

BYZANTINOSLAVICA
REVUE INTERNATIONALE DES ÉTUDES BYZANTINES
fondée en 1929

TOME LXXV (2017) 1-2

Publiée par
l'Institut slave de l'Académie des sciences de la République Tchèque
sous la direction de

PETRA MELICHAR

secrétaire de la rédaction
MARTINA ČECHOVÁ

Comité de rédaction

Petr BALCÁREK, Kateřina BOČKOVÁ LOUDOVÁ, Julie JANČÁRKOVÁ,
Markéta KULHÁNKOVÁ, Štefan PILÁT

Comité international de lecture

Stefan ALBRECHT (Mayance), Michail V. BIBIKOV (Moscou), Leslie BRUBAKER (Birmingham),
Axinia DŽUROVA (Sofia), Simon FRANKLIN (Cambridge), Wolfram HÖRANDNER (Vienne),
Michel KAPLAN (Paris), Taxiarchis G. KOLIAS (Athènes), Ljubomir MAKSIMOVIĆ
(Belgrade), Paolo ODORICO (Paris), Jonathan SHEPARD (Oxford)

Prière d'adresser toute correspondance, ainsi que les manuscrits, les revues en
échange et les livres pour compte-rendu, à la rédaction de la revue à l'adresse

BYZANTINOSLAVICA
Slovanský ústav AV ČR, v. v. i.
Valentinská 1, 110 00 Praha 1, Česká republika
e-mail: byzslav@slu.cas.cz; melichar@slu.cas.cz
<http://www.slu.cas.cz/4.html#byzantinoslavica>

Conditions d'abonnement:

La diffusion en République Tchèque est assurée par
EUROSLAVICA – distribuce publikací, e-mail: euroslavica@gmail.com

La diffusion dans tous les autres pays est assurée par
Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Booksellers & Subscription Agents
D-65174 Wiesbaden – Germany e-mail: service@harrassowitz.de

Abonnement annuel: 102 EUR

La revue paraît dans la maison d'édition
EUROSLAVICA, Celetná 12, CZ-110 00 Praha 1

ISSN 0007-7712 Registrováno u MK ČR pod č. E 1092

© Slovanský ústav AV ČR, v. v. i. 2017

BYZANTINOSLAVICA
REVUE INTERNATIONALE DES ÉTUDES BYZANTINES

Publiée par
l'Institut slave de l'Académie des sciences de la République Tchèque
sous la direction de

PETRA MELICHAR

secrétaire de la rédaction

MARTINA ČECHOVÁ

Comité de rédaction

Petr BALCÁREK, Kateřina BOČKOVÁ LOUDOVÁ, Julie JANČÁRKOVÁ,
Markéta KULHÁNKOVÁ, Štefan PILÁT

Comité international de lecture

Stefan ALBRECHT (Mayance), Michail V. BIBIKOV (Moscou),
Leslie BRUBAKER (Birmingham), Axinia DŽUROVA (Sofia), Simon FRANKLIN (Cambridge),
Wolfram HÖRANDNER (Vienne), Michel KAPLAN (Paris), Taxiarchis G. KOLIAS (Athènes),
Ljubomir MAKSIMOVIĆ (Belgrade), Paolo ODORICO (Paris), Jonathan SHEPARD (Oxford)

Collaborateurs pour les langues étrangères

George BARTLETTT, Oliver J. BREAREY, Nicholas EVANS, Stephanie NOVASIS,
Mathieu PANORYIA, Annika ASP-TALWAR

La revue Byzantinoslavica est citée par ERIH et Scopus

LXXV / 1–2

PRAGUE 2017

the excerptors leave out the description of Beroea.⁷¹ The omissions in the *CE* cover a subject usually mentioned with the phrase *ζητει ἐν τῷ περὶ* (*Look for it in the*) followed by the name of the collection. The phrase appears in the surviving manuscripts when a passage in the main narrative is missing. Based on this system of cross-references, scholars have been able to restore twenty-six out of the fifty-three collections.⁷² Concerning geographical materials, the cross-references reveal the existence of three relevant, but now lost, collections: *περὶ ἐθνῶν* (*On customs*), *περὶ ἐθνῶν* (*On peoples*), and *περὶ οἰκισμῶν* (*On settlements*). And the possibility of yet more collections on the subject cannot be excluded.

The *CE* and the *Excerpta Anonymi* should be seen within the context of the *culture of Sylloge*; the two works share significant similarities in terms of content, format, and methodology. Both enterprises belong to a period in which collections of historical excerpts prevail as an approach towards the transmission of knowledge to succeeding ages by embedding historical texts into the new social, political, and theological context. The *CE* and the *Excerpta Anonymi* also reflect a fashion in terms of literary production during the tenth century and onwards; the chief concern of a writer was to collect writings corresponding to a particular subject matter and to extract information that was perceived as essential to be preserved.

Panagiotis Manafis
Ghent University
Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 35, UFO
9000 Gent
panagiotis.manafis@ugent.be

71 *EL*, 96; On the passage on Beroea in Procopius see: *Procopii Caesariensis opera Omnia*, J. Haury – G. Wirth (ed.), Leipzig 1963, 2.7.2.

72 On the number and names of the collections see: P. LEMERLE, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, Paris 1971, 327–328; B. FLUSIN, *Les excerpta Constantinienis. Logique d'une anti-histoire*, in: S. Pitta (ed.), *Fragments d'historiens Grecs, Autour de Denys d' Halicarnasse*, Rome 2002, 553–555; P. SCHREINER, *Die Historikerhandschrift Vaticanus graecus 977: ein Handexemplar zur Vorbereitung des Konstantinischen Exzerptenwerkes*, *JÖB* 37, 1987, 14–21; NÉMETH, *Imperial Systematization*, op. cit., 65–92.

Compilation methods of the *Excerpta Constantiniana* revisited: From one compiler to the three-stage model of teamwork*

András NÉMETH (Vatican City)

This paper discusses the actual method of compilation of the Excerpta Constantiniana under Byzantine courtly supervision in the tenth century. It demonstrates that scholars who edited historical fragments of classical and Byzantine historians from the Excerpta have projected their own philological practices, changing over the centuries, onto the imperial employees' actual activity of excerpting. From the view of one compiler, they gradually arrived at the concensus seeing a teamwork of expert participants and scribes who processed the historical texts in two consecutive stages. In the first stage, participants classified short coherent sections of texts, each corresponding to one of the fifty-three preselected subjects, by marking them in the manuscripts including complete texts. In the second stage, scribes copied the sections already ascribed to the the same subject heading into separate manuscripts, distinguished by subject, and in groups of authors. Based on the surviving evidence of the Excerpta's manuscripts, this paper describes a range of phenomena that do not fit the two-stage model and ascribes them to an additional draft stage. In addition, it extends the chronological framework of the Excerpta project from the early 940s to the 970s and 980s when the Suda's compilers used the Excerpta's drafts.

When launching the ambitious project of the *Excerpta*, later named the *Excerpta Constantiniana* after him, Emperor Constantine VII (b. 905, sole r. 945–959) was very generous to collect and conserve a massive body of historical works which he chose to cut into short sections and rearrange into fifty-three thematic collections of excerpts.¹ From a wide selection of historians (Tab. #1), each of the imperial collections assembled all the passages that belonged to one of fifty-three preselected topics (Tab. #2), and it did so in the sequence of the original narra-

* This study was funded as part of the project (K 112283), supported by the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Office (NKFI-EPR).

1 On the general context, see A. NÉMETH, *The Excerpta Constantiniana and the Byzantine Appropriation of the Past*, Cambridge 2018, idem, *The Imperial Systematisation of the Past in Constantinople: Constantine VII and his Historical Excerpts*, in: J. König and G. Woolf (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia from Antiquity to the Enlightenment*, Cambridge 2013, 232–258. See the editions of the five surviving collections in *Excerpta historica iussu imperatoris Constantini Porphyrogeniti confecta*, I. 1. *Excerpta de legationibus Romanorum ad gentes*, I. 2. *Excerpta de legationibus gentium ad Romanos*, ed. C. de Boor, Berlin 1903 (hereafter ELr and ELg); vol. II. 1–2. *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis I–II*, ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst – A. G. Roos, Berlin 1906–1910 (hereafter EV); III. *Excerpta de insidiis*, ed. C. de Boor, Berlin 1905 (hereafter EI); IV. *Excerpta de sententiis* (hereafter ES), ed. U. Ph. Boissvain, Berlin 1906 (hereafter ES).

tives and in blocks of excerpts from each historian in turn. Five such collections of the *Excerpta* survive, all incomplete and truncated: *On Virtues and Vices* (EV), *On Gnostic Statements* (ES), *On Embassies of the Romans and to the Romans* (ELr-g), and *On Ambushes* (EI). Two preserved a well-known and often-cited proem that describes the major goal of the *Excerpta* project, outlines its method, and includes a clear indication that the sum total of the collections was fifty-three.² Despite the relatively small size of the surviving portion, the systematically dispersed sections of the historical works shed light both on the contents of their often lost wholes and on the compilation method of their production. My paper invites the reader on a journey through various hypotheses that rely on theoretical models of the reconstruction of incomplete or imperfect texts such as the concept of textual fragments and the stemmatic method, as well as on practical aspects such as auxiliary disciplines (palaeography, codicology) and the analogy of teamwork or philological collaboration for a superior authority.³ When confronting these hypotheses with the actual evidence of the *Excerpta*, I will argue for a three-stage model of transmission of texts from the complete works to the surviving forms of the *Excerpta*, proposing a draft version as an intermediate phase, instead of the commonly accepted model of a two-stage transmission.

Table #1. Historians in the *Excerpta*

name	period	work
Herodotus	(BC 485–425)	<i>Histories</i>
Thucydides	(BC 454–399)	<i>His life by Marcellinus, History of Pelop. War</i>
Xenophon	(BC 428–354)	<i>Cyr., An.</i>
Polybius	(BC 200–118)	<i>Roman History (220–168 BC)</i>
Diodorus of Sicily	(BC 90–30)	<i>Bibliotheca Historica</i>
Dionysius of Hal.	(1st c BC–AD)	<i>Ant. Rom.</i>
Nicolas of Damascus	(1st c BC–AD)	<i>Autobiography, Histories, Life of Augustus</i>
Josephus Flavius	(AD 37–100)	<i>AJ, BJ, Ap., De Macchabeis, Vit.</i>

2 This proem precedes ELr (ed. C. de Boor, 1–2) and EV I (ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst, 1–3). See previous French trans. P. LEMERLE, *Le premier humanisme byzantine, Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au Xe siècle*, Paris 1971, 281–282. U. ROBERTO, Byzantine collections of late antique authors: Some remarks on the *Excerpta historica Constantini*, in: M. Wallraff and L. Mecella, *Die Kestoi des Julius Africanus und ihre Überlieferung* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen, 165), Berlin 2009, 71–84, here 74–75; NÉMETH, The Imperial Systematisation, op. cit., fn. 1, 238. A. KALDELLIS, *Byzantine Readings of Ancient Historians*, London 2015, 43–44. In addition to these translations, see also various interpretations in TH. BÜTTNER-WOBST, Die Anlage der historischen Enzyklopädie des Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos, *BZ* 15, 1906, 88–120, here 88–89. B. FLUSIN, Les *Excerpta Constantiniens*: Logique d'une anti-histoire, in: S. Pittia (ed.) *Fragments d'historiens grecs, autour de Denys d'Halicarnasse*, Rome 2002, 537–559, here 538–539. A. COHEN-SKALLI, Les *Excerpta Constantini*: une συλλογή conçue d'après un modèle juridique?, *JÖB* 63, 2013, 33–52.

