. He and 6000 mercenaries take part in a revolt at Cyrene. Thibron is hanged and order restored by Ptolemy. (92.70a.11-29)</i> 5. <i>Perdiccas offered both Antipater's and Olympias' daughters for marriage. Enmity arises between him and Antigonus. Cynane, a Macedonian noble, offers her daughter to Arrhidaeus. Perdiccas has the mother killed and this causes unrest among the troops. Antipater allies with Antigonus and Craterus against Perdiccas. Ptolemy steals the body of Alexander and conducts it to Egypt. (92.70a.30-70b.21)</i> 6. <i>Perdiccas chooses to marry Olympias' daughter instead of Antipater's. Antipater and Craterus march against Perdiccas, and convince Neoptolemus to join them. Eumenes supports Perdiccas, and defeats Neoptolemus in battle. Eumenes wins another battle in which both Neoptolemus and Craterus are both killed. (92.70b.22-71a.18)</i>
321 B.C.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. <i>Perdiccas marches against Ptolemy, taking with him the two kings (Arrhidaeus and Alexander). He is twice defeated and slain by his own lieutenants. Ptolemy ingratiates himself to the remaining soldiers. (92.71a.19-27)</i> 8. <i>Peithon and Arrhidaeus appointed interim commanders-in-chief. Antigonus and Antipater join the troops, and Antipater made new commander-in-chief. Eumenes and his supporters condemned as</i>

	<p><i>enemies. Discord arises among the troops, who demand money from Antipater. Antigonus and Seleucus speak on his behalf. Antipater quells the mutiny and is reinstated as commander. (92.71a.27-71b.18)</i></p> <p>9. <i>Antipater divides the empire again among the remaining generals at the Partition of Triparadeisus. Ninth book ends. (92.71b.18-72a.24)</i></p>
321/320 B.C.	<p>10. <i>Eumenes, Alcetas (Perdiccas' brother) and the ringleaders of the mutiny against Antipater, form an alliance. They are resisted by Antigonus, Antipater, and Cassander, his son. Antipater's forces again demand their pay, but the general flees to Lysimachus in Thrace. Tenth book ends. (92.72a.25-72b.39)</i></p>
	<p>11. <i>Epilogue: Photius extolls Arrian's virtues as a writer. (92.72b.40-73a.30)</i></p>

The summary begins with the proclamation of Arrhidaeus (brother of Alexander the Great) and Alexander IV (Alexander's son by the Sogdian noble, Roxane) as joint rulers following an army revolt at Babylon. The events Photius describes occurred in 323, just after Alexander's death. The same events are reported in Diodorus Siculus (18.2), Quintus Curtius Rufus (10.6.1-9.21), and in Justin's epitome of Pompeius Trogus (13.2.1-4.4). While a serious comparison of the Alexandrian biographers will not be attempted here, major differences between these narratives will be discussed in order to ascertain the particularities which may have existed in Arrian's text. A survey of the surviving fragments and the problems involved in reconciling them has already been conducted by W. J. Goralski,³¹ who provides an excellent overview of the available material, but was unfortunately not able to consult the Göteborg palimpsest.

Firstly, the style of all surviving accounts vary considerably, but main points of comparison can be found in the names of generals and administrators, their offices, and

31 1989.

the divisions of the empire's satrapies after Alexander's death. As we have seen in the previous chapter, Photius had an impeccable accuracy when recording just such details, and it would be surprising if he did not have notes before him when he recorded Arrian's version of the partition at Babylon. There is little deviation between our sources to begin with, and it would seem that whatever canon Arrian drew his history from was accurately preserved by Photius in this respect. The following table shows the reorganization of satrapies according to our surviving sources:

Table 2 First distribution of the satrapies according to our surviving sources.

Satrapy	Photius, Cod. 92 (Arrian)	Diodorus, 18.3-4	Q. Curtius, 10.10	Justin (Trogus) 13.4
<i>Egypt/Libya</i>	Ptolemy ³²	Ptolemy	Ptolemy	Ptolemy
<i>Syria</i>	Laomedon	Laomedon	Laomedon ³³	Laomedon
<i>Cilicia</i>	Philotas	Philotas	Philotas	Philotas
<i>Media</i>	Peithon	Peithon	Peithon	<u>Atropatus</u> ³⁴
<i>Cappadocia/Paphlagonia</i>	Eumenes	Eumenes	Eumenes	Eumenes
<i>Pamphylia/Lycia</i>	Antigonus	Antigonus	Antigonus	<u>Nearchus</u>
<i>Greater Phrygia</i>	Antigonus	Antigonus	Antigonus	Antigonus
<i>Caria</i>	Cassander	Cassander ³⁵	Cassander	Cassander
<i>Lydia</i>	Menander	Menander	Menander	Menander
<i>Hellespontine Phrygia</i>	Leonnatus	Leonnatus	Leonnatus	Leonnatus

32 Cleomenes to serve as deputy.

33 Also satrap of Phoenicia.

34 Trogus divides the rule between “Greater Media”, which is given to “Atropatus”, and “Lesser Media”, which is given to the “father-in-law of Perdiccas.” The latter was actually Atropates, after whom Lesser Media would become known as “Atropatene” (Strabo, 11.13.1). This is surely a mistake in either Trogus or Justin.

35 Greer's text reads “Asander”, however the manuscript reads “Κάσανδρος” (cf. Greer 1947; Goralski 1989).

<i>Thrace</i>	Lysimachus	Lysimachus	Lysimachus	Lysimachus
<i>Macedonia/ Greece</i>	Craterus/ Antipater	<u>Antipater</u>	unnamed	unnamed

A similar chart was constructed by Goralski;³⁶ however, it seems to require revision. He does not attribute Peithon's satrapy in Media to Photius, although it is mentioned.³⁷ As well, he lists “Asander” as the satrap of Caria in Photius. While he may be referring to a manuscript (which he does not mention), I can find no evidence of this in reproduced texts,³⁸ which list the satrap as “Cassander.” The table above lists only those satrapies mentioned in Photius' summary, although Diodorus, Curtius and Justin also list many more. Aside from two differences in the text of Justin's epitome, the lists are very similar. It is interesting to note as well that the order of satrapies listed are the same in both Photius and Diodorus. All of our sources list the satraps of Egypt, Syria and Cilicia first, however the order in Diodorus and Photius is identical. If this indicates a common source, it is possible that Photius was copying Arrian's words quite accurately in this instance.

Photius' summary of Dexippus also contains a brief account of the Babylon partition (see Appendix 2), and although they differ somewhat, they are in general agreement. Photius makes note of this, saying that “Καὶ τὰ ἄλλα διέξεισιν ἐν πολλοῖς, ὡς κἂν τούτοις, Ἀρριανῶ κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον σύμφωνα γράφων”³⁹ (and he expounds on many other things, about which he writes mostly in concord with Arrian) Indeed, the only major differences one can find in Dexippus' account of the partition is that he assigns complete

36 1989, p. 104.

37 92.69a.37; alternately in Roos, 2002. p. 256 (Fragm. 1A, 5).

38 Bekker 1824; Minge 1860; Roos 2002, 256

39 *Bib.* 82.64b.31-2

control of Macedonia to Antipater (this matches Diodorus' account, although Arrian has him share authority with Craterus), and records the mysterious “Ἀσανδρος” as satrap of Caria (if we are to trust Photius, Arrian writes “Κάσανδρος” instead).⁴⁰ By preserving these discrepancies between our sources, it should become clear that Photius is not simply confusing the two, and may have had reading notes before him in each case.

The titles and responsibilities assigned to the most influential of Alexander's generals following his death have been a source of confusion among scholars,⁴¹ and by comparing our existing sources to Photius' summary we can see the varying interpretations found in each author's account:

Table 3 Sources preserving the titles given to Alexander's successors following his death.

