

## The Chronology of Theophanes 607—775.

It has long been recognised that from 727 to 775 the years of the world in Theophanes do not agree with the years of the indiction. The most obvious explanation of this is that through an oversight he related the events of two years under one, and 50 years lower down, discovering his error, distributed the events of one year over two. Another solution has however been propounded by Prof. Bury<sup>1)</sup>, who supposes that in 726 Leo III raised double taxes, while in 774 or 775 his successor remitted a year's taxation. In this theory he has been followed by M. Hubert<sup>2)</sup>, who has attempted to confirm it by the dating of the Papal letters.<sup>3)</sup> Neither of these writers however has taken into account the fact that the discrepancy is not peculiar to the years 727—775, but is found also in the years 607—714. Hence, if Leo doubled the taxes in 726, we must suppose that Phokas did the same in 607, and in both cases the chronology must at a later time have been set right by a corresponding remission. Both have also confounded together passages in which the number of the indiction is actually mentioned, i. e. passages derived from a Western source, in which the indictional reckoning was used, and passages in which it can only be inferred by calculation, these latter being generally passages derived from an Eastern source, in which the reckoning was by Seleucid years. In this article therefore I propose to consider these two classes of passages separately, discussing every case in which the year indicated can be inferred from correspondence between the day of the week and month, from parallel passages derived from the same source, or by other means. As no one has maintained that in the period 607—714 the years of the indiction are to be reckoned in any other than the usual way, I do not propose, while dealing with the former class of passages, to occupy space by

---

1) History of the Later Roman Empire vol. 2 p. 425.

2) Byz. Zeitschr. vol. 6 p. 491.

3) Also by Mr Hodgkin in English Historical Review vol. 13 p. 283.

discussing the chronology of this period, but shall begin with the year 727.

AM 6221. Deposition of Germanus Tues. Jan. 7 ind. 13. According to the old reckoning this was 730, in which Jan. 7 was a Saturday, according to the new reckoning 729, in which it was a Friday. Now Germanus was consecrated on Sun. Aug. 11, 715, and according to Theophanes sat 14 y. 5 m. 7 d. If we reckon the days inclusively, this brings his deposition to Tues. Jan. 17, 730, and it is therefore the most reasonable supposition that the letter *ι* has by a very common omission fallen out. Moreover, if his deposition was in 729, it is hard to explain why all the catalogues assign him 15 years.

id. Ordination of Anastasius. Jan. 22 ind. 13. Jan. 22, 730 fell on a Sunday, which was the regular day for performing ordinations.

AM 6232. Earthquake at Constantinople Wed. Oct. 26 ind. 9. Oct. 26 fell on a Wednesday in 740, which agrees with the old reckoning.

id. Death of Leo June 18 ind. 9 after a reign of 24 y. 2 m. 25 d. His accession being on Mar. 25, 717, his death, if the term is correct, must have been in 741, which is the year to which the old reckoning would assign it. Further his successor died on Sept. 14, 775 after a reign of 34 y. 2 m. 26 d., which fixes his accession to 741. Moreover in spite of the arguments of M. Hubert I believe that the same date may be deduced from the Papal documents. The earliest document after Leo's death (Jaffé 2262) is dated Apr. 1 'Imp. Constantino a. XXIV PC eius a. II ind. XI'. Now the coronation of Constantine was on Mar. 25, 720; and, as it can hardly be contended that the new method of reckoning the indiction was in use at Rome<sup>1)</sup>, both indications bring us to 743 for the date of the letter and 741 for Leo's death. The same is the case with the dating of the Synod of Rome held Oct. 25 'Imp. Const. a. XXVI PC eius V ind. XIII' i. e. Oct. 25, 745. The letter Jaffé 2274 was obviously written immediately after the Synod, with which the indiction agrees, and we must therefore read 'a. XXVI' for 'a. XXVII'. In Jaffé 2276, dated Jul. 1 'Imp. Const. a. XXVI PC eius a. IV ind. XIV', the indiction and the regnal year do not agree, and, as in all such cases, we must give the preference to the indiction and place the letter in 746. The postconsulate does not agree with either date for Leo's death; but, if it was in 741, we need only make the easy

1) M<sup>r</sup> Hodgkin seems to suppose that it was; but, as Rome was practically independent at this time, it is surely incredible, and in M. Hubert's article the whole argument depends on the opposite assumption. I have dealt with this point in a note in *English Historical Review* vol. 13 p. 503.

correction 'VI' for 'IV', whereas, if it was in 740, we must read 'VII'. A similar divergence between indiction and regnal year is found in Jaffé 2277, dated Jan. 5 'Imp. Const. a. XXVIII imperii eius a. VI ind. XV'. If we accept the indictional date, the letter was in 747 and Leo's death in 741. The same date results from the two letters Jaffé 2291 and 2292, dated 'Imp. Const. a. XXXII PC eius a. XI ind. V' Nov. 4, i. e. Nov. 4 751.