3 On the advantages of studying the scientific practices and techniques of philologies, see L. DASTON and G. W. MOST, History of science and history of philologies, *Isis* 106, 2015, 378–390, here 385–390.

Arrianus	(AD 95–175)	<i>Anab. Alexandri, Diadochi, Parthica</i>
Iamblichus	(AD 2nd c)	<i>Babylonian History</i>
Appianus	(115/7–61)	<i>Hann., Hisp., Ill., Mac., Mith., Pun., Sam., Syr.</i>
Cassius Dio	(d. 235)	<i>Roman History</i>
Dexippus	(210–75)	<i>Diadochi, Scythica, World Chronicle (until 270)</i>
Eunapius of Sardis	(346–414)	<i>Histories (270–414)</i>
Socrates	(379–440)	<i>Church History (305–439)</i>
Priscus of Panium	(5th c)	<i>Histories</i>
Zosimus	(5th c)	<i>Pagan history (until 410)</i>
Procopius	(500–65)	<i>Pers., Vand., Goth. Wars</i>
Peter the Patrician	(500–65)	<i>Roman History (44 BC–AD 361)</i>
Malalas	(490–570)	<i>World chronicle</i>
Malchus of Phil.	(5th–6th c)	<i>Byzantiaca</i>
Agathias of Myrina	(532–80)	<i>Histories (552–559)</i>
Menander Protector	(6th c)	<i>Histories (558–582)</i>
Theophylactus Simoc.	(580s–641)	<i>Histories (582–602)</i>
John of Antioch	(6th–7th c)	<i>World chronicle</i>
George the Monk	(9th c)	<i>World chronicle</i>

Table #2. List of topic titles in the *Excerpta*

category	topic titles (cross-references in Greek)
emperor	(1) On the Inauguration of Emperors (περί βασιλέων αναγορεύσεως); On the Succession of Sovereigns (περί διαδοχής βασιλέων); On Caesars (περί καισάρων); On Marriages (περί γάμων); On Ambushes (EI, περί ἐπιβουλῶν κατὰ βασιλέων γεγονυιῶν, περί ἐπιβουλῶν); On Rulers' Deaths (Suda)
warfare-diplomacy	On Leading of the Army (περί στρατηγημάτων); On Sieges (Parisinus suppl. gr. 607, ff. 16–17, 88–103); On Victory (περί νίκης); On Defeat (περί ἥττης); On Recovering from Victory (περί ἀνακλήσεως ἥττης); On Battles (περί συμβολῆς πολέμων, περί συμβολῆς); On Naval Warfare (omissions in Parisinus suppl. gr. 607); On Public Speeches (περί δημηγοριῶν); (27) On Embassies (ELr-g: περί πρέσβων); On Reasons for Wars (Suda); On Strongholds (Suda)
politics	On Political Affairs (περί πολιτικῶν διοικήσεως, περί πολιτικῶν, τὸ ῥηθὲν ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς); On Magistrates (Suda); On Punishments (Suda)
Church	On Ecclesiastical Affairs (περί ἐκκλησιαστικῶν)

geography	On Customs (περὶ ἐθῶν); On Peoples (περὶ ἔθνῶν); On settlements (περὶ οἰκισμῶν)
leisure	On Hunting (περὶ κυνηγίας); On Fantastic Events (περὶ παραδόξων); On Dangerous Events (Suda); On Natural Phenomena (Suda, Parisinus suppl. gr. 607); On Festivals (Suda)
literary genres	Literary Portraits (περὶ ἐκφράσεως); Epigrams (ἐν τοῖς ἐπιγράμμασι); On Letters (περὶ ἐπιστολῶν); On Gnostic Statements (περὶ γνωμῶν, περὶ γνωμικῶν ἀποστομισμάτων); On Pagan Mythology (περὶ Ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας)
morality	On Courageous Deeds (περὶ ἀνδραγαθημάτων); (50) On Virtues and Vices (EV: περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας, περὶ κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς)
index volume	On Who Found What (περὶ τοῦ τίς τι ἐξεῦρε)

Constantine VII's ambitious project was designed to cover the total corpus of all select works (Tab. #1) without textual loss, as well as to preserve the form of the selected texts. The attempt to meet such requirements rather than those of the *epitomes* reflects the view of Constantine VII's intellectual circle that the textual form of a select passage has value itself in addition to its textual content. The emperor's circle appreciated rhetorical and stylistic aspects of historical works more than world histories did, as demonstrated by the exercise of drawing parallels between analogous cases from the present and the past,⁴ the search for alternate expressions and descriptions of identical phenomena, and the recycling of catchy expressions from ancient texts.⁵ Thus not only did the structure of the *Excerpta* enable learned Byzantine readers to easily find, juxtapose and collate these versions for their enjoyment and practical training,⁶ but it has also proved useful for modern textual scholarship. For aesthetic reasons, Constantine VII's

4 See two associations of actual events with a collection of historical analogies in the form of excerpts in two manuscripts of Basil Parakoimomenos (d. after 985). In *Ambrosianus* 119 sup., ff. 141r–161r, Constantine VII's harangues are juxtaposed with historical precedents cited from historians. In *Lipsiensis Rep.* I 17, the single complete manuscript of *De ceremoniis*, the description of Nicephorus Phocas' coronation (l. 96) is preceded by a list of coronations that have been attributed to Peter the Patrician (l. 84–95).

5 See e.g. the story of the wheel of fortune in *DAI* (29. 123–6) and *Vita Basilii* (ch. 56) as recycled from Menander and Theophylactus Simocatta respectively, both versions assembled in *ELr* 177, 12–34 and 224, 23–225, 17, in I. ŠEVČENKO, Re-reading Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in J. Shepard and S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the twenty-fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Ashgate 1992, 167–195, here 191 n. 60. On possible borrowings from the *Excerpta* in Theophanes Continuatus Book 1–4, see F. PONTANI, A New Edition of Theophanes Continuatus, *Histos* 10, 2016, 88–100, here 91–93; and J. SIGNES CODOÑER, The author of Theophanes Continuatus I–IV and the historical excerpts of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, [forthcoming], with a more skeptical approach. I thank Prof. Signes Codoñer for sharing his article before publication.

6 A. NÉMETH, A “database” for re-conceiving imperial ideology? Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos and his excerpts, in N. Gaul and V. Menze (eds.), *Center, Province and Periphery in the Age of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitos*, Wiesbaden 2018 [forthcoming].

project fossilized the original form of the text it passes on,⁷ enabling modern readers to view the *Excerpta* as a rich repository of fragments of historical works that only survive in part and are dispersed in the odd structure of the *Excerpta*.⁸ The recovery of these lost textual corpora or sections of these historians exclusively draws on Constantine VII's project and dependent texts such as the *Suda* lexicon that borrowed almost all of its citations of historical works directly from the *Excerpta*.⁹ This is the main reason that the *Excerpta* have gained a prominent reputation in textual scholarship as a repository of historical fragments.

Despite many efforts, however, modern students of the *Excerpta* have not come to a secure conclusion on how Constantine VII's team actually carried out the grandiose project. It is unclear from which libraries the imperial team began to work, as well as how many copies of each chosen historical work the participants needed to produce before dividing entire texts into small sections and making them compatible with the fifty-three preselected topics (see Table #2). Also puzzling remains the question how the task of such division and classification was distributed among an uncertain number of participants: whether one person was in charge of working on an author, or one person focused only on a single topic, or whether the responsibilities corresponded to a more complex division of tasks. It is equally uncertain whose responsibility it was to adapt the divided and classified sections to become an integral and comprehensible piece without the original context of the complete text. The precise dates when the *Excerpta* project was launched and finished are still to be clarified, leaving open the possibility that the ambitious project never came to a conclusion.¹⁰ All these questions are crucial for a modern critical editor whose major task is to reconstitute the lost original text via objective criteria.

Textual fragments and stemmatic method: A single compiler

When studying the algorithm of how the original texts were turned into excerpts, a program that Henri de Valois already hinted at in his edition of the new classical texts that he found in *Turonensis* 980,¹¹ editors of historical works com-

7 On this unusual aspect of the *Excerpta*, see P. A. BRUNT, On Historical Fragments and Epitomes, *The Classical Quarterly* 30, 1980, 477–494, here 483–485.

8 The idea of seeing the *Excerpta* as fragments comes from the earliest editor of *ELr*—g, Fulvius Orsini (1529–1600). F. ORSINI (ed.), *Ἐκ τῶν Πολυβίου Μεγαλοπολίτου ἐκλογαὶ περὶ προεβειῶν. Ex libris Polybij selecta de legationibus; et alia quae sequenti pagina indicantur: nunc primum in lucem edita Ex bibliotheca Fulvii Orsini (Fragmenta ex historiis quae non extant: Dionysii Halicarnassae: Diodori Siculi: Appiani Alexandrini Dionys. Cassij Nicaei de legationibus Dionys lib LXXIX et LXXX imperfectus Emendationes in Polybium impressum Basileae per Ioannem Heruagium anno MDXXIX)*, Antwerp, Ex officina Christophori Plantini, 1582, Aii^v. A. NÉMETH, Excerpts versus Fragments: Deconstructions and Reconstitutions of the *Excerpta Constantini*, in A. Grafton and G. W. Most (eds.), *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices: A Global Comparative Approach*, Cambridge 2016, 253–274.

9 C. DE BOOR, Suidas und die Konstantinische Excerptensammlung 1–2, *BZ* 21, 1912, 381–424 and *BZ* 23, 1914–1919, 1–127.

10 N. G. WILSON, *Scholars of Byzantium*, Cambridge, MA 1996 (revised edition), 143–145.

11 H. de Valois reckoned with 106 volumes, projecting the case of *Turonensis* 980, the

bined two concepts, that of the textual fragment and that of the stemmatic model of textual reconstruction. As far as textual fragments are concerned, humanists in the fifteenth-century began to apply the analogy of incomplete ancient objects such as statues or fragments of inscriptions and the like to citations or excerpts from ancient works and view them as fragments of the lost body of a historical work, textual pieces which could be reinterpreted in their lost original contexts.¹² The understanding of the *Excerpta* as a repository of fragments enabled editors to seek Ariadne's thread and reverse the excerptors' practice in order to relocate the fragments into their original position within the lost complete works. Furthermore, it allowed them to purge the excerpts from the transformations introduced by the excerptors who fabricated intact passages that would stand on their own and intervened at points when removal of sections produced gaps in understanding. For the textual sections which survive in alternative textual transmission channels, the *Excerpta* represented an early and prestigious link in the transmission of ancient historical texts to be collated with alternative testimonies. This approach to the *Excerpta* encouraged a projection of the stemmatic method, the genealogy of manuscripts, into the complex evidence of the imperial project. According to the stemmatic method, to give just a simplified summary, the original text undergoes a linear process of corruption before reaching its actual existence in a manuscript. The successive steps of this process can be distinguished by decoding consecutive reproductions of the identical text by copyists or scribes who willingly or accidentally modify what they see in their models. A critical editor is able to establish the genealogy of the linear deformation of the text and classify accidental deformations into separate groups and ascribe each such group to an individual scribe's responsibility. Being incompatible with such a model, the *Excerpta* easily causes headaches for careful editors in their attempt to distinguish human responsibilities behind textual deformations and justify their reconstruction of the original text against what stands in the manuscripts of the *Excerpta*. Thus, the basic ideas regarding the Byzantine practice of excerpting derive from occasional editorial recognitions of the clash between the *Excerpta*'s peculiarities and the traditional model of textual transmission. These hypothetical views are worth studying and comparing against one another and the evidence of the *Excerpta*.