General	Photius, Cod. 92 (Arrian)	Diodorus, 18.2-4	Q. Curtius, 10.7-8	Justin (Trogus) 13.4
<i>Perdiccas</i>	χιλίαρχος	ἐπιμελητής τῆς βασιλείας	tutor filio ex Roxane futuro ⁴²	“castrorum et exercitus et rerum cura adsignatur”
<i>Antipater</i>	στρατηγός τῶν κατὰ τὴν Εὐρώπην	unclear	administer rei in Europa	“Macedoniae et Graeciae praeponitur”
<i>Craterus</i>	προστάτης τῆς Ἀρριδαίου βασιλείας	unclear	administer rei in Europa	regiae pecuniae custodia
<i>Meleager</i>	ὑπαρχος Περδίκκου	unclear	tertius dux	“castrorum et

40 There was both a general named Asander and Cassander, Antipater's son, in the empire at the time (Diod. 19.68.5 mentions that Cassander sent Asander on an expedition to Caria in 315 B.C.). Diodorus frequently cites Asander as the satrap of Caria (18.3.1,39.6; 19.62.2,75.1), and it is unlikely that there was another “Cassander” with whom we are unfamiliar or that Antipater's son would have been given a satrapy so far from Macedon. Texts which preserve “Κάσανδρος” as the satrap of Caria are likely in error.

41 See Hammond 1985.

42 A position to be shared with Leonnatus.

				exercitus et rerum cura adsignatur”
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------

Given the general disagreement among our sources, it is likely that there were varied accounts of the titles distributed to each man. This is not surprising, since unlike the division of satrapies, these titles would all change within the subsequent four years, and the records of the period are likely to have reflected the varying allegiances and unpredictable political realities of the time. It would seem, however, that Arrian's source for this information (perhaps Ptolemy or Aristobulus, his preferred historians in the *Anabasis*) differed slightly from Curtius' and Trogus' in their interpretations. The only clear difference between Arrian and Diodorus is the title given to Perdikkas, whom the latter designates “ἐπιμελητής”, or “regent.” That Photius records “χλῖαρχος” instead may not necessarily reflect an error, but rather Arrian's penchant for recording military administration. If this is true, then it should be understood that Craterus' position as “προστάτης”, or “guardian” of Arridaeus' kingdom, reflected the inarguable but as yet unaddressed power he held as the leader of 10,000 veterans bound for Macedon during Alexander's death⁴³ (the contingent was still en route at the time of the partition, and Craterus' ambiguous public designations would not have become known to him until much later).

The next section in Photius' summary (92.69b.16-33) mentions the Lamian War, for which Arrian may have found some 4th century Atthidographers helpful in compiling his material, as we have discussed above. Leosthenes, the leader of the Greeks, is

43 Arr. *Anab.* 7.12.3-4.

mentioned by name, and it is noted that Leonnatus falls in battle attempting to come to Antipater's assistance in Europe. This matches the descriptions given in Diodorus,⁴⁴ Justin,⁴⁵ and is attested to in much of the tertiary literature on this period in history.⁴⁶ The episode goes unmentioned by Curtius, whose narrative does not extend quite so far. It is in this section, too, that Photius seems to record a large error: that Lysimachus died in Thrace while warring against the tributary Odrysian king Seuthes. This is perplexing, since the event (which presumably occurred in 323, the same year as the other events in the section) is followed later by a description of Antipater fleeing to Lysimachus' protection in Thrace in 321/320 B.C.⁴⁷ It is possible that Photius was in error here, but also that he was transmitting an error found in the original text. The statement in question reads:

Καὶ Λυσίμαχος δὲ Σεύθη τῷ Θρακί πολεμῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρχῆς παραβόλως (σὺν ὀλίγοις γάρ) καὶ εὐδοκιμῶν ὅμως ἀνῆρέθη.
 And Lysimachus, recklessly warring against Seuthes over the control of Thrace (for he had fewer men), though making a good account of himself, was killed.⁴⁸

Goralski,⁴⁹ in the newest English edition of the *Events*, has translated ἀναιρέω to mean “kill” in this case, in accord with René Henry's “fut tué lui.”⁵⁰ An earlier English translation by J. H. Freese, however, simply reads “was defeated.”⁵¹ It is more likely that in this instance – much as we might prefer that Photius' summary be without such glaring mistakes – we should understand ἀναιρέω as “kill”, as Goralski and Henry suggest.

44 18.9, 15.

45 13.5.

46 Most notably, Hyperides' *Funeral Oration*, 6.1; Strabo, 9.5; Pausanias, 1.1, 25; Plut. *Dem.* 27; *Phoc.* 25.

47 92.72b.35-7.

48 92.69b.24-5

49 1989, 87.

50 1959, vol. 2, 22.

51 1920, 160.

Whether in classical, ecclesiastic or Byzantine Greek,⁵² this verb tends to have an emphasis on mortality when its object is a person. Arrian only uses the word once in his surviving texts, and even then it is used to describe the death of a conspirator against Alexander.⁵³ Photius, too, seems to use it in the same way in the *Bibliotheca*.⁵⁴ So either Photius or Arrian wrote that Lysymachus was killed. I am more inclined to think that such an oversight would be found in a summary rather than a completed text that was meant for publication (as the *Bibliotheca* was likely not, as the previous chapter has discussed); however, this is only speculation. The mistake in question may seem trivial, but it may cast doubt on data found in Codex 92 that is unattested elsewhere.

Section 3 of Photius' summary contains a narrative of the fortunes of several Athenian orators following Alexander's death. This corresponds roughly with Diodorus 18.17; however, that author does not mention Demosthenes or Hyperides, as Photius does in his summary of the *Events*. Whereas Diodorus focuses on the exile of twelve thousand Athenians who were not landholders,⁵⁵ Photius' summary instead focuses on the flight of pro-Athenian orators Hyperides and Demosthenes, and the subsequent execution of the pro-Macedonian orator Demades by Cassander.⁵⁶ Photius' account follows more closely that of Plutarch's *Lives* of Phocion and Demosthenes in this respect,⁵⁷ and it is possible that Plutarch and Arrian shared a common source for the lives of the orators. In particular, the negative opinion shown toward Demades in both Plutarch and Photius' summary of the *Events* seems to have been drawn from the same narrative, and each version preserves

52 e.g. Hdt. 4.66; Eus. 1.8.1, 15, 16; Proc. 1.5.6.

53 *Anab.* 3.26.4.

54 80.60a.7; 94.76a.24; 46.10b.40; 72.46a.7.

55 18.17.5-6.

56 92.69b.34-5, 92.70a.1-7.

57 *Phoc.* 26, 30; *Dem.* 28, 31.

a memorable anecdote found nowhere else, which records that Demades was slain for having written a letter of appeal to Perdiccas, calling Antipater an “old and rotten thread” to which the Greeks were bound.⁵⁸ The story is reminiscent of Athenian tragedy: Demades had originally gained wealth and power as a supporter of Antipater's governance over Athens, but suffers a reversal in fortune and is punished for his demagoguery. His wife and son also pay the price for his faults, and are murdered by Cassander as well. This kind of digressive storytelling is not typical in our extant texts of Arrian, and as we have seen from Chapter Three, the disproportionate amount of space Photius sets aside for this account in his summary (136 words) may not reflect its emphasis in Arrian's original text. That said, in a work of such short scope (again, covering only three years) extending over ten books, it is possible that Arrian wrote in a very different style, one that was attentive and precise, and in this case may have taken advantage of local historians (perhaps the Atthidographers mentioned above). We see another example of this in the fourth section of Photius' summary, which pays specific attention to the Cyrenean revolt and the adventures of Thibron the Lacedaemonian. This corresponds to Diodorus 18.19-21, which is much more detailed but does not disagree with the account in Photius' summary.

Sections 5 and 6 of the summary of the *Events* begin to examine Eumenes' role in the wars between the Diadochi. As political and military power begins to polarize between Perdiccas in the East and Antipater in the West, Arrian (from what we can tell in Photius' summary) seems to focus his attention on the shifting fortunes of Eumenes. This

⁵⁸ Phot. *Bib.* 92.70a4-7; Plut. *Dem.* 31.3-4; *Phoc.* 30.5-6. In the *Life* of Phocion, the letter is addressed not to Perdiccas, but to Antigonus. Briant (1973) has suggested that this was an error in Plutarch.

likely indicates a reliance on Hieronymus as a source, and it is perhaps little coincidence that the majority of Photius' summary as well as Arrian's original work seem to have centered on the Eastern campaigns involving Eumenes and Perdiccas. Photius only mentions two points at which a book of the original ends and another begins (the 5th and 9th), but from them we can tell that his summary principally followed Books 6-9 (sections 3-9 in the table above). The papyrus fragment PSI XII 1284 captures a moment in Arrian's narrative that focuses on Eumenes as he battles his enemies, and portrays him in a favourable light. As we have seen, it is believed that the fragment preserves Arrian's own account,⁵⁹ and I include Bosworth's translation of it here:

“... intending] to make their appearance have the most fearful impact upon the cavalry, they advanced in close order; and the troops behind them, those who were cavalry, began to fire javelins where the opportunity offered in order to throw back the cavalry charge by means of the continuity of their barrage. When Eumenes saw the close-locked formation of the Macedonian phalanx at its minimum extension and the men themselves heartened to venture every hazard, he sent Xennias once more, a man whose speech was Macedonian, bidding him declare that he would not fight them frontally but would follow them with his cavalry and units of light troops and bar them from provisions. As for them, even if they considered themselves altogether invincible, they would none the less neither [hold out] for long against famine ... ”⁶⁰

The fragment thus preserves an account of the first battle between Eumenes and Neoptolemus, and according to our surviving sources was a complete victory for Eumenes.⁶¹ The language itself reflects Arrian's predilection for military accounts, and Hieronymus, a soldier in Eumenes' army,⁶² doubtless furnished him with an eyewitness account of the military affairs of the time. Hieronymus' history can also be detected in

⁵⁹ See above, n. 263, also Goralski 1989, 96, n. 9.27.