The documents of the pontificate of Zachariah are therefore all in favour of the old date. The first document which points to the year 740 is the bull of Stephen II (Jaffé 2307), dated 'a. d. XIII Kal. Iun. Imp. Const. a. XXXII PC eius a. XII ind. V', which, if we, as usual, accept the indictional in preference to the regnal date, is May 20, 752, from which it would follow that Leo's death was assigned to 740.<sup>1)</sup> In Jaffé 2331, dated Febr. 26 'Imp. Const. a. XXXVIII PC eius a. XVIII Leone a. IV ind. X', the indictional date points to 757, and the postconsulate does not agree with either date for Leo's death, but would fix it to 739. It would however require a smaller change to bring it into accord with 740 than with 741. Jaffé 2342, dated 'Imp. Const. a. XL PC eius a. XX Leonis VII ind. XII' Feb. 5, i. e. in accordance with the indictional dating Feb. 5, 759, would like the last assign Leo's death to 739. The Synod of Rome, dated June 2 'Imp. Const. a. XLI PC eius a. XXI ind. XIV', must in accordance with the indictional date be assigned to 761, and the postconsulate points to 740 as the date of Leo's death. One more document remains, the bull of Hadrian I (Jaffé 2395), dated 'Imp. Const. a. LIII PC eius a. XXIII Leone a. XXI ind. X' Feb. 20. Here the indictional date points to 772, and the postconsulate assigns Leo's death to 739.

From a comparison of all these data it is clear that in the chancery of the contemporary Pope Zachariah Leo's death was consistently assigned to 741, while in those of Stephen II, Paul I, and Hadrian I it was assigned sometimes to 740, sometimes to 739. Under these circumstances I am unable to see how the Papal documents can be reasonably quoted in support of the year 740. The secretaries of Zachariah could not possibly have been ignorant of the date of Leo's death, and the fact that they unquestionably placed it in 741 appears to me a conclusive proof of the accuracy of that date.

AM 6233. Accession of Artavazd. June 27 ind. 10, according to the old reckoning 742, according to the new 741.

1) The very slight change 'Iul.' for 'Iun.' would bring it into accord with 741.

There are three Papal documents dated by the years of Artavazd.

1) The Synod of Rome held 'Ardabasti a. II Liudprandi a. XXXII ind. XII', i. e. between Sept. 1, 743 and January 744, from which we get 742 as the date of Artavazd's accession. 2) Jaffé 2270, dated 'Imp. Artavaso a. III PC eius a. III sed et Nicephoro imp. a. III ind. XII' June 22, i. e. June 22, 744. 3) Jaffé 2271, dated Nov. 5 'Imp. Art. a. III PC eius a. III sed et Nicephoro imp. a. III ind. XIII' (744). It is difficult to suppose that these two very consistent dates are corrupt, and I have therefore little hesitation in adopting Mr Hodgkin's inference that the reign of Artavazd lasted a year longer than is represented in Theophanes; but this does not affect the question of the indictions. The former of these letters points to 741 as the date of his accession, the latter to 742; but, if 742 is the correct date, the error in the earlier letter is only 5 days, and at Rome men might well be ignorant of the exact day from which his years were to be reckoned. The evidence is therefore strongly in favour of the date 742.

AM 6232. Overthrow of Artavazd. Nov. 2 ind. 12, by the old reckoning 743, by the new 742. The date 742 may be at once rejected; for, since we have a Papal letter of Apr. 1, 743 dated by the years of Constantine, while the earliest document dated by those of Artavazd is not earlier than Sept. 1, 743, we should have the absurdity that the Popes did not begin to reckon by Artavazd's years till at least 5 months after his overthrow. But, as indicated above, I believe that Theophanes is here in error and Artavazd reigned till 744.<sup>1)</sup> This is in favour of the old reckoning, since Theophanes is more likely to have made a mistake of one year than of two.

AM. 6242. Coronation of Leo IV. Whit Sunday ind. 4; by the old reckoning Apr. 18, 751, by the new Mar. 29, 750.

There are three Papal documents dated by the years of Leo. 1) Jaffé 2331 (see above), dated Feb. 26 ind. X (757) in the 4<sup>th</sup> of Leo. This would give 753 for the date of his coronation, but the slight correction 'VI' for 'IV' gives 751, while to get 750 we must read 'VII'. 2) Jaffé 2342, dated Feb. 5 ind. XII (759) in the 7<sup>th</sup> of Leo. This gives 752 for the date of his coronation, but 'VIII' is an easier correction than 'VIII'. 3) Jaffé 2395, dated Feb. 20 ind. X (772) in the 21<sup>st</sup> of Leo, which fixes his coronation to 751. The Papal dating therefore, though not conclusive, is in favour of the old date, and there is no document which points to the new.

AM 6245. Death of Anastasius between Sept. 1 and Feb. 10

1) The Spanish author of the Chronicle of 754 (Mommson Chron. Min. vol. 2 p. 366) makes Constantine besiege Constantinople 'pene per triennium'.

ind. 7. Synod of Constantinople Feb. 10—Aug. 8. Designation of Constantine to the patriarchate Aug. 8. According to the old reckoning these events happened in 754, according to the new in 753. I have already shown that the deposition of Germanus was on Jan. 17, 730 and the ordination of Anastasius on Jan. 22 in that year. Therefore, as all the catalogues give him 24 years, his death was at the end of 753 or beginning of 754<sup>1)</sup>, which agrees with the old reckoning. Further the catalogues give Constantine 12 years and Niketas 13 y. 2 m. or 13 y. 4 m. Now Niketas died on Feb. 6, 780, and his ordination was in November of the 5<sup>th</sup> indiction, which, as is clear from the term assigned to him, must have been Nov. 766. The deposition of Constantine, which was on Aug. 30 of the previous indiction, was therefore on Aug. 30, 766, and his ordination in 754. The same date is given by Michael the Syrian<sup>2)</sup>, who places the Synod of Constantinople in AS 1065 (Oct. 1, 753—Sept. 30, 754).

AM 6254. Battle of Anchialos. Thurs. June 30 ind. 1. June 30 fell on a Thursday in 763, which agrees with the old reckoning.

AM 6257. Deposition of the patriarch Constantine Aug. 30 ind. 4. I have already shown that this happened in 766, which agrees with the old reckoning.

AM 6258. Ordination of Niketas Nov. 16 ind. 5. I have already shown from the catalogues of the patriarchs that this was in 766; and this is further confirmed by the fact that Nov. 16, 766 was a Sunday.

AM 6260. Coronation of Eudokia Easter Eve Apr. 1, ind. 7. The year was manifestly in accordance with the old reckoning 769, in which year Easter fell on Apr. 2. The same applies to the elevation of Christopher and Nikephoros to the rank of Caesar on the next day, Apr. 2, being Easter Day.

AM 6261. Coronation of Eirene. Dec. 17 ind. 8. Under the Isaurian dynasty these minor coronations seem to have followed the rule of ordinations and been celebrated on Sundays or festivals. Thus Mary was crowned on Christmas Day, Constantine on Easter Sunday, Leo IV on Whit Sunday, Eudokia on Easter Eve, the younger Constantine on Easter Sunday. Now Dec. 17 fell on a Sunday in 769, which agrees with the old reckoning.<sup>3)</sup>

Accordingly every passage containing an indictional date which

1) He is recorded in the menologies under Feb. 10.

2) In the Arabic version in Brit. Mus. MS Or. 4402 (fol. 275a).

3) It is true that I cannot name another case of a coronation on a day other than a festival, but the analogy of ordinations is in favour of supposing that in default of a festival a Sunday would be chosen.

we are able to control tells in favour of the old reckoning. Outside Theophanes the only evidence bearing upon the point of which I am aware is the dating of the Ekloge of Leo; but, as in this the MSS vary in the year of the world, little stress can be laid upon it. The idea of a double indiction must therefore be dismissed as baseless; for the passages in Theophanes which are derived from the Eastern source, interesting as they are in considering the author's methods of chronology, are entirely irrelevant to the question of the indictions. The dating of the Ekloge, if it proves anything, can only prove another method of reckoning the years of the world.

The question of the reckoning of the years of the world in Theophanes is an exceedingly complicated one. That down to 606 and from 775 onwards, as well as from 715 to 726, the year AD is to be obtained from the year AM by deducting 5492 (which I shall denote scheme A) is admitted; on the other hand from 607 to 714 and, as has been shown above, from 727 to 775 it is in the passages derived from a Western source to be obtained by deducting 5491 (which I shall denote scheme B). It remains to consider the scheme followed in the passages derived from the Eastern source in these two periods. On this question it is scarcely possible, as yet, to arrive at any certain results, and this article will be practically limited to collecting facts on which a decision may be based.

The basis of this investigation must obviously be a comparison with other chronicles drawn from the same source, of which the chief is the great work of Michael the Syrian, which is at present accessible only in an Arabic version in Brit. Mus. MS Or. 4402<sup>1</sup>) and in an Armenian epitome; it is also epitomized in the Syriac chronicle of Gregory Abu 'l Farag. There are also a few correspondences with Theophanes in a Syriac chronicle ending in 846 which has been published by me in the *Zeitschr. der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* vol. 51 p. 569 ff., possibly also in the Chronicle of 775, falsely attributed to Dionysios.<sup>2</sup>) The work of Michael, like that of Theophanes, consists of two parts, a narrative and a chronological canon, which is inserted here and there in the margin and corresponds closely with that of Theophanes. In a note on fol. 264 we are informed that down to 710 this canon was copied from that of James of Edessa<sup>3</sup>), and this

1) I believe there is also a MS in the Vatican. The original Syriac is extant, but inaccessible (Guidi in *Giorn. della Soc. Asiat. Italiana* 3, 167).

2) Perhaps the work of Joshua the Stylite of Zuknin: see article of M. Nau in *Bulletin Critique* Jan. 1897. It has been edited by M. Chabot (Paris 1895).

3) James died in 708, but the note explains that the canon was continued by a pupil.

is confirmed by a comparison with the fragments of the chronicle of James in *Brit. Mus. Add. MS 14, 685*.<sup>1)</sup> It would therefore appear that at least for the chronological canon the common source<sup>2)</sup> of Theophanes and Michael was James of Edessa; and, if so, it can hardly be doubted that they used him for the narrative also.

Now James equates the 7<sup>th</sup> year of Phokas with Ol. 346, 4 and the 284<sup>th</sup> year from the Synod of Nikaia<sup>3)</sup>, or, as stated by Michael, AS 920 (609 AD), which agrees under the A scheme with the AM 6101 of Theophanes. The latter however gives Phokas only 7 years instead of the 8 allotted to him by James, and therefore equates the 1<sup>st</sup> of Herakleios with AM 6102, while Michael equates it with AS 922<sup>4)</sup> (611). Theophanes therefore reckons the years of Herakleios according to the B scheme. The early events of the reign, the defeat near Antioch, the capture of Kaisareia and Damascus, the occupation of Palestine and capture of Jerusalem, the conquest of Egypt, and the capture of Chalkedon, are in Michael dated by regnal years only, which with slight exceptions, due to erroneous copying<sup>5)</sup>, agree with Theophanes, and it would therefore appear that the dates of these events are to be reckoned by the B scheme. On the other hand, where Michael gives a Seleucid date, it does not agree with Theophanes under either scheme. Thus the murder of the patriarch Anastasius, the freezing of the sea, and the Saracen expedition against Syria (AM 6101, 6104) are in Michael all assigned to AS 922 (611).

The 1<sup>st</sup> year of Mahomet is equated by James with the 12<sup>th</sup> of Herakleios, the 297<sup>th</sup> from the Synod of Nikaia, and Ol. 350, 1, and by Michael with the 12<sup>th</sup> of Herakleios and AS 933 (622). Theophanes mentions Mahomet only in his 9<sup>th</sup> year, which he equates with AM 6122; and he would therefore equate his 1<sup>st</sup> year with AM 6114 and the 13<sup>th</sup> of Herakleios, which is in accordance with the A scheme. On the other hand the capture of Ankyra, assigned by Michael to the 1<sup>st</sup> year of Mahomet, is recorded by Theophanes under AM 6111, which

1) M. Nau (*Journ. Asiatique* 1898) denies the identity of the author of these fragments, who styles himself James Philoponos, with James of Edessa. With this point I am dealing in an edition of the fragments which will shortly appear in the *Zeitschr. der Deutschen Morgenl. Gesellsch.*

2) Not necessarily the direct source.

3) Strictly the 284<sup>th</sup> year of the canon, which begins with 326.

4) So James (286). The difference is perhaps due to the fact that Phokas is the only Emperor after Marcian to whom James assigns months as well as years, which caused Theophanes to neglect the months.

5) The capture of Jerusalem and conquest of Egypt are assigned to the 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> instead of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> years.

does not agree with either scheme. James and Michael give Mahomet 7 years, and therefore equate the 1<sup>st</sup> of Abu Bakhr with Ol. 351, 4 = AS 940. Theophanes however, perhaps following more accurate information, gave him 9 years, and equated the 1<sup>st</sup> of Abu Bakhr with AM 6123, which does not agree with James under either scheme. The 1<sup>st</sup> of Ardashir is equated by James and Michael with Ol. 352, 1 = AS 941 and by Theophanes with AM 6120, the discrepancy being due to the fact that Theophanes has passed from the 33<sup>rd</sup> to the 35<sup>th</sup> year of Khosru; if the missing year were inserted, his dates for Shiruwi<sup>1)</sup> and Ardashir would agree with James under the B scheme. All the later Persian rulers Theophanes confuses together under the name of Hormizd, to whom he assigns the 11 years allotted by Michael to Yazdkert. Both writers assign the death of Abu Bakhr to the 24<sup>th</sup> of Herakleios, and, as Theophanes reckons the regnal years by the B scheme, his AM 6125 = AD 633/4<sup>2)</sup>; and with this agrees the fact that Michael assigns it to AH 13 (Mar. 7, 634—Feb. 24, 635). In this place Michael erroneously equates the 24<sup>th</sup> of Herakleios with AS 946, whereas by his own canon it is 945, which agrees with Theophanes. Similarly the capture of Jerusalem is assigned to the 26<sup>th</sup> of Herakleios, AH 15 (Febr. 14, 636—Feb. 1, 637), and the end of AS 948 (637) instead of, as it should be, 947. From the agreement in the regnal year it follows that Theophanes' year of the world is here also to be reckoned by the B scheme and equated with AS 947 (636). The same is the case with the capitulation of Edessa; for, though Michael's text has the 27<sup>th</sup> of Herakleios, his Seleucid and Arabic years are both three above those of the last event, which is also the interval given by Theophanes, so that we should clearly read '29<sup>th</sup>', as in Theophanes. The error of a year in the Seleucid reckoning disappears in the next two notices, the census of 'Umar and the death of Herakleios, which are rightly assigned to 951 and 952, numbers which agree with Theophanes under the B scheme. In the latter notice the indictional date makes it probable that Theophanes has combined two sources.

In consequence of the antedating of the death of Mahomet the 1<sup>st</sup> year of 'Umar is in Michael's canon equated with AS 943; but in reckoning 'Umar's years it is clear that he followed a double system,

1) In the text of Michael, though Shiruwi is mentioned, his year is not inserted, but the year given to him by James is called the 39<sup>th</sup> of Khosru. The fragments of James break off at the accession of Ardashir.

2) In the notices derived from the Eastern source the years should of course be equated with Seleucid years, beginning on Oct. 1.

for he agrees with Theophanes in assigning the death of Herakleios to the 7<sup>th</sup> of 'Umar, which he there equates with AS 952.<sup>1)</sup> The same reckoning is probably followed in dating the capitulation of Edessa, which in the text is dated in the 6<sup>th</sup> of 'Umar, but, as the Syriac signs for 5 and 6 are easily confused, we should probably read '5<sup>th</sup>', as in Theophanes.

The date of the battle of the Hiermouchthas is given by Theophanes as Tues. Aug. 23 AM 6126, on the A scheme 634, on the B 635; and, since Aug. 23, 634 was a Tuesday, the notice points to the former being here used. The researches of Profs. de Goeje and Nöldeke<sup>2)</sup> have shown that the battle was fought in 636; but this is no justification for adopting the inferior reading 'Ιουλίου'. Perhaps Theophanes has confused two battles fought in the same region, which, as his narrative here shows signs of having been derived from two sources, is on other grounds probable. Michael has the 5<sup>th</sup> of 'Umar, which by the canon is 636, by the reckoning adopted in the narrative 639. The case is doubtful, but the evidence points to Theophanes having in the absence of a regnal year followed the A scheme.

The two authors share the error of assigning 12 years to 'Umar, which brings the 1<sup>st</sup> of 'Uthman in Michael to AS 955 and in Theophanes to AM 6138; but, as in the case of 'Umar, Michael follows a double reckoning, assigning the expedition against Constantinople to the 9<sup>th</sup> of 'Uthman, as in Theophanes, and equating it with AS 966, though in the canon it is 963. Theophanes assigns only 10 years to 'Uthman, and thus his equation 1<sup>st</sup> of Mu'awiya = AM 6148 agrees under the A scheme with Michael's 1<sup>st</sup> of Mu'awiya = AS 947.

The 1<sup>st</sup> of Constantine IV is equated by Michael with AS 954, and the 1<sup>st</sup> of Constantine V with AS 981, both of which agree with Theophanes under the B scheme. The years of the world therefore in notices dated by the regnal years of these Emperors must be reckoned by that scheme. These are 1) The rebellion of Gregory (AM 6138), dated by Michael in the 5<sup>th</sup> of Constantine, AH 25 (Oct. 28, 645 — Oct. 16, 646), AS 958 (646/7). 2) The invasion of Africa, which through an error in copying is dated by Theophanes in the following, by Michael in the same year. 3) The expedition against Constantinople (AM 6146), dated AS 966, AH 35 (Jul. 11, 655 — June 29, 656), the 9<sup>th</sup> of 'Uthman, and the 10<sup>th</sup> of Constantine, for which a reference to the

1) With this agrees the fact mentioned above that he places the death of Abu Bakhr in the 24<sup>th</sup> of Herakleios = AS 945.

2) De Goeje, Mémoires d'histoire et de géographie orientales n° 3 p. 87 ff.; ZDMG 29, 76.

canon and the datings of other events shows that we must read 13<sup>th</sup>. 4) The divergence as to Lent (AM 6156), dated AS 976, AH 44 (Apr. 4, 664—Mar. 23, 665), the 23<sup>rd</sup> of Constantine. 5) The rebellion of Shahpuhr (AM 6159), dated the 26<sup>th</sup> of Constantine, AS 978, for which the regnal year shows that we should read '979', thus making the interval after the last event the same as in Theophanes. 6) The rebellion of the Mardaites (AM 6169). In the following notices, where no regnal years are given, the Seleucid year shows that the years in Theophanes are to be reckoned by the same scheme. 1) The expedition against Cyprus (AM 6140 = AS 960). 2) Occupation of Rhodes (AM 6145 = AS 965). 3) Murder of 'Uthman (AM 6147 = AS 967 AH 35 [Jul. 11, 655 — June 29, 656]). 4) Campaign of Mu'awiya against 'Ali (AM 6148 = AS 968). 5) Murder of Constantine (AM 6160 = AS 980). 6) Earthquake in Mesopotamia (AM 6170 = AS 990). Michael places this on Easter Eve, the Chronicle of 846 on Sun. Apr. 30, and the Chronicle of 775 on Sun. Apr. 3, 990 (679). As Easter 679 fell on Apr. 3, the year is indisputably correct. 7) Death of Yazid (AM 6175 = AS 995). To these may be added the expedition against Africa placed by Michael at the beginning of the reign of Constantine, which from the canon should be AS 981 = AM 6161. There is not in the reigns of these Emperors a single correspondence which points to the A scheme. The following notices however do not accord with either scheme. 1) The fall of Kaisareia. Mich. AS 951; Theoph. AM 6133. The Chronicle of 775 however has 953, which agrees with Theoph. under the B scheme. 2) Murder of 'Umar. Mich. AS 955; Theoph. AM 6137. This divergence depends upon the divergence in the canon as to the Caliphs at this period. 3) Severe winter. Mich. AS 980; Theoph. AM 6162. 4) Rainbow at night.<sup>1)</sup> Mich. AS 989; Theoph. AM 6164. 5) Defeat of the Arabs by 3 patricians. Mich. AS 982 = 2<sup>nd</sup> of Constantine; Theoph. AM 6165. 6) Locusts in Syria. Greg. (not in Michael's text) AS 990; Theoph. AM 6168. 7) Death of Mu'awiya. Mich. AS 992 (681) AH 63 (Sept. 10, 682 — Aug. 29, 683); Theoph. AM 6171.<sup>2)</sup> Here, as in the case of the death of Herakleios, the indictional date<sup>3)</sup> perhaps shows that Theophanes drew from a Western source as well.<sup>4)</sup> 8) Rebellion of Al Mukhtar. Mich. AS 995; Theoph. AM 6174.

1) Theoph. loses the point by omitting the statement that it was at night.

2) The Chronicle of 846 has 991, which agrees with the B scheme.

3) If the date is genuine, we must read 'η' for 'α'.

4) There is one indictional date in Theoph., where a Western source seems impossible, viz. in the record of the earthquake and plague related under AM

In reckoning the years of Mu'awiya the two authors follow a somewhat different system. Michael assigns the first 5 years to Mu'awiya and 'Ali and equates the 1<sup>st</sup> year of Mu'awiya alone with AS 972, while Theophanes reckons the years of Mu'awiya straight on without break. Hence the divergence as to Lent (AM 6156) is in Theophanes dated the 9<sup>th</sup>, in Michael the 5<sup>th</sup> of Mu'awiya. The fact that the difference is 4, not 5, is due to the fact that in Theophanes the correspondence between the years of the world and the years of Mu'awiya follows the A scheme, while the correspondence between the years of the world and the years of Constantine follows the B scheme. Michael assigns 25 years in all to Mu'awiya, while Theophanes allows him only 24; hence the equations for the 1<sup>st</sup> of Yazid (AM 6172, AS 992) accord with the B scheme.

The 1<sup>st</sup> of Justinian is equated by Michael with AS 997, by Theophanes with AM 6178, which is therefore to be reckoned by the A scheme; and the same is the case with all succeeding Emperors as far as the canon of James extends. In the canon of the Caliphs the 1<sup>st</sup> of 'Abd Al Malikh is equated by Michael with AS 997 and by Theophanes with AM 6176, which do not correspond under either scheme, while the 1<sup>st</sup> of Al Walid is equated by Michael with AS 1017, and by Theophanes with AM 6198, which agree under the A scheme. The removal of the Cypriotes is placed by Michael in the 7<sup>th</sup> of Justinian, by Theophanes in AM 6183 = the 6<sup>th</sup> of Justinian. Since according to the canon of Michael the 7<sup>th</sup> of Justinian = AS 1003, the year of the world accords with Michael under the B scheme. Perhaps however the date given by Theophanes is due to the common confusion of  $\varsigma$  and  $\xi$ , in which case the common source dated by the regnal year, which in the case of Justinian follows the A scheme. The appointment of Al Chaggag to the governorship of Al 'Irak is placed by Michael in the 2<sup>nd</sup> of 'Abd Al Malikh, which by the canon is AS 998, by Theophanes in AM 6181, which do not agree under either scheme. After 692 no regnal date of an Emperor is given by Michael<sup>1)</sup>, from which we may infer that this mode of reckoning was no longer used by the common source; hence the connexion

---

6150, a passage absent in Anastasius. In this case the indiction must have been obtained by calculation.

1) There is one regnal date of a Caliph, the capture of Mopsouestia being placed in AS 1015, the 19<sup>th</sup> of 'Abd Al Malikh. The date 6<sup>th</sup> of Al Walid assigned by Gregory to the rebellion of Philippikos is not in Michael. In Langlois's translation of the Armenian version the marriage of Constantine and Eirene is placed in the 24<sup>th</sup> of Leo, but this date is not in the Armenian printed text.

between the canon and the narrative is henceforward much less close. Of the dated events of the period 693—714 the following correspondences point to the A scheme. 1) Capture of Amaseia (AS 1023 = AM 6204). 2) Earthquake in Syria Feb. 28 (AS 1024 = AM 6205). The Chronicle of 846 places this earthquake on Tues. Feb. 8, 1029, corrected in the margin to 1024 (713). Now Feb. 28, 713 was a Tuesday; and we must therefore accept the day given by Theophanes and Michael and place the earthquake in that year, reckoning the date of Theophanes by the A scheme.

The following on the other hand point to the B scheme 1) Death of 'Abd Al Malikh (AS 1017 = AM 6197). 2) Plundering expedition of Maslama (AS 1026 = AM 6206). With regard to the latter however it must be noted that with this exception in the period AM 6204—6208 the correspondences regularly point to the A scheme, so that we have probably a case of the common confusion of the Syriac numerals '5' and '6' and should read '1025'. Moreover the fact that Michael places an expedition of Maslama against the Turks in 1026 makes it incredible that the expedition to Asia Minor should also have been assigned to that year.

The eclipse recorded on Sun. Oct. 5 AM 6186 is doubtful. The actual year must have been 693, which points to the A scheme; but Michael, in whose text the Seleucid year has dropped out, assigns it to AH 75 (694), which points to the B scheme. Sun. Oct. 5 AH 75 is in fact the date given by Elijah of Nisibis<sup>1</sup>) from James of Edessa, which seems to place the use of James beyond question. Probably however James<sup>2</sup>) gave the correct Seleucid year (1005), though he erred in the Arabic year, and Theophanes naturally followed the former. In this case the dating is an instance of the A scheme.

The following agree with neither scheme. 1) Building of Mopsouestia. Theoph. AM 6193; Mich. AS 1017. This variation is perhaps due to the fact that Michael represents 'Abd Al Malikh as going to Mopsouestia immediately after its building and dying there, which made him place it in the year of the Caliph's death. 2) Al Walid forbids the use of Greek in the public accounts. Theoph. AM 6199; Mich. AS 1022. 3) Capture of Antioch in Pisidia, Theoph. AM 6205; Mich. AS 1023.

It seems clear then that from 610<sup>3</sup>) to 685 the years of the world

1) Baethgen, *Abh. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* vol. 8 n° 3 p. 35.

2) Or the continuator.

3) The error began in 607, but in the notices derived from the Eastern source, which were reckoned by regnal years, it would not appear till the beginning of a new reign.

in Theophanes, possibly with the exception of the date of the battle of the Hiermouchthas, are to be reckoned by the B scheme, not because Theophanes adopted a new method of reckoning the years of the world, but because he accidentally passed over a year, and, as in his sources events were dated by indictions and regnal years, he did not notice that his years of the world were wrong. The period 685—692 is doubtful; but after 692 the events were not reckoned by regnal years, and he therefore reduced the Seleucid years by a simple addition sum to years of the world<sup>1</sup>); accordingly we find his years in the notices derived from an Eastern source to be correct. The single exception of the death of 'Abd Al Malikh is easily explained by supposing that he simply added the years assigned to him to the year under which his accession was recorded. In the notices derived from a Western source on the other hand the years of the world remained incorrect up to 714.

In the period 715—726 the years are indisputably to be reckoned in accordance with the A scheme, and none of the dates given by Michael points to the B scheme. In the canon indeed the equations of the years of Theodosius, Leo, Solomon, 'Umar, and Yazid accord with the B scheme; but, since the events are not reckoned by regnal years and there is no reason to suppose the canons derived from the same source, the fact need not be taken into account; the correspondence in the narrative however continues to 746. In this period it will be the simplest plan to take the notices in order, beginning with the year 727.

AM 6221. Defeat of Maslama by the Turks. Mich. Chron. of 846 AS 1039, Greg. 1038. This accords with neither scheme.

AM 6222. Capture of Charsianon by Mu'awiya (Theoph. wrongly 'Maslama'). Mich. AS 1042. This accords with the B scheme.

AM 6223. Expedition of Maslama against the Turks. Mich. AS 1042. This accords with the A scheme, but the correspondence of the notices is somewhat doubtful.

---

1) If the ultimate source was the Chronicle of James, in the existing fragments of which the events are usually recorded opposite the years in the canon, we have a difficulty; but it is very probable that when James (or his continuator) came nearer to his own time, where there were more events to be recorded, he separated the narrative from the canon, as is the case in parts of the existing text. It is not unlikely that this change took place at the point at which the work of James himself came to an end. The existing MS of James seems to be only a collection of extracts, so that the absence of a notice in it does not prove that it was not derived from James. [It should however be remarked that in the period 693—710 the doubtful case of the eclipse is the only evidence for the A scheme except the reckoning of the regnal years in the canon.]

AM 6229. Appearance of a Pseudo-Tiberius. Mich. AS 1048. This accords with the A scheme, but there are considerable variations in the notices.

AM 6232. Martyrdom of Eustace. Mich. AS 1042, for which we should probably substitute 1052, which accords with the B scheme.

AM 6234. Death of Hisham. Mich. AS 1056, which accords with neither scheme. The Chronicle of 846 has the correct date 1054, which points to the B scheme.

id. A sign in the heaven in June. Banishment of Peter of Damascus (Mich. 'the Chalcedonian patriarch'). Michael assigns both these events to AS 1056, which accords with neither scheme.

AM 6235. Sign in the north. Mich. AS 1057. This accords with neither scheme.

With regard to these last four notices it is clear that the chronological connexion is the same in the two authors, though the dates are different; and in the case of the death of Hisham Theophanes, if we reckon his years by the B system, is undoubtedly right, while Michael is 2 years too late, though the correct date is given by the Chronicle of 846, which probably draws from the same source. It is further to be noted that Michael has the same error of 2 years at the death of Yazid, which he assigns to AS 1037 instead of the correct date given by the Chronicle of 846, which is 1035. Probably therefore Michael, having started with an error in the date of Yazid's death, was induced by the number of years assigned to Hisham to place his death also 2 years too late; and then, finding in his source, 'the same year there was a sign in the heaven, and the Chalcedonian bishop of Damascus was banished; and the next year there was a sign in the north' or words to that effect, assigned these events to 1056 and 1057 instead of 1054 and 1055. His dating therefore points to the B scheme in Theophanes.

id. Murder of Al Walid. This is dated by Theophanes Thurs. Apr. 16. Now Apr. 16 fell on a Thursday in 744, which accords with the B scheme, and Thurs. Apr. 16, 744 is in fact the date assigned to the murder in the Arabic writers. Michael does not give any date.

AM 6236. Comet in Syria. Mich. AS 1057. This accords with neither scheme.

After the year 746 I do not find any proof of correspondence between Michael and Theophanes, and therefore assume that for the succeeding period they followed different sources, which is perhaps supported by the second notice of Marwan's victory in Theoph. AM 6239 with the addition 'ὡς προέφην'. For the period 747—775

therefore it must be sufficient to adduce notices of events, of which the dates are certainly known or can be tested by correspondence between the days of the week and month; but this method is of course much less satisfactory than comparison with a work derived from the same source.

AM 6240. Rising of the *'Μαυροφόροι'*. Defeat of *'Ιβινδάρα'*. Defeat of Ibn Hubaira. Battle of the Zabatos.

The rising of the Abbasid partisans was in Mar. 747, the defeat of 'Amir, son of Dhabara, (who must be meant by *'Ιβινδάρα'*) in Mar. 749, the defeat of Ibn Hubaira in Aug. 749, and the battle of the Zabatos in Jan. 750. It is here clear that Theophanes has for the sake of convenience related a series of connected events under one year, so that no inference can be drawn as to the reckoning of the years.

AM 6241. Death of Marwan. The Arabs place his death in Aug. 750. This however does not give time for the events after the battle, and the date Sunday 3 days before the end of Dhu 'l Chigga is not consistent. On the other hand the Egyptian deacon John, quoted by Severus of 'Ushmunain<sup>1</sup>), says that Marwan came to Egypt in the Egyptian year 467 (begins Aug. 29, 750), and that he and other clergy were imprisoned, and were released on Messori 1 (Jul. 25, 751) after the Caliph's death. Now 3 days before the end of Dhu 'l Chigga AH 133 was Jul. 26, 751, which was a Sunday; and, as the difference of one day is easily explained<sup>2</sup>), the date Jul. 751 seems certain. This does not agree with Theophanes under either scheme; but clearly the antedating of the battle of the Zabatos caused him to antedate the Caliph's death.

AM 6246. Death of Abu 'l 'Abbas. This was in June 754, which points to the A scheme.

id. Defeat of 'Abd Allah. Murder of Abu Muslim. These events happened in Nov. 754 and Feb. 755, which points to the B scheme. It is probable however that they were recorded under this year for the purpose of bringing them into connexion with the Caliph's death.

AM 6248. Earthquake Mar. 9. The Chronicle of 775 places this on Tues. Mar. 3, 1067 (756), in which year Mar. 9 was in fact a Tuesday. This points to the A scheme.

AM 6252. Dispute about Easter (Apr. 6 or Apr. 13). Easter fell on Apr. 6 in 760, which points to the A scheme.

1) Renaudot, Hist. Patr. Alex. p. 227.

2) Perhaps by the Arabic practice of beginning the day at sunset; perhaps also Sun. Jul. 26 was the day on which the dispatch announcing his death was sent to Abu 'l 'Abbas.

id. Meteor in the East 10 days, and in the West 21 days. The Chronicle of 775 mentions a sign in the sky in the NE, which appeared in Mar. 760 and lasted 15 days to the Eve of Pentecost (i. Easter), and again on the evening of Whit Monday (May 26) in the SW for 25 days. The *Khitab al 'Uyun* also mentions a tailed star which appeared from Fri. 25 Al Much. 143 (Fri. May 16, 760) to 15 Saf. (June 5). This points to the A scheme, for in spite of the discrepancies I cannot doubt the identity of the appearances.

id. Eclipse of the sun Fri. Aug. 15. Aug. 15 fell on a Friday in 760, which points to the A scheme.

AM 6255. Rebellion of two brothers in Arabia and Al Basra. Mahomet rebelled in Sept. and was overthrown in Dec. 762, Abraham rebelled in Nov. 762 and was overthrown in Feb. 763. This points to the A scheme.

It would appear then that in the passages derived from the Eastern source in the period 727—746 the usage of Theophanes fluctuates, but that he more usually follows the B scheme. The error of a year in the passages derived from the Western source<sup>1)</sup> would of course be likely to lead to a similar error in those derived from the Eastern source, since many events would be recorded in both, and the chronological sequences would extend the error. There are however a few notices in which the other scheme appears to be followed. In the period 747—775 on the other hand the correct reckoning of the years is universal.<sup>2)</sup> The source followed in this period was probably a more purely Eastern one, the invasions of Asia Minor, of which several are recorded in Arabic writers, being conspicuously absent; hence there was little to connect the notices derived from Western sources with those derived from the Eastern source, and the error in the Western chronology would therefore not affect the Eastern passages.

The year of Artavazd's elevation may be fixed in another way. Pope Zachariah, who was ordained in Dec. 741, sent a letter to Constantine, the bearers of which on their arrival found Artavazd in possession. Now it is clear that, if his elevation had been in 741, Zachariah would have known the fact before sending the letter.

London.

E. W. Brooks.

1) This error I believe to have arisen simply from his having narrated the rising of the Helladikoi by anticipation in order to bring it into connexion with the attack upon the images.

2) For the period 756—775 this is indisputable, and there is no ground for assuming a different reckoning for the period 747—755.