The key author among those included in the *Excerpta* whose text generated innovative scholarly reactions and ideas on the Byzantine method was Polybius (ca. 200–120 BC). An overview of the treatment of his fragments in the *Excerpta* by his key editors helps us follow the route that led to the hypothetical recovery of the Byzantine method. Through an account of how Rome conquered the Mediterranean, Polybius summarised the history of the crucial interval of fifty-three years (220–168 BC) in 40 books, each equal to a textual portion that would have fit the size of a papyrus roll. His work became highly influential already in clas-

first volume of EV, onto each of the 53 collections. "Ita unus adhuc & quinquaginta horum Collectaneorum libri desiderantur, gravi sane ac deflenda iactura. Ii enim si omnes extarent, non difficile esset, coniunctis ac consarcinatis omnibus fragmentis, optimos scriptores, aut undequaque integros, aut levissime mutilos exhibere." Valois 1634, aiv^a.

12 G. W. MOST, Fragments, in: A. Grafton, G. W. Most, S. Settis (eds.), *The Classical Tradition*, Cambridge, MA 2010, 371–377.

sical times and enjoyed a high reputation in Byzantium, especially in the tenth century. Constantine's team had access to his complete work, of which now only a small portion survives. In the transition from papyrus to the codex format, extensive texts were copied in blocks of five or ten books. From the textual tradition, it is known that Polybius' oeuvre was copied in *pentades*, units of five books of which only the first unit survives entire (Books 1–5). The rest have been transmitted in abridged summaries (Books 1–18); Books 19–40 only in fragments, with a high number in the *Excerpta*.

Fulvio Orsini (1529–1600) had a potential success in editing a portion of the *Excerpta* when choosing Polybius' new fragments to complete the available Polybian corpus, Books 1–5 and the epitomes of Book 6–18.¹³ In addition, he appended the fragments of some other classical authors but ignored those without a separate textual tradition.¹⁴ Although Orsini did not speculate on the Byzantine method of remaking the historical narratives, he was nevertheless pioneering in turning the excerpts into fragments and establishing equivalence between the excerpts from Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Cassius Dio in ELr–g and the corresponding sections of Livy.¹⁵ Isaac Casaubon (1559–1614) made a further step forward when he began to establish the appropriate position of the excerpts from Polybius in his lost original narrative.¹⁶

The first critical editor of Polybius' *Histories*, who collated variants, including the *Excerpta*, in order to reconstitute the lost work of Polybius in its own original structure was Johann Schweighäuser (1742–1830).¹⁷ Parallel to the *recensio* of the transmission of Polybius' text, he integrated the *Excerpta* into his holistic view of the transmission of Polybius. Using the latest philological theory of the genealogical reconstruction of texts,¹⁸ he applied the method of correcting corruptions with

13 The first five books were edited in Greek first by Vincent Opsopoeus in Basel in 1530 (VD16 P 4082), while the epitomes of Books 6–18 were appended to Books 1–5 by Johannes Hervagius in 1549 also in Basel (VD16 P 4083).

14 Orsini's 1582 edition of the fragments (op. cit. fn. 8) taken from ELr–g (pp. 1–228) is followed by his collection of Polybius's fragments from other sources, such as Athenaeus, Stephanus of Byzantium, the *Suda*, etc. (pp. 229–294); Dionysius of Halicarnassus (pp. 295–312); Diodorus Siculus (pp. 313–333); Appian (pp. 334–371); and Cassius Dio (pp. 373–447). Orsini omitted Dexippus, Eunapius, Peter the Patrician, Malchus of Philadelphia, and Menander Protector.

15 In his manuscript of ELr (*Vaticanus gr.* 1418), Orsini collated the excerpts from Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ff. 90r–112v), Polybius (ff. 113r–198r), and Cassius Dio (ff. 224r–238r) with Livy. In *Vaticanus gr.* 1419, Orsini himself copied the excerpts of Polybius (ff. 1r–84v) and Dionysius (ff. 85r–108v) as fragments in the original sequence of each historian. See also Orsini's other manuscript (ELg), *Neapolitanus III.B.15*.

16 I. CASaubON (ed.), *Πολυβίου τοῦ Λυκόρτα Μεγαλοπολίτου ἱστοριῶν τὰ σωζόμενα, Polybii F. Lycortae Megalopolitani historiarum libri qui supersunt, etc.*, Paris 1609. See its revised version by J. GRONOVIVS (ed.), *Πολυβίου τοῦ Λυκόρτα Μεγαλοπολίτου ἱστοριῶν τὰ σωζόμενα Polybii historiarum libri qui supersunt etc.*, Amsterdam 1670.

17 *Disjecta illa Polybianae Historiae membra, unum in corpus redegerunt.* J. SCHWEIGHÄUSER (ed.), *Πολυβίου Μεγαλοπολίτου ἱστοριῶν τὰ σωζόμενα, Polybii Megalopolitani Historiarum quidquid superest, II*, Leipzig 1789, xliii.

18 S. TIMPANARO, *The Genesis of Lachmann's method*, ed. and transl. Glenn W. Most, Chicago and London 2005, [collated English edition of Timpanaro's various versions in

the help of manuscripts (*emendatio ope codicum*) and the model of a single archetype.¹⁹ He suspected a single Polybius manuscript for Books 1–5 (“archetype”) and another single Polybius manuscript (“hyparchetype”) which the Compiler (!) used for the respective collections of the *Excerpta*.²⁰ According to Schweighäuser, the differences between the reconstructed “archetype” of Polybius and the shared “errors” of the manuscripts of the *Excerpta*, as observed in three collections which were available in those times (ELr–ELg and EV),²¹ should derive from a single manuscript (“hyparchetype”) that had already been corrupted. Schweighäuser posited a single “compiler” who introduced textual corruptions when creating excerpts from Polybius’ work in the volumes of the *Excerpta*.

When reconstituting the lost narratives, textual scholars took it for granted that the *Excerpta* include the “fragments” in sequential order of the original, and regarded it as a guide to the textual reconstitution. This principle of Constantine VII’s method followed from the fact that the imperial employees copied the excerpts mechanically from manuscripts with the full historical texts. This aspect helped the nineteenth-century ambitious enterprises of editing historical fragments. From the editions listed above, each of the major editorial projects included the fragments taken from the *Excerpta*: the *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (FHG, 5 vols. 1841–1870) by Karl Müller and the *Historici Graeci Minores* by Ludwig Dindorf (1870).²² Both enterprises focused on historians whose works do not survive complete, the so-called fragmentary historians.²³

Italian (1963, 1981) and in German (1971)], (on systematic *recensio* of classical authors in the eighteenth century) 70–74.

19 When discussing the *Excerpta*, he says: *Codex, quo usus est Compiler, ab illo vetusto Codice, qui communis fons est eorum Codicum Polybianorum, quibus hodie utimur, jam multis in locis in parvam abierat partem.* SCHWEIGHÄUSER, Πολυβίου, op. cit., fn. 17, iv.

20 *Tum vero rursus Compiler, qui exiguo sane iudicio haec Excerpta confecit, alia multa ipse in transcribendis eis, quae ex integro codice selegit, peccasse videtur; quorum errorum contagium deinde ad omnes Codices, qui ex ipsius exemplo promanarunt, pervasit.* SCHWEIGHÄUSER, Πολυβίου, op. cit., fn. 17, iv.

21 Cf. the editions of ELr–g by F. Orsini (Antwerp 1582), D. Höschel (Augsburg 1603) and the reedition by Labbé (Paris 1648) and the reprints of the latter two and that of EV by H. de Valois (Paris 1634). EI and ES were discovered only in the early nineteenth century.

22 Felix Jacoby (1876–1959) followed in their footsteps in his *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. On the nineteenth century editions of fragments, see A. GRAFTON, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum: Fragments of Some Lost Enterprises*, in G. W. Most (ed.), *Collecting Fragments – Fragmente sammeln* (Aporemata: Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte, 1), Göttingen 1997, 124–143.

23 The idea to grant the same credit to fragmentary historians as to those with complete texts belongs to D. HOESCHEL (ed.), *Eclogae legationum Dexippi Atheniensis Eunapii Sardiani Petri Patricii et Magistri Prisci Sophistae Malchi Philadelphensis Menandri Protectoris Cum corollario excerptorum e libris Diodori Siculi amissis, XXI. XXII. XXIII. XXIV. XXV. XXVI. Omnia e MSS cod. a Davide Hoeschelio Augustano edita*, Augsburg [Typis Ioannis Prætorii] 1603. Höschel used *Bruxellensis* 11301–16 (ELr) and 11317–21 (ELg) as well as *Monacensis gr.* 267 (ELr) and 185 (ELg) and published the sections of the *Excerpta* that Orsini omitted: the fragments from Dexippus, Eunapius, Peter the Patrician, Malchus of Philadelphia, and Menander Protector.

Teamwork: collaboration for a superior authority

Compared to the stemmatic model, described by Schweighäuser, and to the practice of reshuffling fragments, a significant new dimension of the reconstructed method of the *Excerpta* is one of teamwork. Separate attention to revisit one manuscript and clarify its position in the stemma²⁴ as well as to analyse one author’s text in the *Excerpta*²⁵ became a legitimate field of study. In 1866, Ernst Schulze summarized the accumulated literature on the *Excerpta* project and some problems that Constantine’s project raised mostly regarding the collation of classical historians.²⁶ To a hypothetical manager of the *Excerpta* project, scholars ascribed difficulties similar to their own which had arisen in the management of collaborative projects. In the 1880s, the idea of cooperation among Byzantine excerptors and division of work appeared among the reconstruction models. When refuting Nissen’s idea to link the *Excerpta* with the *Excerpta antiqua* of Polybius,²⁷ C. de Boor distinguished between the redactors of the *Excerpta* and the scribes who followed the redactor’s instructions.²⁸ Without accepting this view, de Boor described Schweighäuser’s interpretation that the *Excerpta* included at some points a superior authority’s written instructions to a subordinate assistant.²⁹

24 As for the *recensio* of individual manuscripts, see e.g. TH. BÜTNER-WOBST, *Der Codex Peirescianus. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss der Excerpta des Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos, Berichte über die Verhandlung der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse* 45, 1893, 261–352; and CH. JUSTICE, *Le «Codex Schottanus» des extraits «De legationibus», Anecdota Bruxellensia, Recueil de Travaux publiés par la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres* 3, 1896, 1–119. C. DE BOOR, *Bericht über eine Studienreise nach Italien, Spanien und England zum Zwecke handschriftlicher Studien über byzantinische Chronisten, Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 51, 1899, 922–934; *Id.*, *Zweiter Bericht über eine Studienreise nach Italien zum Zwecke handschriftlicher Studien über byzantinische Chronisten, Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 9, 1902, 146–164.

25 E.g., J. WOLLENBERG, *Excerpta ex Ioanne Antiocheno ad Librum Peirescianum a se excussum*, in: *Programme d’invitation à l’examen public du collège royal français*, Berlin 1861, 1–26; *Id.*, *Recensentur LXXXVII loci ex Flavi Josephi scriptis excerpti qui ex conlectaneis Constantini Augusti Porphyrogenetae περί ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας in codice Peiresciano extant*, in *Programme d’invitation à l’examen public du collège royal français*, Berlin 1871, 1–36; *Id.*, *LXIII locos ex Herodoto Excerptos qui ex conlectaneis Constantini Augusti Porphyrogenetae περί ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας in codice Peiresciano extant*, in *Programme d’invitation à l’examen public du collège royal français*, Berlin 1882, 1–24. O. ZOSEL, *De excerptis historicis Constantini Porphyrogeneti iussu confectis quaestiones Herodotae, Thucydidae, Xenophontae*, Zürich 1913.