⁶⁰ 1978, 228.

⁶¹ Diod. 18.29.5; Plut. *Eum.* 5.5, 7.2.

⁶² Diod. 19.44.3. Diodorus says that Hieronymus was much esteemed by Eumenes; he was likely a commander, and not a common footsoldier. Arrian also claims that Eumenes named a son Hieronymus (*Indica*, 18).

Diodorus,⁶³ and he was probably a well-used source for the early wars among Alexander's successors. Eumenes' two biographers, Plutarch and Nepos, would certainly have made use of Hieronymus' material, and they may also reflect the same source bias when mentioning Eumenes' bravery and cunning against his opponents.⁶⁴

Hieronimus was on the losing side of the First War of the Successors, and when Eumenes' army was finally defeated by Antigonus, many of his soldiers were captured or changed allegiances, Hieronymus included. Diodorus tells us that following his capture, Hieronymus enjoyed the favour of Antigonus.⁶⁵ Thus he was employed by both of the competing factions that would figure most prominently in the history he would write. Sections 6-9 of Photius' summary, whether or not they are proportionate to the original material, reflect only the events that occur in Asia. With the exception of Perdiccas' campaign against Ptolemy in Egypt (which we know Arrian had Ptolemy's history to account for), the narrative never strays far from events that Hieronymus may have witnessed or been aware of before writing his history. Sections 6-9 primarily follow the political intrigues and battles between Antipater, Perdiccas, Eumenes and Antigonus, and correspond to Diodorus 18.22-39, Justin 13.6-8, and varying sections of Plutarch's and Nepos' *Lives* of Eumenes.⁶⁶ Eumenes and Antigonus are central figures in each account, and Hieronymus' history was likely used by all of our sources, although perhaps at one or more removes. Fragments from the Vatican Palimpsest as well as the Heidelberg Epitome also preserve parallel versions of the story, and while the former contains only excerpts on Perdiccas' invasion of Egypt in 321 B.C., the latter preserves a glowing report on

63 Homblower 1982, 34 ff, 263; *FGrHist* II D 544-7.

64 Esp. Plut. *Eum.* 5-7; Nepos, *Eum.* 3-4.

65 19.44.3.

66 Plut. *Eum.* 5-8; Nep. *Eum.* 3-7.

Eumenes' loyalty and ingenuity.⁶⁷ It is generally thought that an attention to or sympathy for Eumenes in our accounts can be traced back to Hieronymus on some level,⁶⁸ however without a control text it is impossible to define source bias precisely. Hieronymus may have incorporated Perdikkas' campaigns in Egypt into his history as well, since he also seemed to admire Ptolemy more than his own patron, Antigonus.⁶⁹

Where Arrian may have diverged from Hieronymus (or, in this case, Diodorus, who accounts for most of our surviving knowledge of the period, though it is difficult to determine precisely what he digested from Hieronymus) is in his description of the Macedonian princess Cynane and her plans to marry off her daughter to Arrhidaeus. Photius' summary of the *Events* preserves details of this transaction that appear nowhere else in our sources, and Diodorus' only mention of the princess is her burial by Cassander years later (~317 B.C.).⁷⁰ Cynane, Alexander's half-sister by Philip and Eurydice, an Illyrian princess, was killed by Perdikkas and his brother Alcetas in 322 B.C. The murder so enraged Perdikkas' troops (she was, after all, of royal blood) that he was forced to fulfill her wishes posthumously, and married her daughter Adea to Arrhidaeus.⁷¹ Photius' summary also mentions that this was one of the major reasons that Antigonus, Antipater and Craterus became belligerent toward Perdikkas so soon after the death of Alexander.⁷² Related passages in our other sources for this period make no mention of this important motive,⁷³ and it is possible that Arrian was using a unique source. In any case, this is not

67 *FGrHist* 155 F3.

68 Brown 1947, 693; Hornblower 1982, 163.

69 Cf. Diodorus' glowing asides to Ptolemy (19.55.5; 19.86.2-4), and Hornblower's assessment of his relationship with Antigonus (1982, 211 ff).

70 19.52.5.

71 *Bib.* 92.70a.42-70b.10.

72 92.70b.11-16.

73 Plut. *Eum.* 8; Diod. 18.23.

the type of material Photius is likely to have added on his own, and there are no breaks in the narrative to suggest so. As an intriguing diplomatic exchange, the episode may have simply sparked his interest.

Section 9 of Photius' summary outlines the second partition of the satrapies at Triparadeisus in 321 B.C. The new organization of the empire is only detailed in Diodorus and Photius' summary of Arrian. They are both in perfect agreement, and may have used the same source (perhaps Hieronymus?). Also, with 37 satrapies to be accounted for in all, it is unlikely that either Diodorus or Photius were working from memory. The only discrepancy is found in the Heidelberg epitome, which lists the new satrap of Susania as “Antigonus”, whereas our other two sources name “Antigenes.”⁷⁴ The Heidelberg epitome, which Wheatley has suggested was written by a Byzantine epitomator who revised an earlier source (given its mixture of Byzantine and Hellenistic syntax),⁷⁵ is more likely in error. As a collection of epitomes compiled by a Byzantine scholar 500 years after Photius, it may have even used the *Bibliotheca* as a source. Section 10 of Photius' summary also deserves special mention, since its material is paralleled in the Göteborger Palimpsest. Like the material in sections 6-9, it contains details of political intrigues and rivalries between the Diadochi, and lists some troop numbers which indicate that Photius was likely working with notes.⁷⁶ Both Photius' summary and the palimpsest cover the campaign of Antigonus and Antipater against Eumenes in 321/320 B.C. Whereas the palimpsest focuses on Eumenes' victories and his plans to unite with other condemned generals,⁷⁷ Photius' summary focuses on Antipater's

74 Cf. *FGrHist* 155 F1 and *Bib.* 92.71b.28-34; Diod. 18.39.6.

75 2013, 22.

76 See ch. 1, pp. 9-10

77 *FGrHist* 182.

journey back to Macedon with Arrhidaeus and Alexander IV in tow. Photius focuses on the political intrigues between Antipater and his troops, who were without pay and mutinous.⁷⁸ Photius also mentions the hostility between Antipater and Cleopatra (Alexander III's sister), who had been on good terms with Eumenes. This information is not included in the Göteborger Palimpsest (quite possibly because of its short length), but is typical of Photius' emphasis on political and diplomatic intrigue, as we have seen in Chapter Three. There are no disagreements between the palimpsest and Photius' summary, however they focus on very different elements of Arrian's history, giving us a glimpse of what we have lost in Photius' condensed version.

Photius was clearly impressed with Arrian's work, as he mentions in Section 11 of his summary. The *Anabasis* and *Events After Alexander* still present themselves as compelling texts today, and the latter is cited often in works concerning the wars between the Successors. Its fragmentary context, however, is often ignored. Most often it is simply cited as “Arr. *Succ.*”,⁷⁹ which is misleading in light of the uniqueness of Photius' summaries. Arrian's and Photius' literary goals were very different, and as such the surviving fragments of the *Events* must be used in a manner that reflects a sensitivity for this, as well as for Photius' own interpretation of the text. For instance, one of our only surviving fragments believed to be from Arrian's original work (PSI XII 1284) relates a battle scene, which are frequent in the *Anabasis* and seemed to have been a favorite topic of Arrian's.⁸⁰ Photius summary, however, does not preserve these scenes or (more importantly) the immediate strategic importance of any battles that are mentioned in

78 *Bib.* 92.72b.29-39

79 See Roisman 2012; Heckel 2005; Anson 2014; Heckel; Tritle, 2011; Campbell; Tritle 2013; Green 2007, to name just a few recent works of reference that use this appellation for Photius' summary.

