



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Chronology of Theophylaktos Simokatta

Author(s): John B. Bury

Source: *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 3, No. 10 (Apr., 1888), pp. 310-315

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/546366>

Accessed: 16/10/2008 07:54

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=oup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The English Historical Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

pretiosa in conspectu eius morte IIII. idus martias⁵² expectat feliciter in ecclesia sancti Petri, cuius sedit episcopatum annos XIII, menses VI, dies X, ante eius offitii secretarium sepultus corpore⁵³ dormit in pace. A quo est resuscitandus in gloriam. Cuius corporis et sanguinis secreta nobis initiavit sacramenta, qui solus remotis omnibus hostiis carnalibus tollit immolatus omnium peccata, cum quibus omnibus in unitate deitatis sue semper est regnaturus in secula seculorum amen.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THEOPHYLAKTOS SIMOKATTA.

THE text of M. de Boor's new edition of Theophylaktos¹ is based on a Vatican manuscript (977) of the eleventh or twelfth century, which also contains the Breviarium of Nikêphoros, edited in 1880 by the same scholar. The value of M. de Boor's work may be estimated by the fact that Pontanus had used for his text only one late Munich manuscript. The requirements of the student of language as well as of the student of history are consulted by two copious indexes.

A careful reading of the 'Ecumenical History'—things 'ecumenical' were the mode in the days of Maurice and Joannês Nêsteutês—in the new edition led me to discover certain serious chronological difficulties that beset the order of events in the second half of the reign of Maurice. At that time the forces of the empire were engaged in operations against the Avars and Slavs in the provinces of Illyricum and Thrace. The difficulty is to determine the dates of these campaigns, and to bring Theophanês into congruity with Theophylaktos.

The restoration of Chosroes Eberwiz to the throne of the Sassanids, by the assistance of Maurice, in the summer of 591, put an end to the Persian war that had broken out in 572. The first step of the government was to transfer the armies that had served on the oriental frontier to the Balkan peninsula, which suffered almost every year from the hostilities of the Avars or the plundering incursions of the Slavs, who were already beginning to settle in cis-Danubian territory. Subsequently to the transference of the armies the emperor Maurice made a progress in Thrace. Now Theophylaktos places these two events in the closest temporal proximity—*τὰς δυνάμεις ὁ αὐτοκράτωρ ἐς τὴν Εὐρώπην ὡς τάχιστα μετεβίβαζεν ἐπὶ τε τὴν Ἀγχιάλον τὴν ἐκδημίαν παρασκευάζεται* (v. 16, p. 218)—whereas Theophanês places them in separate years. According to Theophanês, namely, the soldiers were transported

⁵² *id. mar. cod.*

⁵³ *corporis cod.*

¹ *Theophylacti Simocattæ Historia*, ed. C. de Boor (Teubner, 1887).

to Europe in the year of the world 6082, which ran from 1 Sept. 589 to 1 Sept. 590, and the progress of Maurice took place in the following year, 6083—that is (as it took place after the restoration of Chosroes), in the autumn of 591. The first statement of Theophanês as to the date of the transference of the army can of course not be accepted without reserve, but there is no difficulty in supposing that a portion of the army was removed from Asia in 590, and that Theophanês omits to mention the removal of the remainder in 591. In this way we can reconcile the two accounts. Theophylaktos tells us that the year in which these events took place was the ninth year of Maurice (p. 218), *i.e.* between 13 Aug. 590 and 13 Aug. 591 (almost coincident with *annus mundi* 6083). We are consequently entitled to conclude that the recall of the Roman forces which assisted Chosroes and the progress of Maurice took place in the summer of 591, before the 13th day of August. Theophylaktos, however, has been guilty of an error which has led Clinton and others to a different conclusion. He says that there was an eclipse of the sun when Maurice was at Hebdomon, a place at a little distance from Constantinople on the way to Herakleia. Astronomical calculation determines that there was an eclipse of the sun on 19 March 592. Hence Clinton places the progress of Maurice in March 592—that is, in the tenth year of Maurice—and he is thus obliged to reject Theophylaktos' statement that it was in the ninth year of Maurice. But it is equally legitimate to suppose that he was mistaken in the date of the eclipse; and this supposition is more scientific because (1) the notice of Theophanês supports the *ἐνατον ἔτος* of Theophylaktos, and (2) the language of Theophylaktos forbids the assumption that a winter intervened between the recall of the army and the progress of Maurice.

The course of the narrative naturally leads us to imagine that the siege of Singidon, the operations of the general Priskos and his defeat at Herakleia by the Chagan, took place immediately after the return of Maurice to Constantinople, in August and September 591. In that case *μετοπώρου ἀρχομένου* of vi. 6 would mean the late autumn of 591, and *ἡρος ἀρχομένου*, immediately below, would mean the spring of 592. And thus the expedition of Priskos against the Slavs would fall in 592. The account of this expedition extends in Theophylaktos from p. 230 to p. 239, ed. De Boor. Priskos receives a letter from the emperor, with a mandate that the army should spend the winter—*τὴν χειμέριον ὥραν* (p. 239)—in the territory of the barbarians; that is, the winter of 592–3. Immediately after this Maurice deposes Priskos from the command in favour of his own brother Petros. Priskos, however, commences operations—spring 593—and gains some successes before he hears of his recall; then he returns to the capital (p. 245), and Petros proceeds to take the command. The campaign in which Petros proves his incom-

petence we naturally assume to occupy the rest of the year 593, and place his deposition and the reappointment of Priskos (p. 254) at the close of that year.

But at this point Theophylaktos gives us a definite date, which puts us completely out of our reckoning. Immediately after his notice of the return of Petros and the appointment of Priskos he says (vii. 6, p. 254): *πρὸ τεττάρων τοίνυν τούτων ἐνιαυτῶν (πρὸς γὰρ τὰ πρεσβύτερα τῆς ἱστορίας αὐθις γινόμεθα) Ἰωάννης ὁ τὴν ἐς Βυζάντιον ἐκκλησίαν ἰθύνων τὸν τῇδε βίον ἀπέλιπεν.*

Joannēs Jejunator became patriarch of Byzantium on 12 April 582, and we learn from the 'Brief Chronography' of Nikêphoros that he held that office for thirteen years and five months. His death consequently falls about 11 Sept. 595. Hence the history of Theophylaktos must have already reached the end of 598, when the notice occurs that the patriarch John died four years ago. But in following the course of the narrative we had not succeeded in reaching further than the end of 593—a difference of five years. We may reduce the difference by one year, if we suppose that Theophylaktos accepted a different date from that given by Nikêphoros for the death of John, viz. September 594; for such a date seems to be implied by Theophanēs, who mentions that Kyriakos (John's successor) was bishop of Constantinople in 6087 = 1 Sept. 594–1 Sept. 595.

To explain this incongruity two alternative suppositions are possible. Either the historian has omitted to mention the winter seasons, which formed breaks in the campaigns and serve to the reader as a chronological guide, and has thereby run several years into one, or else there is a gap in the text. In the former case we must suppose that Theophylaktos was ignorant himself of the precise chronology, and consciously left it undetermined.

Turning to Theophanēs, whose sole authority for these wars was Theophylaktos, we find that he has hammered out the metal thin, so as to make it extend over the years which are not accounted for. The first campaign of Priskos and the battle of Herakleia took place in 6084, that is, 592; the expedition against the Slavs is placed in 593, the mission of Tatimer and the recall of Priskos in 594. The campaign of Petros is drawn out to extend over three years—595, 596, 597—and thus the deposition of Petros at the end of 597 agrees with the date of Theophylaktos, assuming that he assigned the decease of Joannēs Jejunator to 594.

The question is whether Theophanēs used a source, not accessible to Theophylaktos, which indicated these chronological divisions, or whether, in order to suit the plan of his chronicle, he exercised his own judgment in parcelling out the events recorded by Simokatta. We cannot hesitate to reject the first alternative; for not only has no hint come down to us of the existence of such

a source,² but the facts do not render the assumption necessary. Theophanês presents us with nothing more than an excerpt of Theophylaktos; he records the same events in the same order. Moreover a very remarkable event took place in 597, which the historian of Maurice does not mention—namely, the siege of Thessalonica by the Avars, of which an account has come down to us in the ‘Life of St. Demetrios of Thessalonica.’ This event is also omitted by Theophanês. We may, then, take it for granted that the only sources accessible to Theophanês were the history of Theophylaktos, and possibly official documents; but the latter would hardly have furnished much information about the Avaric wars. The conclusion is that the division of events from 592 to 597 given by Theophanês is quite arbitrary, and if we compare it in detail with his source we shall hardly consider it very plausible.

Theophylaktos must have derived his facts mainly from the oral evidence of persons who witnessed the course of the campaigns, and, living in Egypt, he may not have been able to inform himself accurately on all the details. There is no trace of a lacuna in his history; the narrative flows smoothly. It follows that the writer was ignorant of the exact years in which the various events fell; and though he was not candid enough to say so directly, he was not dishonest enough to supply from his imagination the deficiencies of his information. His reticence about the siege of Thessalonica shows that his knowledge of events as well as of dates was defective.³

It is not my purpose to make any attempt in this place to rearrange the chronology of the six years elapsing between the progress of Maurice and the reappointment of Priskos. The data are not sufficient for any definite conclusions; but Theophanês is mistaken in lengthening out the period of Petros’ command to three years. If anything can be certain on the subject, it appears to me certain that Petros held the post of general for one year only—namely, the year 597—the year in which Thessalonica was rescued by the miraculous intervention of its patron saint. I hardly think that even Maurice, with all his *opiniâtreté* and all his affection for his kindred, would have tolerated the incompetence of his brother for three years.

For the remaining five years of Maurice’s reign Theophylaktos furnishes us with sufficiently clear chronological indications. The

² The only other source could be the chronicle of John Malalas, who, as G. Sotiriadis has lately proved, carried his chronicle down to Phokas. If this be so, what we say of Theophanês will apply to Malalas, who certainly furnished Theophanês with no fact not recorded by Theophylaktos, and who (even if we place him as early as Heraklios) we may assume drew on Theophylaktos for the Avaric wars.

³ It is worth mentioning that in his digression on the history of the reigns of Justin and Tiberius in bk. iii. Theophylaktos gives a false date for the adoption of Tiberius, naming December in the ninth indiction—that is, 575. The true date is December 574, which falls in the eighth indiction.

campaign of Singidon and the expedition to Dalmatia occupied the year 598. Theophanês places the first of these events in 6090, and the second in 6091 ; correctly, for the last four months of 598 correspond to the first four months of 6091. After the Dalmatian expedition no military events of any consequence took place for more than eighteen months : *ἐπὶ μῆνας τοιγαροῦν ὀκτώκαίδεκα καὶ περαιτέρω Ῥωμαίοις τε καὶ βαρβάροις τοῖς ἀνὰ τὸν Ἰστρον αὐλιζομένοις οὐδὲν ἄξιον συγγραφῆς διαπέπρακται* (vii. 12, p. 266).

Reckoning therefore from October or November 598, we reach March or April 600. The campaigns of Priskos and Komentiolos occupy the year 600, and we must not allow ourselves to be confused by a notice which Theophylaktos inserts in an unsuitable place. Before entering upon the campaigns of 600 he mentions the incident of the man who unsheathed a sword in the forum at Byzantium and used menacing language against Maurice, and assigns the nineteenth year of Maurice as the date. The nineteenth year of Maurice was current from 13 Aug. 600 to 13 Aug. 601, almost corresponding to the year of the world 6093, in which Theophanês places the same event. Thus Theophylaktos here anticipates chronological order. In the early part of the year a treaty is concluded between the Avars and Romans (p. 273), but it is soon broken. The summer of 600 is marked (p. 285). Komentiolos abode in Philippopolis during the winter and proceeded to Byzantium in the spring of 601 ; in summer he was reappointed general (p. 290). But although he was nominally general no operations took place in the nineteenth year of Maurice—Aug. 600—Aug. 601 (p. 290). In spite of this assertion Theophanês assigns the victories of Priskos to the year 6093. In this he may be right, for we must not press the words of Theophylaktos to include strictly the latter part of the year 600 ; they refer, as is evident from the context, to the year 601.

In the twentieth year of Maurice Petros was again appointed general in Europe. He proceeded to Palastolon, a town on the Danube, *καὶ χάρακα ποιησάμενος οὕτω τὴν τοῦ θέρους ὥραν διήνυνεν*. At the beginning of the autumn, *μετοπώρου ἀρχομένου*, he proceeded against the Avars, who had taken up quarters in Dardania (p. 292). Negotiations between the Avar captain, Apsich, and Petros came to nothing, but no hostilities seem to have taken place, and the armies separated, the barbarians proceeding to Constantiola and the Romans to quarters in Thrace. Now it is important to observe that these events must have taken place in 601, not in 602, as Theophanês apparently understood. The twentieth year of Maurice began on 13 Aug. 601, and *θέρους* may refer to the end of that month. The summer and autumn of 602 cannot possibly be meant, as Theophylaktos proceeds to mention them immediately afterwards : *τοῦ δὲ θέρους ἐπείγοντος ἀκοὴ γίνεται Μαυρικίῳ, κ.τ.λ.*, and a little further on *ὥρας τοῖνυν μετοπωρινῆς ἐνδημούσης, κ.τ.λ.* He thus implies

without any ambiguity that the army spent the winter 601–2 in Thrace. The narration of the events which led up to the fall of Maurice, occupying the last months of 602, presents no chronological difficulty.

We must call attention to a misstatement of Theophylaktos respecting the marriage of Maurice's eldest son, Theodosios. Having stated (p. 291) that 'Maurice appointed his brother Petros general in the twentieth year of his reign,' he proceeds: *πρὸ τούτου τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ Θεοδοσίος ὁ τοῦ βασιλέως υἱὸς νυμφίος πομπεύεται*. That is, he places the marriage some time before 13 Aug. 601. But we learn from Theophanès that the event took place in the month of November, in the fifth indiction, which was current from 1 Sept. 601 to 1 Sept. 602; that is, it took place in, and not 'before,' the twentieth year of Maurice. Now, on all events that took place inside the capital Theophanès is far better informed than Theophylaktos, and on such a matter as the marriage of a member of the imperial house registers were extant from which he could obtain precise information. Theophanès based his chronology on the years of the world, adopting the Alexandrine era of Panodoros; and he only occasionally dates an event by the current indiction. Now it is a very significant fact, and I do not remember to have seen it noticed, that those events which he honours by mentioning the appropriate indiction are almost invariably connected with the emperor, or the imperial family, or the city of Constantinople. As the indiction system was the official mode of reckoning dates in the Roman empire since the year 312 A.D., the obvious conclusion is that these dates were copied directly from official registers preserved in the praetorium of the prefect of the city. We are therefore bound to accept Theophanès' date for the marriage of Theodosios; and it is probable that this mistake of Theophylaktos misled Theophanès into transposing events that happened in 601 to the following year.

Having discovered that the last five years of Maurice's reign, 598 to 602, are satisfactorily accounted for by Theophylaktos, we are now in a position to affirm the hypothesis which we provisionally adopted above—namely, that he placed the deposition of Petros at the end of 597, and consequently believed that Joannès Nèsteutès died in 594. There is thus a great gap in the chronology of Theophylaktos from A.D. 593 to 597, and we have no materials to fill it up.

JOHN B. BURY.

THE DEATH OF QUEEN ELEANOR OF CASTILE.

ELEANOR of Castile, the gentle and loving wife of Edward I, died on her way to Scotland, whither she was following her husband, on 28 Nov. 1290, at a place described as 'Herdeby iuxta Lincolniam.'¹

¹ Rishanger, *Chronica*, p. 120, copied by Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, i. 32