26 E. SCHULZE, *De excerptis Constantini quaestiones criticae* (Dissertatio Philologica), Bonn 1866.

27 H. NISSEN, *Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius*, Berlin 1863, 319–323, (on the relationship between the *Excerpta antiqua* and the *Excerpta*) 322.

28 C. DE BOOR, *Zu den Excerptensammlungen des Konstantin Porphyrogenetos*, *Hermes* 19, 1884, 123–148, esp. 126 and 138.

29 De Boor relied on Schweighäuser’s note who had distinguished between the superior authority behind the modification and the reconstitution of the *Excerpta* (*eo, qui conficiendis colligendisque his eclogis praefuit*) and an assistant (*amanuensis*) based on some infiltrated texts in Polybius’s work that he could only interpret as instructions. J. SCHWEIG-

The idea of teamwork is perhaps linked to the shared experience of the *Excerpta*'s three editors, Carl de Boor,³⁰ Theodor Büttner-Wobst,³¹ and Ursul Philip Boissevain,³² the students of Theodor Mommsen.³³ Their master no doubt played an important role in arousing their interest in Greek sources of Roman history. Mommsen had a reputation for his organizational ability to efficiently run major and international projects such as, for example, the *Corpus Inscriptio-num Latinorum*, launched in 1853, and to coordinate the collaboration of numerous international scholars applying shared principles to a common project. The editors of the *Excerpta* followed the same path when contributing to the critical edition of all surviving evidence of the *Excerpta*, as structured in the Byzantine imperial volumes, but mostly with the purpose of creating an efficient assistance to collate the included historians' texts within their own manuscript tradition. As a side product of their editorial project, they outlined the working method of the Byzantine project.

Two-stage model

In the analogy of work division according to competence and expertise, the widely accepted view today is that the text of the complete historical works underwent at least a two-stage process to arrive into the actual collections of the *Excerpta*. This two-stage model, as best described by Th. Büttner-Wobst in his seminal article on the *Excerpta* in 1906 and analysed in greater depth by P. Schreiner in 1987,³⁴ distinguishes between two groups in the imperial team. On the one hand, each member of the first group carefully read the entire work

HÄUSER (ed.), *Πολυβίου Μεγαλοπολίτου ἱστοριῶν τὰ σωζόμενα*, *Polybii Megalopolitani Historiarum quidquid superest*, VII. *Adnotationes ad lib. XI–XXX*, Leipzig 1793, (annotation to Polybius 22.5, ed. Büttner-Wobst, IV, 95–97 = ELg 273–274 [Polybius exc. 29–30]) 498.

30 C. de Boor edited Theophylactus Simocatta (1883–1885) and George the Monk (Teubner, 1904) among other historians. His major edition was perhaps that of Theophanes confessor (1883–1885) and he also started preparing the edition of Theophanes continuatus.

31 His major contribution was the most authoritative critical edition of Polybius (Teubner, 1882–1904).

32 Ursul Philip Boissevain made the latest edition of Cassius Dio (1895), perhaps the most complex philological task among the respective reconstructions of the authors in the *Excerpta*.

33 Carl de Boor and Boissevain studied in Berlin, Büttner-Wobst studied in Leipzig and was active in Dresden. However, the latter's doctoral thesis is under Mommsen's influence. TH. BÜTTNER-WOBST, *De legationibus reipublicae liberae temporibus Romam missis, Dissertatio inauguralis quam ad summos in philosophia honores ab amplissimo ordine philosophorum Lipsiensi rite imperandos*, Leipzig 1876. On Carl de Boor, see F. DÖLGER, "de Boor, Carl Gotthard", in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 2, 1955, 451. On Boissevain, see D. C. HESSELING, Levensbericht van Ursul Philip Boissevain, *Jaarboek* 1930–1931, 35–78, with a full bibliography of his publications.

34 BÜTTNER-WOBST, *Die Anlage*, op. cit., fn. 2, 99–100. *Vaticanus gr.* 977 was identified as a direct model for the classification of Theophylactus Simocatta's *Histories* in the first production stage of the *Excerpta* by P. SCHREINER, *Die Historikerhandschrift Vaticanus Graecus 977: Ein Handexemplar zur Vorbereitung des konstantinischen Exzerptenwerkes?*, *JÖB* 37, 1987, 1–29, (reflections on the actual working method) 25–29.

of a certain historian and classified its sections into fifty-three topics. On the other hand, a circle of collaborators seems to have been in charge of excerpting in the second phase. Each excerptor copied the sections into one of the final copies and carried out the necessary small adjustments of the text following the instructions of the classifier. The distinction between the two steps is based on a note written in a copy of ELr that reads: "Theodosius the Younger assembled the present [volume]".³⁵ According to this hypothesis, Theodosius carried out the second stage of excerpting. In the first phase, each work (or volume) was assigned to a particular learned man to classify its content according to the imperial topics. Büttner-Wobst accredited a central office or authority (*Zentralstelle*) which controlled these two phases of excerpting.

This central office seems to correspond to the image of the imperial "centre de copie" as Jean Irigoín, combining the stemmatic method, palaeography and codicology, envisaged the activity of the scribe-excerptors who produced the final copies (*Turonensis* 980 and *Vaticanus gr.* 73) that included parchment quires of similar dimensions and identical ruling schemes in scripts similar to those characterizing only a small group of other manuscripts that seem to be closely linked to Constantine VII and his circle.³⁶ He confirmed this hypothesis by his other observation that a group of historical texts in tenth- and early eleventh-century codices are copied in 32 lines, a layout similar to that of the *Excerpta*'s two final copies, and appear as cognates with the corresponding texts of the *Excerpta* based on the stemma of a few historians (Thucydides and Diodorus of Sicily, B. 1–5, 11–15, 16–20).³⁷ The coincidence of such external features seems to confirm the method outlined by Büttner-Wobst and contextualize scribal responsibilities that had been distinguished in the assistance of editorial work. Influenced by this hypothesis, Irigoín excluded the option that manuscripts other than the actual deluxe copies of the *Excerpta* derive from the complete texts in the process of excerpting.³⁸ However, such a direct link between the complete texts and the deluxe copies is less probable than a transition through some sort of draft copies. *Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607 is a good example to illustrate the alternative option.

35 *Bruxellensis* 11301–16, f. 2r: ὁ ἐρανίστας τὸ παρὸν Θεοδοσίος ὁ μικρός. The note is by a later hand, which is different from the copyist's. The same note also appears in *Cantabrigiensis* O.3.23, f. 1r. P. CAROLLA, Non deteriores: Copisti e filigrane di alcuni manoscritti degli Excerpta de legationibus, in: *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae* XV, Città del Vaticano 2008, 129–170, here 145–8. Moore thinks that Theodosius was a sixteenth-century scribe employed by Andreas Darmarius, in whose workshop *Bruxellensis* 11301–16 was copied. See J. M. MOORE, *The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius*, Cambridge 1965, 165.

36 J. IRIGOÍN, Pour une étude des centres de copie byzantins 1–2, *Scriptorium* 12, 1958, (on the general concept of scriptoria) 208–227 and 13, 1959, 177–209, here (on imperial scriptorium) 177–188.

37 J. IRIGOÍN, Les manuscrits d'historiens grecs et byzantins à 32 lignes, in: K. Treu (ed.), *Studia codicologica. Melanges Marcel Richard*, Berlin 1977, 237–245.

38 J. IRIGOÍN, Les manuscrits, op. cit. fn. 37, 240–241 and fn. 8.

Challenges to the two-stage model

Parisinus suppl. gr. 607 includes a selection of historical excerpts on sieges (ff. 16–17, 88–103) which permits two contradictory interpretations of its origin.³⁹ On the one hand, the focus on sieges, the systematic omission of sections that belong to other topics of the *Excerpta*, the observation of narrative sequence, the link of some excerpts with the *Suda*, and the date of the hand copying this section, as will be shown below, would support the view that this collection was part of the *Excerpta*. On the other hand, its script is earlier than the imperial copies of the *Excerpta* (*Turonensis* 980 and *Vaticanus gr.* 73),⁴⁰ the ruling of the parchment is different, and the excerpt from Thucydides (2.75–78), as Irigoien underlined, belongs to a different branch of Thucydides' textual tradition. The latter would be the strongest argument to support Irigoien's view that the collection on sieges in *Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607 is independent from the *Excerpta*. As far as the philological arguments are concerned, Kleinhogel, who offered the grounds for Irigoien's argument, is reluctant to separate the origins of the two excerpts when concluding that the short excerpt from Thucydides derives from pre-Constantinian excerpts.⁴¹ At the same time, Niese finds a similar relationship between the model of *Turonensis* 980 and that of the excerpt in *Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607 on the siege of Iotapata from Flavius Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum* (3. 167–187).⁴² Editors of other historians both possessing⁴³ and lacking parallel transmission alike who use these fragments tend to classify the collection on sieges as belonging to the same category as the *Excerpta* without however offering an opinion about the relationship between the two.⁴⁴ Historical and methodological contexts support a conclusion contrary to Irigoien's.

39 On this manuscript, see A. NÉMETH, The Mynas Codex and the Bibliotheca Corviniana, in: Ch. Gastgeber et al. (eds.), *Das Zeitalter des Corvinus zwischen Wien und Konstantinopel: Ausgewählte Akten der Internationalen Konferenz Matthias Corvinus and his Time, Cluj-Napoca, 23.–26. Oktober 2008*, Vienna 2011, 153–176, (on the excerpts on the sieges) 157 fn. 16.

40 On the date of these two manuscripts in the 970s and 980s, see A. NÉMETH, Layers of Restorations: *Vaticanus gr.* 73 Transformed in the Tenth-, Fourteenth-, and Nineteenth Centuries, *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae* 21, 2015, 281–330, here 298–299.

41 A. KLEINHOGE, *Geschichte des Thukydidestextes im Mittelalter*, Berlin 1965, (*Turonensis* 980 = siglum T) 102–104, (*Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607 = siglum Pm) 158–159.

42 B. NIESE, Praefatio, in *Flavii Iosephi Opera*, VI. *De bello iudaico libros VII ediderunt Iustus a Destimon et Benedictus Niese*, Berlin 1894, iii–lxxvi, here iv–lvi.

43 On Arrian, see A. G. ROOS, Prolegomena, in: id. (ed.), *Flavius Arrianus*, I. *Alexandri Anabasis cum excerptis Photii tabulaque phototypica*, Leipzig 1907 (*Vaticanus gr.* 73 [ES] = siglum δ; *Ambrosianus* N 135 sup. [ELg] = siglum ζ; *Neapolitanus* III.B.15 [ELg] = siglum η) xxxix–xl, (*Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607 = siglum θ) xl. On Polybius, see MOORE, The Manuscript Tradition, op. cit. fn. 35, (siglum T) 134–136.

44 E.g. on Dexippus, see G. MARTIN, *Dexipp von Athen*, Tübingen 2006, 51–52. On Priscus, see F. BORNHANN, Tradizione del testo dei frammenti, in: id. (ed.), *Prisci Panitae Fragmenta*, Firenze 1979, xvii–xxxv here xxvii–xxx and P. CAROLLA, Priscus Panita, *Excerpta et Fragmenta*, ed. ead., Berlin 2008, vii–xxxiv, here xxvii; See a more critical overview in L. MECCELLA, Introduzione, in *Dexippo di Atene, Testimonianze e frammenti*, ed. ead., Roma 2013, 1–118, here 24–25 and fn. 53–56.