80 Most notably *Anab.* 1.12.6-1.17.2; 2.7.2-2.11; 3.11.1-3.15.4; 4.4-4.5.1; 5.8.4-5.18

passing. Instead, emphasis is placed on the leading figures in the narrative and their diplomatic exploits, as we have seen. It is impossible to infer from Photius' excerpts whether Arrian's original *Events* was as just as character-driven as its summary, especially when we compare it to the *Anabasis*, which above all follows the exploits of Alexander and no one else. Perdikkas, Antigonus, Antipater and Eumenes seem to take centre-stage in Photius' summary, and in the case of Eumenes and Antigonus this may be because it reflects the goals of Hieronymus' history at two dim removes, and not necessarily Arrian's.

What we can take away from this assessment is that caution is necessary when using Photius to fill gaps in other authors, not just because of the nature of the fragmentary evidence, but also because of the dearth of material for the events of 323-320 B.C., and the desire to search for more “grams” of evidence.⁸¹ By exercising “caution”, I mean that a reader must be aware of several things when using the *Bibliotheca* to reconstruct the events after Alexander's death: first, that Photius' summary will reflect a sensitivity for diplomatic details which may not have been a focal point in Arrian's original work; second, certain details (names, figures, etc.) found in Photius' fragment can be compared to other surviving accounts of the period, but not the general form of the work; finally, though we can deduce from the summary that Arrian used one of the same sources as our other surviving accounts (Hieronymus), there must have been many more for which we cannot account in Photius' summary. With these points in mind, we might, for instance, safely compare the titles and satrapies given to Alexander's generals in our surviving sources with Photius' summary, but not necessarily the

81 Wheatley 2013.

anecdotal evidence they provide for political motives. It also may be far-reaching to compare the sources used by Diodorus and Arrian in writing their respective histories, but we might at least use Photius' summary to corroborate sections of Hieronymus' history in Diodorus.

Photius also preserves his fragments of Arrian in a convenient form, and the casual reader of footnotes may miss the fact that some information or other did not actually come from “Arr. *Succ.*”, but a Photian fragment thereof. But such is the force of established norms in historiography; the same authors⁸² who cite the *Bibliotheca's* fragments of Arrian's *Events* in this way also cite Justin as an author and epitomator unto himself (and not simply as “Pompeius Trogus”, the author whom he epitomizes). The major difference between the two authors is that Justin made a long epitome of one work, whereas Photius summarizes hundreds; for historiographical purposes, however, both sources are used similarly in reconstructing the period following Alexander's death. In the Budé edition of Diodorus Siculus (which remains the only complete modern critical edition) as well as the Loeb Classical Library edition (the only modern English translation), Photius's summary of the *Events* is used to corroborate the partition of satrapies at Triparadeisus at 18.39.⁸³ The Budé edition refers to this text here (and indeed, throughout) as “Arrien, *Succ.*”, without mentioning its context. The Loeb edition refers to the author as Arrian as well, although it does cite it appropriately as a fragment by its *FGrHist* number. For a source as unique as the *Bibliotheca*, which does not paraphrase or synopsis predictably, and which carries with it the sophisticated literary criticism of its

82 All those mentioned in n. 339: Roisman 2012; Heckel 2005; Anson 2014; Heckel; Tritle 2014; Campbell; Tritle 2013; Green 2007.

83 Goukowsky 1978, 56; Greer 1947, 112.

author, an approach is necessary which takes into account context, and that Arrian's *Events* cannot simply be consulted as a large fragment.

Chapter Five: Conclusions

We have a relatively large number of sources for the four years following Alexander's death, and yet the period is poorly understood, suffers from a tortured and sometimes contradictory chronology, and has overall been the source of much discord in modern scholarship. This is in part because we have no definitive contemporary account from the period, but rather a collection of texts written hundreds of years later, all relying on their own source material, and at times disagreeing. An epitome of Pompeius Trogus, as well as the last book of Quintus Curtius Rufus' *History of Alexander*, preserve some material, as do some *Lives* of Plutarch and Nepos. Diodorus provides us with our most thorough account, and in his work we can see the influence of Hieronymus of Cardia, who is perhaps our best known witness to the events of this period. Ptolemy, Diyllus, Duris, and Demochares all wrote contemporary histories, but it is impossible to identify them in our surviving accounts with any certainty. It is in this confusion of material that Photius becomes an important preserver of Arrian's work dedicated to these early years of the First War of the Successors. The *Bibliotheca*, Photius' collection of summaries, is not itself perfectly understood; however, we have determined several key elements in its composition and potential treatment of Arrian's lost work.

In the second chapter, we observed that the context in which the *Bibliotheca* was written is poorly understood; however, we have seen that it was likely compiled using sources from Byzantium, and not Arab copies or material from a journey to Baghdad. An array of secular material was already available to Photius. Given the rough nature of the *Bibliotheca*, its numerous inconsistencies, and the orderless way in which it was

compiled, it was argued that Photius likely only meant it for very limited publication, if at all. Material in the preface and postscript, as well as a running discourse with Tarasius within the text, seems to suggest that its function as a correspondence is genuine. We observed that the summarized works within the *Bibliotheca* were somewhat obscure by the 9th century, and that it omits canonical Greek texts with which Byzantines were familiar. Moreover, we saw that Photius' summarized works vary widely in their composition, as shown by the different ways he treats the earliest secular historians summarized in the *Bibliotheca*. Exploration of Photius' summaries of Ctesias, Theopompus, and Agatharchides showed that a degree of literary criticism accompanies each of Photius' summaries, and he will often consciously compare some works to others, judge an author's style, and impose his own interpretations on a work.

In the third chapter, a detailed exploration of three of Photius' summaries – of Arrian's *Anabasis*, Procopius' *Wars* and Theophylact's *History* – demonstrated that we cannot rely on the summaries in the *Bibliotheca* to preserve the form or development of a work it describes. Rather, each summary seems to be a collection of the points that Photius found most memorable or interesting. All the same, despite their not representing the overall form of a work, Photius' summaries are remarkably accurate in transcribing names, figures, and other specific details. His summaries of Procopius' *Wars* and Theophylact's *History*, however, show that these facts are often divorced from their strategic importance in the narrative. Strikingly, Photius' summary of Theophylact's *History* shows that the *Bibliotheca* is capable of transmitting source bias, from which we can even trace the works consulted by a summarized author. Photius' emphasis on

diplomatic, political, and character-driven history is a general theme in all three summaries analyzed in Chapter Three, and it is likely therefore that this trend can be applied elsewhere in his summaries of secular histories.

In the fourth chapter, we first considered those excerpts from Arrian's *Events After Alexander* that survive in several fragments outside of the *Bibliotheca*, which when compared to Photius' summary, reveal that his predilection for political and diplomatic intrigue, as well as a focus on historical personalities, has guided his description of the *Events*. We saw that Photius was likely working with accurate notes when writing his summary of the *Events*, since his list of satraps and titles aligns well with other surviving accounts of the same. From the treatment of Eumenes, Antigonus and the Lamian War preserved in Photius' summary, we concluded that Arrian likely made use of Hieronymus of Cardia as well as one or more Atthidographers when compiling the *Events*. Finally, we noted how often the *Events After Alexander* is considered outside of its place in the *Bibliotheca*, without Photius being named as its summarizer and principal source.

The period immediately following the death of Alexander the Great is a uniquely complex time in ancient history, and the struggles between the generals and politicians who found that they had inherited his empire had far-reaching repercussions. Photius' *Bibliotheca* is an excellent source for fragmentary evidence of all kinds, but, like all sources for fragments, it offers both benefits and drawbacks to the modern student of Arrian and the period he covered. It should be seen as a trustworthy source for the lists of titles and satraps, and one can be sure its author had an eye to the diplomatic developments in Arrian's lost work. As for the form of the *Events*, in Photius' summary

we are missing topographical notices,¹ ethnographies,² battle scenes and many of the components that provide a text with its overall character, speeches, anecdotes and points of digression. We cannot be sure that Arrian's work exhibited these components, although we may infer it from his surviving work. Such is the nature of fragmentary texts, and here I must defer to P. A. Brunt, who has suggested that "...the chief value of "fragments" is that they enable us to perceive that the history from which they are taken is the source, or one of the sources, of a history still extant."³ But the *Bibliotheca* is not a work of history, and should be treated differently. What makes it so remarkable is that its form and contents enable us to observe a Byzantine lay scholar at work in interpreting many classical works, some surviving and others not. The *Events After Alexander* is a text that, were it still surviving, would certainly look quite different from Photius' summary, but in its absence we must always recollect the degree to which our view of late 4th century history depends upon the confidence we place in Photius' interpretations.

1 A favorite of Arrian's in the *Anabasis* (3.28.5-7; 6.22.4-8; 5.4-5.6; 4.28.3).

2 *Anab.* 5.1.1-2; also see Bosworth 1977.

3 1980, 486.

Appendix 1:
Photius' Summary of Arrian's *Events After Alexander*

To my knowledge, the text of Photius' summary (codex 92) has already been translated into English four times: first by John Rooke in 1814, as an addendum to Arrian's *Anabasis*, then by J. H. Freese in his incomplete edition of the *Bibliotheca*, published in 1920, then again in a selection of Photius' work by Nigel Wilson in 1994, and finally by Walter Goralski in a 1989 article outlining selected fragments of the *Events* (see bibliography, pp. 114-18). I have included Goralski's text here, which I view as superior. The following is from his work, "Arrian's 'Events After Alexander': summary of Photius and selected fragments." *Ancient World*. 19. pp. 84-91, 96-100:

Also by him is the "Events After Alexander" in ten books, in which he covers the revolt of the army and the proclamation of both Arrhidaeus (who was the son of Philine of Thessaly and Philip, the father of Alexander) and Alexander (the proper heir begotten by Alexander from Roxane), who was to be also made king when he saw the light of day, which is what happened. Arrhidaeus was proclaimed king and his name was changed to Philip.

Discord arose between the infantry and the cavalry. The most eminent of the cavalry and leaders were Perdikkas the son of Orontes, Leonnatus the son of Anthous, and Ptolemy the son of Lagus. The ones after them were Lysimachus the son of Agathocles, Aristonous the son of Peisaeus, Pithon the son of Craterus, Seleucus the son of Antiochus, and Eumenes of Cardia. These were the leaders of the cavalry; Meleager led the infantry. They sent many embassies to each other, and in the end both the infantry who had proclaimed the king and the leaders of the cavalry made an agreement, which decreed that Antipater should be general throughout Europe, Craterus protector of the kingdom of Arrhidaeus, Perdikkas to command the chiliarch which Hephaestus had originally held (it entrusted him with the entire kingdom), and Meleager lieutenant of Perdikkas.

Perdikkas purified the army as a pretext to arrest the foremost of the leaders of the revolt, and, as if by order of Arrhidaeus himself, put them to death in his presence. This terrified the rest of the army. He also killed Meleager not much later. For this he was suspected by all and was himself suspicious. Nevertheless, he proclaimed for the satrapies those who were suspected, as if under the orders of Arrhidaeus. And so Ptolemy the son of Lagus was appointed to rule Egypt, Libya, and the parts of Arabia close to Egypt; Cleomenes, who had been assigned to rule

this satrapy by Alexander, was to be lieutenant of Ptolemy. Also, Syria next to Egypt to Laomedon, Cilicia to Philotas and Media to Pithon; to Eumenes of Cardia Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and the land along the Euxine Sea as far as the Greek city of Trapezus, a colony of Sinope. Pamphylia, Lycia, and Greater Phrygia to Antigonus. Asander¹ to Caria, Menander to Lydia. He also decreed Hellespontine Phrygia to Leonnatus, which Calas had been named to hold by Alexander, and then had been entrusted to Demarchus. In this matter were the provinces of Asia divided.

As for the European: Thrace, the Chersonese, and the peoples neighboring Thrace as far as the sea at Salmydessus on the Euxine were entrusted to the rule of Lysimachus. The farther part of Thrace, as far as the Illyrians, Triballians, Agrianes, Macedonia itself, Epirus as far as the Keraunian Mountains, and all of the Greeks were distributed to Craterus and Antipater.

This was the division. Also, many of those remaining were not given out, continuing under their native rulers, who had been appointed by Alexander.

During all this Roxane was pregnant and then gave birth, and the troops proclaimed the infant king. After the death of Alexander, revolts were everywhere. Antipater entered into a war against the Athenians and the other Greeks; Leosthenes was their commander. At first he was defeated and in danger of being encircled, but they were finally subdued. But Leonnatus had fallen coming to bring aid to Antipater. Lysimachus rashly went to war with Seuthes over the rule of Thrace (and with fewer troops) and was killed.

Perdiccas also entered into a war with Ariarathes of Cappadocia because he would not give up the rule to Eumenes, the appointed ruler. He won two battles, seized him, crucified him, and re-established Eumenes as ruler. Craterus, fighting with Antipater against the Greeks, was the cause of victory over them. From this point on, all of them unhesitatingly carried out whatever Craterus and Antipater commanded them to do. And this is up to the Fifth Book.

In the Sixth he related how Demosthenes and Hyperides fled from Athens with Aristonikos of Marathon and Himeraios (the brother of Demetrius of Phalerum) going at first to Aegina. While there, the Athenian people passed a death sentence brought forward by Demades, and Antipater carried out the decree.

Also how Archias of Thouroi, who put them to death, passed the rest of his life in extreme poverty and disgrace. Also how Demades soon after this was sent off to Macedon under Cassander and had his throat slit, after Cassander had first killed his son in his arms, all because Cassander found out that he had insulted his father when he wrote to Perdiccas to save the Greeks who were hanging from a rotten and ancient thread. (He mocked Antipater in this way.) Dinarchos the Corinthian was his accuser. But at least Demades received his just reward for his bribe-taking and treason and constant distrust.

He also related how Thibron the Lacedaemonian killed Harpalus, who during the life-time of Alexander had stolen his money and fled to Athens. What remained of the money he took first to Cydonia in Crete, then he crossed to Cyrene with an army of fully six thousand men. He was called in by the exiles of Cyrene

¹ The text actually reads "Cassander" here (see p. 90)

and Barca. After many battles and ambushes, sometimes winning, sometimes losing, in the end fleeing, he was brought in by Libyan horse-herders and taken before Epicydes of Olynthus at Teucheira, which is the city that Ophellas (a Macedonian) had saved when he was sent out to the aid of Cyrene by Ptolemy son of Lagus. The people of Teucheira, with the permission of Ophellas, tortured Thibron and sent him to the port of Cyrene to be hung up. As the revolt around Cyrene continued, Ptolemy intervened and overpowered everyone, then sailed back home.

Perdiccas conspired to summon Antigonus before a tribunal. He detected the plot and did not obey, and so they developed a mutual hatred. At this time, Iollas and Archias came to Perdiccas from Macedon, bringing Nicaea the daughter of Antipater to marry him. But Olympias (the mother of Alexander) sent for him the same purpose her daughter Cleopatra. Eumenes of Cardia advised him to take Cleopatra, but his brother Alcetas exerted his influence in favour of Nicaea. Alcetas was more successful, so Nicaea was chosen. Not much later the murder of Cynane occurred, killed by Perdiccas and his brother Alcetas. Cynane had Philip for a father, who was also Alexander's (but her mother was Eurydice) and she was wife of Amyntas, who was put to death by Alexander when he crossed to Asia. He was a son of Perdiccas (the Perdiccas who was the brother of Philip), so the Amyntas who was assassinated was the cousin of Alexander. Cynane brought her daughter Adea (who later changed her name to Eurydice) for Arrhidaeus to marry. This happened later through the intervention of Perdiccas, which ended the revolt of the Macedonians who were inflamed by the great injustice of the death of Cynane. Antigonus fled to Antipater and Craterus in Macedon and told them about the conspiracy which Perdiccas had planned, and how he intended to do the same to all the others, and he also played up the murder of Cynane in an exaggerated manner. This disposed them to make war against him because of this.

Also, Arrhidaeus, who was in charge of the body of Alexander, according to the plan, took it from Perdiccas so that Ptolemy son of Lagus could have it: from Babylon through Damascus on to Egypt it was carried. In spite of much opposition from Polemon (an associate of Perdiccas) he nevertheless succeeded in carrying out the intended plan.