To begin with the historical contexts, the hand of the excerpts on sieges is close to hand B² of the single mid-tenth-century manuscript of the *Palatine Anthology* and is likely to be dated to the 940s.⁴⁵ The redactor of the collection had access to a rich body of epigrams as shown in an epigram copied after an excerpt on the siege of Megara from Polyaeus.⁴⁶ The selection of the authors such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus (20.1–3), Polyaeus (*Strategemata*, 4.3.22 and 4.6.3), Dexippus (*Scythica*, F 22, 24, and 27), Priscus, Arrian (*Alexandri Anabasis*, 2.15.6–24.2 and 2.25.4–27.7), Polybius (8.3–7 and 21.27.1–28.18), Thucydides, Eusebius and Flavius Josephus closely resemble the selection of the *Excerpta*. In addition, the excerpts on the sieges in *Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607 include texts that lent lexicographical citations to the *Suda* in the 970s or 980s.⁴⁷ Is this a coincidence? Behind the *Suda*'s citations from Dexippus and Priscus, who never attained a reputation making them worthy of lexicographical studies, it is less convincing to see a lexicographical source. How can the method of excerpting explain the close relationship, despite the interval of several decades, between the excerpts of *Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607 and the *Suda* and the latter's link with the *Excerpta*? By revisiting the methodological context we can offer a plausible explanation.

When analyzing the *Excerpta*, De Boor made a clear distinction between two practices of textual reproduction, namely epitomizing and excerpting.⁴⁸ In my view, the methodological peculiarities of the *Excerpta* are helpful for evaluating some evidence, potentially pertinent to the *Excerpta*, which survive beyond the small circle of imperial deluxe copies. Let us see how the method of the *Excerpta* was applied in the longest excerpt, an account of the siege of Tyre in 332 BC by Alexander the Great, which was taken from Arrian's *History of the Expedition of Alexander the Great*.⁴⁹ This section is probably the most indicative of the textual practice that was followed in this entire section of the excerpts on sieges. The long excerpt is adjusted with a minimum number of changes to constitute a coherent and comprehensible passage with an exclusive focus on the siege of Tyre. The first sentence of the excerpt, for example, includes a reference to how Darius III (*ca.* 380–330 BC) fled after the battle of Issus and a short description

45 On the date of B², see M. L. AGATI, Note paleografiche all'Antologia Palatina, *Bollettino dei Classici* 3,5, 1984, 43–59, here 45–8. I thank Mgr. Paul Canart for advising me to search for close hands in the *Palatine Anthology*.

46 *Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607, f.91r. This epigram survives only in later redactions of Greek epigrams. *AP, Epigrammata Demonstrativa* 55.

47 See the major study of the relationship between the *Suda* and the *Excerpta* by C. DE BOOR, *Suidas* 1–2, op. cit. fn. 9. De Boor's view is now widely accepted in scholarship. On the date of the *Suda*, see B. BALDWIN, Aspects of the *Suda*, *BZ* 76, 2006, 11–31, here 18–19. On the borrowed citations from a collection on sieges, see the entries: e.g. Arrian (2.19.2): *Suda* ε 3021, s.v. ἔρμια, ed. Adler, II, 411; Dexippus F 27, *Suda* ε 3874, s.v. ἔφεστρίς, ed. Adler, II, 484; Priscus, F 1a: *Suda* α 3145 s.v. ἀπηγόρευον and τ 458, s.v. τευχήρεις, ed. Adler, I, 282 and IV, 536. Thucydides (2.75.3): *Suda* ξ 20, s.v. ξενναγῶν, ed. Adler, III, 492. See also DE BOOR, *Suidas* 2, op. cit. fn. 9, 110–111.

48 DE BOOR, *Zu den Excerptsammlungen*, op. cit. fn. 28, 123.

49 *Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607, ff. 94v–96v: Arrian, *Alexandri Anabasis*, 2.15.6–2.24.2. The entire passage is compared to the full version in A. NÉMETH, *Imperial Systematization of the Past: Emperor Constantine VII and His Historical Excerpts*, PhD thesis, defended at Central European University, Budapest 2010, 318–326.

of the city of Marathos (Amrit) as follows:⁵⁰ “<After Darius’ flight, Alexander> departed from Marathos <, which is a big and rich city located in the land opposite the island Arados> and took Byblos...” These additions provide the excerpt with a comprehensible context. When a long section is omitted on the naval aspects of the siege of Tyre (2.19.6–2.21.1), the compiler maintains the sentence on the siege and summarizes the second half of it which refers to naval war:⁵¹ “<He (i.e. Alexander) was disposed to collect the largest fleet possible :> because he already saw that – given the dominant sea power of Tyre – the siege would be rather difficult.” After the insertion of a couple of additional words at the occasional omissions, the excerpt finished with the conclusion “and this was the end of the siege”.⁵²

It is equally striking that all sentences dealing with naval business were probably assigned to another collection, since they are missing from the excerpt. In addition to the sections on naval warfare, the excerptor omitted the passages on Heracles’ cult in Tyre, Alexander’s exhortatory speech to his army leaders, and the geographical description of Tyre (Table 3). As in the *Excerpta*, there is no reference to the content or summary of the omitted textual sections as one would expect from an epitomator’s routine. All omitted texts can be classified within topics treated by the *Excerpta*.

Table 3: Pattern of omissions in Parisinus suppl. gr. 607, ff. 94v–97r

	(Arrian) content	topic
	(2.15.6) preparation of the siege of Tyre	On Sieges
omitted	(2.15.7) Flee of Azemilcus, king of Tyre on Sea	On Naval Warfare
omitted	(2.16.1–6) cult of Heracles (Melqart) in Tyre	On Pagan myths
	(2.16.7–8) Tyre’s embassy to Alexander before siege	On Sieges
omitted	(2.17.1–4) Alexander’s exhortation to the army leaders	On Public Speeches
	(2.18.1) Alexander decides to begin the siege	On Sieges
omitted	(2.18.1–3) geography of Tyre	On Settlements
omitted	(2.19.6–21.1) Alexander collects navy against Tyre in Sidon	On Naval Warfare
	(2.21.1–24.2 with short omissions) siege of Tyre	On Sieges
omitted	(2.21.6–22.6) partial omission of all material relevant for naval war	On Naval Warfare

50 *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607*, f. 94v (added to Arrian, *Alexandri Anabasis*, 2.15.6.): <μετὰ τὴν Δαρείου φυγὴν Ἀλέξανδρος> ἐκ Μαράθου δὲ ὀρηθεὶς <ἢ δὴ καὶ ἀντικρῦ τῆς Ἀράδου ᾧκισται νήσου τὴν ἡπειρον πόλιν μεγάλη τε καὶ εὐδαίμων> Βύβλον τε λαμβάνει.

51 *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607*, f. 95v (added to Arrian, *Alexandri Anabasis*, 2.19.6.): <αὐτὸς δὲ στόλον ὅτι πλείστον ἀθροίζειν διανοεῖτο> ἤδη γὰρ αὐτῷ θαλασσοκρατούντων τῶν Τυρίων, ἀπορότερα τὰ τῆς πολιορκίας ἐφαίνετο.

52 *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607*, f. 97r (added to Arrian, *Alexandri Anabasis*, 2.24.2): <καὶ τοῦτο τῇ πολιορκίᾳ τέλος ἐγένετο>.

To sum up, the scribe of the excerpts on the sieges had access to a collection of excerpts from historians, which were already adjusted by the principle of the *Excerpta*. Coherent sections suiting the system of imperial topics were omitted without notice, and only the text relevant to sieges was preserved. The systematic omission of passages belonging to a definite range of topics characterizes only the practice of excerpting in Constantine VII’s project.⁵³ I find such a specific methodology more indicative of the *Excerpta* project than palaeographical features since compositional methodology survives the process of transfer from one manuscript to another. At the same time, as Irigoín rightly observed,⁵⁴ *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607* has palaeographical and layout features different from the final copies of the *Excerpta*, so that it was not produced in the same imperial scriptorium as were the deluxe imperial copies somewhat later. However, these differences make the collection on sieges especially valuable for the early history of Constantine VII’s project. In my view, the scribe of the excerpts on sieges in *Par. suppl. gr. 607* was involved in the preparation of the *Excerpta* and added to the artillery manuals a selection from a body of material systematically prepared for the *Excerpta* project. This material which was produced in this early phase mediated between the manuscripts of the complete texts and the final copies (e.g., *Vaticanus gr. 73* and *Turonensis 980*). The latter ones seem to have been copied a couple of decades after the excerpts on sieges in *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607*. How does this evidence modify the two-stage model of excerpting?

Three-stage model: distinction between drafts and final copies

The actual practice can perhaps better be described as a three-stage model which breaks the second stage into two distinct phases. My new proposal assumes the insertion of a work phase between the complete historical works and the actual volumes of the *Excerpta*, clearly distinguishing between the group of employees in charge of preparing drafts by adjusting the intact passage into the form of the excerpt, as seen in *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607*, and the circle of the scribes in charge of assembling the drafts and copying them into the deluxe imperial copies. The responsibilities for each task sometimes conflicted with one another. Such tension that followed from the nature of the challenging tasks from time to time led to confusion or loss of material, as will be shown shortly. As seen in the two deluxe copies that survive from the tenth century (*Turonensis 980* and *Vaticanus gr. 73*), the last phase was the responsibility of a single scribe for each manuscript. The end result⁵⁵ was checked and corrected by one or more other control “editors” who reviewed the scribe’s work and introduced some corrections and

53 See the treatment of Procopius’ *Persian Wars*, Book 2 in NÉMETH, *The Imperial Systematisation*, op. cit. fn. 1, (Table 2) 237 and (explanation) 239–240.

54 Irigoín regarded palaeographical features as indicative and refused the assumption that *Parisinus suppl. gr. 607*, ff. 16r–17v, 88r–103v are linked to the *Excerpta* project. Cf. IRIGOÍN, *Pour une étude 2*, *opt. cit.* fn. 36, 1959: 177–181 and *Id.*, *Les manuscrits*, op. cit. fn. 37, 240. Most scholars have accepted this argument. In the excerpts from Polybius, Moore saw a philological connection with the *Excerpta*. MOORE, *The Manuscript Tradition*, op. cit. fn. 35, 134.

55 The text in *Turonensis 980* suffers from many spelling mistakes, confusions of vowels due to the identical phonetic value of several vowels and diphthongs, and incorrect word-

additional notes.⁵⁶ The ultimate revision took place without a control copy of the full text since it could hardly be at the disposal of the control “editor(s)”⁵⁷ This last phase is the step that Irigoien ascribed to the imperial scriptorium when identifying similar palaeographical and codicological features of the final copies of the *Excerpta*. In my view, these final imperial codices were not copied directly from models including the complete texts but rather from some kind of drafts.

The production of the drafts must have been a long process with shared responsibilities of multiple participants across historical works, imperial collections, and the types of textual identities that can be distinguished with the stemmatic method. Demonstrating the tension between the evidence of the *Excerpta* and the individual responsibilities of scribes, detected via the stemmatic method, the variant readings of individual historians from the *Excerpta* generally do not agree with those in any branches of the stemma of the respective texts, as far as they can be traced from extant manuscripts.⁵⁸ When reconstructing the actual method of excerpting, one should consider the claim of the proem that no passage of complete works was to escape the process of classification into fifty-three topics. To be able to understand the actual challenge this ambitious claim involved, we need to reckon with the practicalities of manuscript production, including temporal and financial aspects.

Constantine VII's project relied on the accumulation of numerous manuscripts that included mostly rare historical works. Such a precondition was more challenging than one would assume today based on our modern experience of easy access to the standardized versions of easily retrievable works. It seems that

divisions and accents. See Büttner-Wobst's introduction to his edition of EV, op. cit. fn. 1, xxv–xxix.