Meanwhile, Eumenes brought gifts from Perdiccas to Cleopatra at Sardis, indicating that Perdiccas might send Nicaea away and marry her instead. On this being revealed (by Menander the satrap of Lydia) and reaching Antigonus and through him the entourage of Antipater and Craterus, they prepared for war all the more against Perdiccas.

Perdiccas arrived in Egypt from Damascus with the kings and his forces to make war on Ptolemy. He accused Ptolemy, who refuted the charges before the troops, and these were deemed to be brought against him unfairly (even now the troops did not want war). Twice beaten and turning out to be extremely harsh toward the sympathizers of Ptolemy and, moreover, acting excessively arrogant for a leader of the army, he was killed by his companion cavalry during a battle. After the killing of Perdiccas, Ptolemy crossed the Nile to the kings and showed kindness

with gifts and other solicitations to not only the troops but many of the uninvolved Macedonians. He also grieved with the friends of Perdiccas and dispelled zealously the fears of those as yet remaining in danger from the Macedonians. Arrian says such action brought him great renown both immediately and also in the future.

A council met to choose rulers with supreme power in place of Perdiccas: Pithon and Arrhidaeus in due course were proclaimed. Also, they condemned fifty of the followers of Eumenes and Alcetas, especially for the killing of Craterus during this civil war of the Macedonians. They recalled both Antigonus from Cyprus and Antipater as well, to come in haste to the kings.

As they had not yet arrived, Eurydice claimed that Pithon and Arrhidaeus could do nothing legally without her. They did not denounce her at first, but then they spoke against her arrangement, not wanting her to share in the affairs of the state. Therefore, until Antigonus and Antipater were present, everything was up to them. On their arrival, the power was delivered to Antipater. The army asked him for the pay promised to them by Alexander, and Antipater answered quite frankly: although having nothing at the moment, he would examine the Royal Treasury and whatever was stored anywhere else, and then do his best not to deserve their reproaches. The army listened to him grudgingly. Eurydice joined in the slanders against Antipater with the troublemakers among the troops and a revolt broke out. Eurydice made a public speech against him, Asclepiodorus the secretary rendering the service of supplying the text, and Attalus as well. Antigonus and Seleucus, at the request of Antipater, made a speech to the troops defending him and saving him from having his throat slit with great effort, nearly endangering themselves by this. Escaping death, Antipater withdrew to his own camp. And the hipparchs of Antipater came when summoned, and after bringing to an end with great effort the revolt, they chose Antipater again, as before, to rule.

And he carried out another distribution of Asia himself, confirming some of the former distributions, changing some when he felt it proper. Egypt and Libya and farther beyond, and also together with whatever would be conquered to the west, went to Ptolemy. Laomedon of Mytilene was entrusted with Syria. Philoxenus he appointed to Cilicia, who had it previously. Of the upper satrapies, Mesopotamia and Arbelitis he gave to Amphilochus the brother of the king. On Seleucus he bestowed Babylon. To Antigenes, the first attacker of Perdiccas and commander of the Macedonian Silver Shields, he granted the rule of the whole of Susiana. Peucestas he confirmed in Persia. He gave Carmania to Tlepolemus. Media as far as the Caspian was for Pithon. To Philip the Parthian lands. Areia and Drangiene he assigned to Stasander as governor. Bactria and Sogdiane to Stasanor of Soli. Arachosia to Sibyrtius, and Parapamisadae to Oxyartes father of Roxane. In India, the lands bordering on Parapamisadae were granted to Pithon son of Agenor. Of the adjacent satrapies, the one along the Indus River and Patala, greatest of the Indian cities there, he granted to King Porus, and the one along the Hydaspes River to Taxiles, another Indian, since it would not be easy to remove them because Alexander turned the rule over to them and they had considerable forces. In the lands stretching to the north beyond the Taurus Mountains: Cappadocia was

entrusted to Nicanor. For Greater Phrygia and for Lyconia and also for Pamphylia and Lycia, as before, Antigonus. Caria he assigned to Asander. Lydia he gave to Cleitus. Also, Hellespontine Phrygia to Arrhidaeus. He appointed Antigenes to bring down the money in Susa, and he handed over to him three thousand of the most rebellious Macedonians. For bodyguards of the king he appointed Autodicusson of Agathocles, Amyntas son of Alexander and brother of Peucestas, Ptolemy son of Ptolemy, and Alexander son of Polyperchon. He made his own son Cassander chiliarch of the cavalry. He decreed Antigonus to be entrusted with command of the forces previously under Perdiccas. He also assigned to him the guardianship and protection of the kings, and, at his own request, the completion of the war against Eumenes. Antipater himself, greatly applauded by all on account of all this, returned to his homeland.

The tenth relates how Eumenes, learning about Perdiccas and because he had been declared an enemy of Macedon, prepared for war. Also how Alcetas brother of Perdiccas fled because of this. Also Attalus, shortly after the failed revolt against Antipater, fled as well to join up with the fugitives. Attalus raised an army of ten thousand infantry and eight hundred cavalry, and he and his followers attempted attacks on Cnidus, Caunus, and Rhodes, but were beaten off by the stronger Rhodians (Demaratus commanded their fleet).

He relates how Eumenes nearly came to blows with Antipater, who was going to Sardis. Cleopatra the sister of Alexander, in order not to be falsely accused by the Macedonian troops of urging them into war, advised and persuaded Eumenes to retire from Sardis. Nevertheless, on the arrival of Antipater, he reproached her from her friendliness to Eumenes and Perdiccas. She defended herself in regard to this much better than typical woman [sic], and she gave her side against many other complaints. In the end they parted at peace with each other. Because Eumenes had raided those not recognizing his authority and had seized much plunder and money, he distributed the wealth to his army. He sent ambassadors to Alcetas and those with him to try to unite their forces and thus fight against their common enemy. His advisors had many differing opinions, and in the end he was not persuaded.

Antipater sent Asander to make war against Attalus and Alcetas because he did not dare make war on Eumenes up to this point. The battle was indecisive, but then Asander was vanquished.

Cassander had a disagreement with Antigonus, but his father Antipater suppressed it. Nevertheless, Cassander, on meeting his father in Phrygia, persuaded him not ever to part with the kings and to be suspicious of Antigonus. The latter allayed the suspicions as much as possible by his moderation, his goodness, and other fine services. And Antipater, having been convinced, entrusted to him from the forces that had crossed over to Asia eighty-five hundred infantry, the same number of allied cavalry, and half of all the elephants, seventy in number, in order that the war against Eumenes could be brought to an end more easily. And Antigonus began the war, Antipater taking the kings and the rest of the army and going with the intention of crossing to Macedon. But the army rebelled again because of the money. Antipater promised to pay them all he could when he came

to Abydos; as for the bonus, if not this too, at least the greater part. And by these hopes they were rallied to him, and undisturbed by further revolts hereafter he came up to Abydos. There, having misled them by a ruse, he crossed over the Hellespont by night together with the kings to join Lysimachus. The next day, they crossed over themselves, letting rest for the moment the matter of their demands for money. With this the Tenth book ends.

Goralski does not include the last paragraph of Photius' summary in his article, since it does not deal with the historiographical concerns of his article. I have included my own translation below:

The author is second to none of the best writers of history. He is quite skilled in forming a concise account, and never breaks the continuity of his history with ill-timed digressions not befitting the text. He is novel in the organization of his words, rather than in his speech, and in this way his story could not be set forth with more clarity or brilliance. His manner is intelligible, euphonious, and well-rounded, and he mixes smoothness with a sense of importance. He does not attempt overreaching innovations in his writing, but rather uses expressive novelties that are easy to understand, such as figures of speech, and does not simply change the usual use of a word. And he draws together a clarity not only in this way, but also in the construction, order and array of the story. This is the art of clear knowledge. For amateurs tend to use straightforward sentences, which, if not pointed out, allows their work to reduce to flatness and meanness, and it becomes quite simple. But our author does not allow this. He also uses ellipses in this manner: he does to ellipse whole sentences, but rather just words, so that one is not aware the ellipsis is even there. And if someone were to try to fill it in, it would seem to stretch out the idea to the point of redundancy, and would not really restore what was missing. His variety of rhetorical forms is outstanding. They are not thrown about in clusters, eschewing traditional usage, but rather woven into his narrative gently but with authority. Thus they do not annoy with tedium, or become incessant by being thrown into confusion. Frankly, if someone were to be referred to Arrian's historical works, they would find that many of the old authors come up short in comparison.