56 On the corrector hand(s) of *Turonensis* 980 (EV), see Th. Büttner-Wobst's introduction in his edition of EV, op. cit., fn. 1, (*siglum* P) xxviii. In *Vaticanus gr.* 73, the tiny corrections of the main texts are now impossible to study because of the superposition of the upper script and the chemical treatment of the palimpsest. It is clear, however, that a red hand systematically entered index-type references to highlight proper names and the location of gnomic statements with anchor-shaped red marks in the left margin that are different from the citation marks of the original. See NÉMETH, *Layers of Restorations*, op. cit., fn. 40, 300, 304–305. In *Turonensis* 980, the main hand copied the index type references. However, a red hand intervened on f. 228r (ἐκ τῆς στορίας Θουκυδίδου Ἀθηναίου: EV II, 33, 21) and inserted ἱ in περὶ Πομπη<I>ου on f. 172v (EV II, 261, 22).

57 The great majority of these corrections seems to be based on internal evidence rather than a control copy.

58 On Diodorus of Sicily, see P. BERTRAC, *Le texte de la Bibliothèque Historique, in: Diodore de Sicile. Bibliothèque historique*, I, Paris 1993, lxxvii–clxvi, here cxxxiv–cxxxvii, and P. GOUKOWSKY, Introduction, in: *Diodore de Sicile. Bibliothèque historique, fragments*, II, livres xxi–xxiv, Paris 2006, i–xxxiv, here x–xii. On Thucydides, see A. KLEINOGEL, *Geschichte des Thukydidestextes*, op. cit., fn. 41, 102–104, 158 and 168. On Herodotus, see H. B. ROSÉN, Praefatio, in *Herodoti Historiae*, I, Leipzig 1987, v–lxv, here xlvi–xlvi, lv–lvi. On Procopius, see J. HAURY, Prolegomena, in *Procopii Caesariensis opera omnia* I, Leipzig 1905, v–lxiii, here xxxiii; G. WIRTH, Mutmassungen zum Text von Prokops Gotenkrieg I–II, *Helikon* 4, 1964, 153–210, here 163–167, 210 and *Helikon* 5, 1965, 411–462, here 435. On Polybius, see MOORE, *The Manuscript Tradition*, op. cit., fn. 35, 166–167. On the earliest codices of Herodotus and Thucydides, contemporary with but independent from the *Excerpta* project, see L. PORCIANI, *Storici greci a Bisanzio: alcuni problemi di ricezione del classico*, in: M. Bernabò, (ed.), *Voci dell'Oriente. Miniature e testi classici da Bisanzio alla Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana*, Florence 2011, 55–88, here 81–83.

Constantine VII first had to assemble the select historical works and – as a precondition of his project – his team needed to locate and acquire or reproduce copies of the select works. Photius' *Myriobiblos* or references found in world chronicles about historians or perhaps other sources must have offered a checklist of authors. Such lists of names and titles, however, did not guarantee that a certain historical work was accessible in a select group of libraries, and any secure knowledge of libraries' holdings must have been difficult given the frequent lack of inventories. The keepers or owners of these libraries were probably not happy to approve the availability of books or negotiate their eventual acquisition, even when forced by imperial authority. In the source manuscript of Constantine's project, an unknown scholiast to Eunapius' *New Edition*, is a witness to such attitudes of reluctance, and describes his experience with a keeper of manuscripts in a library like “the fable of the dog in the manger, who herself takes no enjoyment of what is stored there and barks noisily at those willing and able to do so”.⁵⁹

When the mission to retrieve selected authors or their works was accomplished, new difficulties arose. The imperial team's effort to collect complete works sometimes turned out to be unsuccessful. In such cases, they occasionally combined an unabridged portion of a work with another portion, condensing the text in the form of epitomes or supplying missing sections with passages of similar content from different works. For example, the excerptor of John of Antioch supplemented the full redaction of the work with epitomes of the period from Justin I (r. 518–527) to Phocas I (r. 602–610), for which the full redaction was not available.⁶⁰ Likewise, Constantine VII's team did not possess the complete corpus of Cassius Dio's 80 books. In this preparatory phase, for example, the imperial team completed a missing section of Cassius Dio, Books 30–35 with Plutarch's *Life of Sulla*, a work which served as a model for Cassius Dio. The completion took place before the text was divided into small sections, which were then classified by topics. In this way, excerpts from Plutarch survive in EV and ELg.⁶¹ The idea of including the epitomes for the imperial period, a work attributed to Peter the Patrician,⁶² who continued Dio's narrative after 229, may have been necessitated by the incomplete set of Cassius Dio.

59 *Vaticanus gr.* 73, f. 132r (ES 71.3–11), trans. T. BANCHICHI, *Eunapius und Arethas*, *GRBS* 24, 1983, 181–184, here 181.

60 U. ROBERTO (ed.), *Iohannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia Chronica* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 154), Berlin 2005, xlii–xlv. In EI 143–150 (exc. 104–110), EV I, 206 (exc. 75), the excerptors used a redaction dating to the time of Phocas I (F 314–321). On the use of this redaction of epitomes by other historians, see E. PATZIG, *Johannes Antiochenus und Johannes Malalas*, Leipzig 1892. These excerpts have been excluded from the authentic corpus of John of Antioch by S. Mariev (ed.), *Ioannis Antiocheni fragmenta quae supersunt omnia* (CFHB, 47), Berlin 2008. See more on the question of authenticity in W. T. TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, New York 2013, 4–5 fn. 13–14.

61 Cassius Dio, exc. 106–111 (EV II, 276–8) = Plut. *Sulla* 12. 3–4; 12. 6–9; 13. 1–3; 15. 3; 22. 1 Cassius Dio, exc. 24–27 (ELg 416–417) = Plut., *Sulla* 22. 5–23. 2; 23. 3–4; 24. 1; 24. 3–4. BÜTTNER-WOBST, *Die Anlage*, op. cit., fn. 2, 98–99. Cf. the edition of Cassius Dio by Ph. U. Boissvain, Praefatio, in Id. (ed.), *Cassi Dionis Cocceiani historiarum Romanorum quae supersunt*, I, Berlin 1895, i–cxxvi, here cvii–cx.

62 B. BLECKMANN, *Die Reichskrise des III. Jahrhunderts in der spätantiken und byzantinischen Geschichtsschreibung: Untersuchungen zu den nachdionischen Quellen der Chronik des*

The *Excerpta* project required competent scholars who were able to understand historical texts and carry out the division between excerpts and the small changes needed to turn the select passages into distinct excerpts. Even at court, professionals who were able to carry out such work must have been available only in a relatively small number. The ambitious claim to preserve the entire text during the process of excerpting required a smooth collaboration among these participants.

If one takes the imaginary role of the manager of Constantine's project, who must have sought to get the maximum results from the smallest number of manuscripts while coordinating the smallest number of collaborators, one could get closer to the actual situation. Given at least twenty-six historians (Table 1) and exactly fifty-three topics (Table 2), each with at least one volume but often two, it would have been difficult for a professional scribe responsible for a few thematic volumes to produce a deluxe copy directly from the manuscripts of the complete historical works.⁶³ Dozens of such scribes could certainly not have worked simultaneously from dozens of complete manuscripts. Taking the manuscripts apart into loose fascicules (quires, or groups of quires) would have accelerated the excerptors' work,⁶⁴ but could also have led to confusion. This is very likely what occurred, and to avoid such confusion, the scribes relied on instructions in the margins, which informed them about the new destinations of the passages and about missing sections and their content. The fascicules were probably numbered or included other tools to assist the process of their reunification. However, the reunited manuscripts probably returned to their owner and left the circle of the production of the *Excerpta*, and have subsequently been lost to us; already the compilers of the *Suda* did not have them at their disposal in the 970s and 980s. At the same time, we cannot exclude the possibility that multiple manuscripts of a single text were sometimes used to speed up the production of the *Excerpta*. Such a method can more easily explain the spontaneous contamination between the redactions represented in the manuscripts being used.

The reasonable conjecture that the manuscripts of complete texts had sometimes been taken apart and then were circulated in fascicules to assist the production of drafts can explain a few odd features of the *Excerpta*. For example, the final *Johannes Zonaras* (Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt, 11), Munich 1992, 51–52. For the question of Cassius Dio's epitomes and Peter the Patrician, see A. M. MARTOLINI, *L'Anonymus post Dionem, Pietro Patrizio e la Leoquelle: uno studio sulle fonti post-dionee dell'Epitome di Giovanni Zonara* (PhD thesis at Sapienza), Roma 2009, 1–56, and T. M. BANCHICH, *The Lost History of Peter the Patrician, An Account of Rome's Imperial Past from the Age of Justinian*, London 2015, 4–6.

63 FLUSIN, *Les Excerpta*, op. cit., fn. 2, 541; SCHREINER, *Die Historikerhandschrift*, op. cit., fn. 34, 25.

64 Without developing this idea, Irigoín suggested that the excerptors may have developed a method somewhat resembling the *pecia* system. J. IRIGOÍN, *Les manuscrits*, op. cit., fn. 37, 308 fn. 8. On the *pecia* system, see B. BISCHOFF, *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Cambridge 1990, 42–43. FLUSIN (*Les Excerpta*, op. cit., fn. 2, 541) also raises the possibility of simultaneous copying because of the large number of fifty-three topics. On Byzantine examples on collaboration of multiple scribes on the same model that had been taken apart in fascicules, see P. CANART, *Quelques exemples de division du travail chez les copistes byzantins*, in Ph. Hoffmann (ed.), *Recherche de codicologie compare, La composition du codex au Moyen Âge, en Orient et en Occident*, Paris 1998, 49–67.

scribes of two collections (EV and ES) had trouble finding the relevant section of Book 14 of Polybius. Each manuscript has a note at this point. *Turonensis* 980 has a note in majuscule in the body text saying, “Keep searching, because forty-eight folios are missing which contain text on Ptolemy and Arsinoe”.⁶⁵ *Vaticanus gr.* 73 includes a marginal note in majuscules at the same location that says: “It is worth keeping in mind that only the proem of Book 14 had clear indications <of the contents>, the rest was entirely lost up to thirty folios.”⁶⁶ In both cases, the length of the missing section, five quires of texts in EV and an estimate of four quires in ES, points to a portion of the manuscript with the complete text and perhaps the same lacuna. Both the note on the content in EV and the reference to the προοίμιον in ES,⁶⁷ derive from the initial portion of Book 14, and testify to an incomplete portion of the complete manuscript already taken apart. In my view, each note derives from the redactor of the respective drafts of Polybius to EV and ES, who did not access the successive portion of the same complete text with which probably another colleague was busy and inserted a note to enable another collaborator in a later phase to complete the lacuna. Since the lacuna remained to be filled, the scribes transferred the note from the drafts into the final copies.

Starting with the same “Keep searching!” note, instructions appear in the manuscripts at places when a section was classified elsewhere. Such notes reveal a number of once extant but now lost titles of the *Excerpta* (Table 2). In my view, these notes had a technical function and addressed, as the previous example, other participants of the imperial team rather than the future readers of the final manuscripts. It is worth noting that the excerpts often go across chapter divisions but never cross book divisions. We frequently find indications in the margins, normally in majuscule script and separated from the main text body, when a new book begins (the most frequent type) or ends,⁶⁸ sometimes combined with contents⁶⁹ or imperial topic titles under which some sections from the actual place of the actual book are classified.⁷⁰ Our hypothesis of the excerptors' work with loose

65 *Turonensis* 980, f. 318v: ζῆτει ἐνέλειπε γὰρ φύλλα μῆ', ἐν οἷς περὶ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου ἐνεφέρετο καὶ περὶ Ἀρσινόης EV II, 140, 6–8 in exc. 50.

66 *Vaticanus gr.* 73, f. 15v, Plb. exc. 89, ES 167: ἰστέον ὅτι τὸ προοίμιον μόνον διεσάφει τοῦ τεσσαρεσκαυδεκάτου λόγου· τὰ δ' ἐφεξῆς πάντα ἐνέλειπεν μέχρι λ' φύλλον.

67 A Polybian proem normally includes indications on the forthcoming contents of the actual Book it precedes.

68 Cf. e.g., *Turonensis* 980, ff. 304v: λόγος κ' (EV II, 163,4), τέλος τοῦ κ' λόγου τῆς Πολυβίου ἱστορίας (EV II, 166,18), 117r: τέλος τοῦ δεκάτου λόγου τῆς Πολυβίου ἱστορίας (EV II, 124,26). See some notes as part of the body text in minuscule: f. 304r: ὅτι φησὶν ὁ Πολύβιος ἐν τῷ η' λόγῳ ὅτι... (EV II, 161,25); *Vaticanus gr.* 73, ff. 42r: ὅτι φησὶν ὁ Πολύβιος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ λόγῳ... (ES 121.8), 30r: ὅτι φησὶν ὁ Πολύβιος ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ δευτέρῳ... (ES 178.15).

69 E.g. *Vaticanus gr.* 73, f. 35v: ὅτι ἡ λη' βιβλος περιέχει τὴν συντέλειαν τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀτυχίας... (Polybius 28.3.1, ES 210.14–15).

70 In addition to the note on Polybius Book 14 and the note on Nicolaus of Damascus' Book 7 below (fn. 78), see, e.g., *Vaticanus gr.* 73, f. 23r: ὅτι ὁ Πολύβιος φησι κατὰ τὸ τέλος τῆς συγγραφῆς... (ES 221.3), 23v: ζῆτει ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ τίς τί ἐξεύρε. τέλος τῆς Πολυβίου ἱστορίας λόγου λθ'. ζῆτει τὸν μ' λόγον Περί γνωμικῶν ἀποστομισμάτων (ES 222.10–12).

fascicules would make a more reasonable sense of these notes and the redactors' special attention on book divisions. Similar notes feature in the main hand such as "what follows is unknown", "keep searching, a bit of text is missing" and "keep searching".⁷¹ Like the previous notes, they apparently do not address the readers of the final copies but the collaborators of the project. In most cases, omission of texts did not produce such a cross-reference. These technical remarks hint at the difficulty of the research the redactors needed to carry out constantly during the construction of the series of excerpts from a single historical work.

Another previously ignored body of evidence supports this hypothesis. Among the excerpts from Procopius, Theophylactus Simocatta and Polybius, various collections of the *Excerpta* include huge gaps of books' length, although a careful excerptor could have ascribed appropriate passages to each of these collections. The two-stage model of excerpting directly from the complete text to the final copies, thus, cannot explain the omission of passages that would suit the topic of final copies. ES (*On Gnomonic Statements*), for example, embraces a large number of short excerpts one would expect to be more or less proportionately dispersed among different books. This collection, however, does not include a single excerpt from Procopius *Wars* Books 1–2, 8 (Table 4), or Book 5 of Theophylactus Simocatta's *Historiae* (Table 5) or Polybius' *Historiae* Books 17–19, 25–26, 34–35, or 40 (Table 6), although all the other books of Polybius contributed material to this collection.

Table 4: Distribution of excerpts in Procopius' Wars

Book	ELr (exc.)	ELg (exc.)	ES (exc.)
1	1–4	1–7	—
2	5–16	8–13	—
3	—	14–15	1–18
4	—	—	19–38
5	17–19	16–19	39–49
6	20	20–2	50–64
7	21–2	23–6	65–78
8	23–5	27–31	—

Table 5: Distribution of excerpts in Theophylactus Simocatta

Book	ELr (exc.)	ELg (exc.)	ES (exc.)
Dial.	—	—	1
Proem	—	—	2

71 *Turonensis* 980, f. 79v: καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς εἰὼν ἄπειρα (at the end of the excerpts from George the Monk: EV I, 156,22–23); f. 321v: ζητεῖ ὀλίγον διέλιπε (lacuna after Polybius 16.17.7: EV II,148,2); f. 316v: ζητεῖ (after Polybius 12.25.9: EV II,135,4); f. 122v: ζητεῖ (Cassius Dio 59.27: EV II, 333,1); f. 126v: ζητεῖ refers to the gap of Cassius Dio 61.9.5: EV II, 347, 3–4).

1	1–3	1–3	3–15
2	—	—	16–27
3	4	4	28–32
4	—	5–7	33–44
5	—	8–11	—
6	5	12–13	45
7	6	14–15	46–47
8	8–9	16	48–53

Table 6: Distribution of excerpts in Polybius

Book	EV (exc.)	EI (exc.)	ELr (exc.)	ELg (exc.)	ES (exc.)
1	—	—	1	—	1–2–(1 lost f.)–3–12
2	1–4	—	—	—	13–(2 lost f.)–15
3	5	—	2–4	—	16–24–(1 lost f.)
4	6–14	—	—	—	25–32
5	15–18	—	—	—	33–35–(1 lost f.)–37
6	19–20	—	—	—	38–42
7	21–25	—	—	—	43–44
8	26–28	—	8	—	44–46–(1 lost f.)–49
9	29–30	—	9	—	50–58
10	31–36	—	—	—	59–63
11	37–38	—	λόγος ια'	—	64–72
12	39–44	—	—	—	73–78–(1 lost f.)–85
13	45–49	—	—	—	86–88
14	50	—	—	—	89
15	51–56	1	10	—	90–95
16	57–63	—	11–14	—	96
17	—	—	—	—	—
18	64–70	—	15	1–4	—
19	—	—	—	—	—
20	71–72	—	—	5–7	(1 lost f.)–97–98
21	73–75	—	16–17	8–28	99–101
22	76–79	—	18–20	29–37	102–10
23	80–85	—	21	38–44	105–110
24	86–87	—	22–23	45–49	111–112
25	88–89	—	—	50–53	—
26	—	—	—	—	—

27	90–97	—	24–25	54–60	113–115
28	98–101	—	26	61–72	116–118
29	?	—	27	73–78	119–127
30	?	—	28	79–85, 89	128–133
31	102–104	—	29	87–88, 90–99	134–138
32	105–109	—	30	100–109	139–143
33	111–112	—	31–33	110–117	144–146
34	113	—	—	—	—
35	—	—	—	118	—
36	114–115	—	—	119	147–148
37	—	—	—	—	149–155
38	116–119	—	34–35	—	156
39	120–124	—	—	—	157–166
40	—	—	—	—	—

ELr and ELg (both collections *On Embassies*) disregard Procopius' *Vandal Wars* (Books 3–4) although one could find here appropriate passages for both collections. For example, Book 3, which is absent from both imperial collections, includes passages on embassies of Romans to foreigners.⁷² ELg (*On Embassies of Foreigners [to the Romans]*), however, includes two excerpts from Book 3 but not appropriate for the topic *On Embassies*. Each of these excerpts is a short description of peace treaties with the Romans initiated by the Vandal king Gaiseric, one concluded in 435 with the emperor Valentinian III (r. 425–455) securing the Vandals the new occupied territories in North Africa,⁷³ and an “eternal peace” agreed in 474 with the Eastern Roman Emperor Zeno (r. 474–475, 476–491).⁷⁴

Such disregard of Procopius' *Vandal Wars* in ELr–ELg (both collections *On Embassies*) might demonstrate that the excerptor responsible for these topics lacked access to Procopius' *Vandal Wars*. Another person, however, who focused on peace agreements rather than embassies, had access to Book 3. It was yet another task to copy the excerpts into ELr and ELg, distinguishing them on the basis of who sent the embassies, whether the Romans or the foreigners. The

72 See the accounts on Maiorinus (Proc. *Wars*, 3. 7. 4–15, ed. Haury: I, 340–342), who went in disguise to the Vandal king Gaiseric (r. 428–477) as an imperial envoy; Justinian's two unsuccessful attempts (Proc. *Wars*, 3. 9. 10–24, ed. Haury: I, 351–355) to convince the Vandal king Gelimer (r. 530–534) via envoys to release Ilderic from prison, who would in theory enjoy precedence on the Vandal throne and cherish good relations with Byzantium; or the embassy of Eulogius (Proc. *Wars*, 3. 10. 32–34, ed. Haury I, 360), whom Justinian sent to Godas (d. 533), the sovereign of Sardinia, to accept the alliance he offered against the Vandals; or the unsuccessful Roman embassy to Gaiseric (Proc. *Wars*, 3. 22. 6–11, ed. Haury I, 405–406).

73 Proc. exc. 14 in ELg 497–498: 3.4.12–14, ed. Haury I, 327.

74 Proc. exc. 15 in ELg 498: 3.7.26–27, ed. Haury I, 344.

person in charge of this task, probably the scribe of the final copy, decided to add excerpts from four historians⁷⁵ and those on peace agreements to ELg.

The unification of fascicules containing the excerpts that had been classified by topic sometimes led to confusion. In EV, for example, excerpts from Dionysius of Halicarnassus were mistakenly copied among those of Nicolaus of Damascus.⁷⁶ The two excerpts from Dionysius narrate episodes involving the founders of Rome, Romulus and Remus, directly following the passages on Cyrus' conquest of Lydia.⁷⁷ Subsequent to the misplacement of the two excerpts, we read the excerptor's instruction: “the end of Book 7 of Nicolaus of Damascus; search for the missing sections in [the collection] *On Pagan Mythology*”.⁷⁸ At some point, the redactor could not find the continuation and copied a text that clearly does not fit the content. Ultimately, the redactor confessed that he could not find anything from Book 7. Similar confusion took place in the collection ELg⁷⁹ and in EI.⁸⁰

I assume that an index volume assisted the teamwork of excerptors in the third stage, especially at points where the loose fascicules left off and the continuation had to be found. Such an index volume probably included the list of historians involved in the *Excerpta*, their works and their separate portions, along with contents of their sections (author, title, book and hints at the range of included topics), in order to assist the process of excerpting these sections into separate thematic groups. This assumption relies on a note at the very end of the excerpts from Polybius: “Search in the volume *On Who Found What* (περὶ τοῦ τίς τι ἐξεῦρε). The end of Polybius Book 39. Search Book 40 *On Gnomonic Statements*”.⁸¹ This statement has so far been mostly understood as a reference to a lost volume

75 Hdt. (ELg 435–436), Thuc. (ELg 436–438), Agathias (ELg 438–441), and Appian (ELg 516–568) are under the heading *On Embassies*.

76 EV I, 349–353 (ed. Büttner-Wobst): after Nicolaus of Damascus, exc. 30–31 (*FGrHist* 90 F 69–70). The location of the misplaced passages (f. 162r–v and f. 155r–v) proves that it was the main scribe of *Turonensis* 980 who committed this mistake and not a later bookbinder. É. PARMENTIER-MORIN, Les fragments de Denys d'Halicarnasse attribués à Nicolas de Damas, in: S. Pittia (ed.), *Fragments d'historiens grecs, autour de Denys d'Halicarnasse*, Rome 2002, 461–477.

77 Two passages with the same content and sequence appear in *Parisinus suppl. gr.* 607A, ff. 47v–55v, see M. Treu (ed.), *Excerpta anonymi byzantini e codice Parisino suppl. gr.* 607, Ohlau 1880, 33–37.

78 *Turonensis* 980, f. 155v: τέλος τοῦ ζ' λόγου τῆς Νικολάου ἱστορίας; ζητεῖ τὰ λείποντα περὶ ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας.

79 ELg 477,21–479,3 (Theoph. Sim. exc. 1–2) was copied in all manuscripts of ELg at the point of ELg 462,5 after Menander exc. 20. DE BOOR, *Suidas* 1, op. cit. fn. 9, 422–423.

80 An excerpt from Polybius entered the excerpts of Dion. Hal. (EI 212–224) is in *Scorialensis* Ω.I.11, ff. 188r–196v. The excerpt of Polybius is ca. one bifolio (f. 188v, line 15–190v, line 7). It can be a mistake made in the sixteenth century.

81 See the reference to this volume in *Vaticanus gr.* 73, f. 23v (at the end of Polybius, exc. 166). This note can be interpreted as the general index volume by analogy with the *Tipucitus* of the legal corpus of the *Basilica* (τιπουκείτος from τί πού κείται “where to be found what”) with summaries and *incipit* of the subdivisions. Cf. *Vaticanus gr.* 853. Cf. DE BOOR, *Zu den Excerptsammlungen*, op. cit., fn. 28, 140–144.

On Inventors and Their Inventions,⁸² interpreting discovery (ἔξευρίσκω) in the more restrictive modern sense of the term rather than the more general sense of the classical word, which encompassed “inventions” of rhetorical and moral kind. However, discoveries in this modern sense seem to have been classified under other headings as, for example, under the title *On Virtues and Vices* (EV)⁸³ and would conflict with the basic grounds of topical distinction in the classifications system of the *Excerpta* (Table 2). The location of this note and its relevance in the coordination of teamwork rather support the hypothesis that this statement refers to an index volume that helped the coordination of the second stage and the scribes of the final volumes assembling the drafts in the third stage. The title *On Who Found What* actually would refer to historians who found material and topics for their works as part of the rhetorical construction of their discourse.⁸⁴ The initial phase of excerpting was dedicated to carefully classifying this material. Such an index volume can be the source of the note in the collection *On Embassies of foreigners to the Romans*: “It is worth knowing that [this topic] cannot be found among the excerpts from Xenophon”.⁸⁵

Summary of the three-stage method and the *Suda*

Considering practical challenges and circumstances, I assume three consecutive phases of work instead of two. First, each of the complete texts was classified into topics by perhaps no more than one person per historical work with a minimalist approach, using probably a number or a symbol to mark the division points of the text according to topic. This phase is roughly the same as the first phase of the widely accepted two-stage model.

In the second phase, each redactor was responsible for a certain number of topics and select portions of texts that included substantial material appropriate to these topics. Annotated texts of the complete works could perhaps be accessed in groups of loose fascicules that were taken out of their bindings and circulated among redactors. Such a method may have accelerated the production of the excerpts from one manuscript. Each redactor probably had the task to copy, into

82 Cf. P. SCHREINER, *Die Historikerhandschrift*, op. cit., fn. 34, 21 and 26; and FLUSIN, *Les Excerpta Constantiniens*, op. cit., fn. 2, 555. It has been rendered as “On Who Discovered What” in: TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, op. cit., fn. 66, 159; and KALDELLIS, *Byzantine Readings*, op. cit., fn. 2, 40.

83 See a few stories from EV describing an invention of an idea or thing by a historical figure in which the word ἔξευρίσκω is used: the interpretation of the Pharaoh’s dream by Joseph (EV I, 23,31–25,14 = Jos. *AJ* 2.80–90); the invention of the brazen bull by Phalaris tyrant of Agrigentum (EV I, 251,3–12 = Diod. 20.71.2); the invention of public disgrace by Tarquinius Superbus to stabilize his tyrannical power with the concluding sentence ‘and this is what he invented and what happened many times’ (καὶ τοῦθ’ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου τότε ἐξευρεθὲν καὶ πολλακίς ἐγένετο) (EV II, 237,1–238,5 = Cassius Dio F 11,2–6).

84 See this sense of ἔξευρίσκω in Marcellinus, *Vita Thucydidis* 38 (EV II,32,15): μόνος ὁ συγγραφεὺς ἐξευρὲν τε δημηγορίας καὶ τελείως ἐποίησε μετὰ κεφαλαίων καὶ διαρρέσεως.

85 *Ambrosianus* N 135 sup., f. 386r and *Scorialensis* R.III. 13, f. 6v red, margin, next to the heading of Agathias (ELg 438.14) ση. ἰστέον ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας Ξενοφώντος οὐχ εὔρηται.

new parchment fascicules distinguished by topic, the excerpts in the sequence of the narrative following the division marks already present. The production of these drafts involved textual adjustments of the kind we saw in the excerpt from Arrian in *Par. suppl. gr.* 607, which required the careful understanding of the complete text. It can be interesting to note that the direct models which the scribe of *Turonensis* 980 used probably included excerpts from Polybius Books 1–10 and 11–20 separately, hinting at two different excerptors in charge in the second phase, since he departed from his usual standard of finishing the page in line thirty-two and instead copied thirty-three lines on the page with an increasing density of abbreviation towards the end.⁸⁶ At the end of Polybius, such an instance produced a “Keep searching” note in *Vaticanus gr.* 73.⁸⁷

In the third phase, scribes assembled all fascicules of drafts that belonged to each topic, relying on an index volume that probably assisted the coordination of work already in the second phase, and copied them in deluxe manuscripts. Only a single set of deluxe manuscripts of the *Excerpta* was intended to enter the imperial library. The complicated production of the *Excerpta* would not allow for additional complete sets. Between the second and third phases several decades might pass and the accumulation of the drafts must have been a gradual process with a varying pace.

As a final note, the relationship between the *Suda* and the *Excerpta* seems to support the idea of separating the second and the third work phases. The compiler(s) of the *Suda* must have been in contact with one or two of the scribes of the last phase, including that of *Turonensis* 980, who enabled them to access certain collections of the *Excerpta* with which these scribes were busy in the 970s when the *Suda* was produced. It is indicative that only a certain number of Constantine VII’s collections reached the hands of the *Suda*’s compiler(s).⁸⁸ These collections included *On Virtues and Vices* (EV), *On Embassies* (EL), *On Heroic Deeds*, *On Leading the Army*, *On Defeats*, *On Sieges*, and *On Preparation for War*. Two extant collections, *On Ambushes* (EI)⁸⁹ and *On Gnomic Statements* (ES) did not provide the *Suda*’s compiler(s) with source material. The compilers of the *Suda* had access to Procopius’ *Secret History* as well as Xenophon’s *Hellenica*, though both are absent from the surviving sections of the *Excerpta*. In addition, the *Suda* frequently cites Patriarch Nicephorus’ *Short History*, which the surviving portion of the *Excerpta* does not include. At the same time, no citation derives from John Malalas or Peter the Patrician, though both are present in the *Excerpta*. My assumption that the drafts of the *Excerpta* included the historical excerpts already classified by topic in fascicules grouped by the historian would explain why the compilers of the *Suda* excluded certain topics and historians of the *Excerpta* and included others.

86 *Turonensis* 980, f. 117r (end of Book 10) and f. 306r (end of Book 20).

87 *Vaticanus gr.* 73, f.23v; cf. fn. 70 and 81.

88 Cf. DE BOOR, *Suidas* 2, fn. 8, 126–127; BÜTTNER-WOBST, *Die Anlage*, op. cit., fn. 2, 119–120; ROBERTO, *Iohannis Antiocheni Fragmenta*, op. cit., fn. 60, lxxix.

89 In a disagreement with de Boor, Roberto believes that the *Suda* used the collection *On Ambushes* (EI) of John of Antioch. Cf. ROBERTO, *Iohannis Antiocheni Fragmenta*, op. cit., fn. 60, lxxxix–xxxix, xcii–xciii.

The individual volumes of the *Excerpta* – in either their draft or final versions – could hardly have circulated outside the circle of the Byzantine court without good reason. In my view, the production of the final luxury copies of the *Excerpta* could explain how the *Suda*'s compiler(s) accessed them probably beyond the restricted readers at court. In a scriptorium that also worked on the basis of a courtly commission, the scribes could access the draft fascicules when assembling and copying their contents in separate manuscripts by topic, and use them for other purposes too.

András Németh
Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
Cortile del Belvedere
00120 Città del Vaticano
nemeth@vatlib.it

Towards the compilation principles of *Excerpta historica Constantiniana*

Daryia RAFIYENKO (Leipzig)

Our knowledge about the mechanisms underlying the creation of Excerpta historica Constantiniana (EC) – an encyclopedia commissioned by the Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos in 10th century Byzantium – is still insufficient, despite a number of important studies. This paper sets out to approach this question on the basis of textual repetitions present in the text of EC. The overall goal is to shed light on the principles and methodology that were guiding the compilers of EC. In particular, the focus of this study lies on repetitions, i.e. those text passages of the same author that appear in at least two different places in EC; Such pairs of passages are denoted as reiterations in the following. Overall, 54 pairs of reiterations were identified by using automated tools and then analyzed. The respective length of the reiterated passages ranges from 8 to 150 words per reiteration; the reiterated passages were found in 101 excerpts. The subsequent analysis reveals two main types: the subset type and the intersection type. The former is found when the excerpt attesting the reiteration also contains a text not present in the counterpart excerpt. In turn, the latter type is found when only one of the excerpts contains a text not present in the counterpart excerpt. The two main types can be further classified into two subtypes each: transition, patchworking, extraction, and duplication. The analysis of these types allows to reconstruct the workflow of the excerptors, in turn illuminating the methodology of the entire EC project.

1 Introduction

In 10th century Byzantium, an ambitious project on the creation of a large-scale collection of excerpts¹ was commissioned by the Emperor Constantine VII

1 I denote EC here as *collection of excerpts* (or *excerpt collection* respectively) because there is no *opinio communis* on how to denote the genre of EC. The most frequent term used is probably *encyclopedia*, see K. KRUMBACHER, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches: (527 – 1453)*, 2 vols., 2nd edition, München 1897, 258; TH. BÜTTNER-WOBST, *Der Codex Peirescianus. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Excerpte des Konstantinos Porphyrogenetos, Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse* 45, 1893, 261–352; A. DAIN, *L'encyclopédisme de Constantin Porphyrogénète, Bulletin de l'association Guillaume Budé, Supplément Lettres d'humanité* XII, 1953, 64–81; P. LEMERLE, *Le premier humanisme byzantin*, (Bibliothèque byzantine – Etudes, 6), Paris 1971, 287–288; A. NÉMETH, *The imperial systematisation of the past in Constantinople. Constantine VII and his Historical Excerpts*, in: J. König – G. Woolf, (eds.), *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, Cambridge 2013, 232–258, esp. 234–235; cf. CH. HANNICK, *Enzyklopädie, Enzyklopädie*, in: *Lexikon des Mittelalters* 3, 1986, 2031–2039. However, the question whether it is appropriate to denote EC as encyclopedia is a matter of the ongoing debate, cf. P. ODORICO, *La cultura della ΣΥΛΛΟΓΗ. 1) Il cosiddetto enciclopedismo bizantino 2) Le tavole del sapere di Giovanni Damasceno*, *BZ* 83, 1990, 10–21 and the volume edited by P. Van Deun, C. Macé (eds.) *Encyclopedic Trends in Byzantium?* (Proceedings of the International Conference held in Leuven, 6–8 May 2009), (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 212), Leuven 2011, and the contributions of Magdalino, Odorico, and Schreiner in this volume in particular.