Appendix 2: Photius' Summary of Dexippus' *History*

Codex 82 of the *Bibliotheca* has been translated into English in no publication that I am aware of other than Freese's unfinished edition of the *Bibliotheca* (1920). There are a few inconsistencies in his version (see notes below), and his English, while exquisite, is somewhat archaic. thus I have provided a new translation of the short passage here.

Read Dexippus' *Events After Alexander*² in four books. Read also his abridged *History*,³ which reaches up to the affairs of the emperor Claudius. Read also his *Scythia*, in which the war between the Romans and the Scythians is recorded, as well as other notable events. His expression is without superfluity, delighting in both dignity and quality. One might say that he is another Thucydides, and he shares that author's clarity. This is best represented in his history concerning the Scythians.

He begins his *Events After Alexander* after the death of the king, and describes how Macedonian empire went to Arrhidaeus, Alexander's brother, who was the son of Philip by Philine of Larissa. The kingship went to him but also to Alexander's son, who was about to be born by Roxane (who had been left carrying the child in her womb),⁴ and to Perdiccas, whom the Macedonians chose to manage the empire.

The author also describes how Alexander's empire was apportioned. Asia was divided like this: Ptolemy son of Lagus gained possession of Egypt, Libya, and the lands adjacent to Egypt. Cleomenes, who had been made satrap of these possessions by Alexander, became Ptolemy's lieutenant. Laomedon the Mytilenean was given Syria to administer; Philotas Cilicia; Peithon Media; Eumenes Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, and the territories on the Black Sea as far as Trapezus; Antigonus Pamphylia and Cilicia as far as Phrygia; Asander Caria, Menander Lydia, and Leonnatus Hellespontine Phrygia.

Thus was Asia divided, and Europe like this: Lysimachus was given Thrace and the Chersonese; Antipater all of Macedonia, Greece, Illyria, Triballia, Agriana, and as much of the mainland for which he had appointed Alexander's chief general. The general supervision and care of the empire was handed over to

2 Freese (p. 148) calls this work the *History* (as it is usually known), although Photius only calls it “τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον”, as he does Arrian's summarized work.

3 Freese calls this the *Historical Epitome* (p. 148), although I call it the *History* here to distinguish it from Dexippus' *Events*.

4 Freese has “The yet unborn child of Roxana by Alexander, should it be a son, was to be associated with him in the government” (p. 149). This is not quite consistent with the original, which assumes the reader already knew that Alexander IV would be born a male: “εἰς αὐτόν τε καὶ εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα Ἀλεξάνδρου παῖδα τίκεσθαι ἐκ Ῥωξάνης (ἐν γαστρὶ γὰρ ἔχουσα κατελείπειτο)”

Craterus, which was the highest of honours among the Macedonians. Perdicas was given the title “chiliarch”, previously Hephaestion's.⁵

Poros and Taxiles were given all the governorships of India. Poros received all the lands between the Indus and Hydaspes rivers, while Taxiles received the remainder. Peithon was given dominion over the adjacent territory, except that of the Paramisadae. Control of the regions situated near the Caucasus Mountains bordering India were given to Oxyartes the Bactrian, who was the father of Roxane. After the Alexander's death, she bore him a son, whom the Macedonians also called Alexander, after his father. Sibyrtius became governor of Arachosia and Gedrosia; Stasanor the Solian governed Areia and Drangia; Philip ruled Sogdiana; Rhadaphernous Hyrcania; Neoptolemus Carmania; Peucastas was assigned Persia. Oropius held the kingship in Sogdiana, not by lineage but because it was a gift from Alexander. When the fate befell him that he was blamed for an insurrection and threatened with the loss of his kingdom, he became co-ruler with Philip. Seleucus became governor of Babylon and the land between the Tigris and Euphrates, while Archilaos became governor of Mesopotamia. This was the number of provinces and governorships which Perdicas distributed after the death of Alexander. The author writes in accord with Arrian in most things.

5 Freese's translation reads: “The general charge of affairs and the defence of the kingdom was entrusted to Craterus; Perdicas obtained the chiliarchy of Hephaestion, the highest dignity amongst the Macedonians”, however in their editions of the Greek, both Bekker (1824) and Roos (2002) take “Τὴν δὲ κηδεμονίαν καὶ ὄση προστασία τῆς βασιλείας, Κρατερὸς ἐπετρόπη, ὃ δὴ πρῶτιστον τιμῆς τέλος παρὰ Μακεδόσι.” to be a separate idea from “Περδίκκας δὲ τὴν Ἡφαιστίωνος χιλιάρχον.”

Bibliography

- Ahrweiler, H. 1965. "Sur la carrière de Photius avant son patriarcat." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*. 58. 348-363.
- Anson, E. M. 2014. *Alexander's Heirs: The Age of the Successors*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- . 2002. "The Dating of Perdiccas' Death and the Assembly at Triparadeisus." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 43. 373-90.
- Asheri, D. 2006. "Hieronymus of Cardia." in *Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greece*. ed. N. G. Wilson, 360. Oxford: Psychology Press.
- Astruc, Conus-Wolska, Gouillard, Lemerle, Papachryssanthou and Paramelle. 1970. "Les sources grecques pour l'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure." *Travaux et Memoires*. 4. 99-183.
- Baker, A. 1988. "Eunapius' Νέα ἔκδοσις and Photius." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 29:4. 389-402.
- Baldwin, B. 1994. "Photius in English : the Reviewer Reviewed." *Classical Views*. 38. 373-391.
- Bekker, I., ed. 1838. *Theophanes Continuatus*. Bonn: E. Weber.
- ., ed. 1824. *Bibliotheca*., Vols. 1-2. Berlin.
- Bigwood, J. 1993. "Aristotle and the Elephant Again" *The American Journal of Philology*. 114:4. 537-555.
- . 1993 "Ctesias' Parrot," *The Classical Quarterly*. New Series. 43. 321-327.
- . 1989. "Ctesias' "Indica" and Photius." *Phoenix* 43:4 302-316.
- . 1983. "The Ancient Accounts of the Battle of Cunaxa." *The American Journal of Philology*. 104:4. 340-357.
- . 1978. "Ctesias as Historian of the Persian Wars." *Phoenix*. 32. 19-41.
- Blockley, R.C. 1985. *The History of Menander the Guardsman*. Francis Cairns: Liverpool.
- Boiy. 2007. *Between High and Low. A Chronology of the Early Hellenistic Period*. Oikumene Studien zur antiken Weltgeschichte, Bd. 5. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Antike.
- Bompaire, J. 1981. "Photius et la seconde Sophistique d'après la Bibliothèque." *Travaux et memoires du Centre de recherches d'hist. et civil. Byzantines*. 8. 79-86.
- Bosworth, B. A. 2002. *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda Under the Successors*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . 1988. *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in Historical Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- . 1978. "Eumenes, Neoptolemus and PSI XII 1284." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 19:3. 227-237.
- . 1977. "Arrian and the Alani." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. 81. 217-55.
- Bouquet, A. C. 1935. "The References to Josephus in the Bibliotheca of Photius." *Journal of Theological Studies* 36:143. 289-293.
- Briant, P. 1973. *Antigone le Borgne*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Brodka, D. 2004. *Die Geschichtsphilosophie in der spätantiken Historiographie*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Brown, T. S., 1947. "Hieronymus of Cardia." *The American Historical Review*. 52:4. 684-96.
- Browning, R. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Brunt, P. A. 1980. "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes." *The Classical Quarterly*. 30:2. 477-94.
- Campbell, B.; Tritle, L. A. 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Warfare in the Classical World*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Canfora, L. 1998. "Le "cercle des lecteurs" autour de Photius: une source contemporaine." *Revue des études byzantines*. 56. 269-73.
- Christ, M. 1993. "Theopompus and Herodotus: A Reassessment." *The Classical Quarterly*. Vol. 43:1 47-52.
- Condit, L. 1937. "Bibliography in its Prenatal Existence." *The Library Quarterly*. 7:1/4. 564-576.
- Conley, T. 1990. "Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in Byzantium." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*. 8:1 29-44.
- Connor, W. 1967. "History without Heroes: Theopompus' Treatment of Philip of Macedon." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 8. 133-154.
- Diller, A. 1962. "Photius' Bibliotheca in Byzantine Literature." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. 16. 389-396.
- Dreyer, B. 1999. "Zum ersten Diodochenkrieg: der Göteborger Arrian-Palimpsest (ms Graec 1)." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*. 125. 39-60.
- Duffy, J. 1980. "Philologica Byzantina." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 21:3. 261-268.
- Dvornik, F. 1970. *The Photian Schism: History and Legend*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Edelstein, L. 1967. *The idea of progress in classical antiquity*, John Hopkins Press: Baltimore.
- Evans, J. A. 1972. *Procopius*. Twayne Publishers, Inc : New York.

- Flower, M. 1994. *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B. C.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fortescue, A. 2001. *The Orthodox Eastern Church.* Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press.
- Freese, J. H. 1920. trans. *Library of Photius.* London: Bibliolife.
- Frendo, J. D. 1988. "History and Panegyric in the Age of Heraclius." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers.* 42. 143-56.
- Gillett, A. 2003. *Envoys and Political Communication in the Late Antique West, 411–533.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Goossens, G. 1951. "Le sommaire des Persica de Ctésias par Photius." *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire.* 28:2. 513-521.
- Goralski, W. J. 1989. "Arrian's 'Events After Alexander': summary of Photius and Selected Fragments." *Ancient World.* 19. 81-108.
- Goukowsky, P. 1978. *Diodore de Sicile: Bibliothèque Historique, Livre XVIII.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Greatrex, G. 1998. *Rome and Persia at War.* ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 37 : Leeds.
- Green, P. 2007. *The Hellenistic Age: A Short History.* New York: The Modern Library.
- Greer, R. M. 1947. ed. trs. *Diodorus Siculus: Library of History, Vol. 9.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Grumel, V. 1960. "Une nouvelle édition de la bibliothèque de Photius." *Revue des Études Byzantines.* 18. 214-224.
- Hägg, T. 1999. "Photius as a Reader of Hagiography: Selection and Criticism." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers.* 53. 43-58.
- . 1975. *Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur: Untersuchungen zur Technik des Referierens und Exzerpieren in der Bibliothek.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Halkin, F. 1963. "La Date de composition de la Bibliothèque remise en question." *Analecta Bollandiana.* 81. 414-417.
- Hammond, 1985. "Some Macedonian Offices." *Journal of Hellenic Studies.* 105. 156-60.
- . 1983. *Three Historians of Alexander the Great.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Hauben, H. 1977. "The First war of the Successors (321 B.C.): Chronological and Historical Problems." *Ancient Society.* 8. 85-120.
- Heckel, W; Tritle, L. A. 2011. *Alexander the Great: A New History.* Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heckel, W. 2005. *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire.* London: Routledge.
- . 1988. "The last Days and Testament of Alexander the Great." *Historia Einzelschriften.* 56. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

- Henry, R. 1959. trans. *Photius Bibliotheca*. 8 Vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Herrin, J. 2009. *Byzantium: The Surprising Life of a Medieval Empire*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Hornblower, J. 1981. *Eumenes of Cardia*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Hunger, H. 1978. *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*. I Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Ives, S. A. 1951. "Photius of Constantinople, the First Book-reviewer." *The Library Quarterly*. 21:4. 285-289.
- Jacoby, F. 1962. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Leiden: Brill.
- Jokisch, B. 2007. *Islamic Imperial Law: Harun-al-Rashid's Codification Project*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kaldellis, A. 2004. *Procopius*. Pennsylvania : University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kebric, R. B., 1977. *In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Kustas, G. 1960. "The Literary Criticism of Photius: a Christian Definition of Style." *Hellenika*. 17. 132-69.
- Lee, A. D. 1993. *Information and Frontiers: Roman Foreign Relations in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Lemerle, P. 1971. *Le Premier Humanisme Byzantine: Notes sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au X^e siècle*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Liddell, H.; Scott, R.; Jones, H. 1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mango, C and Scott, R. 1997. *The Chronicle of Theophanes*. Oxford UP: Oxford.
- Mango, C. 1980. *Byzantium, The Empire of New Rome*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- . 1975. "The Availability of Books in the Byzantine Empire, A. D. 750-850." In *Byzantine Books and Bookmen*, eds. Cyril Mango and Ihor Ševčenko. 29-45. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies.
- Maraglino, V. 2007. "Reconsidering the Date of Photius' Bibliotheca: the Biographical tradition of Gregory the Great in chapter 252." *Ancient Society*. 37. 265-278.
- Marcovich, M. 1973. "Photius on Ctesias." *Rheinisches Museum*. 116. 358
- Martini, E. 1911. *Textgeschichte der Bibliothek des Patriarchen Photios von Konstantinopel: I Die Handschriften, Ausgaben und Übertragungen*. Leipzig: Teubner).

- Maas, M. 2005. "Roman Questions, Byzantine Answers: Contours of the Age of Justinian." in Maas, M. ed, *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge University Press : Cambridge.
- Minge, J. P. 1860. *Patrologia Graecae*. Vols. 101-105, 117. Paris: Imprimerie Catholique.
- Markopoulos, K. 1987, "Νέα στοιχεία για τη χρονολόγηση της "Βιβλιοθήκης" του Φωτίου ." *Symmetika*. 7. 165-81.
- Orth, E. 1928. *Photiana*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- . 1929. *Die Stilkritik des Photios*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Pédech, P., 1989. *Trois historiens méconnus : Théopompe-Duris-Phylarque*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Perrin, B. 1919. *Plutarch's Lives*. Vol. 7. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Robson, E. I. 1961. *Arrian, History of Alexander and Indica*. Vols. 1-2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Roisman, J. 2012. *Alexander's Veterans and the Early Wars of the Successors*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Roos, A. G. (ed.), 2002. *Arriani Scripta Minora*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Treadgold, W. T. 2002. "Photius before his Patriarchate." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. 53:1. 1-17.
- . 1988. *The Byzantine Revival, 780-842*. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- . 1980. *The nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks center for Byzantine Studies.
- . 1980. "The Recently Completed Edition of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius." *Byzantinoslavica*. 41. 50-61.
- . 1978. "Photius on the Transmission of Texts (*Bibliotheca*, Codex 187)." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 19:2. 171-175.
- . 1977. "The preface of the "Bibliotheca" of Photius: Text, Translation, and Commentary." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*. 31. 343-349 .
- Sarris, P. 2007. *Procopius, Secret History*. Penguin Books : London.
- Schröder, S. 1988. "Zum Göteborger Arrian-Palimpsest." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 71. 75–90.
- Sélincourt, A. 1958. trans. *The Campaigns of Alexander*. London: Penguin Books.
- Severyns, A. 1938. *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclo*s. 4 Vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Shrimpton, G. 1991. *Theopompus the Historian*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP.

- Smith, L. C., 1961. "The Chronology of Books XVIII-XX of Diodorus Siculus." *American Journal of Philology*. 82. 283-90.
- Stadter, P.A. 1980. *Arrian of Nicomedia*. North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.
- Wheatley, P. 2013. "The Heidelberg epitome: a Neglected Diadoch Source." In *After Alexander: The Time of the Diadochi (323-281 BC)*, eds. Victor Tronosco and Edward M. Anson . 17-29. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- . 1998. "The Chronology of the Third Diadoch War: 315-311 B.C." *Phoenix*. 52. 257-81.
- Whitby, M. 2000. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. Liverpool UP : Liverpool.
- Whitby, M. & Whitby, M. 1986. eds. trns. *The History of Theophylact of Simocatta*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wilson, N.G.; Reynolds, L.D. 1968. *Scribes and Scholars*. London: Oxford UP.
- Wilson, N. G. 1994. trans. *The Bibliotheca : a selection*. London: Duckworth.
- . 1968. "The Composition of Photius' Bibliotheca." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 9:4. 451-455.
- Woelk, D. 1966. *Agatharchides von Knidos: Über das Rote Meer*. Inaug. Diss. Freiburg im Breisgau. Bamberg.
- van Herwerden, H.1889. "Varia ad Varios. IV. Ad Theophylacti Simocattae Historias." *Mnemosyne*. 17. 24-43.
- Van Hook, L. 1909. "The literary criticism in the Bibliotheca of Photius." *Classical Philology*. 4:2. 178-189.
- Ziegler, K. 1941. "Photios." In *Paulys Realencyclopaedie Der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus, eds. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagbuchhandlung.