THE *PATRIA* OF HESYCHIOS OF MILETOS:

A LITERARY PERFORMANCE

PIRIL US MACLENNAN

BOĞAZİÇİ UNIVERSITY

2020

THE *PATRIA* OF HESYCHIOS OF MILETOS:

A LITERARY PERFORMANCE

Thesis submitted to the

Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

by

Pırıl Us Maclennan

Boğaziçi University

2020

The *Patria* of Hesychios of Miletos:

A Literary Performance

The thesis of Pırıl Us Maclennan

has been approved by:

Prof. Nevra Necipoğlu (Thesis Advisor) _____

Assoc. Prof. Koray Durak _____

Prof. Niels Gaul (External Member) _____

July 2020

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Pırıl Us Maclennan, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Boğaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature ..... Pırıl Us Maclennan .....

Date ..... 04/08/2020 .....

ABSTRACT

The *Patria* of Hesychios of Miletos:

A Literary Performance

This thesis examines Hesychios of Miletos's late antique *Patria* of Constantinople within a framework of tools and concepts developed within literary studies, literary criticism, and memory studies. Modern scholarship has often approached the corpus of patriographic literature on Constantinople as an unreliable treasure of evidence about the city's topography. Likewise, Hesychios's *Patria* has been primarily used as evidence about the state of the contemporary social milieu and has not been thoroughly analyzed as a literary artifact. Hence, it has been the case that what we know about Hesychios's literary personality and interpretations of his *Patria are* reconstructions of modern scholars based on their view of Late Antiquity. This thesis conceives Hesychios's work as a literary performance. It starts by discussing the concept of genre and the genre of *patria* in Byzantine literature in chapter two. Looking at both primary sources about Hesychios and modern reconstructions of who he was, it examines what we can know about Hesychios's literary personality in chapter three. Chapter four introduces structural literary analysis tools and examines Hesychios's source *Anaplous Bosporou*. Chapter five is a thorough analysis of Hesychios's work through structural and literary analysis using tools and concepts developed in memory studies. All throughout, this thesis asks the perennial historiographical question, "How much can we really know?" and rather than reaching definitive conclusions, it aims to enrich and complicate what we think about Hesychios and his *Patria.*

ÖZET

Miletoslu Hesykhios'un *Patria*'sı

Edebi bir Edim

Bu tez, Miletoslu Hesykhios'un geç antik dönem eseri Konstantinopolis *Patria*'sını edebiyat kuramları, eleştri kuramları ve hafıza çalışamaları çerçevesinden incelemektedir. Günümüz araştırmacıları Konstantinopolis üzerine yazılmış patriografik edebiyata şehrin topografyası hakkında güvenilmez bir bilgi hazinesi olarak yaklaşmıştır. Bu bağlamda, Hesykhios'un *Patria'*sı çağın sosyal durumu hakkında bir kanıt olarak kullanılmış ve edebi bir eser olarak analiz edilmemiştir. Bu yüzden, Hesykhios'un edebi kimliği hakkında bildiklerimiz günümüz araştırmacılarının Geç Antik çağa dair görüşlerinden oluşmuş bir tarihi yeniden kurmacılıktır. Bu tez, Hesykhios'un eserini bir edebi performans olarak ele almaktadır. Giriş bölümünden sonra, ikinci bölümde edebi tür kuramını ve özellikle Bizans edebiyatında *patria* edebi türünü tartışır. Üçüncü bölüm, hem birincil kaynaklara hem de modern yeniden kurmalara bakarak, Hesykhios'un edebi kişiliği hakkında neler bilmemizin mümkün olduğunu inceler. Dördüncü bölüm, çeşitli yapısal edebi analiz araçlarını tanıtır ve Hesychios'un kaynağı *Anaplous Bosporou*'yu inceler. Beşinci bölüm, Hesykhios'un eserinin hafıza çalışmaları bünyesindeki kavram ve araçlarla yapısal ve edebi analizidir. Bu tez, çalışma boyunca tarih yazıcılığının "Gerçekten ne kadar bilebiliriz?" olan daimi sorusunu sorar; kesin sonuçlara ulaşmak yerine Hesykhios ve *Patria*'sı hakkında düşüncelerimizi zenginleştirmeyi ve komplikeleştirmeyi hedefler.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

With this thesis, I express my gratitude to Prof. Nevra Necipoğlu and Prof. Koray Durak for initiating me into Byzantine studies at an advanced level at Boğazici University and changing the course of my life with their encouragement and guidance. I would like to thank Dr. Athanasia Stavrou for patiently teaching me and my graduate cohort Ancient Greek from scratch. I would also like to thank her for helping me with translations in this thesis. I am indebted to Prof. Niels Gaul for helping me appreciate the intricacies of Byzantine Greek during long summer days. I would also like to thank the Byzantine Studies Research Center and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for their financial and academic support during my master's studies. Finally, I would like to acknowledge many of my professors and fellow student friends with whom I crossed paths for making my journey enjoyable.

Special thanks goes out to my dear mother, Hülya, and my dear father, Melih for supporting my education and ambitions from an early age and putting me through the best schools possible. I would not be where I am today if it were not for them.

Lastly, I would like to express my gratitude to my husband, John who selflessly supported me in all ways possible throughout my studying years and encouraged me to pursue an academic career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Introduction to the genre, corpus, modern editions and translations 1

1.2 Modern scholarship on the corpus 4

1.3 Key concepts, methodology and chapter plan 10

CHAPTER 2: *PATRIA* AS A GENRE AND MEMORY STUDIES 14

2.1 Brief introduction to modern genre theories 15

2.2 Modern genre theory in Byzantine literature 19

2.3 *Patria*: Use of the term as a substantive adjective and genre 233

2.4 Conceiving the genre of *Patria* from the perspective of memory studies 29

2.5 Chapter summary and conclusions 38

CHAPTER 3: REEVALUATING MODERN RECONSTRUCTIONS OF HESYCHIOS'S *PATRIA* 40

3.1 The nature of the *Bibliotheca* and the transmission of knowledge 42

3.2 The transmission of knowledge: Photios on Hesychios 54

3.3 Hesychios's religious identity 68

3.4 Chapter summary and conclusions 78

CHAPTER 4: STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE *ANAPLOUS BOSPOROU* 81

4.1 Structural analysis of Hesychios's history according to the "seven internal operative principles" of Panagiotis Agapitos 81

4.2 What the main source of Hesychios says and how he says it 89

4.3 Chapter summary and conclusions 108

CHAPTER 5: HESYCHIOS'S WORK AS A LITERARY PERFORMANCE.....110

5.1 C^e – The foundation of Byzantion: Discredited versions and the more persuasive one.....112

5.2 The narrative of Byzas: An epic hero.....118

5.3 Apollonios of Tyana: What does it (can it) signify?.....136

5.4 The siege of Philip II of Macedon: The role of Hekate.....139

5.5 The Athenian general Chares: His role in the narrative.....143

5.6 The Roman rule.....149

5.7 Hesychios: Christian or pagan?.....155

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....160

REFERENCES.....1744

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to the genre, corpus, modern editions and translations

Patria is the name of a literary genre used for works on local topography, monuments, and history in Greek literature.[1] These works involve mythological foundation stories and legendary accounts. They develop concomitantly with the sense of identity of their respective communities. While the genre of *patria* stems from the genre of *ktiseis*, epic foundation stories of Ancient Greek cities, it experienced a revival in Late Antiquity with many *patria* produced in many eastern Roman cities. The genre also enjoyed popularity through various texts on Constantinople in Byzantium.[2] Hence, in modern scholarship, "patriographic literature" has developed as a term to refer to works that involve information about the monuments of Constantinople.[3] However, in this thesis, it will be used to refer to works that contain information about the monuments, myths, and legends of late antique cities in general.

The *Patria* of Constantinople,[4] Πάτρια Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, is a compilation of legends and etymological stories about the foundation, statues, buildings, and monuments of Constantinople by an anonymous editor.[5] While the *Patria* of Constantinople was compiled in the tenth century, it contains material that dates between the sixth and ninth centuries.[6] A significant number of manuscripts

[1] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, s.v. "Patria."
[2] In this thesis, while Byzantium refers to what is now known as the Byzantine Empire, Byzantion refers to the ancient city that was later called Constantinople.
[3] Cameron and Herrin, *Parastaseis*, 1.
[4] The tenth-century compilation will be referred to as the tenth-century *Patria* from now on in this thesis.
[5] Albrecht Berger states that the work has reached modern times in more than sixty different manuscripts. Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 281
[6] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, vii.

testify that the text was well-known in the Byzantine literary community.[7] However, due to its compilatory nature, the text was copied rather freely with frequent redactions and editions.[8] The compilation's first modern edition was produced by Theodor Preger in the early twentieth century and published, together with a number of other texts, in his *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum.* [9] Thus, his edition, which is now commonly used as the tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople, should be conceived as a "synthesis of the [manuscript] tradition" rather than the absolute representative of one original text.[10]

The tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople is composed of four distinct sections, called "books" in modern scholarship. The first one of these integrates the sixth-century *Patria* of Hesychios of Miletos (Πάτρια κατὰ Ἡσύχιον), the primary subject of this thesis.[11] However, the first book of the tenth-century *Patria* is not solely made out of Hesychios's work; it also contains additions by later Byzantine editors.[12] Hesychios's sixth-century *Patria* (not the tenth-century Book I) was translated to English relatively recently by Anthony Kaldellis in 2007.[13] The second and third books of the tenth-century *Patria* are entitled *On Statues* and *On Buildings*, respectively. The second book, *On Statues,* makes use of an earlier work commonly known as the *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronika,*[14] an anonymous text that is commonly dated to the late seventh and the early eighth century, as well as other additions.[15]

---

[7] Brill's *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle* counts the following as the best-preserved manuscripts:
Munich, BSB, cod. gr. 218, fol. 107-135 (11th century); Vienna, ÖNB, cod. hist. gr. 37 (14th century), Paris, BnF, cod. gr. 1782, fol. 1-67 (14th century) and 1783, fol. 1-67 (15th century); and Vatican, BAV, cod. gr. 162, fol. 1-39 (16th century). *Encyclopedia of Medieval Chronicle,* s.v. "Patria Constantinoupoleos."
[8] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 282.
[9] Preger, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum.*
[10] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 282.
[11] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, xi.
[12] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, xii-xiii.
[13] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_7.
[14] *Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronika* will be referred to as *Parastaseis* from now on in this thesis.
[15] Cameron and Herrin, *Parastaseis*, 1.

The *Parastaseis* itself, separate from the tenth-century compilation, survived only in one single eleventh-century manuscript and was translated into English in 1984 by Averil Cameron and Judith Herrin with a commentary.[16] The third book of the tenth-century *Patria*, *On Buildings,* mostly appears to be a tenth-century compilation from various chronicles.[17] The fourth book is a narrative about the construction of Hagia Sophia and is commonly called the *Diegesis*.[18] Parts of the *Diegesis* were translated into English by Cyril Mango[19] and into French entirely by Gilbert Dagron in his work entitled *Constantinople imaginaire.*[20] The tenth-century compilation in its entirety (as Preger assembled it) was translated into English in 2013 by Albrecht Berger, who had made a partial German translation available earlier.[21] Over time the translations and commentaries have enabled the study of the patriographic literature of Constantinople. However, most attention has been given to the tenth-century corpus as a whole, and there currently does not exist a detailed study of Hesychios's work as a literary artifact.

The above introduction to the contents of the tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople was deemed necessary to separate Hesychios's *Patria* from a corpus that it is an essential part of and commonly associated with.[22] This thesis uses Preger's edition of Hesychios's *Patria.*[23] Modern scholars agree that originally

[16] Cameron and Herrin, *Parastaseis.*
[17] Berger, *Accounts* of *Medieval Constantinople*, xv.
[18] For a description of the contents of the tenth-century compilation in general, see Berger's introduction to his translation of the compilation in *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople.*
[19] Mango, "The Construction of St. Sophia," 96-102.
[20] Dagron, *Constantinoplei imaginaire*, 196-201(trans.); 211-264 (commentary); 256-314 (notes).
[21] English translation: Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople.* For the partial German translation, see Albrecht Berger's Ph.D. dissertation, entitled *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos*.
[22] *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, s.v. Patria Constantinoupoleos. Hesychios's *Patria* was inserted into an anonymous *vita* of Emperor Constantine in its entirety, along with extra Christian additions in the Biblioteca Angelica manuscript. The *vita* dates between the end of the ninth and the eleventh centuries. Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 395.; Berger, *Accounts* of *Medieval Constantinople*, xx.
[23] Preger, "The Patria of Constantinople," in *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum.*

Hesychios's *Patria* was not an independent work but was part of Hesychios's larger work dedicated to Roman history and general history, which is now lost in its entirety except for a few fragments.[24]About Hesychios's works and life, we know very little. Literary sources that give information about Hesychios and his works include Photios's ninth-century *Bibliotheca* and the tenth-century reference work *Souda*, both of which this thesis analyzes in detail in chapter three with regards to their entries on Hesychios. Besides a universal history, Photios's *Biblitotheca* attributes unfinished accounts of Justin's and Justinian's reigns to Hesychios, both of which have not survived to modern-day. In addition, the *Souda* attributes an *Onomatologos*, or a Table of Eminent Writers, to Hesychios. In terms of material evidence, we have three inscriptions found in Hesychios's hometown, Miletos, that mention a certain Hesychios, son of Hesychios, who lived in the sixth century; however, they cannot be definitively attributed to our Hesychios, the writer of the late antique *Patria* of Constantinople.[25] In fact, even when Hesychios lived is a matter of scholarly speculation since our textual sources do not provide any detailed information on this subject. Most convincingly, Kaldellis asserts that it is likely that Hesychios has spent a majority of his adult life under the rule of Anastasios (r. 491-518) and produced his *Patria* before the 540s.[26]

1.2 Modern scholarship on the corpus

Mainly hindered by the low survival rate of the sources, studies on the late antique *patria*, in general, have been a desideratum in the field. One of the most well-known contributors to the field, Alan Cameron, has published many works on poetry, poets,

[24] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," Biographical Essay.
[25] For a compilation of these inscriptions' Greek text and English translations, see Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," T_3, T_4, T_5.
[26] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 540.

and philosophers in Late Antiquity.[27] However, Cameron mainly discusses Hesychios's *Patria* within a paradigm of paganism vs. Christianity in Late Antiquity. A recent work that focuses on late antique *patria* is Lorenzo Focanti's Ph.D. thesis entitled "The Fragments of Late Antique *Patria*."[28] In his work, Focanti gathers all testimonies and fragments of the late antique *patria* and provides these with a critical edition, translation, and commentary, as well as a detailed introduction that focuses on various aspects of late antique *patria.* However, Focanti only briefly deals with Hesychios's *Patria* and "the architecture" of Hesychios's account of history.[29] Focanti concludes that Hesychios's *Patria* was part of his universal history; thus, he excludes it from the corpus of late antique *patria* and, consequently, from his study.[30]

The most thorough contemporary works discussing Hesychios's life and works belong to Anthony Kaldellis and Warren Treadgold. Kaldellis's works include an article entitled "The Works and Days of Hesychios the Illoustrios of Miletos,"[31] published in 2005, and his translation of and commentary on the fragments about Hesychios from different Byzantine sources as well as his translation of and commentary on the *Patria*.[32] Warren Treadgold's works include a section on Hesychios, entitled "Hesychius of Miletus," in his book *The Early Byzantine Historians* (2007)[33] along with Treadgold's various discussions of the nature of the so-called *Hesychius Epitome*[34] in his works *The Middle Byzantine Historians*

[27] For a compilation of his articles and essays see, Cameron, *Wandering Poets*.
[28] Focanti, "The Fragments."
[29] Focanti, "The Fragments," l.
[30] Focanti, "The Fragments," li.
[31] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 381-403.
[32] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)."
[33] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 270-278.
[34] We discuss the so-called *Hesychius Epitome* in detail in chapter three. At this stage, it is sufficient to note that some scholars claim that both the *Souda* and the *Bibliotheca* used a later epitome of Hesychios's table of eminent writers for biographical information of their entries.

(2013)[35] and *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (1980).[36] While all these works can be quite informative and insightful at times, they can also be speculative and often in complete disagreement with each other due to their interpretation of evidence. Furthermore, both Treadgold's and Kaldellis's studies are geared towards uncovering the religious identity of Hesychios and the literary atmosphere of the social and religious world of late antique Byzantium. They do not analyze the work as a literary artifact in its own right.

Thomas Russell features Hesychios's *Patria* in his recent book, *Byzantium and the Bosporus* (2017), which analyzes the relationship between ancient Byzantion and the Bosporos.[37] However, this work is not an in-depth analysis of the entirety of the *Patria*, which Russell classifies explicitly as Christian.[38] Following the footsteps of Kaldellis, Marion Kruse explores what it meant to be Roman after the fall of the western Roman Empire in 476 in his work, *The Politics of Roman Memory* (2019). While Kruse dedicates a chapter to Hesychios's *Patria* and offers a close reading of some sections of the work, he ultimately uses Hesychios's *Patria* to make an argument for the identity of the late antique Roman Empire and does not analyze the work thoroughly. [39]

As is the case with the corpus of late antique *patria*, the disappearance of Hesychios's works and the limited amount of information about them and his life are significant hindrances to the study of his *Patria* and his literary personality. The fact that the *Patria* of Hesychios has survived either as an individual fragment or in later compilations and not in its organic corpus (the universal history of Hesychios that it

[35] Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, 104-109.
[36] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 53-66.
[37] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*.
[38] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 24.
[39] Kruse, *The Politics*, 43-57.

was part of) further complicates its analysis. Hence, it is often the case that modern scholarship has focused on the tenth-century compilation as a whole.

One of the most famous and insightful modern works on the subject is Gilbert Dagron's *Constantinople imaginaire* (1984). In his work, Dagron includes a useful introduction to patriographic literature.[40] However, the focus of the work is not the late antique *patria* of Hesychios but the tenth-century compilation in its entirety. Often, Dagron makes use of terms related to memory. However, he never provides an analytical use of memory studies. We discuss this subject further in chapter two. Other well-known works have often used the tenth-century *Patria* to understand the attitude of Constantinopolitans regarding ancient statues. Unfortunately, some of these works have not reflected positively on the corpus. For example, in his famous article "Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder" (1963), Cyril Mango deems both the tenth-century *Patria* and its source material, the aforementioned *Parastaseis,* to be "on a very low intellectual level" and thus "representing the attitudes of common men."[41] In an effort to rehabilitate the image of the Byzantines, Liz James has used the *Parastaseis* to understand the Byzantine texts and statues "in Byzantine terms" in her article "Pray Not to Fall into Temptation and Be on Your Guard': Pagan Statues in Christian Constantinople" (1996).[42] While these works are valuable contributions to the scholarship, they do not treat the tenth-century *Patria* or the earlier *Parastaseis* as literary creations, but rather use them to make an argument. Likewise, other prominent works that have used the tenth-century *Patria* and the earlier *Parastaseis* aim to draw a picture of the material landscape and topography of late antique and medieval Constantinople.

[40] Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 9-29.
[41] Mango, "Antique Statuary," 60.
[42] James, "Pray Not to Fall,"12.

Such recent and well-known examples include *Studies on the History and Topography of Byzantine Constantinople* (2007)[43] by Paul Magdalino and *The Urban Image of Late Antique Constantinople* (2006)[44] by Sarah Bassett. In his collection of articles, Magdalino makes use of the *Patria* and the *Parastaseis* as sources to reach conclusions about various aspects of medieval Constantinople. Bassett offers an erudite directory of the statues and monuments of Constantinople. While these constitute some of the most prominent works that have used the tenth-century *Patria*, there are, of course, numerous others that have mined the work for the information it contains about late antique and medieval Constantinople. Nevertheless, none of these works treat Hesychios's *Patria* as a literary artifact.

Overall, one of the few surviving examples of a late antique *patria*, Hesychios's *Patria*, has not been granted a detailed monograph by modern Byzantine scholars. While recent works that focus on or utilize Hesychios's work all have a different purpose, there is a common element amongst them. As discussed in detail in this thesis, they all comment on Hesychios's religion. In fact, the current scholarship on Hesychios remains dominated by the quest to determine whether or not he was a pagan and by the entrenched conclusion that Hesychios in his fragment of *Patria* draws parallels between the city of Rome and Byzantion. The debate about his religion is carelessly echoed in prominent modern reference works as well. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*'s first words on Hesychios is that he is a "pagan historian." There are numerous problems concerning the entry itself. Let us take a look,

[43] Magdalino, *Studies on the History*.
[44] Bassett, *The Urban Image*.

> HESYCHIOS (Ἡσύχιος), pagan historian; born at Miletos, died after 582. Son of a lawyer, Hesychios is always described as *illoustrios*. He wrote a world history in six sections (surviving only in fragments), from the Assyrian king Bel to the death of Emp. Anastasios I in 518; PHOTIOS (Bibl., cod.69), who still had access to the entire work, says Hesychios added a (now lost) supplement on the early reign of Justinian I. The PATRIA of CONSTANTINOPLE (Preger, *Scriptores* 1: 1-18) preserves a revised fragment from his account of the history of the city of Byzantion up to the time of Constantine I, which is an imaginative blend of fact and fancy. Hesychios also assembled a collection (*Pinax* or *Onomatologos*) of biographies of pagan men of letters, exploited by Photios and acknowledged as a prime source by the *Souda*, but now lost; a work of similar title and scope surviving under his name (cd. J Flach [Leipzig 188o]) is spurious and late.[45]

Besides the definitive comment that Hesychios is pagan (we hardly know anything about his life and his work has survived only in fragments), the entry sites that Hesychios lived until 582, a speculative conclusion reached by Treadgold based on the claim that Hesychios included Agathias in his table of eminent writers, which has not survived to our day.[46] Nevertheless, the entry goes on to state that Hesychios combines biographies of pagan writers, which implies a sense that Christian writers were absent from it, as it is stated in the *Souda* but refused by Treadgold, who includes Agathias, a writer that is often considered to be Christian, in Hesychios's table of eminent writers. Likewise, *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity* follows a similar path by stating that Hesychios is pagan and he was born around 505.[47] While Kaldellis reaches the conclusion that Hesychios was pagan, it is Treadgold who speculates that Hesychios was born around 505. Hence, once again the entry is a patchwork of various speculations.

[45] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, s.v. "Hesychios."
[46] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 270-278.
[47] *The Oxford Dictionary of Late Antiquity*, s.v. "Hesychius Illustris."

1.3 Key concepts, methodology and chapter plan

Throughout its chapters, this thesis puts the religion and modern reconstructions of patriographic writers and Hesychios aside. It treats Hesychios's *Patria* as a literary performance deserving of analysis, rather than as a source of empirical evidence for reconstructing the social and political world of late antique Byzantium and the city of Constantinople. It takes off from what Dagron has initiated, conceiving of the information in Hesychios's late antique *patria* as real as it is imaginary and overall as a literary performance of a creative agent that is the author. To analyze it as a literary performance, it applies concepts and tools from literary studies and literary criticism as well as memory studies. Since the application of theory-driven interdisciplinary approaches to Byzantine texts is promising as it is still at its infancy, this study aims to contribute to it. Furthermore, the study of *ars memoriae* in Byzantine culture and how memory looms large in Byzantine literary culture remain underexplored. This thesis shows how Dionysios, Hesychios, and Photios have made use of the *ars memoriae* and figures and places of memory. It explores how Hesychios might have aimed to shape the collective memory of his era. Moreover, it provides a structural analysis of Hesychios's narrative and focuses on his use of genre. By applying these interdisciplinary approaches, this thesis aims to contribute to the deconstruction of common and entrenched conceptualizations of late antique *patria* and, most importantly, reconstructions of Hesychios's work. Rather than reaching definitive conclusions, which it deems to be impossible, the present study offers an analysis and alternative complicating, and enriching ways to think about Hesychios's literary performance.

This thesis is divided into five chapters. Following the present introductory chapter, chapter two proposes to conceive patriographic literature as a hybrid literary

production composed of memory and history, stripped of the overpowering weight of paganism or Christianity. First, it analyzes the modern conceptualization of literary genres and suggests that rather than formulaic conventions, we should first and foremost conceptualize the use and development of genres as communication between authors and their readership. Secondly, it takes a look at how modern Byzantine scholarship approaches the use of genres. It suggests that we should consider the persistent use of genres in Byzantine literature within a spectrum and dialectic of change and continuity of narrative forms. Thirdly, this chapter looks at how the Byzantines defined the term *patria* both in a general sense as a noun (grammatically speaking, a substantive adjective) and more specifically as a genre, and discusses how modern scholars approach the genre of late antique patria. It suggests reconsidering the emergence and the use of the genre of late antique *patria* through various tools and concepts developed within the discipline of memory studies. It introduces these conceptualizations as a background for understanding Hesychios's work.

In chapter three, this thesis shifts its focus to the transmission and construction of information by Byzantine and modern scholars of Hesychios's work, especially Kaldellis and Treadgold. This chapter starts with an analysis of what kind of information can be gathered from the *Bibliotheca* and the *Souda* to discuss how Kaldellis and Treadgold have interpreted this data in return. This chapter questions the empirical method of history writing epistemologically and emphasizes the impossibility of uncovering what an author really believed in. Thus, this chapter focuses on a series of issues essential to modern history writing and asks the existential historiographical question, "How much can we really know?" to better understand what we can know/infer/conclude about Hesychios and his universal

history and the fragment of *Patria*. Overall, this chapter demonstrates that scholarship on Hesychios contains irreconcilable interpretative and subjective reconstructions by modern scholars and deconstructs them to prepare a clean slate for the analysis of Hesychios's *Patria* as a literary performance.

In chapter four, the initial stage of the analysis of Hesychios's work starts by introducing various structural literary analysis tools. First, this chapter introduces the seven "internal operative principles" that Panagiotis Agapitos developed for analyzing Byzantine literature.[48] The first section of chapter four analyzes the structure of the original corpus of Hesychios's *Patria.* Secondly, this section introduces Roland Barthes's structural theories. The introduction of these tools equips the reader with core instruments and background information to further analyze Hesychios's *Patria* through close reading. Furthermore, using both Barthes's and Agapitos's theories, the last section of this chapter offers an analysis of one of Hesychios's primary sources, Dionysios's *Anaplous Bosporou*, as it pertains to Hesychios's text. This section also comments on the genre and goals of Dionysios's work and his use of figures and places of memory to compare with Hesychios's in the subsequent chapter.

Chapter five explores the continuities and changes between Dionysios's and Hesychios's narratives and investigates traces of Hesychios's authorial decisions. In addition, this chapter analyzes the narrative structure of Hesychios's text and his use of various figures and places of memory and questions whether we can reach definitive conclusions regarding Hesychios's religion and whether he was forming connections between Rome and Constantinople as it is often concluded by modern scholarship. Overall, through textual analysis, this section argues that while it could

[48] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84-86.; Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 25-27.

be the case that Hesychios intended to form parallels between Constantinople and Rome, it is more likely that the figures of memory present in his text were from the Greek cultural heritage of Byzantion and Greek mythology. Nevertheless, this section does not disregard the fact that Hesychios could be forming a connection with Rome and the city's Greek past concomitantly. Regardless, it emphasizes that Hesychios appears to have strived to connect his present-day Constantinople with the cultural and physical landscape of ancient Byzantion.

The concluding chapter of this thesis deliberates on whether Hesychios was forming a historical narrative, historical fiction, or a fictional literary product through the previous chapters' findings. It concludes that Hesychios was interested in creating none of them and was instead striving to create a hybrid product, "a possible world," where within the overall parameters of historical truth Byzantion and Constantinople were connected seamlessly.

CHAPTER 2

PATRIA AS A GENRE AND MEMORY STUDIES

The main primary source of this thesis is Hesychios's *Patria,* believed to have been produced some time in the sixth century.[49] However, the genre and the tradition of patriographic writing in Greek literature is part of a deeply established tradition. Today, scholars agree that the genre of *patria* stems from the genre of *ktiseis* or epic foundation stories that we can trace back to the fifth century BC while going through a revival in the fifth and sixth centuries in Late Antiquity and ultimately constituting part of the Byzantine reading culture of the tenth century.[50] As we have noted in chapter one, the tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople appears to have been produced prolifically in manuscripts until the sixteenth century.

Understanding the reasons behind the recurrence of this literary phenomenon and understanding the continuous appreciation of the genre by different literary publics in different literary eras are of utmost importance in grasping the patriographic writings' pivotal position in society and likewise the *Patria* of Hesychios's specific role in the cultural memory and construction of identity in Byzantium. In this quest, first and foremost, it is necessary to understand the use and role of genres and fixed narratives such as myths, both of which give the authors the power to manipulate and exploit centuries of accumulated traditions, collective memories, rules of production and aesthetics, and anticipated reactions from audiences in a given present. Hence, this thesis starts with a brief introduction to the concept of modern genre theory in general. It also examines the application of

[49] Kaldellis states that a passage from Hesychios's *Patria* appears to have been used by John Lydos, in his work *On the Months* ca. 540. Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 383. However, as stated earlier in chapter one, we do not have a specific date as to when Hesychios produced his *Patria*.
[50] Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire,* 11.; Focanti, "The Fragments," xxviii.

modern genre theory to the understanding of Byzantine literature by contemporary scholars. Then, this chapter discusses how the Byzantines conceptualized the genre of patriographic writing and advances into how modern scholars who study late antique literature conceptualized the genre in return. Lastly, this chapter offers preliminary theories guided by memory studies to show how the genre of patriographic literature might have served the needs of the times they emerged. Overall, this chapter intends to enrich and complicate conceptually the way we think about the genre of patriograhic literature in Late Antiquity and serves as a theoretical background to the issues that this thesis tackles in the subsequent chapters.

2.1 Brief introduction to modern genre theories

The discussion of genre in literary theory and criticism has been at the forefront ever since the time of Aristotle. Nevertheless, the relevance or the irrelevance of genre in the analysis of literary works and literary history has been a matter of scholarly debate with various levels of interest. Especially in the past forty years, the validity of the concept has enjoyed and suffered from multiple highs and lows of valuation and degradation. Regardless, genre studies has expanded dramatically in the past couple of decades and is now part of different disciplines that include literature, linguistics, rhetoric, sociology, media, and pedagogy, only to name a few.[51] Thus, even under the single umbrella of literary theory and criticism, the issue of genre can cover a vast spectrum as it was approached by different schools of thought. Therefore, only a short introduction to its theoretical framework, especially as it pertains to how we should analyze Byzantine patriographic literature, can be achieved within the parameters of this thesis.

[51] Bawarshi and Reiff, *Genre: An Introduction*, 3.

Etymologically, the word genre derives from the Latin *genus*, meaning "kind" or "sort."[52] In its broadest terms, a genre can be defined as "a category of artistic, musical or literary composition characterized by a particular style, form or content."[53] While the form can be thought of as the structural element of literary compositions, the content can be categorized as the sort of information, the narrative and the subject that are presented by the literary form. Then, the genre can be conceived as an amalgamation of these two elements.

The above introductory paragraph is a schematic conception of the genre; nevertheless, genres are not only formulaic conceptions. They also serve a function. Genres present the authors with a set of guidelines of literary performance while providing the readers with clues of what to expect from these literary productions. Hence, they inform the dialogue between the authors and the readers. For example, satirical pieces make use of humor and irony to offer social criticism.[54] The authors take advantage of the light-hearted method of this genre to make statements on more serious topics. The readers aware of the conventions of the genre, such as sarcasm and irony, do not read satirical pieces literally and appreciate the witty commentary. We tend to imagine written culture in an inanimate and static manner; however, as this thesis often emphasizes to its readers, every writer writes for his/her readers. Writing is communicating. Hence, aspects of written works, such as genres, provide communicative cues in written literature interactively. As such, even though genres are often conceived as authoritative formulaic limitations,[55] they should not be conceived within a limiting schema of unchanging prescriptive skeleton made out of

[52] De Bruyn, "Genre Criticism," in *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory*, 79.
[53] *Merriam-Webster*, s.v. "Genre," https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/genre.
[54] Thomas Kent also uses satire as an example. Kent, *Interpretation and Genre*, 16-20.
[55] For example, see Derrida, "The Law of Genre," 55-81.

pre-established form and content. They should be seen part of an organic dialogue between readers and authors in various reading and writing contexts.

The Russians formalists, a school that contributed much to the understanding of modern genre theory, conceived genres not as static *a priori* concepts but saw them as part of the dynamic progressions of innovations, rejections, and revolutions in a broader spectrum of literary history.[56] Byzantines were highly genre aware even to the point of being called "genre obsessed."[57] Often, Byzantine literary products are perceived to be mere imitations of classical types. Nevertheless, it is by individual works and step by step evolutions that Byzantines were able to progress their literature. This is especially apparent with the development of Hesychios's *Patria*, from one of its main sources, *Anaplous Bosporou.*

Attempts to categorize and judge ancient and medieval works according to the yardstick of modern classifications of genres, which we can call "recategorization at will,"[58] are as dangerous as conceiving genres as static concepts. This pitfall has often been the subject of modern scholarship. Foucault, for example, draws attention to the fact when we think about past literature and try to systemize it, all we can attempt is to engage with a "retrospective hypothesis."[59] He postulates that these categories we create for past endeavors in our modern society can not reflect the reality of an era.[60] An example from modern Byzantine studies of "recategorization at will" is the categorization of Byzantine compilation projects of the tenth and eleventh centuries as "encyclopedias." Unfortunately, the use of modern terms such as encyclopedias to describe these compilation projects

[56] Duff, *Modern Genre*, 7-8.
[57] Afinogenov, "Comments," 23.
[58] Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 13.
[59] Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, 25.
[60] Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge*, 25.

superimposes modern constructs on these works and with that attaches modern expectations and limitations. Ultimately, it removes the "encyclopedic" works from their temporal and spatial place of origin, deprives them of their intended meaning, and clouds their role in and contribution to the past world that they belonged. As a result, they have been labeled as uninventive and unsuccessful attempts at becoming "true" encyclopedias and are blamed for having limited influence.[61]

How are we to use genres to define Byzantine literary products then? Can genres be retrospectively applied at all? Or can genres only be used to categorize literary products of modern literature? Can a system and categories of genres be conceived for medieval and Byzantine literature? Most importantly, are genres constructed concepts?

In his seminal essay "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory" Jauss notes that thus far literary studies have given little attention to "aesthetics of reception and impact."[62] Thus, in his works, Jauss is ever mindful of the key role of the often forgotten reader in "the triangle" and the "dialogue" between the author, work and the reader."[63] Jauss emphasizes that literary works do not appear in "informational

[61] Although the term "encyclopedism" existed before, Paul Lemerle's book on Byzantine humanism published in French in 1971 widely popularized the term and shaped the trend's perception in academia. See, Paul Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin.* It was translated to English under the title *Byzantine Humanism: The First Phase* in 1986. In his work, Lemerle focuses on compilation projects initiated during the reign of Constantine VII. He deems these works to be far from achieving modern encyclopedic standards and he blames the *Excerpta*, a compilation of excerpts from ancient and classical history sponsored for decontextualising and ultimately destroying the meaning of the works from which it uses excerpts. Lemerle, *Byzantine Humanism*, 331. Alexander Kazhdan readily accepted Lemerle's nomenclature, as he deemed "encyclopedism" to be a better solution to defining the so-called "Macedonian Renaissance" since "the emphasis was not on creativity, but on collecting and copying." *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (1991), s.v. "Encyclopedism," by Alexander Kazhdan. In 1991, Paolo Odorico refrained from using the term "encyclopedism" on the basis that Byzantine compilation works were simple compilations of information, like a literary museum, "un museo letterario," that did not further knowledge. Odorico, "La Cultura della ΣΥΛΛΟΓΗ. Recently, improvements have been made to recategorize these works by Catherine Holmes, Paul Magdalino and András Németh ; nevertheless, the so-called encyclopedias still suffer from the repercussions of the word encyclopedia. For more recent works see: Catherine Holmes, "Byzantine Political Culture,"; Magdalino, "Byzantine Encyclopaedism,"; Németh, *The Excerpta Constantiniana*.

[62] Jauss, "Literary History," 7. Jauss is one of the founders of the Konstans school of "reception aesthetics." A concise introduction to his work can be found in Duff, *Modern Genre Theory,* 127-128.

[63] Jauss, "Literary History," 8.

vacuums" but that they appear within a horizon of expectations of their contemporary reading public and within familiar rules of aesthetic, which together form genres.[64] Furthermore, Jauss emphasizes that literary works do not have static meanings and readers from different periods can interpret them quite differently."[65] Hence, he argues that if modern readers are to truly understand medieval works, they should "reconstruct" their expectations according to the norms and values of the work when its author produced it to his readership.[66] In his work, entitled "Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature," Jauss espouses a collective approach and states that genres are "neither subjective creations of the author, nor merely retrospective ordering-concepts, but rather primarily a social phenomenon."[67] In this work, Jauss argues that we should combine a "synchronic" structural analysis of literary works vis à vis the contemporary historical moment and a "diachronic" generic approach within a larger historical continuum. Thus, Jauss conceives genres as a product of the reading and writing public that develops over time rather than a categorically impossible context.

2.2 Modern genre theory in Byzantine literature

Building on Hans Robert Jauss's theories, Margaret Mullett in her seminal article "The Madness of Genre" (1992) introduces the notion that we should analyze works of Byzantine literature "the way Byzantines wrote and read," while suggesting that Byzantines were very genre conscious in their reading and writing of literature.[68] Thus, she proposes that we should use genre to "identify the horizon of generic

[64] Jauss, "Literary History," 13.
[65] Jauss, "Literary History," 10.
[66] Jauss, "Literary History," 34.
[67] Jauss, "Theory of Genres," 100.
[68] Mullett, "The Madness of Genre," 234-235.

expectation of literary society at the time."[69] In the same vein, Dimitry Afinogenov states that the Byzantines had a "high formal consciousness" especially with regards to the distinction between "the form" and "the content." [70] As such he notes that the "genre obsessions" of Byzantines cannot be disposed of so easily."[71] As an example, Afinogenov draws attention to the fact that the Byzantines continued to copy Julian the Apostate's writings as they were able to disregard the content of the work for the form they appreciated.[72] Afinogenov highlights an important awareness that Byzantines possessed; however, he falls short of noting how the Byzantines conceived genre as an interplay of form and content, as we will see in the subsequent chapters.

Alexander Kazhdan, on the other hand, is quite more cautious than Mullett and Afinogenov in ascribing fundamental importance to genre in studying Byzantine literature. For Kazhdan understanding the use and development of genres is not enough to understand the intricacies of Byzantine literature. "Suffice it to say that the genres themselves are subject to historicity -they live and they die out," he states.[73] Furthermore, Kazhdan argues that Byzantine literature should not be seen as "a development (much less a stability) of genres but a development of *littérarité*, of the modes and ways of poetical expression."[74] Therefore, rather than ascribing importance to the genres, Kazhdan defends that one should keep in mind the "particularity of a historical period and of a person within the period."[75]

[69] Mullett, "The Madness of Genre," 236.
[70] Afinogenov, "Comments," 23.
[71] Afinogenov, "Comments," 23.
[72] Afinogenov, "Comments," 22.
[73] Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature*, 4.
[74] Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature*, 4.
[75] Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature*, 4.

Kazhdan's desire to seek the person behind the curtain of Byzantine literary tropes may prove to be a doomed attempt. The image of the persona of the author we can reconstruct (mind the various processes of reflection, transmission, and reconstruction) may not reveal much about the author's personality, or on the contrary, the personality of the author may not inform us much about his particular period. As a genre conscious literary culture, the Byzantines adopted styles and personas according to the nature of the genre or for the patronage that they aimed to write for. One just has to recall the versatility of Prokopios. Perhaps, Kazhdan was overly harsh in his attempts to outdo the works of Krumbacher and his successors, who divided Byzantine literature according to genre, which led him to ignore the fact that genres were also capable of transforming.

However, Kazhdan was not entirely wrong either in suggesting that we should focus on the author. The authors, in their decision to use a certain form, undoubtfully have in mind a specific goal, connected to a particular reception from their audience in terms of the genres' perception even if the nature of their work is determined by patronage. Thus, understanding the use of genres can explain the contemporary motives behind the work's production and this production's anticipated reception, hence the contemporary writing and reading culture and to a degree, the contemporary social milieu. This paragraph may seem to contradict the earlier paragraph, but as stated earlier, this chapter does not seek to reach conclusions; instead, it aims to enlarge our conceptual horizons.

Ultimately, the questions about how modern scholars should interpret the use of genres remain, especially in Byzantine literature. Is the use of genre solely an indicator of the cultural and social atmosphere of the era, or should literary works and genres be analyzed as works of art in their own right? Should we focus on the

social and communicative aspect of the genre in the works' contexts as an interaction between the author and the audience, or should we focus on the literary and aesthetic aspect of the work, as a matter of literary taste? Do ancient and medieval works deserve a critical literary approach or rather the approach of a greedy historian who always seeks breadcrumbs to reconstruct the past?

When analyzing late antique and Byzantine works, Ingela Nilsson offers an invaluable insight by noting that "confronted with this complex literary tradition, we may profit from seeing narrative as an ever-present, transcultural form."[76] Nilsson espouses a similarly dynamic view that was introduced at the beginning of this chapter: that we should acknowledge the "powerful continuity" and "the constant change" of narratives.[77] Thus, Nilsson highlights that a compromise is possible in recognizing the impact and importance of genre. While recognizing the organic nature of genres, the intertextuality of the written culture, and the cultural memory that encapsulates and shapes them all, it is possible to keep in mind the guidelines that genres can offer to works in terms of communicative cues between the author and the audience as well as discovering the cultural clues they lay for the historian to explore. Such an approach is especially pertinent to the understanding of both Hesychios's *Patria* and the tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople as they are composed of various excerpts and sources from different centuries on the foundation myth, monuments, and sculptures of Constantinople guided by the genre of patriographic literature.

[76] Nilsson, "Desire and God," 236.
[77] Nilsson, "Desire and God," 236.

2.3 *Patria*: Use of the term as a substantive adjective and genre

2.3.1 *Patria* as a substantive adjective and genre in the *Souda*: A Byzantine point of view

To arrange our horizon of expectations and to see what the Byzantines thought of the word and genre of *patria,* it is of use to take a look into the *Souda*, a late tenth-century reference work composed of earlier sources with over 31.000 headwords. [78] The *Souda* is often defined as a Byzantine "encyclopedia" by modern scholarship. It is also considered to be similar to modern works of lexicography, biography, and bibliography.[79] As we discussed earlier, these categorizations might prove to be contentious. However, they do not take away from the fact that the *Souda* informs us about how the Byzantines defined words, literary works, authors, and significant characters in their factual and literary history.

The reasons why this thesis chooses to look into the *Souda*, instead of other available Byzantine reference works, are manifold. First, there is a special relationship between some parts of the *Souda* and Hesychios's *Patria* in terms of their authorship. There are theories that Hesychios had composed the original source of the epitome that the *Souda* uses, as this thesis analyzes in subsequent chapters. Therefore, there is a possibility that Hesychios's and *Souda's* conceptualizations of the genre of *patria* can be interrelated and similar. Thus, taking a look at the definition and sort of information present in the *Souda* on the term *patria*, which could be used interchangeably as a noun and as a genre, can inform us about how Hesychios conceptualized his *Patria*. The second reason for choosing the *Souda* as a reference work for these concepts is its grand compilatory nature. Since the *Souda* is

[78] Németh, *Excerpta Constantiniana*, 238.
[79] Németh, *Excerpta Constantiniana*, 238.

a compilation of earlier sources, it can attest to a thoroughly Byzantine eye in Jauss's and Mullett's terms. So far this study has focused on modern conceptualizations of genre in general, let us now explore what Byzantines thought of the word of *patria* and genre of patriographic writing and circle back to how modern scholars defined specifically the genre of patriographic writing.

Under the headword Πατρῴων, the *Souda* states that the orators call the customs, the laws, the mysteries, and the festivals, πάτρια.[80] Furthermore, within the explanations of other various and unrelated headwords, the term *patria* appears quite often in the *Souda*. Overall, references to the term can be grouped into two related yet different concepts connected to this definition. While one refers to the ancestral customs and laws of communities, the other refers to the genre of the written works detailing customs, festivals, and monuments of cities.[81] Let us take a look at several examples for clarity.

Under the headword *Pericles,* the eminent Athenian general, we can see how the word *patria* was used to refer to established ancestral customs. The entry, after going through Pericles' various deeds, ends with stating that he had two sons, Xanthippos and Paralos, and that he named the latter by giving the name of a hero, which was not allowed and was *against the patria*. [82] Likewise, the entry on Diocletian states that Diocletian transformed many of the services to the emperor

[80] *Souda*, π, 803, s.v. "Πατρῴων." When citing the original content present in the *Souda*, I used the Adler number system for easier reference. I accessed the work through the *The Suda On Line (SOL) Project* which enables the researchers to search the original *Souda* text for specific words. The project can be accessed by the link: https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-html/
Lorenzo Focanti also looks at the meaning of the word *patria* and notes that Photios used a similar description in his *Lexica*. The relationship between the two will be discussed later. Focanti, "The Fragments," xii.

[81] Focanti also analyzes the occurrences of the word πάτρια in much more detail than presented here, in his work, Focanti, "The Fragments," xi-xx. As I believe such an analysis is crucial to understanding the use of the genre I am including a similar section here.

[82] *Souda*, π,1178, s.v. "Περικλῆς." The original Greek is as follows, the translation and emphasis is mine. ἔγημε δὲ Ἀσπασίαν τὴν Μιλησίαν, ἐξ ἧς ἔσχε παῖδας Ξάνθιππον καὶ Πάραλον: ὃν παρὰ τὰ πάτρια ὠνόμασεν, ἥρωος ἐπιθεὶς ὄνομα, οὐκ ἐξόν.

with more self-willed things *against the settled customs* of the Romans.[83] In these two examples, among many which cannot be enumerated all here, the *Souda* exemplifies how the word was used in the form κατὰ τὰ πάτρια "according to the ancient custom" and παρὰ τὰ πάτρια "against the ancient custom" as Lorenzo Focanti also notes.[84]

The word *patria* was also used as a title to refer to works describing ancient customs, laws, festivals and monuments of cities, which seems to have been also used for the genre of such works, as for example in the *Souda*'s entry on Christodoros. In the entry, Christodoros is described as an epic poet in his prime during the reign of Emperor Anastasios who wrote the *Patria* of Constantinople, Thessalonica, Nacle, Heliopolis, Miletos, Tralles, and Aphrodisias.[85] It appears from the *Souda* and the surviving fragments that works such as those of Christodoros are mostly clustered around the period between the third and sixth centuries; however, none of them has survived as a whole to our day and we currently only possess fragments.[86] Their structures reveal that while they could be written in prose form, most were written in verse.[87] In terms of content, they mostly provide information about the origins and past of their cities by referring to different local traditions, monuments, and myths.[88] The formal freedom of these works reflects on the dynamism of the genre and attests to the fact that in Late Antiquity it was the contents that defined the genre of *patria* rather than the form.

2.3.2 *Patria* as a genre as conceived by modern scholarship

[83] *Souda*, δ, 1156, s.v. "Διοκλητιανός." The original Greek is as follows, the translation and emphasis is mine. ἐπιμελὴς δὲ ὅμως καὶ ταχὺς ἐν ταῖς τῶν πρακτέων ἐπιβολαῖς καὶ πολλὰ τῶν τῆς βασιλικῆς θεραπείας ἐπὶ τὸ αὐθαδέστερον παρὰ τὰ καθεστηκότα Ῥωμαίοις πάτρια μετεσκεύασεν.
[84] Focanti, "The Fragments," xii-xiii.
[85] *Souda*, χ, 525, s.v. "Χριστόδωρος."
[86] Focanti, "The Fragments," xxi.
[87] Focanti, "The Fragments," xxix -xxx.
[88] Focanti, "The Fragments," xxviii.

A Companion to Late Antique Literature only briefly touches on the genre of *patria* under the panegyrical poetry section. Here, Mary Whitby and Michael Roberts state, "by their very occasional context panegyrical poems are prone to perish" and "a whole category the verse *patria* celebrating individual cities, has all but disappeared."[89] Alan Cameron defines works with the title *Patria* as "*mythological* histories, most often in verse, of civic origins and antiquities, an established and popular genre in the very ancient cities of the late antique Greek world."[90] While *A Companion to Late Antique Literature* somewhat evades the topic, Cameron focuses on the genre and notes that the increasing popularity of the genre seems to be in direct correlation with the "resurgence of poetry" in both Greek and Latin literature of Late Antiquity, with a specific interest in mythological poetry, especially in the fifth century.[91] Thus, Cameron places the emergence of *patria* within a literary spectrum and continuum. However, for him, as much as *patria* are part of a literary continuum that valued poetry over prose, they stand out amongst the other examples of mythological poems as they focused on the mythological past of individual cities.[92]

Often the resurgence of classicizing poetry with an emphasis on mythological past is seen as paganism's last act in an increasingly Christian world, assuming that authors who were engaged in the production of these works rich in mythology were not Christian.[93] In a similar vein, Kaldellis in a myriad of articles and a monograph on Prokopios, claims that Late Antiquity, especially the sixth-century, was not as monolithically Christian as it is often as it is often reconstructed by modern

[89] Whitby and Roberts, "Epic Poetry," 224.
[90] Cameron, "Paganism in Sixth Century Byzantium,", 271.
[91] Cameron, "Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity," 164-165.
[92] Cameron, "Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity," 166.
[93] Cameron, "Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity," 173.

scholarship. In one instance, for example, Averil Cameron notes that Prokopios was writing an overwhelmingly Christian time in the sixth-century.[94] In fact, these assumptions from both sides have been on the forefront of discussion about the religious identity of Hesychios, who presumably wrote his *Patria* in the early sixth century.[95] This claim is exacerbated by the fact that he does not mention any Christian elements present in the fabric of the city, except for few instances which are taught to be an interpolations. While this thesis deals with Hesychios's work and literary personality in the subsequent chapters, it is sufficient to say at this point that an argument formed on the singular use of genre or literary tropes or an argument singularly based on identity politics can both be quite reductionist when the complexity of genres and expectations of the reading and writing public are taken into consideration. These approaches can relegate important and rich aspects of cultural memory and literary taste to bare formalistic or ideological grounds.

2.3.3 The genre of *patria's* reappearance in Late Antiquity as conceived by modern scholarship

Lorenzo Focanti in his Ph.D. thesis initially follows a similar line of analysis to Alan Cameron by noting the increasingly popular use of the verse over prose. However, Focanti delves more into what he calls "the historical context" of the late antique *patria.*[96] He notes that the late antique *patria* were first prevalent in Egypt and then later in Asia Minor, reflecting the gravitational field that Constantinople offered at the time. [97] Thus, he rightly notes that *patria* were produced in the cities along a

[94] Cameron, *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, 317.
[95] A prime example of this is Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 381-403.
[96] Focanti, "The Fragments," xxxiv.
[97] Cameron, "Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity," 166.

specific corridor by using Peter Brown's concept of "corridors of the empire."[98] He argues that *patria* were used by cities in this new gravitational field to legitimate their new position in the imperial network by connecting them "to the mythical circuits of the Greek world."[99] He asserts that *patria* gave these cities an identity in the wider context of Greek mythology.[100]

In a collective work entitled *Historiography and Space in Late Antiquity*, the chapter by Anthony Kaldellis draws attention to how "the mobile empire of the third and fourth centuries" contributed to the "multipolar world" of the fifth century, which disabled the hegemony of a single city in Byzantine historiography until the sixth century.[101] Likewise, Peter Van Nuffelen in the same compendium suggests that late antique political history was characterized by fragmentation and agrees with Focanti's reasoning in terms of the "corridors of the empire."[102] Thus, more recent conceptualizations of late antique *patria* (than Alan Cameron) are deeply conditioned by the political, economic, and historical context of Late Antiquity while tangentially focusing on the cultural impulses.

Even though they contribute to it, religious, political, economic, and historical realities are not alone in causing the rise and fall of genres. As we have stated earlier, genres should be conceived within a more holistic synchronic literary atmosphere and diachronic literary continuum, along with being firmly grounded in the horizon of expectations of a particular moment of experience and communication in cultural history. Since Focanti, Nuffelen, and Kaldellis's works cover the genre's reappearance within political, economic, and historical contexts, and Cameron's

[98] Focanti, "The Fragments," xxxvi.
[99] Focanti, "The Fragments," xl.
[100] Focanti, "The Fragments," xl.
[101] Kaldellis, "Constantinople's Belated Hegemony," 21.
[102] Van Nuffelen, *Historiography and Space in Late Antiquity*, 10-11.

work is limited by a formal diachronic continuum, in this particular contemporary moment in the study of patriographic literature, a study that shows how the cultural memory of the public appears to be needed in understanding the reappearance of *patria*.

Gilbert Dagron in *Constantinople imaginaire* often uses the word memory in referring to the nature of the tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople. However, throughout this work, as insightful as Dagron's comments are, they remain as inspired musings of a leading scholar as he neither develops his observations nor ever espouses an analytical approach based on concepts and theories developed by others in memory studies. However, as Dagron had well noticed, since patriographic works of the era often include mythological and often fictional anecdotes stored in and shaped actively by the cultural memory of the society, memory studies can provide useful tools and concepts in understanding the late antique *patria*. Again, the aim of this chapter is not to offer a correct way of thinking that argues that memory studies is the answer to understanding it. Instead, the rest of the chapter aims to highlight alternative yet effective ways hitherto unexplored by modern scholarship.

2.4 Conceiving the genre of *Patria* from the perspective of memory studies

Collective memory provides authors with various resources, possibilities as well as limitations, to create a symbolic world for their readers that is utterly multi-layered. Authors are creative agents. However, it cannot be denied that while authors create their texts, they mine images and symbols provided by the cultural and communicative memory. This is especially true for patriographic literature: myths are like durable warehouses of cultural memory. Thus, exploring the cognitive, social and cultural dimensions of these works through the framework of cultural

memory is especially promising in enriching our understanding of the nature and proliferation of late antique *patria*. Once created the text than enters into a discourse with its contemporary and future audiences. Ultimately, texts can be read in many different ways, creating many different worlds after their conception. Thus, it can prove to be quite hard to pinpoint the exact reasons behind Hesychios's or any other late antique writers choices of content. However, we can hypothesize and articulate their possibilities and limitations provided by the cultural setting of their era by arranging our horizon of expectations.

2.4.1 The use of classical mythology: A cognitive perspective

Why did the writers of late antique *patria* use classical mythology? Why were they involved in classicizing the past in their fast-changing present? Alan Cameron, notes that classical mythology was one of the corner stones of education in Late antiquity, and hence it was quite normal to be in the repertoire of any poet, as it was the case in later Byzantium was well.[103] However, myths are not only useful technical tools that are present in the toolbox of poets which can be applied whenever the opportunity presents itself. Myths can also serve as schemes of thought for representing the past in the "toolkit of human cognition" as narrative templates.[104] For example, modern states contribute to the creation of this toolkit by imposing certain myths through formal education, public holidays, and the media.[105] In return these narrative templates form the "deep collective memory" of a society, a type of memory that is ingrained in the collective with strong emotional attachment. [106] It becomes so deeply

[103] Cameron, "Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity," 1-28.
[104] Wertsch, "Collective Memory," 120.
[105] Wertsch, "Collective Memory and Narrative Templates," 139.
[106] Wertsch, "A Clash of Deep Memories," 49.

ingrained that it remains closed to conscious reflection.[107] In his article, "The Narrative Organization of Collective Memory" (2008) James Wertsch examines how narratives indoctrinated by the modern states can serve as "cultural tools" for individuals as they give their own accounts of past events.[108] Often, he notes that while creating their version of events people use phrases and stories indoctrinated by their states. The origin myths in the late antique *patria* are not that different from the foundation epic narratives of modern states. These origin myths were inculcated by education, epics, stories, feasts, monuments and sculptures. Thus, in short it is not hard to think of myths as providing specific narratives that are ingrained in the deep cultural memory of the collective for authors. These narrative templates have the power of affecting the reconstruction of the past in various presents.[109] They are not solely part of technical skills, they are also important cultural tools in the cognitive structuring of narrating of events.

2.4.2 The use of classical mythology: In between memory and history

What other purpose do the myths serve other than providing schemes of thought? Assmann refers to myths as stories about "…the time of the Gods, the time of the great events, changes and upheavals that gave rise to the world as we have known it…" and as "the past condensed into foundational narrative."[110] Furthermore, Assmann does not draw a strict line between history and myth and chooses to connect them on the basis of memory. He argues that "the forms of the remembered past entail myth and history without any distinction between them. The past that is fixed and internalized as foundational history is myth, regardless of whether it is fact

[107] Wertsch, "A Clash of Deep Memories," 49.
[108] Wertsch, "The Narrative Organization," 120-135.
[109] Wertsch, "The Narrative Organization," 120-135.
[110] Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 57.

or fiction." [111] Along similar lines, Cameron notes that to what extent people believed in these mythological stories still remains unclear; however, he suggests that they were treated as ancient history.[112]As such we should keep in mind that when late antique writers were producing *patria* of their homelands, they may not have been necessarily making a distinction between making use of myths and historical facts. For them these two were amalgamated into ancient history.

Thus, late antique *patria* stand at the intersection between factual history and myth, and can be called works of remembering. However, it must be noted that an eminent scholar on cultural memory, Pierre Nora, suggests that history and memory stand in complete opposition to each other.[113] Nora argues that main difference between remembrance and history writing lies in each of these concepts' relationship with the present. He notes "memory is always a phenomenon of the present, a bond tying us to eternal present; history is a representation of the past."[114] Furthermore, Nora emphasizes that "open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting" [115] memory "remains in permanent evolution,"[116] while history is a less organic "reconstruction" of "what is no longer."[117] Wertsch also notes that whereas scholarly history has "a method," works of remembering have an "agenda" with "particular goals" but "no explicit standards."[118] Thus, ever connected to the present, open to whims of remembering and forgetting, collective memory and remembering are invariably tied to emotions and "vulnerable in various ways to manipulation and

[111] Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 59.
[112] Cameron, "Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity," 166.
[113] Nora, "Between Memory,": 8.
[114] Nora, "Between Memory," 8.
[115] Nora, "Between Memory," 8.
[116] Nora, "Between Memory," 8.
[117] Nora, "Between Memory," 8.
[117] Nora, "Between Memory," 8.
[118] Boyer and Wertsch, "How Do We Build," 113.

appropriation."[119] Overall, Nora and Wertsch highlight crucial differences between history writing and remembering.

One way to reach a compromise between Nora and Wertsch's insightful classifications and what this thesis suggests, which is considering *patria* in between history and remembrance, goes from Jauss's suggestion of reconstructing our horizon of expectations. Nora and Wertsch are scholars who focus on the conceptualization of contemporary cultural memory and history. Therefore, their understanding of history writing is a product that results from methods used by modern academic historians. However, late antique historiography was inherently different. We can see that the qualities that Nora and Wertsch ascribe to works of remembrance are not that far from qualities that "works of history" from late antiquity display. In fact, as will be seen in chapter five, Hesychios's *Patria*, originally part of his account of universal history, displays acts of textual and oral remembrance, and the author's acts of manipulation of collective memory.

2.4.3 *Patria* as a constructor of collective identity

The role of manipulation and appropriation bestowed to remembrance and works of memory, as mentioned in the previous section, opens up the discussion of identity construction (construction implies a sense of novel creation) and reconstruction (reconstruction implies a sense of manipulation) in late antique *patria*. According to Lorenzo Focanti, the late antique *patria* can serve to solidify aspects of collective identity,

[119] Nora, "Between Memory," 8.

> The elements listed by the definition [of patria] can be analyzed from two complementary points of view. On the one hand, they should be read as factors of discrimination: whatever is inherited from the past and distinguishes a social group from others falls under the category of πάτρια. On the other hand, one should see them as factors of cohesion: in other words, as elements defining the identity of a collectivity, thereby supplying a standard paradigm to all its members.[120]

Focanti is quite right to note this aspect of the late antique *patria*. In fact, collective identity is not naturally generated but socially constructed through the "construction of boundaries" and "symbolic codes of distinction."[121] In terms of patriographic works, the symbolic codes of distinction are spatial (the idea of one particularly glorious city), temporal (difference between past and future, simultaneous and the non-simultaneous events) and reflexive (differences between a center and periphery, and differences between the sacred and the profane.)[122] Particular codes of collective identity can be ascribed to specific social groups who then become carriers of a symbolic code and function as "constructors" of collective identity.[123] Furthermore, Assmann, states that group identity is firmly based on the reproduction of shared memories.[124]Along these lines, the writers of patriographic literature can be conceived of reproducers of shared memories and constructors of collective identity. They become "agents of memory".[125] Briefly introduced here, this aspect will be more evident as we analyze Hesychios's text. In the especially dynamic world of Late Antiquity then, *patria* can be seen as manifestations to articulate an identity based on shared memories of the past.

[120] Focanti, "The Fragments," xii.
[121] Eisenstadt and Giesen, "The Construction," 74.
[122] Eisenstadt and Giesen, "The Construction," 75.
[123] Eisenstadt and Giesen, "The Construction," 77.
[124] Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 77.
[125] Boyer and Wertsch, "How Do We Build,"113.

2.4.4 *Patria* as mythomotors

Foundational stories render the present "meaningful, divinely inspired, necessary and unchangeable" based on the past.[126] As obvious as the importance of foundation stories can be in terms of meaning making in the present, foundation stories can also serve another purpose: rather than glorifying the present, mythological memories of the past can also highlight the irremediable differences between the past and present. In these instances the present is reduced in glory in comparison with the memories of a "heroic past" where the foundation stories take place. As such, Assmann calls these "contrapresent memories" that serve as "mythomotors" in various presents [127]. For example, Assmann claims that Homeric poems serve as a contrapresent memory and mythomotor at a time of lifestyle change in the Greek world, during which "the horse-breeding aristocracy was giving way to the narrower and more communal lifestyle of the Polis" which "brought about the vision of a heroic age beyond the age of decline."[128] Assmann refers to the act of memorization of Homeric epics as "codification of memory" and "a typical instance of continuity constructed across rupture."[129] In his work Assmann also discusses efforts of codification of memory during the period of Alexandrian canonization of literature. At a point of immense change, we can also imagine *patria* as a process of absorption of the oral cultural memory of myths into texts. Thus, the contrapresent myths that descended from an oral phenomenon were systematically made part of the past and they were maintained at a point of rupture.

[126] Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 62.
[127] Mythomotor can be defined as the "constitutive myth of a polity." Armstrong, *Nations before Nationalism*, xxii.
[128] Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 62.
[129] Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 249.

The issue of how modern scholars should approach the literary texts of Late Antiquity and even the duration of the period of Late Antiquity are still contested topics, as Late Antiquity was a time of enormous yet gradual change in the social, cultural, and political spheres with profound consequences. While mythological content of the late antique *patria* in an increasingly Christian environment can be seen as a way of negotiating with the past and aligning it with the current present, it can be used as a way of resisting change in a subversive literary fashion, if we think in terms of contrapresent memory and mythomotors. Either way, the use of a genre can be considered as a tool for expressing a moment of crisis in the cultural memory. Since different authors have different worldviews and fragments of the late antique *patria* range from the third century AD to the sixth century AD, espousing one view or the other in terms of the use of the past can be too generalizing and a fragment by fragment approach is necessary to make such judgements. This subject will be more thoroughly analyzed in the upcoming chapters.

2.4.5 *Patria* as a collection of places of memory

If praise is the effigy of a city, the *Patria* are its concrete and imaginative memory; concrete because it is fixed to the self and the stones; imaginative because it is suitable for the most complex elaborations from a few monuments.[130]]

Even though never quite systematically, Gilbert Dagron underscores a valid quality of patriographic works along the lines of memory studies: the juxtaposition of "mémoire concrète," and the "mémoire imaginative." A "mémoire concrète" can be associated with a specific and historical episode in collective memory. These

[130] Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 10. « Si l'éloge est l'effigie d'une cité, les *Patria* sont sa mémoire concrète et imaginative; concrète parce que fixée au soi et aux pierres; imaginative parce que apte aux éiaborations les plus complexes à partir de quelques *monumenta*. » (Emphasis by Dagron)

episodes can be retrieved by monuments. However, the past that is imposed on the public memory by the monuments is often selective, principally guided by political agendas aimed to create, establish, reinforce, and lastly to preserve a chosen state-approved collective identity.

What remains in the consciousness of the public, however, about the certain monument or of its instituted identity is subject to the vicissitudes of historical development. Often a public's self-image and its collective memory are in slow yet forceful and constant evolution. Over time what monuments are supposed to make the society remember may eventually be shaped by the memory of the public. As Andreas Huyssen has well coined the term, monuments can become "palimpsests" of history, shaped as much by the memory of the past as from the present.[131] Whether it is a reconstruction of the present, or a past associated meaning, these instituted places become places of memory, where "memory crystallizes and secretes itself."[132]

Patriographic literature that stems and feeds from the evolution of public memory can serve a dual function, just like monuments themselves. Whereas patriographic literature can help solidify in the collective memory what is sanctioned to be remembered by authorities, it can also be shaped by what the author remembers or chooses to remember as well as what the public remembers. Thus, the author is the creative agent; in Dagron's term while there is "mémoire concrete," there is also the imaginative. The imaginative aspect that forms the connecting tissue of the *patria* is bound to be a reconstruction of the present. There, patriographic literature,

[131] Palimpsest is recurrent motif in Andreas Huyssen's work. He explains it as follows in the introduction of Huyssen, *Urban Palimpsests*, 7. "One of the most interesting cultural phenomena of our day is the way in which memory and temporality have invaded spaces and media that seemed among the most stable and fixed: cities, monuments, architecture, and sculpture. After the waning of modernist fantasies about *creatio ex nihilo* and of the desire for the purity of new beginnings, we have come to read cities and buildings as palimpsests of space, monuments as transformable and transitory, and sculpture as subject to the vicissitudes of time."
[132] Nora, "Between Memory and History,"7.

just like monuments, can represent the natural process of memory, a cycle of constant construction.

Let's take a look at Pierre Nora's conceptualization of places of memory for one more point.

> Our curiosity about the places in which memory is crystallized, in which it finds refuge, is associated with this specific moment in French history, a turning point in which a sense of rupture with the past is inextricably bound up with a sense that a rift has occurred in memory. But that rift has stirred memory sufficiently to raise the question of its embodiment: there are sites, *lieux de memoire*, in which a residual sense of continuity remains. Lieux de memoire exist because there are no longer any milieux de memoire, settings in which memory is a real part of everyday experience.[133]

Pierre Nora's conceptualization of "places of memory" (*les lieux de mémoire*) is specifically based on his interpretation of modern French society. However, keeping in mind that the period of Late Antiquity was a time of change might offer us parallel views as to how *patria* worked in shaping the places of memory in the cultural memory in Late Antiquity. This thesis will explore how memory pervaded the reconstruction of space in the *Patria* of Constantinople in subsequent chapters.

2.5 Chapter summary and conclusions

This chapter introduced a dynamic understanding of genre, based on various different approaches from modern genre theory. It conceived genre as an interaction between the authors of literary works and the expectations of the contemporary reading public. Furthermore, it argued that genre is best understood within a

[133] Nora and Kritzman, *Realms of Memory*, 1.

parameter of almost Hegelian dialectic evolution between continuity and change when studying Byzantine literature.

This chapter has also introduced how the genre of *patria* was conceptualized by Byzantine scholarship. It has argued that that when applied to understanding the context of late antique *patria*'s production, concepts from memory studies can enrich our understanding of the *patria* in terms of understanding the reoccurrence of the genre. It has argued that myths present in *patria* can be conceived of as cognitive narrative templates for authors and need to be considered within a continuum of history and memory. It has suggested that *patria* could be an attempt to negotiate with and codify the past at a time of immense change. It has also proposed that *patria* could be used to promote subversive contrapresent memories. Lastly, this chapter has introduced the concept of places of memory by drawing attention to the notion of evolution of meanings. However, these concepts which have been presented at a theoretical level in the present chapter, should be used accordingly to a text's structure and contents. They cannot apply to all late antique *patria*. Thus, a clearer perspective will emerge with their application to Hesychios's *Patria* in the subsequent chapters. However, before we move on the analyze Hesychios's text, we should first deconstruct the established reconstructions of Hesychios's literary personality to make way for our own conceptions.

CHAPTER 3

REEVALUATING MODERN RECONSTRUCTIONS OF HESYCHIOS'S *PATRIA*

What we now refer to as Hesychios's *Patria* is one of the best-preserved examples of late antique *patria*. However, scholars agree that it was probably not an individual work but had initially been a part of Hesychios's account of history.[134] Thus, when analyzing the content and the form of the text, and when interpreting the author's motivation to compose the text and the goals that he had hoped to achieve as well as discussing the literary decisions he made in these regards, we should take into consideration the guidelines and limitations set by the genre of history writing as much as the genre of late antique *patria*. For the most part, modern scholarship has been keeping this important topic in mind. However, Hesychios's account of history has not survived in its entirety. The information we gather about the whole of the work has only reached us from second-hand sources such as Photios's ninth-century collection of book reviews, commonly known as the *Bibliotheca*, and an anonymous tenth-century reference work commonly known as the *Souda*. [135] Likewise, only a few pieces of information have reached us regarding Hesychios's life from fragmentary sources along with a few inscriptions.[136] Therefore, our modern conceptualization of Hesychios and his works are primarily products of modern scholars such as Anthony Kaldellis and Warren Treadgold's reconstruction and historical imagination of who Hesychios "really" was.[137] While these works can be

[134] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 385.
[135] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 382. Both fragments are present together by Kaldellis, in Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)."
[136] For a compilation of these inscriptions' Greek text and English translations see Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)", T_3, T_4, T_5.
[137] For definition of reconstructionist history Munslow, *The Routledge,* 194-198. As stated in chapter one, the most thorough works discussing Hesychios's works are as follows "Works and Days of Hesychios the Illoustrios of Miletos" by Anthony Kaldellis (2005), Warren Treadgold's section on Hesychios entitled, "Hesychius of Miletus" in his book *The Early Byzantine Historians* (2007) along

quite informative and insightful at times, they can also be rather speculative and often in complete disagreement with each other as well due to, ironically, their empiricist methodology. Thus, this thesis claims that before we analyze Hesychios's *Patria*, first, we should examine the nature of our primary sources, the *Bibliotheca* and the *Souda* that provide information about the *Patria*[138] and determine what kind of knowledge we can deduce from them. Secondly, bearing in mind the possible conclusions we can reach from our primary sources, the thesis argues that we should then question the reconstructions of Kaldellis and Treadgold. Overall, this chapter argues that we should assess the strength of the building blocks of modern historical imagination and deconstruct these primary and secondary works to have a clean slate on which to base our own analysis of the work.

This chapter starts with a discussion of the nature of Photios's *Bibliotheca* in order to make us determine what type of information we can gather from it. Next, it introduces the contents of Hesychios's work and his literary personality based on the information given by Photios's *Bibliotheca* and the tenth-century reference work the *Souda.* Further, this chapter evaluates Kaldellis and Treadgold's conclusions' degree of certainty on Hesychios's personality and his work from these primary sources. In all these stages this chapter focuses on various levels of transmission of knowledge present in the *Bibliotheca* and the *Souda* and questions the nature of empirical evidence that can be gathered about an object (Hesychios) from different subjective subjects, such as the author of the ninth-century *Bibliotheca* Photios, the editors of the tenth-century *Souda* and the modern reconstructions of Kaldellis and Treadgold. This chapter also analyzes the "fact vs. truth" value of the knowledge that modern

with Treadgold's various discussions of the nature of *Hesychios Epitome* in his works *The Middle Byzantine Historians* (2013) and *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (1980).

[138] Unless, otherwise stated it from now on *Patria refers to* Hesychios's *Patria.* Not the tenth century compilation.

scholars can gather from the *Bibliotheca* and the *Souda* and from the historical fragment of the *Patria* of Hesychios.[139] Rather than reaching a definitive hypothesis on Hesychios's identity and the contents of his work, this chapter focuses on offering a multilayered and deconstructive criticism on the assumptions of current scholarship with original considerations.

3.1 The nature of the *Bibliotheca* and the transmission of knowledge

3.1.1 The date and the narratee of the *Bibliotheca*

The original title of what is known as *Bibliotheca* is *Inventory and Enumeration of the Books That We Have Read, of Which Our Beloved Brother Tarasios Requested a General Analysis (They Are Three Hundred, Lacking Twenty Plus One [i.e., 279]).* [140] The dating of the text, whether Photios has in fact produced it for his brother Tarasios and why he has undertaken these reviews remain unclear for various reasons.

First, in the work's preface, Photios states that he has produced the reviews of the books that he had read when his brother was not present in order to keep his brother company when Photios left for an embassy to "Assyrians," which in classicizing language could mean Arabs.[141] Therefore, earlier scholars working on the *Bibliotheca* had generally agreed that Photios had produced the work, as Photios states himself in the preface, before he left for an embassy on the Arab-Byzantine border, which scholars assumed was around 855-856 or possibly even earlier around 838 or 845.[142] However, not all had agreed and still do not agree. While the preface

[139] In this thesis, while the fact refers to indisputable and objective realities reached by provable evidence, the truth refers to claims reconstructed by processing the facts subjectively.
[140] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 18.
[141] Ronconni, "The Patriarch and the Assyrians," 388-390.
[142] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 12.

explicitly mentions that the reviews cover the books that Photios had read during his brother's absence, the postscript mentions that these reviews cover all the books that Photios has read ever since the time he was able to judge literature critically.[143] While both sections mention Photios's embassy to Assyrians, due to discrepancies between the preface and postscript, there have been arguments that the preface and the postscript of the *Bibliotheca* had been manufactured, or that the work was revised or completed at a later date.[144] Most recently, in a short article, Filippo Ronconni has convincingly contributed to this debate and for some has successfully ended it. Ronconni claims that the embassy to Assyrians that Photios mentions in his preface was, in fact, a cryptic reference not to an actual embassy but to Photios's excommunication and first exile "in a metaphoric and sarcastic way."[145] Thus, Ronconni argues that the book reviews should be dated to "shortly after February 870."[146]

The debate on the dating shows that when analyzing the "information" that Photios provides (and information provided by many other Byzantine authors as well for that matter), we should keep in mind the multi-layered "meanings," that could be clearer to Photios's readers but not necessarily to a modern one. It is of use to keep in mind some of the basics of reader-response theory led by Jauss which we introduced in the previous chapter. While the content and from of the text is the starting point of a reader's interpretation, readers inevitably bring along a set of social, historical and cultural norms. In this case, the modern readers bring along the piece of information that usually the ethnonym "Assyrians" refers to Arabs in

[143] Lemerle, *Byzantine Humanism*, 40.
[144] For a detailed list of scholars and their arguments see Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 11-13.
[145] Ronconni, "The Patriarch and the Assyrians," 388
[146] Ronconni, "The Patriarch and the Assyrians," 388.

classicizing Greek, while the medieval reader could more easily apprehend metaphors that stem from intertextuality. Thus, we should carefully monitor our horizon of expectations and keep it at the level of medieval sophisticated reader[147] to the best of our capabilities.

Secondly, with the previous notion in mind, we should also consider that while composing his text, as mentioned in the preface, Photios most likely had "a narratee"[148] in mind. This narratee was is not necessarily any virtual[149] or ideal reader[150] but a a specific narratee whom Photios was specifically addressing with his work: Tarasios. If indeed this work was actually written for his brother Tarasios, it might have been shaped by what a single person, the narratee of the text, not a wide authorship, would find interesting or could understand. Therefore, adjusting our horizon of expectations may not be enough. It will be prudent to keep in mind that Photios might have omitted some information or provided less information on some books or issues on the consideration that his narratee would be familiar with them."[151] Thus, the information we receive about Hesychios from Photios might have been filtered not only by a set of knowledge that Photios acquired about Hesychios and found interesting, but also might have been screened for his brother Tarasios's background and interests. Now that we have a clearer sense of what the title, preface and postscript of the work might indicate to us about the work's nature,

[147] Thomas Kent argues for a spectrum of readers, starting with a naïve reader, who is not capable of comprehending generic conventions, to a sophisticated reader who can recognize the conventions of a large number of genres and a superreader can recognize the conventions of every genre. Kent, *Interpretation and Genre*, 19.
[148] Cuddon, "narratee," in *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, 529. The term is invented by Gerald Prince see: Prince, *Narratology: The Form*, 16-24. The narratee can be summarized as the fictional or real person that the work is addressed to.
[149] Virtual reader: the kind of reader the narrator has in mind while composing the discourse, Cuddon, "narratee," 529.
[150] Ideal reader: the reader who understands everything the writer/narrator is saying and doing, Cuddon, "narratee," 529.
[151] Treadgold, "The Preface of the '*Bibliotheca*'," 346.

let us take a look at the form, content, and the genre of the *Bibliotheca* and hence the nature of the information Photios gives in his work in a more detailed manner.

3.1.2 Form, content, genre, and the production of the *Bibliotheca*

The *Bibliotheca* is a collection of 280 "numbered descriptions" of book reviews that almost all start with ἀνεγνώσθη.[152] Scholars have referred to these numbered descriptions as codices.[153] Within these codices, Photios reviews 386 books.[154] Photios's reviews often include a summary of the work reviewed, as well as his comments and judgements on its style and contents. In his reviews, Photios displays a high sensitivity with regards to genres as Byzantine rhetorical training required identifying genres and analyzing the style and structure of ancient texts.[155] Furthermore, Photios appears to be highly sensitive to the conventions of the genre that he himself was producing his reviews in: literary criticism. It appears that, for the most part, Photios uses "a fixed inventory of literary qualities" adopted from Hermogenes and other rhetorical handbooks in his reviews.[156] Furthermore, Photios seems to liberally pick and choose from Hermogenic criteria that agree with his conception of Christian ethical conduct and philosophy.[157] Although there are times when Photios skillfully separates the relationship between the style of the author and the content of the works he analyzes, we can see that he perceives an intrinsic link between the style and character of the work and its author in many of his many reviews.[158] Hence, it can be argued that Photios's literary analysis is based on the

[152] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 5.
[153] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 5.
[154] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 5.
[155] Bourbouhakis, "Byzantine Literary Criticism," 114.
[156] Bourbouhakis, "Byzantine Literary Criticism," 116.
[157] Kustas, "The Literary Criticism of Photius," 144-145.
[158] Kustas, "The Literary Criticism of Photius," 136. Kustas argues that while Photius uses Hermogenic principles, the foundation of his analysis rests on "character" developed by the Isocratic

cultural moment of ninth-century Byzantium with characteristically Christian principals.[159] Therefore, we should keep in mind that Photios was guided by the criteria of the genre of literary criticism as well as his religion rather than the inherent and essential qualities of the works he analyzed.

Kazhdan highlights the fact that the *Bibliotheca* is composed of two distinct parts with different natures: while the entries in the first part of the work are concise, the entries in the second part are more detailed. [160]At times, these entries even contain excerpts from the reviewed works.[161] (Unfortunately for us, Photios's review of Hesychios's history falls into the first more succinct part.) Thus, considering that the reviews get longer and more detailed as the work progresses, Kazhdan concludes that Photios must have composed the work "at a leisurely fashion, slowly acquiring the taste for analysis and completing the corpus with extended entries."[162] Kazhdan's inference is yet another observation and conjecture. We can even classify it as a fact, but we cannot argue for the true reason behind it. Nevertheless, this observation sheds light on the fact that Photios's work is not as encyclopedic and systemic as it can sometimes considered to be. It was an organic composition composed with a specific narattee in mind, at least at the beginning of the work. The work itself could have changed and grown with its author impacted by his world view.

One last feature covered here is that Photios often incorporates short biographical notes on the author of the reviewed book.[163] Ironically for our matter of investigation, some scholars assert that Photios has compiled some of these

school. This is especially apparent as Kustas displays in Photius's analysis of religious literature. Kustas, "The Literary Criticism of Photius,"140-144.
[159] Kustas, "The Literary Criticism of Photius," 163.
[160] Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature*, 11.
[161] Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature*, 11.
[162] Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature*, 11.
[163] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 6.

biographical notes from earlier sources such as the lost epitome entitled the *Hesychios Epitome* of a yet again lost sixth-century *Onomatologos* of Hesychios, the writer of our *Patria*.[164] The need to be cognizant of this understanding is especially pertinent when analyzing the modern reconstructions of Photios's information on Hesychios about whom we do not have much other evidence to compare Photios's notes with. We shall see how these claims can affect our judgment of Photios's notes on Hesychios in the upcoming sections in more detail.

3.1.3 The *Bibliotheca* as a memory device

In terms of sources that Photios uses and books that he reviews, we must keep in mind the availability of manuscripts and how this might have shaped the selection of books as well as the biographical information he provides.[165] A telling example of this is Photios's review on Apollinarios, *Against the Heathen, On Piety*, and *On Truth.* He notes that while Apollinarios's other writings are also worthy of mentioning/remembering but he did not have a chance to read them yet.[166] The word, "ἀξιομνημόνευτα" which can translated as worth mentioning/recording/remembering, calls forth another issue mentioned by Photios in his preface and another subject often debated by scholars: Was Photios composing his book reviews from his memory, only writing what he could remember, or was he working from earlier notes after some time had passed?[167]

In his preface, Photios refers to the challenges he faced while producing his work in terms of remembering and recollecting knowledge. He states,

---

[164] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 6.
[165] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 97-98.
[166] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 14. For entries of Photios, I used R. Henry's edition and the codex system. The original Greek of the phrase is follows, translation is my own. Λέγεται δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕτερα συγγράμματα ἀξιομνημόνευτα εἶναι, οἷς οὔπω ἡμεῖς ἐνετύχομεν.
[167] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 81-96: Wilson, "The Composition," 451-45

> For it is no trouble for a man who reads through one book by itself to compose its summary and to commit it to memory and writing if he wishes, but for a man who reads many books together to come to an exact recollection of them especially when some time passes in the interval is not, I think an easy thing.[168]

The first intuitive judgment of a modern reader who seldom has to use his/her memory as much as a medieval scholar is to assume that Photios was having difficulties producing his work from memory. This inference is, in fact, entirely plausible. Nevertheless, we should also be careful and focus on changing associations between different horizons of expectations once again. One observation that has been disregarded so far is that when Photios refers to acts of remembering information, he might be referring to a tradition that can be traced back to Aristotle and that Photios might have brought up the whole issue on remembering to show his erudition as well as commenting on aspect of producing the work.

Photios's referral to memory concepts even overlaps with his specific word choices of Aristotle. Aristotelian concepts were fairly well-known in Byzantium and continuously taught in schools.[169] Thus, such an allusion could have been understood by Tarasios, Photios's narratee, who appears as an intelligent and erudite man that Photios produced book reviews for and assumed was capable of understanding his reference "embassy to Assyrians." Furthermore, in *Amphilochia* Photios follows a philological method focusing on the linguistic interpretation of Aristotle's works.[170] Likewise**,** Photios also displays his erudition of Aristotelian concepts and his interest in perception as well as memory in a well-known homily commemorating the unveiling of the image of the Virgin and Child in Hagia Sophia.[171]

[168] Treadgold, "The Preface of the '*Bibliotheca*'", 345-346.
[169] Trizio, "Reading and Commenting on Aristotle," 397-398.
[170] Efthymiadis, "Questions and Answers," 54.
[171] Photios, *The Homilies*, 286-296.

Let us take a deeper look into Photios's frequent Aristotelian word choices in the preface of *Bibliotheca*. He uses nouns and verbs such as ἀνάμνησις, recollection, μνήμη, memory, μνημονεύω, to remember, ἀναμνημονεύω/ ἀναμιμνήσκω to recollect. These belong to the exact same terminology laid out by the very first sentence that Aristotle starts his treatise commonly known as *De Memoria*. In *De Memoria,* Aristotle makes a clear difference between μνημονεύω, to remember, and ἀναμνημονεύω, to recollect.

For Aristotle, "Memory (μνήμη) is neither a sensation (αἴσθησις) nor a conception (ὑπόληψις)."[172] It is "a state of having one of these or an affection resulting from one of these, when some time elapses."[173] Aristotle states that sensation plays a role in perceiving the present, expectation takes its place for thinking about the future and memory is the chief agent for relating to the past.[174] Thus, Aristotle conceives memory, as an independent cognitive process that is specifically used while referring to the past. For the action of remembering, Aristotle refers to a sense of inner movement.[175]

Let us take a look into how Photios conceptualizes memory in his preface. He refers to his memory as an active and independent cognitive agent. He specifically uses the third person when he refers to the memory. For example, rather than saying that he has edited as many of the summaries as he remembered, Photios prefers to say that he has edited as many of the summaries as his memory preserves (ἡ

[172] For Aristotle, I used David Bloch's English translation with the facing Greek text. The Greek is as follows, ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἡ μνήμη οὔτε αἴσθησις οὔτε ὑπόληψις. Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection,* 26-27.
[173] The Greek is as follows, ἀλλὰ τού των τινὸς ἕξις ἢ πάθος, ὅταν γένηται χρόνος. Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection,* 26-27.
[174]The Greek is as follows, τοῦ δὲ νῦν ἐν τῷ νῦν οὐκ ἔστι μνήμη, καθάπερ εἴρηται [καὶ πρότερον], ἀλλὰ τοῦ μὲν παρόντος αἴσθησις, τοῦ δὲ μέλλοντος ἐλπίς, τοῦ δὲ γενομένου μνήμη. Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection*, 26-27.
[175] Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection,* 31, n.12.

μνήμη διέσωσε).”[176] Likewise, Photios refers to his memory as an independent process that present him with the order of the reviews, (ἡ μνήμη προβάλοι).[177] Προβάλλω can mean to put forward but it also means to throw, a word full of movement which calls forth the inner movement of Aristotle.

On recollection, Aristotle states that when people wish to recollect, they search for a starting point of movement and recollect the things that are related to this movement with an associative process. [178] This associative process seems to be Photios’ method of recollecting and organizing his reviews since he often groups works according to genre in his work, which gives him a starting point. When referring to the active process of recollection as defined by Aristotle; Photios uses the passive voice of the verb remember, απομνημονευσθαι, to refer to his mind’s act of recollection, which again autonomizes the process of memory and separates it from Photios.[179]

The similarity with Aristotle’s concepts is quite apparent when Photios refers to the hardships of producing a book’s summary and transmitting it to memory and writing[180] after finishing a book and to the hardship of reaching an exact recollection[181] after having read many books especially after some time passes.[182] Thus, just like Aristotle, Photios highlights the importance of time in memory. He likewise, uses ἀνάμνησις for recollection, following Aristotle, and uses a verb that signifies an active process ἐφικέσθαι (to reach) to refer to it.

[176] Photios, “The Preface of the ‘*Bibliotheca’*,” 345.
[177] Photios, “The Preface of the ‘*Bibliotheca’*,” 345.
[178] Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection,* 41.
[179] Photios, “The Preface of the ‘*Bibliotheca’*,” 345.
[180] Photios, “The Preface of the ‘*Bibliotheca’*,” 345. The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. τὴν ὑπόθεσιν συλλαβεῖν καὶ μνήμῃ καὶ γραφῇ παραδοῦναι.
[181] Photios, “The Preface of the ‘*Bibliotheca’*,” 345. The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. εἰς ἀνάμνησιν μετὰ τοῦ ἀκριβοῦς ἐφικέσθαι.
[182] Photios, “The Preface of the ‘*Bibliotheca’*,” 345-346.

Furthermore, Photios uses memory concepts when he refers to what his book reviews can do to his brother Tarasios's process of recollection. To understand it better, let us take a look at phrase of Aristotle which seems to have inspired Photios in this instance. For example, Aristotle states that recollection is neither the recovery (ἀνάληψις) of memory, nor the original acquisition (λῆψις) of it.[183] He elaborates on this statement and adds,

> For when one first learns or experiences something, he neither recovers any memory (since there had been no memory there before), nor does he acquire it for the first time; but when the state of having or the affection is produced in the person, then it is memory.[184]

Photios makes an ingenious use of these phrases. He states that the edited material will be manifestly useful to his brother, to his essential memory (εἵς τε κεφαλαιώδη μνήμην), and to his recollection (ἀνάμνησιν) [of books] that he came upon by his own reading and to finding readily what he seeks for in them, for easier recovery (ἀνάληψιν**)** of these things that have not yet been undertaken to be read by his wise self.[185] Here Treadgold translates ἀνάληψιν as comprehension.[186] However, Photios seems to be using ἀνάληψις, which is recovery of memory, instead of λῆψις acquisition as for Aristotle. This appears to be a conscious choice and what Photios means here seems to be that with the reviews Photios has produced, Tarasios would

---

[183] Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection*, 37. The Greek is as follows, οὔτε γὰρ μνήμης ἐστὶν ἀνάληψις (recovery) ἡ ἀνάμνησις (the recollection) οὔτε λῆψις (acquisition).

[184] Bloch, *Aristotle on Memory and Recollection*, 38. The original Greek is as follows, ταν γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον μάθῃ ἢ πάθῃ, οὔτ' ἀναλαμβάνει μνήμην οὐδεμίαν (οὐδεμία γὰρ προγέγον) οὔτ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς λαμβάνει· ὅταν γὰρ ἐγγένηται ἡ ἕξις ἢ τὸ πάθος, τότε μνήμη ἐστίν, ὥστε μετὰ τοῦ πάθους ἐγγινομένου οὐκ ἐγγίνετα.

[185]Photios, "The Preface of the 'Bibliotheca'," 346. The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. Χρησιμεύσει δέ σοι δηλονότι τὰ ἐκδεδομένα, εἵς τε κεφαλαιώδη μνήμην ἀνάμνησιν τῶν εἴτε κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἀναλεξάμενος ἐπῆλθες, εἰς ἕτοιμον εὕρεσιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐπιζητουμένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς εὐχερεστέραν ἀνάληψιν τῶν οὔπω τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τῆς σῆς συνέσεως ὑπελθόντων. Treadgold's translation: "These materials that we have edited will no doubt be of use to you for your general memory and remembrance of the [books that(?)]; you have gone through in your reading [either with others(?)] or by yourself, and for finding readily what you look for in them, as well as for your easier comprehension of those things that have not yet come to be read by your perceptive self." Treadgold, "The Preface of the 'Bibliotheca'," 346.

[186] Treadgold, "The Preface of the 'Bibliotheca'," 346.

have a set of memory devices for the books that he will read and would like to remember in the future.

Therefore, just like Photios's reference of "embassy to the Assyrians," it is possible that Photios was not simply talking about the hardships of producing a work. He was using Aristotelian terms to do so. Furthermore, Photios was also commenting on the function of his compilation as a memory device to be used by Tarasios by making a reference to Aristotle's theory. This incident once again shows that Photios' work should not be taken at face value, and the multiplicity of meanings and layers should always be searched for. Likewise, once more it attests to the fact that the work was not meant as encyclopedia but rather as a functional memory device for his brother and highlights the personal nature of it.

3.1.4 Photios's selection criteria and interests

We have been highlighting various idiosyncrasies of Photios's work and by now it should be clear that the *Bibliotheca* is far from an inventory of eminent works and personalities of Greek literature. It is shaped Photios's choices and what has been available to him. However, scholars have been conflicted in determining what Photios's selection criteria were. Treadgold claims that the best possible way to determine Photios's real interests would be focusing on the detail that he provides in his reviews.[187] He concludes that Photios was a man who "liked to read political history" and that he "shows a love of the strange and exotic."[188]

[187] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 97-98. Treadgold calculates that overall 57% of the entire length of the *Bibliotheca* is devoted to secular entries, while the ratio of secular books analyzed amongst the whole is 38%. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 99. While this approach can give us a clue about Photios's interests, it disregards the fact that there is a change in nature of Photios entries: that they get longer as the work progresses. For that matter. Treadgold notes that while less than half of the first more succinct part of the *Bibliotheca* is secular, the more detailed part with excerpts has 67% secular works. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 99.
[188] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 101.

On the other hand, Doron Mendels assigns a data collecting quest to Photios and claims that Photios was "collecting information on the succession of Empires in the East (Persia, Macedonia and Rome), concentrating his efforts on the problem of legitimacy of the New Rome in the eastern part of the Empire."[189] However, as ironically Mendels points out in another article of his, the rise and fall of empires was a common theme in Greek historiography ever since the works of Herodotus and Ctesias.[190] Thus, this aspect might be a common feature of the genre of the works Photios has read i.e. history, but not necessarily of any specific an interest to Photios. Markopoulos draws attention to the fact that that Photios was keenly interested in works of history, especially that of imperial Roman history.[191] All of these above suppositions disregard the fact that Photios might have shaped his selection keeping in mind what his audience, which in this case could have been only his brother, would find interesting.

In short, while much can be said about Photios, his work and his interests; a basic overview of the characteristics of the *Bibliotheca* as exemplified in the preceding paragraphs is sufficient at this point. Armored with the information summarized as follows we can focus on Photios's review of Hesychios with a critical eye and review the process of transmission of knowledge that comes down to our own times: While reading Photios' book reviews, the modern readers and historians must modify their horizons of expectations, never forgetting the fact that Photios might have been composing his work with a specific narratee in mind. Hence, his selection criteria of information and the books he reviews might have been affected by his narratee would find interesting. His reviews, as we briefly mentioned and

[189] Mendels, "Greek and Roman History in the Bibliotheca," 204.
[190] Mendels, "The Five Empires," 330.
[191] Markopoulos, "Roman Antiquarianism," 283.

shall see in further detail in his review of Hesychios, have been impacted by the genre of literary criticism, his erudition, and his world view and may not reflect the intrinsic qualities of the works he assesses.

3.2 The transmission of knowledge: Photios on Hesychios

In his review of Hesychios's history, Photios starts off by enumerating some basic "facts" about the background of Hesychios. He notes that Hesychios was from Miletos and was the son of Hesychios and Philosophia.[192] Towards the end of his entry, he also mentions that Hesychios had a son named Ioannes, after whose death Hesychios has lost his desire to write.[193] On Hesychios's origins and personal life Photios makes no further comments.

Kaldellis infers that the Hesychios's mother's name might indicate that she "had some education, as was the case among pagan Neoplatonic circles in Late Antiquity, though it cannot be ruled out that the name was given with a Christian sense."[194] Therefore, for Kaldellis Hesychios's mother's name can be an evidence for a pagan Neoplatonic familial origin to Hesychios on his mother side. Treadgold just comments that Hesychios's mother's name suggests an educated family.[195] On the other hand, Hesychios's son's name Ioannes indicates to Treadgold that Hesychios was a Christian.[196] For Kaldellis, Hesychios's son name is not convincing enough of a proof for his religion as we shall see in further detail.

[192] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69.
[193] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69.
[194] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days of Hesychios," 382.
[195] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 270.
[196] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 270, n.130.

3.2.1 Hesychios's "truthfulness" as reported by Photios and interpreted by Kaldellis

After providing information on Hesychios's origin, Photios states that he has read the history of Hesychios written in the manner of a synopsis of world history[197] named *the History of Romans and of All Sorts/Every Kind* (Ἱστορίας Ῥωμαϊκῆς τε καὶ παντοδαπῆς).[198] Kaldellis translates the title as "Roman and General History" [199] while Treadgold deems the title to be "idiosyncratic but accurate" and translates it as "Roman and Miscellaneous History."[200] Moving on, Photios states that this work of Hesychios's starts with the reign of Belos, the king of Assyria, and continues until the death of Anastasios, the emperor of Rome (r.419-518).[201] Following this brief statement, Photios comments on the literary style of Hesychios' history before he focuses on the content of the work. He states,

> He is concise and elegant. For he uses florid yet intelligible language and his composition is arranged suitably. He delights in the proper meaning of the words, and at some point if he starts to use figurative speech he does so with clarity and expressiveness of style. He delights the reader by the use of figurative language, and renders the deeds not less but even more clearly than if he had not used figurative language. The writer professes to be truthful.[202]

Overall, Photios's review of Hesychios clearly calls forth the main Hermogenic principles: clarity (*sapheneia*), grandeur (*megethos*), beauty (*kallos*), rapidity

[197] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69.The Greek is as follows, Ἀνεγνώσθη μοι βιβλίον ἱστορικὸν ὡς ἐν συνόψει κοσμικῆς ἱστορίας. Kaldellis translates this sentence as follows, "I read a book of history which contains a summary history of the world". Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)", F_1. Treadgold translates this part as, "as a work of world history, as if in a synopsis." Treadgold, *Early Byzantine Historians*, 271.

[198] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69.

[199] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 382. Kaldellis translates this phrase as "a history both Roman and universal." Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)", F_1.

[200] Treadgold, *Early Byzantine Historians*, 271.

[201] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69.The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. Ἄρχεται μὲν οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Βήλου τοῦ Ἀσσυρίων βασιλέως βασιλείας, κάτεισι δὲ μέχρι τῆς τελευτῆς Ἀναστασίου, ὃς Ῥωμαίων γέγονεν αὐτοκράτωρ.

[202] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69. The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. ἔστι δὲ σύντομος καὶ καλλιεπής. λέξει τε γὰρ ἀνθηρᾷ καὶ εὐσήμῳ κέχρηται, καὶ ἡ συνθήκη τοῦ λόγου κατὰ λόγον αὐτῷ ἡρμοσμένη· κυριολογίᾳ μὲν μάλιστα χαίρων, εἰ δέ που καὶ τρέψοιτο, τῷ τε εὐσήμῳ καὶ ἐμφατικωτάτῳ τῆς λέξεως ἥδυνε μὲν τῇ τροπῇ τὸν κροατήν, οὐδὲν δὲ ἧττον, εἰ μὴ καὶ μᾶλλον σαφῶς τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἢ εἰ μὴ ἐτέτραπτο, παρεστήσατο. ὑπισχνεῖται δὲ καὶ ἀληθείας εἶναι φροντιστής.

(*gorgotes*), character (*ethos*), sincerity/truth (*alêtheia*) and force (*deinotes*).[203] In Photios's review the first three principles of clarity, grandeur, and beauty are covered by the adjectives concise (σύντομος), elegant (καλλιεπής), and florid yet intelligible, (ἀνθηρᾷ καὶ εὐσήμῳ). Photios's employment of rapidity (*gorgotes)* is visible in his statement that praises the suitable arrangement of Hesychios's composition. In Hermogenes, the principle character (*ethos*) covers simplicity (*apheleia*), sweetness (*hlykytēs*), subtlety (*drimytēs*), and modesty (*epieikeia*).[204] Photios comments on the character of the work by noting how Hesychios delights the reader (sweetness) with his clarity and balanced use of figurative language (subtlety and modesty). As stated earlier, since style was an essential component in the making of meaning and character for Photios, at the end of his discussion on Hesychios's style, Photios adds that Hesychios professes to be truthful.[205] Thus, all these aforementioned qualities that Photios relates are all factors that contribute Hesychios's representation of a truthful account of history, which yet again checks the box of sincerity/truth (*alêtheia*) in Hermogenic principles. In short, one can even argue that Photios has provided a textbook review of Hesychios's work according to Hermogenic principles.

However, in Photios's statement of Hesychios's promise to be truthful, Kaldellis finds "a polemic intent," connected to Hesychios's choice to start his history with the Assyrians rather than the Creation.[206] Kaldellis translates and interprets Photios's sentence "'Υπισχνεῖται δὲ καὶ ἀληθείας εἶναι φροντιστής'" as "he promises to serve the interests of truth (*alêtheia*)".[207] Then, Kaldellis asserts that this

[203] Cecil W. Wooten's introduction to her translation of Hermogenes' *On Types of* Style presents a useful summary of the principles. Wooten, *Hermogenes' On Types of Style*, xi-xviii.
[204] Wooten, *Hermogenes' On Types of Style*, xi.
[205] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69. Ὑπισχνεῖται δὲ καὶ ἀληθείας εἶναι φροντιστής.
[206] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 390.
[207] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 390.

claim to serve the interests of truth, along with the starting point of Hesychios's history at the reign of Belos, while all Christian accounts of universal history start with the Creation, signify "a deliberate, indeed unique for its time, rejection of a biblical view of ancient history."[208]

With these definitive comments, Kaldellis opens up a vast topic of discussion and, indeed, a polemic. While a thorough look at Hesychios's historiographical choices is, in fact, necessary, there are immediate problems with Kaldellis's interpretation of Photios's assertion of Hesychios's intention to be truthful. Kaldellis takes at face value myriad stages of transmission and interpretation of knowledge. Before further complicating the issue, we should first tackle the nature of the immediate claim that Kaldellis focuses on: professing to be truthful. Even if we put aside Photios's application of Hermogenic principles in his book reviews, we cannot deny that the truth value of history writing was highly valued ever since the time of Herodotos. Indeed, proclaiming to be truthful in historiography was a common claim made by many Byzantine historians of many eras in their introduction to their histories with examples too numerous to cite here. However, we can venture into the proems of Hesychios's estimated contemporaries to get an idea of how common it was in his own lifetime among historians of very different interests and religious backgrounds. For example, the overtly pagan historian, Zosimos, whose work is not that far off in time from Hesychios,[209] states his ambition at the beginning of his work: that it was necessary for him to demonstrate the role of fates, movement of stars and god's will with reference to the deeds.[210] Zosimos's translator to English

[208] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 390.
[209] Ridley, *New History*, xi-xv.; Kaldellis, *Byzantine Readings of Ancient Historians*, 68.
[210] I used F. Paschound's edition of Zosimos and accessed it through TLG. Zosimus, *Historia Nova,* Book 1, Chapter 1, Section 1. Ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν οὐκ ἄν τις ἀνθρωπίνην ἰσχὺν αἰτιάσαιτο, Μοιρῶν δὲ ἀνάγκην ἢ ἀστρῴων κινήσεων ἀποκαταστάσεις ἢ θεοῦ βούλησιν τοῖς ἐφ' ἡμῖν μετὰ τὸ δίκαιον ἀκόλουθον οὖσαν· ταῦτα γὰρ εἰρμόν τινα αἰτιῶν τοῖς ἐσομένοις εἰς τὸ τοιῶσδε δεῖν ἐκβαίνειν

translates this section by using the word "truth" as follows: "I must demonstrate the truth of what I say from events themselves."[211] Prokopios, in his preface to the *Wars*, states that it was his conviction "that while cleverness is appropriate to rhetoric, and inventiveness to poetry, truth alone is appropriate to history."[212] Likewise, Malalas, who wrote a historical account combining biblical, mythological and Roman history, and whose work is considered to have similarities with Hesychios's and possibly even the same title,[213] also professes to relate the events as truthfully as possible.[214]

Furthermore, since being truthful was not an extraordinary claim in Greek historiography, it is often mentioned in Photios's reviews as well. In fact, *akribeia* and *aletheia* are deemed to be "recurrent criteria in Photios's judgment of style."[215] For example, Photios says that Cytesias professes to write most truthfully even though he makes use of myths and legends.[216] Likewise, Photios notes that Herodotus uses legends and myths but that these; however, sometimes "obscure the due appreciation of history and its correct and proper character."[217] Thus, professing to be truthful was a common quality of the genre of history writing in Greek literature, and Photios appears to be an especially perceptive reader of this quality.

Could Hesychios's history have an integral and overarching agenda other than writing a generically standard truthful account of world history? It certainly

---

ἐπιτιθέντα, δόξαν τοῖς ὀρθῶς τὰ πράγματα κρίνουσιν ἐμποιεῖ τοῦ θείᾳ τινὶ προνοίᾳ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἐπιτετράφθαι διοίκησιν, ὥστε εὐφορίας μὲν συνιούσης ψυχῶν εὐθενεῖν, ἀφορίας δὲ ἐπιπολαζούσης ἐς τὸ νῦν ὁρώμενον σχῆμα κατενεχθῆναι· χρὴ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ὃ λέγω διασαφῆσαι.

[211] Zosimos, *New History*, 1.

[212] Prokopios, *History of the Wars*, 6.

[213] Croke, "The Development of Early Byzantine Chronicles," 33,35.; Scott, "Malalas and His Contemporaries," 69.; Moffatt, "A Record of Public Buildings and Monuments," 96-98.

[214] Malalas *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, 1.

[215] Papaioannou, "The Aesthetics," 8.

[216] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 77. The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. Ταῦτα γράφων καὶ μυθολογῶν Κτησίας λέγει τὰ ληθέστατα γράφειν, ἐπάγων ὡς τὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἰδὼν γρά φει, τὰ δὲ παρ΄ αὐτῶν μαθὼν τῶν ἰδόντων, πολλὰ δὲ τούτων καὶ ἄλλα θαυμασιώτερα παραλιπεῖν διὰ τὸ μὴ δόξαι τοῖς μὴ τεθεαμένοις ἄπιστα συγγράφειν. Ἐν οἷς καὶ ταῦτα.

[217] Croke, "Tradition and Originality," 66.

could, yet we do not have the whole account; and Photios's review of Hesychios's style does not give us that information. Even if the work had such an agenda, it is also likely that this agenda was not specifically signified by this one sentence for the reasons stated above. It is more likely that Photios would mention such an agenda more clearly, if it had one, given that he had read the whole text of Hesychios's work. This is probable, especially because Photios does not shy away from explicitly mentioning that he had read accounts of heresies and works by pagans. For example, Photios mentions that he has read the history of Zosimos which he notes is a pagan work that "often and many times snarls/barks at the faithful."[218] If Hesychios had a similar agenda, Photios could have mentioned it. However, Photios does not draw any connections with the work of Zosimos and instead compares the coverage of Hesychios's account to that of Diodorus Siculus and Cephalion, who are further removed from Hesychios's time but seem to share similar characteristics of the genre of universal history writing.[219] We have discussed the Christian character of Photios's reviews earlier emphasized by Kustas. Likewise, Stratis Papaioannou notes that Byzantium over time acquired a taste of Christian aesthetics based on "valuing of objective truth over and against subjective aesthetic form," [220] which might explain Photios's frequent praise of conciseness and his choice to include Hesychios's declaration of truth as well.

All of the above points demonstrate that we can neither judge Hesychios's claim to be truthful nor Photios's comments on it independently. Photios's criteria

[218] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 98. The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. Ἔστι τὴν θρησκείαν ἀσεβὴς καὶ πολλάκις ἐν πολλοῖς ὑλακτῶν κατὰ τῶν εὐσεβῶν.
[219] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 70. The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. Ἀνεγνώσθη μοι Διοδώρου Σικελιώτου βιβλίον ἱστορικὸν ἐν λόγοις μ΄. Οἰκουμενικὴν περιέχουσιν ἱστορίαν. Ἔστι δὲ πολλῷ πλατύτερος τοῦ τε Κεφαλίωνος, ἐν οἷς τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους συμβαίνει αὐτοῖς ἀναγράφειν, καὶ τοῦ Ἡσυχίου τοῦ Ἰλλουστρίου.
[220] Papaioannou, "The Aesthetics," 6.

were based within the tradition of Byzantine literature and rhetoric, and his Christian faith. Hesychios, in the tradition of Greek literature, could have professed to be truthful. Thus, we should consider the significance that genres bears on works within a dialectic of change and continuity. Most importantly, we should also reconsider what elements of Photios's review is a signifier from Hesychios and what is signified by Photios in return, and what is signified by Kaldellis as well. While we can gather some basic facts from Photios's review about Hesychios's family's origins or the information on his history's coverage, we should be careful that some other information Photios presents is the image of Photios's world imprinted on Hesychios's work in this case, lastly interpreted by Kaldellis. Nevertheless, as Kaldellis also asserts Hesychios's choice of using Belos, a fact, is a signifier in its own right.

3.2.2 The use of Belos: an ideological choice or a sign of a genre?

Kaldellis points out that besides a supposed anti-Christian sentiment, the choice of Belos can be a sign of the Roman leanings of Hesychios, as in many traditions, Belos was the son of Io, who Hesychios portrays as the mother of Byzas's mother Kereossa, as we shall analyze in further detail in the upcoming chapters.[221]

Furthermore, Kaldellis traces the use of Belos in Greek historiography, and he points out several other minor instances that Belos appears in Greek historiographic tradition as a God, starting with Herodotus, Septuagint (3rd century BC) and Josephus (1st century AD). [222] He highlights that Euhemoros (late 4th century- early 3rd century BC) gives a more prominent role to Belos and portrays

[221] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_3, Commentary.
[222] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 391.

him as the founder of the kingdom of the Assyrians.[223] Furthermore, he notes that one of the primary sources that Africanus and Eusebios consulted was Kastor of Rhodes, who also began his epitome of world-history by starting with the King Belos of the Assyrians.[224] Kaldellis notes Christian chronograph largely accepts Belos as the first king of the Assyrians as well.[225]

Therefore, even though Kaldellis deems Hesychios's choice to start with Belos as unique, contrary to his argument, all such examples he picks point out to the interpretation that Hesychios's choice not as unique as Kaldellis portrays it to be. These examples guide the reader to the direction that Hesychios's choice could be more than a personal rejection of biblical "truth" and, instead could be part of a tradition. If we look at other reviews of Photios, there is another clue that shows Hesychios choice was not unique and was considered to be part of a genre as well, even if it is only by Photios. Photios places his review of Hesychios between Cephalon's *Historical Epitome* and Diodorus Siculus's *History.* He states Diodorus Siculus's *History* is more detailed than Cephalion and Hesychios in its *coverage of the same periods.* [226]Cephalon's history has not survived to our times, but Diodorus's did and it covers the deeds of the Assyrian King Ninos, and Belos is portrayed as a potent god.[227]

In fact, not only in these select works that Photios reviews but in general Assyria had a prominent position in classical tradition ever since the time of Herodotus.[228] Robert Drews claims that legends and information about Assyria

[223] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 391.
[224] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 391.
[225] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 391.
[226] Photios, *Bibliotheca,* 70. The Greek is as follows, translation and emphasis are mine. Ἔστι δὲ πολλῷπλατύτερος τοῦ τε Κεφαλίωνος, ἐν οἷς τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους συμβαίνει αὐτοῖς ἀναγράφειν, καὶ τοῦ Ἡσυχίου τοῦ Ἰλλουστρίου.
[227] Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History,* Book 2.
[228] Rollinger, "Assyria in Classical Sources," 576.

played a major role in the "formation and crystallization" of Greco-Roman chronological framework in classical universal history.[229] He also asserts that Assyria's power raised "questions for the mythographer, the choreographer and, eventually, the universal historian" to determine the position of Greek history in a wider perspective and chronology. [230]

For example, in his work, Herodotus promises an "Assyrian History," which is either lost, or has never materialized.[231] In another section, Herodotus states that that the founder of Assyria was Ninu, who was the son of Belos, who was the son of Alcaeus, son of Heracles.[232] Thus, even though, Herodotus does not provide his reader with an Assyrian history, he puts Assyrian history within the mold of Greek mythology by making a connection to Heracles. Ctesias, the court physician to Artaxerxes II, also includes the history of Assyria in his *Persica*.[233] Ctesias does not trace the origins of Assyrians to Heracles like Herodotus, and places the Assyrian Empire a 1000 years before the Trojan War.[234] In fact, it was usually the case that Greek universal historians placed Assyria at an earlier date than Greek myths. Ephorus of Cyme who had read Ctesias '*Persica* and whose *Histories* were published ca. 335 BC, concluded that the barbarians were an older generation than the Greeks.[235] Later universal historians (Diodorus Siculus, Pompeius Trogus and Nicolaus of Damascus) who had all read Ctsesias, include Assyrian history in their works and for the most part place Assyrian history earlier than Greek myths.[236] This is similar to Hesychios's treatment considering that Photios states that Hesychios's

[229] Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 129.
[230] Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 131.
[231] Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 130.
[232] Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 132.
[233] Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 130.
[234] Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 132.
[235] Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 158.
[236] Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 134-135.

history starts with Belos and that the first section of Hesychios's work encompasses the events before the Trojan War.[237]

Thus, it is quite likely that Hesychios was writing in the confines of the genre of classical universal history like the others that came before him. Furthermore, Drew notes that the interest in Assyrian History increased and decreased according to the Greek and Roman involvement in the East.[238] Thus, at a time when strife with Persia was common, it would not be uncommon for Hesychios to include Assyria in his history. Therefore, Hesychios's choice to start with Assyria is in line with the established tradition of classical universal history writing and in line with the realities of his time and not as unique as Kaldellis makes it to be.

3.2.3 The other contents of Hesychios's work as reported by Photios

Photios mentions that Hesychios' history is formed out of six τμῆμα/sections. He states that the first section of Hesychios' work encompasses the events before the Trojan War. The second section encompasses the capture of Troy until the founding of Rome. The third section spans from the founding of Rome until the abolition of the rule of kings and the introduction of councils at the 68th Olympiad. Fourth from the rule of the consuls, until 182nd Olympiad, when the sole rule of Julius Caesar terminated the rule of the councils. The fifth section, encompasses the events of the rule of Julius Caesar until Byzantion was raised to glory and strength at the beginning of the 277th Olympiad. The sixth encompasses the time from when

[237] Moreover, it was usually the case that Greek universal historians placed Assyria at an earlier date than Greek myths. Ephorus of Cyme who had read Ctesias '*Persica* and whose *Histories* were published ca. 335, concluded that the barbarians were an older generation than the Greeks. Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 158. Later universal historians (Diodorus Siculus, Pompeius Trogus and Nicolaus of Damascus) who had all read Ctsesias, include Assyrian history in their works and for the most part place Assyrian history earlier than Greek myths. Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 134-135.
[238] Drews, "Assyria in Classical," 130.

Constantinople had the chance to have Emperor Constantine until the death of Anastasios. At the end of this summary, Photios states that Hesychios praises Anastasios that he surpassed others in humility and gentleness. Lastly, Photios calculates that the whole of Hesychios's history covered 1,190 years.[239] Kaldellis claims that this is most likely not an error since it is written in out in full and since John Lydos, Hesychios's contemporary also estimated 1,746 years between Aineias and the death of Anastasios.[240] However, Treadgold asserts that it could be 2.790 years instead.[241] At the end of this chapter plan, Photios adds that Hesychios has also written another book covering the succession and reign of Justin and the early years of Justinian; however, he had stopped writing as he was grief-stricken by the death of his son.[242]

3.2.4 What can we deduce from Hesychios's chapter plan (reported by Photios)?

From Photios's report of Hesychios's chapter plan, we can deduce that Hesychios was primarily interested in the succession of political orders and constitutional changes of the Roman Empire. It appears that Hesychios's synopsis of world history was only a prelude to his Roman History and that the forms of government of the Roman Empire deserved more immediate historical consideration than the events of other areas. Assuming that Photios cited the events of each chapter's beginnings and ends, without any personal criteria or bias of selection, the fact that Hesychios's history starts with Belos brings forth the notion that Hesychios could have briefly

[239] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69. For translation, see Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_1.
[240] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_1.
[241] Treadgold, *Early Byzantine Historians*, 272, n.130.
[242] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69. The above is my summary of the following section. Ἀνεγνώσθη δέ μοι καὶ ἑτέρα αὐτοῦ βίβλος ἐν ᾗ περιείχετο τά τε Ἰουστίνῳ πραχθέντα, ὅπως τε Ἀναστασίου τελευτήσαντος αὐτὸς ἀνερρήθη. εἶτα καὶ τὴν Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ μετὰ Ἰουστίνον ἔστιν ἀνάρρησιν κατιδεῖν, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας πράξεις μέχρις ἐτῶν τινῶν τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας. καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ὁ ὁ συγγραφεὺς ἐπεσχέθη, θανάτῳ τοῦ παιδὸς Ἰωάννου τὴν ψυχὴν καιρίαν βληθεὶς καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸ γράφειν ὁρμῆς ἐκκοπείς. See Kaldellis's translation Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_{10}.

included the succession of the three empires of Assyria, Media, and Persia leading up to the Roman Empire. Momigliano argues that "the notion of imperial succession represented a pattern of general history known to the Greek historiographic tradition, and was even typical of Greek historiographic thought."[243] Thus, this statement is a hypothesis, yet it would not be an unconventional choice since Hesychios appears to be emulating the genre of classical universal history writing.

Hesychios's focus on the form of government of the Roman power also brings forth the idea that he could have employed classical theories of historical evolution, such as the biological analogy/cycle of growth and the political cycle of historical development in his history. Again, it would not be out of place to feature these theories as Hesychios was writing within the genre of classical universal history. At the beginning of the *Patria*, Hesychios refers to the first Rome as the πρεσβυτέρος Rome, older Rome, at a time when "when her actions reached a limit" signifying an end to its lifetime, a notion of decay.[244] Following, Hesychios, narrates that at this time of Rome's decay, Constantine took over the scepter of power and established the νέος**,** younger Rome, a moment of rejuvenation. [245] Hesychios's ends this part by stating that Constantinople reached its "prescribed greatness" after having been ruled by various form of government. The biological analogy, as its

[243] Momigliano, "Daniel and Imperial Succession," 29.
[244] For the text of Hesychios's *Patria*, I used Preger's edition**.** The work is composed of 42 paragraphs, (Albrecht Berger calls these "chapters.") I cite the paragraph numbers for easier comparison with other editions of the work instead of Preger's page numbers. For example, the above statement is from the first paragraph, hence it is cited as Hesychios, *Patria*, 1. I consulted Kaldellis's translation in Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)" whose paragraph numbers are the same. I also consulted Berger's translation of the tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople as Hesychios's work is also featured in the tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople. Berger's paragraph numbers are different. I cite Berger's translations from the tenth-century *Patria* of Constantinople's as they are placed in the tenth-century Constantinople with the text's paragraph numbers.. I cite my own and the other scholars' translations separately.
Hesychios, *Patria*, 1. τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῆς ἤδη πρὸς πέρας ἀφιγμένων. Translation by me. Albrecht Berger translates this part as "when fortunes were coming to an end," [244] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, {1}. I agree with Kaldellis who translates this part as "when the affairs of the city had already reached their limit." Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F7.
[245] Hesychios, *Patria*, 1.

name suggests, is based on the principle of birth, growth, decay, and rejuvenation climaxed by an ultimate point."[246] The influence of this scheme is evident in Hesychios's above word choices.[247] Likewise, Photios imparts a similar sense of biological growth and decay in his summary of the chapters. For example, Photios states that Hesychios's history covered the time when Byzantion reached the zenith of its growth and great glory, and that it reaches until the death of Anastasios, whom Photios states that Hesychios praised for unknown reasons.[248] Kaldellis notes that praise of an earlier emperor was a way of criticizing the current one amongst Hesychios's contemporaries, Prokopios and John Lydos.[249] Following this argument, we can argue that Anastasios's death would signify the beginning of a decay. Nevertheless, this is once again hypothesis; however, not unlikely.

Just as Hesychios takes advantage of the a classical biological cycle of evolution at the beginning of the *Patria*, he also takes advantage of the classical idea of political cycles at the beginning of the *Patria*, ascribing the order of tyranny, monarchy, aristocracy, democracy and "prescribed greatness" to Byzantion. Hesychios's use of this schema is also evident in the separation of his books, which he does so according to the form of constitutional change. Therefore, the use of these schemes again guides us to the fact that Hesychios was adapting ideas of classical historiography writing to Roman history as was the case of his inclusion of Assyria and that Hesychios was writing within the confines of the genre of classical historical writing. However, Kaldellis claims that through his statement of forms of government, Hesychios, was making connections with the past of Rome (which was

[246] Lemon, *Philosophy of History*, 35.
[247] Hesychios, *Patria*, 1. Προκείμενον…μέγεθος. Berger translates this part as "present greatness." I agree with Kaldellis that "prescribed greatness" is much more appropriated. Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, {1}. Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_7.
[248] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, 69.
[249] Kaldellis, "Dissident Circles," 11-12.

indeed ruled by these regimes) and Constantinople and that "there is no reason to suppose" that Hesychios was espousing a Greek perspective rather than a Roman one. [250] Furthermore, Kaldellis argues that even though Hesychios was "culturally Greek," he had a "strong Roman identity" which made him associate himself with "the conquerors."[251] Kaldellis's conclusion is a rather definitive and areconstructive one. First of all, we should point out that we cannot rule out Hesychios's intention to form a connection with Rome. However, from a very small fragment, we cannot determine how Hesychios perceived himself either. If we consider genres within a dialectic of continuity and change, there is every reason to suppose that Hesychios was making use of and applying classical Greek ideas of historiography on Roman history.

Overall, this section demonstrates to us that both Photios and Hesychios (as much as we can understand from Photios's review of Hesychios) were writing within the genre conventions. However, as genres are not static concepts, their use of genres appears to have been influenced by their cultural moment, especially in the case of Photios. For Hesychios we can argue that he has used several schemes of classical Greek historiography to highlight the "prescribed greatness" of Constantinople. However, from these statements we cannot argue for Hesychios's ideology, religion, and worldview as Hesychios appears to be writing within the confines of genre. However, certainly there is no shortage of amongst modern scholars about what they can deduct from Photios and the *Souda* about Hesychios's religious associations, as exemplified by the chapter analysis, and they deserve special attention as they affect how we perceive the *Patria*. Let us now take a detailed look.

[250] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_7, Commentary.
[251] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_7, Commentary.

3.3 Hesychios's religious identity

3.3.1 Hesychios's religious identity according to Photios

Even though, Hesychios's religion is a point of debate amongst modern scholars, one of the primary sources (who is a yet again secondary source), Photios refrains from commenting on Hesychios' religious identity. The *Souda* on the other hand, provides a quite opposing and almost vilifying view of Hesychios. Before we comment on the *Souda* and modern interpretations, let us take a look at why Photios was refraining to comment on Hesychios's religion and what we can deduce from it . A couple of reasons can be hypothesized as follows.

First, that it was well known during Photios's time that Hesychios was Christian or that he was Pagan and since Photios who was not producing an encyclopedic, he did not need to mention it. Secondly, it could be the case that it was obvious from his writings that Hesychios was Christian or Pagan. However, this is a low-possibility since Photios often comments on the style and content of the work. In the case of Zosimos's example, as we have seen, Photios mentions Zosimos's religious leanings. Thirdly, Photios might have considered Hesychios's religion irrelevant, as we have discussed, it appears that Hesychios was writing within the confines of a genre and was not guided by ideology as was the case of Zosimos, for example. Likewise, Photios seems to be aware of genre conventions as he places Hesychios's work amongst other universal histories. Lastly,it could be the case that Photios also did not know and thus refrained from commenting on Hesychios's identity. All of the above reasons can be multiplied even further. However, we can argue that it is more likely that Photios might have considered Hesychios's religion to be irrelevant, since

throughout his work he only comments on the religion of the authors he reviews in the way they effect the literary product.

3.3.2 Hesychios's religious identity according to the *Souda*

The entry on Hesychios in the *Souda* and the information about his religion are part of a quite interesting mystery of Byzantine habit of making literary inventories from other literary inventories. Before we delve into interesting details about Hesychios's religion, let us take a look into some specifics about Hesychios's biography as the *Souda* lists them.

First, the *Souda* states that Hesychios was born to Hesychios, a lawyer, and to Philosophia.[252] The *Souda* adds that Hesychios lived in the reign of Anastasios.[253] Kaldellis thinks that this is "an inference" since Hesychios's history ends with the death of Anastasios.[254] Similar to Photios, the *Souda* states that Hesychios wrote a chronicle of history, *Χρονικὴ ἱστορία*, divided into six *diesthemata*. The *Souda* notes that the account recounts chronologically Roman emperors, foreign rulers and history of Byzantium until the emperor Anastasios.[255] Besides the information present on Hesychios's account of history, the *Souda* asserts that Hesychios produced an *onomatologos*, a table of eminent writers, and states that "the present book" is an epitome of it.[256] Then, the *Souda* claims that in this *onomatologos*, Hesychios does not mention any teachers of the Church, and adds that due to this fact it is possible to suppose that Hesychios was a not a Christian and instead "sailed

[252] *Souda*, ἦτα 611, s.v. Ἡσύχιος Μιλήσιος.
[253] *Souda*, ἦτα 611, s.v. Ἡσύχιος Μιλήσιος.
[254] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 383.
[255] *Souda*, ἦτα 611, s.v. Ἡσύχιος Μιλήσιος. Translation by Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," $F_{2.}$
[256] *Souda*, ἦτα 611, s.v. Ἡσύχιος Μιλήσιος. Translation by Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)." $F_{12.}$ ἔγραψεν Ὀνοματολόγον ἢ Πίνακα τῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ ὀνομαστῶν, οὗ ἐπιτομή ἐστι τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον.

back upon the waters of Hellenic vanity."[257] These polemical statements give rise to the below crucial questions regarding Hesychios's identity and works.

1. Let us take a step back. Why did Photios not mention the *onomatologos* if Hesychios had indeed produced one? What does "the present book" and "the epitome" refer to?
2. Should we accept the *Souda* as essentially a reedited work of Hesychios? This is an important question as it opens the gates of information on the tastes, judgments and even the lifespan of Hesychios, and as the *Souda* also remarks, his religious identity.
3. Finally, was Hesychios pagan and not Christian?

There is no definitive answer as to why Photios does not mention the *onomatologos* of Hesychios. Yet, it is quite an intriguing question, especially because Wentzel has demonstrated that the *Souda* and the *Bibliotheca* indeed share a common source: possibly what is referred to in the *Souda* by the sentence as "the present book." Wentzel argues that a careless copyist must have copied this sentence directly from an earlier epitome of Hesychios's *onomatologos* that the editors of the *Souda* were using as a source. He calls this intermediary work the "Hesychios Epitome."[258] Treadgold asserts that this later epitome of Hesychios's original *onomatologos* could be "conjecturally assigned" [259] to Ignatios the Deacon, who must have added to it entries from *St. Jerome's Famous Men*, a fourth-century

[257] *Souda*, ἦτα 611, s.v. Ἡσύχιος Μιλήσιος. Translation by Kaldellis, "In his Table of Eminent Writers he fails to mention any of the teachers of the Church who excelled in learning, thereby giving rise to the suspicion that he was not a Christian but rather one who sailed back upon the waters of Hellenic vanity." εἰς δὲ τὸν Πίνακα τῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ λαμψάντων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν διδασκάλων οὐδενὸς μνημονεύει· ὡς ἐκ τούτου ὑπόνοιαν παρέχειν μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸν Χριστιανόν, ἀλλὰ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ματαιοπονίας ἀνάπλεων. Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_{12}.

[258] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 10, 53.
[259] Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, 104.

dictionary of ecclesiastical authors and compiled it between 843- 845.[260] Furthermore, Treadgold claims that Photios often inserts biographical information driven from this *Hesychios Epitome* by using phrases like "they say" or "it is said" as way of citation.[261]

With this information, let us go back to the first question. If there is such an organic relationship with the *Hesychios Epitome* and the *Bibliotheca*, why did Photios not mention that Hesychios had produced an *onomatologos*? Perhaps, the reason why Photios does not mention Hesychios's *onomatologos* is due to the fact that he used this later epitome and not the original work, which was compiled by a later author and was not aware that it was an epitome of Hesychios' work or considered it a work of the later editor and not Hesychios anymore, Another theory is that Photios could have been aware of the fact Hesychios probably drew from earlier *onomatologos* and that the original *onomatologos* of Hesychios was in fact hardly original.[262] Either way these are only speculations.

Should we accept the *Souda* as essentially a reedited work of Hesychios? This is a sensitive topic. Treadgold remarks that we should indeed consider some of the original information in the *Souda* to be written or compiled by Hesychios himself. For example, he deems some part of the information on Hesychios himself in the *Souda* as autobiographical and others as "later additions."[263] Kaldellis asserts

---

[260] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 10.; Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 273.; Treadgold, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, 53.
[261] Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca*, 31.
[262] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days of Hesychios," 386.
[263] As an example of this arbitrary classification see: Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 274. "Likely examples of the editors' revisions of the Name-Finder appear in the Hesychius's entry on Hesychios himself. It begins: "Hesychius the Milesian, son of Hesychius the lawyer and Philosophia, born under the emperor Anastasius. He wrote a Name-Finder; or, Register of Famous Men in Scholarship, of which this book is an epitome." Here the last clause must have been added by the editor of the Hesychius Epitome. The entry continues: "[He] also [wrote] a chronological history, which he divided into six 'periods' (for that is what he calls each book)." Here the explanatory parenthesis looks like another addition by the editor of the Hesychius Epitome. After briefly describing Hesychius' history, the entry concludes: "However, in the Register of Famous Men in Scholarship [Hesychius] gives entries for none of the teachers of the Church; so that for this reason he

that Hesychios's name was often attached to biographical reference works and it is not possible to determine what originally came out of Hesychios's pen.[264] Altogether, it appears that we are dealing with a continuous and organic stream of information transmission, which different sources contributed to and channeled to different directions.

Now our final yet most intriguing question: Was Hesychios a Christian? As we have seen, Photios refrains from commenting on the issue. According to the *Souda*, it was likely that he was not a Christian. Let us now take a deeper look into the reconstructions of modern scholarship.

3.3.3 Hesychios's religious identity according to Treadgold and Kaldellis

Treadgold deems that Hesychios was a Christian according to both textual and material evidence. According to textual evidence, Treadgold draws attention to the fact that Photios states that Hesychios praises Anastasios in his history, which to Treadgold indicates that Hesychios was a Monophysite Christian.

As we have stated earlier while discussing Kaldellis's comments about Photios's statement of Hesychios's desire to be truthful, Photios' subjective comments cannot be taken to reflect the intrinsic qualities of Hesychios's work. If we play the devil's advocate, we can argue that for whatever reason, it might have seemed to Photios that Hesychios was more positive towards Anastasios while Hesychios was actually not. Likewise, it is entirely plausible that Hesychios was indeed more positive towards Anastasios but for completely different reasons other

---

arouses suspicion that he was not a Christian, but infected by the lost cause of paganism." Here the first clause was probably part of an explanation by the editor of the Hesychius Epitome that his source for ecclesiastical writers was not Hesychius. Then the editor of the Suda evidently abridged the first clause and added the second clause as his own mistaken guess."

[264] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_{13}, Commentary.

than religious sympathy. For example, Hesychios could have been more lenient towards Anastasios as he might have produced his work during his reign and did not want to get on the wrong side of him. Then again, we can remind ourselves Prokopios and Lydos, both historians of the sixth-century, who have produced very favorable accounts of Anastasios as well, which Kaldellis argues was a way of criticizing Justinian.[265]

Secondly, accepting that parts of the *Souda* have indeed come out of Hesychios's pen, Treadgold claims that Hesychios "expressed qualified admiration for the extreme Monophysite theologian John Philoponus" in the *Souda*.[266] To reach this conclusion, Treadgold uses the *Souda* not only as if the information present in it was from Hesychios but also as if it was unaltered and directly from Hesychios. However, the *Souda* also cites that Hesychios's *onomotologos* did not include Christians, which makes Treadgold's claim that Hesychios wrote a positive entry on John Philoponos, a theologian, very unlikely. Furthermore, at another instant Treadgold also claims that Hesychios probably did not include Christian works as such a work had been produced before by St. Jerome or because Hesychios intended to model his work on other classical writers.[267]

All of the above arguments of Treadgold are incredibly self-defeating. First of all, it is not clear whether Treadgold argues that Hesychios did or did not include Christian writers in his work. Secondly, if Hesychios were to decide not including Christian authors in his work on the sole reason that it was done before by St. Jerome, would he then decide not make an *onomotologos* on the reason that it was also done before many times? Thirdly, if there were no theologians in Hesychios's

[265] Kaldellis, "Identifying Dissident," 11.
[266] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 270.
[267] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 274.

onomotologos, as Treadgold argues, then how can we take the *Souda* entry on John Philoponos to reflect Hesychios's religious conviction? For the sake of argument, let us ignore the sentence in the *Souda* that Hesychios did not include any Christian writers, and presume as Treadgold does that Hesychios included "entries on eleven of his contemporaries, most of them probably his friends."[268] The *Souda*, notes that either the *Souda* was "an epitome" of Hesychios's work, or it is argued that editors used the *Hesychios Epitome*. Can we then be sure that entries in the *Souda* are not edited at all and reflect Hesychios's religious views and his view on "his friends"? That we cannot argue since we cannot claim that the entries are not edited as Hesychios would not call himself a pagan in a negative sense.

Treadgold attributes a fragment on the birth of Christ written by a certain Hesychios to be part of Hesychios the Illoustrios's history, specifically of the fourth period. He states that this certain Hesychios dates Christ's resurrection six thousand years after the creation (which is not the standard Byzantine dating), by using Eustathios of Epiphania and John Malalas as sources.[269] This argument ties into another one of Treadgold's articles,[270] which can be summarized as such: John Malalas has invented his sources to hide the fact that he has copied Eustathios of Epiphania's work after Eustathios's death and changed the language register of Eustathios's work to further hide his plagiarism. Treadgold argues that Hesychios also had access to Eustathios's work, since it is mentioned in the *Souda* (again he is arguing for the fact that the information in the *Souda* comes directly from Hesychios) and that he must have based his bizarre calculation of Christ's resurrection on Eustathios's work and perhaps the majority of his work like Malalas

[268] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 277.
[269] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 272.
[270] Treadgold, "The Byzantine World Histories of John Malalas and Eustathius of Epiphania," 709-745.

himself. Altogether, in this argument Treadgold argues against the popular conception that Malalas's history had an impact on Byzantine world-chronicle writing, and argues that it was Eustathios's history to which we should give credit.[271] Through the intertextuality of Treadgold's arguments, we can see that Treadgold is preoccupied with reconstructing what really happened and what is the actual truth in the grand scheme of Byzantine historiography based on tangential evidence and speculations. Hesychios's history plays its part in this reconstruction that resembles a house of cards. Thus, Treadgold's argument based on textual evidence that Hesychios was a monophyte Christian is set on contradicting and tenuous "evidence" as interpreted by Treadgold.

However, Treadgold also uses material evidence to determine that Hesychios was a Christian as well. First of all he notes the existence of inscriptions that were found in Miletos, Hesychios's hometown, which states that a certain Hesychios that lived in the reign of Justinian had sponsored the erection of a large church and a column bearing a statue of the Emperor.[272]However, not all scholars agree that the emperor mentioned in the inscription is Justinian. Regardless, this inscription combined with the fact that Hesychios named his son John, shows Treadgold, Hesychios's "essential Christianity."[273] However, as we have noted these inscriptions cannot be safely attributed to our Hesychios and the emperor mentioned is not named as Justinian.[274]The best way to summarize Treadgold's approach to

[271] Treadgold, "The Byzantine World Histories of John Malalas and Eustathius of Epiphania," 709-745.
[272] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 270. Transcriptions and translations of the inscriptions are available in their entirety in Kaldellis's work. Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)."
[273] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians*, 270, n.130.
[274] Transcriptions and translations of the inscriptions are available in their entirety in Kaldellis's work. Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390),T_3,T_4,T_5."

history writing is in fact provided by Treadgold himself in his preface to *Middle Byzantine Historians.* It is as follows:

> Since the Byzantine historians supply us with few details about themselves or their working methods, we must often choose between saying nothing about them and guessing. My assumption has been that readers are better served by being told my best guess on the basis of all the evidence than by simply being told that we know nothing for certain.[275]

Having considered Treadgold's argument, let us now take a look at Kaldellis's reconstruction of Hesychios's religion. We have already discussed Kaldellis's claims in which Hesychios's history's starting point, the reign of Belos, and Hesychios's claim to be truthful as it was reported by Photios signify to Kaldellis that Hesychios's work had a non-Christian agenda. Furthermore, Kaldellis claims that the sixth-century Byzantine society was not as 'monolithically Christian ' as some scholars claim.[276] Moreover, Kaldellis puts forth that Hesychios's work was treated "as yet another Christian world chronicle" because of this common view amongst modern scholars.[277] Kaldellis is not entirely wrong in his claims; however, is he entirely right? We have seen the evidence that contributes to the reconstruction that Hesychios was Christian, let us now look at the other side of the medallion.

Kaldellis states that while the fragment on the birth of Christ (with Eusthahios and Malalas's dating system) is attributed to a certain Hesychios, our Hesychios is always called Hesychios the Illoustrios and that Hesychios was a common name in the sixth century. Secondly, Kaldellis claims that in the dating of the fragment on the birth of Christ, the dating system is based on the Creation, and Hesychios does not start his history with Creation, according to the information provided by Photios and the *Souda*. Therefore, according to Kaldellis it does not

[275] Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians,* xiv.
[276] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 389.
[277] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 389.

make sense for Hesychios to use Christ's birth as a matter of calculation for years in general; hence, he concludes that the fragment on the birth of Christ is not from Hesychios's history[278] Thirdly, Kaldellis states that "the tenor of the fragment is theological, unlike the playful pagan aetiologies of our author, and the style of writing is, in my opinion, quite different."[279]

While the first two arguments of Kaldellis against attributing the fragment to our Hesychios are reasonable, the third one has a pitfall. Kaldellis ignores the fact that within his historiographical writing, Hesychios might have been applying the framework of another 'genre,' that of patriographic writing only in this specific fragment of the *Patria*. That is to say that the rest of his work may not display "playful pagan aetiologies" that *Patria* displays. Thus, Hesychios' work could have presented itself as an interesting amalgamation of "supergenre," a type of that easily shifts from "one set of generic conventions to another."[280] Thus, even though the fragment on the birth of Christ can display characteristics of a theological writing theoretically, it can still belong to Hesychios' history just as the part on the foundation of Constantinople can display the characteristics of patriographic writing. Furthermore, because of the mythological contents of the *Patria,* Kaldellis ascribes "a pervasive paganism" to the fragment.[281] Once again, Kaldellis ignores genre conventions. In doing so, Kaldellis puts aside all the generic formulations that Hesychios might have been adhering to for the aesthetics of the work or for his readers' expectations and instead places the genre as a tool for Hesychios's ideological agenda.

[278] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 393.
[279] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 393.
[280] Kent, *Interpretation and Genre*, 20.
[281] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 397.

In his conclusions about Hesychios's religion, Kaldellis argues that material "evidences" about Hesychios cannot be used as evidences. Kaldellis states that "To understand many of the authors of this period—in fact many of the key authors—we must defend the autonomy of their writings against the encroachments of their social and political context."[282] There is a paradox in this statement, if Hesychios's building of a church can be considered just a show for the establishment, can we not argue for his intellectual work to do the same?

Just as we noted how Hesychios's religious identity serves Treadgold's wider historical imagination, we should also note that Kaldellis's work on Hesychios is a building block of Kaldellis's reconstruction of "true" and "real" Late Antiquity, cleared from the ideological blinders of modern Western scholarship in his point of view. Kaldellis as a classicist in education and a Greek in ethnicity, underscores in most of his writings that what mostly western Anglo-Saxon Byzantinists has been missing/misjudging can be uncovered by the techniques exercised by classicists and philologists.[283] In many of his works, he claims to uncover the real workings of the late antique Byzantine society.

3.4 Chapter summary and conclusions

This chapter focused on both Byzantine sources and secondary sources about Hesychios's life and works to determine what and how much we can really know about Hesychios's works. It has underlined several peculiarities of the nature of

[282] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 401.

[283] In the preface of his work on essentially what Prokopios really believed, Kaldellis is critical towards British scholars who study Byzantine literature and blames them for basically underestimating the literary capacity and inventiveness of Byzantine historians. Kaldellis, *Procopius of Caesarea*, 5. In his own words, Kaldellis is engaged with a desire to "rehabilitate" the Roman identity of the Byzantines themselves. (Kaldellis, Byzantine Republic, x) This will be more as we go over Hesychios's text in more detail in chapter five.

Bibliotheca and the compilatory nature of the *Souda*. Overall, this chapter demonstrated that scholarship on Hesychios contains irreconcilable interpretative and subjective reconstructions by modern scholars through the fragmentary information provided by primary sources.

While the conclusions that Kaldellis and Treadgold reach are quite the opposite, we should note that their methodology of historical enquiry is quite similar. Their methodology is based on an "ontologically modernist history" which postulates that the "universal-centered knowing subject" can know the reality of the past and produce an objective account of history.[284] In this case, Treadgold and Kaldellis are the "universally-centered knowing subjects" that claim to produce an objective and reliable account of history based on the notion that the past reality is knowable and it can be explained from posterior evidence.[285] They perform an evidence-based empirical study even though they are working from fragmentary and incoherent evidence to reconstruct "an objective" and "truthful" conjecture of Hesychios, the author, his complex motives and intentions. Indeed, their work is a matter of interpretation of evidence and reconstruction of a person's life from the very beginning starting from his mother's name, Philosophia, leading to a preconceived end to fit the mold of larger arguments. In the end, Kaldellis claims to reach a construction of "what Hesychios *really* believed" for Treadgold, "what Hesychios believed" is quite obvious.

Given the fragmentary nature of the evidence, and since as Kaldellis and Treadgold demonstrate from this evidence what can be interpreted can differ tremendously, this thesis argues that such reconstructions and definitive conclusions are not tenable. Instead, it focuses on Hesychios's work as "a literary performance"

[284] Munslow, *The Routledge*, 4.
[285] Munslow, *The Routledge*, 4-5.

structurally based on aesthetic and narrative structures and collective memory. The next chapter of this thesis highlights the structural and contextual choices of Dionysios, one of the sources of Hesychios, and Hesychios's literary performance. The upcoming chapters also question whether Hesychios was a disinterested observer of historical events or a participant of reconstructing the past in a specific way as Kaldellis portrays him to be from a structural analysis. Thus, it aims to question whether we can find an "an authorial persona" that wanted to promote a certain ideology and whether we can have "a definitive" and "objective" picture of Hesychios.

CHAPTER 4

STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE *ANAPLOUS BOSPOROU*

The first section of this chapter involves a structural analysis of Hesychios's account of history from what we know through Photios's and *Souda*'s accounts, based on the seven "internal operative principles" that Panagiotis Agapitos developed for analyzing Byzantine literature. The aim of this section is to introduce these concepts for the analysis of Hesychios's *Patria* as well as Dionysios's *Anaplous Bosporou* and to get a clear idea of what we can and cannot learn through a structural analysis of a fragmentary work, from which virtually nothing, except for the *Patria*, which is another genre, has survived. After this general introduction to a structural analysis of Hesychios's history, the section introduces theories from Roland Barthes to analyze the narrative structure and the language of one of Hesychios's sources, Dionysios's *Anaplous Bosporou*, and later Hesychios's *Patria.* The third section solely focuses on Dionysios's work by using Agapitos and Barthes's theories to better understand the changes Hesychios has introduced to the body of literature about Byzantion and its implications which are analyzed in the next chapter.

4.1 Structural analysis of Hesychios's history according to the "seven internal operative principles" of Panagiotis Agapitos

Panagiotis Agapitos claims that late antique Byzantine works of literature, buildings, paintings, manuscripts, and even the liturgy often display seven internal operating principles, which renders them different from those works of Antiquity and Early Modernity.[286] Agapitos argues that structural analysis of Byzantine works can reveal

[286] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84.

important markers on how to periodize Byzantine works. More important to the aim of this thesis, Agapitos notes that structural analysis can reveal the "authorial consciousness" of Byzantine writers through an elaboration of their structural, generic, stylistic, and other formative choices as well as their attitude towards their predecessors in terms of convergence, divergence, and innovations.[287] By analyzing what we know about Hesychios's history through our sources and as well as what we can gather from the surviving fragment of the *Patria* itself with the seven "internal operative principles" developed by Agapitos, this section intends to cast an analytical eye on the structure of the text and Hesychios's choices, as far as we can deduce them.

4.1.1 Centricity

Agapitos defines the principle of *centricity* as the Byzantine texts displaying "a marked structural or conceptual center placed within a clearly hierarchical disposition."[288] A well-known example is that of Malalas. Malalas places the birth of Christ at the very center of his world chronicle, which he dates at 5967 differently than the traditional Byzantine dating of 5500, which would mean that the year 6000, commonly believed to be herald the Second Coming of Christ had already passed.[289] Jeffreys points out that Malalas's unique calculation and his positioning of Christ's birth at the precise center of his history demonstrate Malalas's attempt to deal with the immediate concerns over the impending apocalypse at the end of the year 6000.[290] Hesychios is speculated to have endorsed the same dating system due to a

[287] Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 25.
[288] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84.; Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 25.
[289] Gwynn, "The Religious," 252.; Jeffreys, "Chronological Structures," 165.
[290] Jeffreys, "Chronological Structures," 165.

fragment assigned to his history on the birth of Christ, as we have discussed in the previous chapter.[291] Nevertheless, as stated before, neither do have Hesychios's whole history and nor are scholars in agreement whether the fragment on Christ's birth belongs to Hesychios's history.

Be that as it may, even though we do not have Hesychios's whole text, Photios's description of its contents and Photios's word choices can give us clues regarding the centricity of Hesychios's work. Photios states that the fifth period of Hesychios's work covers the era starting from Julius Caesar's single rule until the time when Byzantion was raised *to glory and strength.*[292] We can hypothesize that the only surviving fragment from this work, the *Patria,* appears to be from this section. At the beginning of this fragment, the *Patria*, Hesychios states that after having been ruled by tyrants, kings, aristocracy, and democracy, Byzantion reached its prescribed greatness.[293] Thus, we can see that Photios actually echoes Hesychios's emphasis on the glory and strength of Byzantion. Subsequently, we can argue that the theme of Byzantion achieving greatness as stated by Photios, emerges as an inherent part of Hesychios's work, not as an interpretation of Photios in his review.

Therefore, taking the emphasis on Byzantion reaching greatness as a milestone in the whole narrative through the evidence provided by Photios in his overall review and Hesychios's emphasis in his surviving fragment, as well as taking into consideration that the only surviving fragment of the text is, in fact, the *Patria,* we can hypothesize that Hesychios's work gives special importance to the

[291] Gwynn, "The Religious," 251.
[292] Photios, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 69. The Greek is as follows, translation and emphasis are mine. Τὸ δὲ πέμπτον τμῆμα περιέχει τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουλίου τοῦ Καίσαρος μοναρχίας μέχρις ὅτου Βυζάντιον ἐπὶ μέγα δόξης ἰσχύος ἤρθη.
[293] Hesychios, *Patria*, 1.

foundation and rise of Constantinople. Hence, it might have formed a conceptual center and a raison d'être for the work. In the previous chapter, we have argued that Hesychios was writing within the confines of the genre of universal history, focusing on Rome's political phases and Byzantion's ascendance to power. Hence, concentrating on Byzantion's rise to power might have been a conscious choice by Hesychios's history. This supposed centrality of the work would contribute to making Hesychios's history "thoroughly" Byzantine according to Agapitos's principle and would take away from the notion of "uniqueness" Kaldellis attributes to the work.

4.1.2 Linearity/counterlinearity

Agapitos defines *linearity* as a "structural hypotaxis" that would "allow the multiple and in-depth connection of the text's recognizable parts."[294] He suggests that there is a cancellation of a linear hypotaxis in Byzantine works and hence claims that these works display what he calls "*counterlinearity*."[295] Unfortunately, we do not have enough fragments of Hesychios's history to compare them with each other. From Photios's description of the work's sections, we can only deduce that Hesychios's account of world history seems to follow a linear structure and chronology of events; regardless, this does not signify that the work drew in-depth connections within its chapters. In the next chapter, we will analyze the structural hypotaxis of the fragment of *Patria* with regards to its language and contents, and determine, and question whether there is a structural hypothesis in this little fragment.

[294] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84.; Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 25-26.

4.1.3 Paratacticality

The concept of paratacticality suggests that instead of displaying structural hypotaxis, Byzantine texts are made out of smaller units with an "observable sequence" "placed on the same narrative level."[296] The autonomous nature of the *Patria* and its ability to survive, as well as the survival of the disputed autonomous fragment on Christ's birth, if it is indeed part of the whole work, suggest that Hesychios's work might have been indeed structured in smaller independent units, while the linearity of the overall chronology of the work might suggest that they were placed with an observable sequence. Furthermore, the narrative of the *Patria* demonstrates paratacticality, as Hesychios narrates different myths and stories that do not have causal relationships with each other.

4.1.4 Compartmentalization

Compartmentalization signifies that individual units of Byzantine works "are highlighted through some kind of strong marking as autonomous and often 'water-tight' compartments,"[297] which means that "removal or insertion of one or more compartments would not affect the text's macrostructure."[298] Survival of individual fragments might indicate that Hesychios's work could have been composed of smaller and autonomous individual units. However, the fact that the work was composed as a chronologically linear account of world history in a narrative form, and not in a chronicle form, might suggest that the work operated within a framework of cause and effect relationships whereby one action would cause a

[296] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84.; Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 25.
[297] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84.; Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 26.
[298] Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 27.; Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 26.

reaction and connect various events in history. Hence, removal or insertion of other compartments can hypothetically affect the texts' macrostructure. However, Hesychios's *Patria* is composed of quite independent individual units, as we shall see. Overall, to achieve definite conclusions on the centrality, linearity/Counterlinearity, paratacticality and compartmentalization of the whole work is not possible for two reasons: first, as stated earlier, we only have fragments of the work, and secondly, because the surviving fragment of the *Patria* is of a different genre than the rest of the work. Regardless, these three are all useful classifications to enrich our understanding of the work.

4.1.5 Non-closure

Agapitos defines non-closure as the Byzantine texts not having a closure and giving the "impression of continuously awaiting further working."[299] This is an interesting criterion, as it implies and applies a modern subjective eye in the analysis of the structure of Byzantine texts. Nevertheless, if we analyze Hesychios's work with regards to this criterion we can observe that neither does Hesychios' fragment of the *Patria* give this impression nor does Photios who has read the whole work implies such a sense. Photios comments on the brevity of the work in terms of style and content, yet this does not imply a need for "further working."[300] Of course, Photios is not a mechanical and unbiased transmitter of knowledge. We will look further into this criteria as we analyze Hesychios's language in the fragment of the *Patria*. Overall, as we shall see in the next chapter, Hesychios's work displays a sense of careless editing of his sources at times, but not a sense of non-closure.

[299] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84.; Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 27.
[300] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84.; Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 27.

4.1.6 Absorptivity

Absorptivity is a criterion that focuses on whether the text "visibly absorbs" and "makes use of passages from older sources for various purposes."[301] Since Hesychios is writing an account of world history, most of his information that he uses to form his narrative comes from the textual memory of "reported events" in contrast to some other historians that write a history of their times working from "experienced events."[302] Thus, the knowledge that Hesychios acquires has "a social origin" and may be acquired from other people, sources, texts, as well as "social institutions" which help shape but not determine Hesychios' authorial persona.[303] Therefore, absorptivity is an important structural component in the formation of the *Patria*.

4.1.7 Revealment

Agapitos defines revealment as "the texts continuously referencing the mechanisms of its own structuring with continuous references to its structural parts and their 'relation to each other."[304] Byzantine authors often fell the need to intervene in their accounts to guide the reader/audience in a particular direction, as we will see in this and the next chapters. Hesychios's text is no exception, and his revealment strategies continuously make references to his own narrative structure. We will analyze this further in the next chapter by making use of Roland Barthes's theories as well.

[301] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84.; Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 27.
[302] For detailed explanations of these terms see, Larsen, "Remembering," 326-355.
[303] For the concepts see, Larsen, "Remembering," 330.
[304] Agapitos, "Late Antique or Early Byzantine," 27.

4.1.8 Interim conclusions

The fact that we do not have Hesychios's complete account of history naturally hinders us from an advanced structural analysis. Nevertheless, analyzing the work according to the seven internal operative principles and reaching hypothetical conclusions through them can guide us in our analysis of Hesychios's authorial choices.

Our first hypothesis is that Hesychios's work displays a marked centricity with regards to the rise of Byzantion to power. Secondly, we may deduce that the work displays paratacticality and compartmentalization within a linear chronological structure, which would highlight that there were specific instances that Hesychios intended to focus on in his universal history, such as the rise of Byzantion. This hypothesis also aligns with Photios review in which he notes Hesychios uses specific events rather than years/reigns of emperors in dividing the structure of work and gives obvious significance to the rise of Byzantion. Lastly, we can note that the work, as we shall analyze in the next section, has a high degree of absorptivity that Hesychios shaped with his revealment strategies. While some of our conclusions can only be hypotheses, these principles can push us to think further and give us tools to better analyze Hesychios and his source Dionysios's fragments, even though Dionysios's text is not a Byzantine one. Let us now focus on the language, content, and the narrative of first Hesychios's source Dionysios's *Anaplous Bosporou,* and then Hesychios's *Patria* to use these strategies in our analysis of the source.

4.2 What the main source of Hesychios says and how he says it

At the beginning of the *Patria*, Hesychios states that he works from the ancient poets and writers without directly citing any of his sources.[305] This could be due to a couple of reasons. First, we can hypothesize that this was because none of his sources were direct reporters of experienced events. What Hesychios's sources reported, and what Hesychios collected were instances ascribed to the deep and common collective memory, what Lewis calls the "remembered history."[306] However, by the time Hesychios was writing his account, the information on Byzantion that he was compiling had gone through multiples stages of evolution and transmission. Through oral repetition and written reconstruction, these mythological events were part of the collective memory of the whole, as well as forming part of the textual memory of his "textual community"[307] as well. Hence, in terms of

[305] Hesychios, *Patria*, 1. The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. λεκτέον δὲ ἡμῖν ὅπως τε ἐξ ἀρχῆς γέγονε καὶ ὑπὸ τίνων ἀπῳκίσθη, ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν καὶ συγγραφέων τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ποιουμένοις.

[306] Bernard Lewis categorizes three types of history composed of as remembered, recovered, and invented history. He defines remembered history as "the statements about the past, rather than history in the strict sense, and ranges from the personal recollections claimed by the elders to the living traditions of a civilization, as embodied in its scriptures, its classic, and its inherited historiography. It may be described as the collective memory of a community or nation or other entity—what it, or its rulers and leaders, poets, and sages, choose to remember as significant, both as reality and symbol." Lewis, "*History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented,"*11-12.

[307] Brian Stock has originally devised the term "textual community" to refer to the hotbeds of religious dissent centered around texts in small communities in Europe, in his seminal work *The Implications of Literacy Written Language and Models of Interpretation in Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* published in 1983. In his work, Stock explores the interdependence of the spoken word and the written text, different levels and layers of meaning that arose with the increase in literacy, and how dissident and heretic social and cultural groups get organized around the presence of key texts in medieval Europe. Most importantly, Stock focuses on how specific key texts, primarily through individuals who have mastered them, were instrumental in the making of a group's identity and actions. In short, according to Stock, texts form and define the communities that revolve around them. Stock's concept has proven to be quite influential and flexible with the widespread use of the model to explain the behavior of different "textual communities" from different centuries. As a result, Stock has revaluated his concept for Antiquity in his work "Textual Communities Judaism, Christianity, and the Definitional Problem." This revised model of the textual community can be used to conceptualize the literary atmosphere of the late antique Byzantium. In his revision, Stock asserts that while the critical texts preceded the community in Antiquity, the texts of the Middle Ages, especially religious ones, created a community around themselves. Stock, "Textual Communities," 151. In the same vein, we can argue that the *paideia* of the late antique Byzantium formed by canonical texts provided the preexisting cultural structure that educated people became part of and contributed to a preexisting community similar to Antiquity. This is quite similar to how Byzantine authors and historians imagined their selves. Byzantine historians were highly conscious of the tradition and genres that they

sources, Hesychios was working from the records of collective oral memory and textual memory of remembered history.

However, Hesychios himself was not interested in just producing another repertoire of remembered history. He was not even interested in an account of "recovered history,"[308] a task that Lewis associates with academic scholarship based on the recovery and study of earlier sources. Instead, Hesychios was interested in producing an account of "invented history."[309] Hence, he was actively using narrative strategies, especially various layers of revealment and absorptivity to shape his invention of the capital city's history.

4.2.1 C^e: An overview of the events reported and an introduction to Roland Barthes' theories

First, Hesychios introduces the events that he reports (and at times invents), by noting that he gathered his information from old poets and historians τῶν ἀρχαίων

were part of and along with their place in them. They imitated and adapted earlier models. Often, historians took it upon themselves to continue the works of others that came before them; such was the case with sixth-century historians Prokopios and Agathias. Stock also notes that compared to the Middle Ages, in Antiquity, texts "were longer, more complicated and inseparable from historical contexts. Thus, he argues that more attention must be given to reception, reader reconstruction, intertextuality, and oral discourse within rhetorical channels. Stock, "Textual Communities," 151. All of the above conceptualizations and especially the primacy of text apply to the historians of late antique Byzantium since Byzantium's relationship with the classical heritage was mediated through an unbroken chain of classicizing learning called the *paideia*. Through the imitation of the classics and the use of Atticizing language, not only the textual link between the collective memory and textual memory of the past was actively kept alive but also the literary forms that these works were composed of were kept alive albeit in a continuously modified fashion.

[308] Lewis defines recovered history as such "is the history of events and movements, of persons and ideas, that have been forgotten, that is to say, at some stage and for some reason rejected by the communal memory, and then, after a longer or shorter interval, recovered by academic scholarship—by the study of records, the excavation of buried cities, the decipherment of forgotten scripts and languages, and the consequent reconstruction of a forgotten past. But reconstruction begs the basic question, and disguises what would be better described as construction. The word itself indicates the dangers of the process, and leads us to the third type of history." Lewis, "*History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented,"* 12.

[309] Invented History: "This is history for a purpose, new purpose differing from previous purposes. It may be invented in either the Latin or the English sense of the word, devised and interpreted from remembered and recovered history where feasible, and fabricated where not." Lewis, "*History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented,"* 12.

ποιητῶν καὶ συγγραφέων by using words that indicate a manner of reporting such as "Φασὶ," it is said/they say. Roland Barthes defines these words as "testimonial shifters." Barthes formulates that when historians use such testimonial shifters, first, they refer to an original reported event, which he designates as "C^{e}." Secondly, Barthes formulates the way historians mention the act of their informant as "C^{a1}" (they say). Thirdly, he draws attention to the act of the writer who refers to both of these levels (such as using testimonial shifters as I suppose and I think), which he calls the "C^{a2}." [310] Thus, Barthes formulates a narrative mechanism that works in a threefold manner: first by referral to events, secondly by referral to the sources, and lastly by the way the authors present their information. Barthes's conceptualization can help us analyze the stages of absorptivity and revealment in Hesychios's history and uncover its many narrative layers and interconnections, and see how his work differs from his sources.

Hesychios starts his narrative by enumerating multiple foundation stories of Byzantion. These foundation stories form the first events reported in his narrative framework. Through relating multiple foundation stories, Hesychios lays a multilayered gridwork beneath the upcoming, what he deems to be the "more plausible" narrative of the foundation of Byzantion, which then becomes the basis for the second layer of the events he reports. After this "more plausible" foundation story, Hesychios narrativizes the acts of Byzas, the founder of Byzantion. Thirdly, Hesychios relates various acts and moments from the reigns of the seven *strategoi* who succeeded Byzas. Finally, Hesychios goes through an abrupt shift of focus and switches to the Roman rule under Severus and Constantine the Great. Broadly, these four chronological steps of the narrative form the main events reported, the "C^{e}" of

[310] Barthes "Discourse of History," 128.

Hesychios's work. In all of these sections, Hesychios engages in re-inventing "the remembered history" of the city in a particular fashion by using what Barthes defines as testimonial shifters, the narrative levels of C^{a1} and "C^{a2}.[311]

4.2.2 *Anaplous Bosporou:* The use of genre and Dionysios's aim

While enumerating possible foundation stories of ancient Byzantion, Hesychios either uses Dionysios of Byzantion as a source or uses the same source as Dionysios of Byzantion. Therefore, to better understand the literary performance of Hesychios and what he chooses to do with the events and information present in his source, it is necessary to make a digression and take a closer look at the work of Dionysios of Byzantion, how modern scholars interpreted it and finally how the events present in Hesychios were presented by Dionysios first. Not everything present in Dionysios's text can be analyzed here due to the constraints of the thesis. The subsequent section aims to shed light on Dionysios's authorial choices regarding the information that is also present in Hesychios's work. Secondly, this section aims to form a basis for the next chapter of this thesis, which partly deals with what sort of information Hesychios found in Dionysios and what he chose to do with that information.

Dionysios of Byzantion's work is called *Anaplous Bosporou*. It belongs to the genre of *periploi,* the earliest form of Greek descriptive geographical writing about coasts which contains information about harbors, landmarks, shelters from bad weather, hazards, etc.[312]It also bears resemblances to the genre of *periegesis* devoted to the description of a specific region with geographical, historical, mythological, and artistic information, form "the local tourist guidebooks of the Hellenistic

[311] Barthes "Discourse of History," 128.
[312] *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, s.v. "*Periploi*."; *Encyclopaedia of the Hellenic World, Constantinople.*
s.v. "Dionysius of Byzantium."

period."[313] Following these traditions, Dionysios's work presents itself as a guide to sailing along the Bosporos and the Golden Horn with information on various legends and myths about the landmarks, shrines and monuments with accompanying etiological explanations. It is believed to have been produced before the second century AD.[314] In his work, Dionysios seamlessly moves from one region of the Bosporos and the Goldarn Horn to another with brief remarks in the order and manner of smoothly sailing through the Bosporos.

As describing coasts was one of the oldest forms of geographical literature,[315] it is likely that Dionysios had access to other textual sources for this sort of information. Nonetheless, most probably, Dionysios had access to the local oral information, the treasures of the collective memory of Byzantion, as well. For example, Thomas Russell, the author of *Byzantion and the Bosporus* (2017), points out that there are instances in which Dionysios displays "palpable pride" in terms of his local knowledge based on oral memory of his homeland.[316] Along the same lines, Russell also remarks that Dionysios intends to install a source of wonder to his audience.[317] This aspect is most apparent when Dionysios states his mission in writing the work at the beginning of his work:

> If a delightful and amazing view happened to be the only thing for those who sail to Euxeinos Pontos to its so-called Stoma/Mouth, [to give an account] of the things to be seen would be otherwise hard. [318]

[313] *Encyclopaedia of the Hellenic World, Constantinople,* s.v. "Dionysius of Byzantium."
[314] *Encyclopaedia of the Hellenic World*, Constantinople, s.v. "Dionysius of Byzantium."
[315] Dihle, *Greek and Latin Literature*, 235.
[316] Russell, *Byzantion and the Bosporus*, 23.
[317] Russell, *Byzantion and the Bosporus*, 23.
[318] For Dionysios's work, I used R. Güngerich's edition entitled *Dionysii Byzantii Anaplus Bospori una cum scholiis x saeculi* as it is present in TLG. I am citing paragraph numbers for ease of reference as follows, Dionysios, *Anaplous,* 1. Unless otherwise stated, the English translations in this chapter are my own. The original of the above sentence is as follows, Εἰ μόνην συνέβαινε τοῖς ἀναπλέουσιν εἰς τὸν Εὔξεινον Πόντον κατὰ τὸ καλούμενον αὐτοῦ Στόμα τερπνὴν ἅμα καὶ θαυμαστὴν εἶναι τὴν ὄψιν, δυσχερὴς ἦν ἄλλως ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁρωμένοις ὁ λόγος·

Dionysios here implies that the view of the Bosporos is so marvelous that his account would not be able to do it justice. He adds,

> Since the [vision] exhibits no less with hearing than from seeing, it seemed necessary to me to write about these, so that those who see would lack nothing of the whole and perfect inquiry and those who see not [the vision] have the hearing.[319]

What was Dionysios's aim? Was it to produce a local navigation guide or a tourist guide to the Bosporos and Byzantion? Was it to install wonder in his audience about the marvels of the landscape as Russell also notes? For example, Russell claims that Dionysios "is in reality only tangentially interested in topographical information, using it as a *façade* behind which he paints a picture of a legendary, mythological landscape along the shores of the Bosporus." [320] Even though Russell repetitively points out that Byzantion's history should be conceived within the framework of its geography;[321] nevertheless, paradoxically, he conceives Dionysios's use of geography, as a *façade*, which implies a sense of deceptiveness on behalf of Dionysios. Although Dionysios's work is a much earlier product, it is not necessarily a "Byzantine" work in the modern sense of the word, the modern scholarly attitude of conceiving Byzantine literature "as a distorting mirror" seems to be affecting Russell's conceptualization of Dionysios's work. Instead, we should interpret Dionysios's use of a genre, at this instance, a navigation guide of the *periplous*

[319] Dionysios, *Anaplous,*1. Thomas Russell translates rather freely as follows. "Since its audience gains nothing less from the sight, it seemed necessary for me to write about these things all together, so that for those who have seen them there may be nothing lacking for sake of full appreciation, while for those who have not seen them they may, at any rate, be able to learn at least a little about these things." Russell, *Byzantion and the Bosporus*, 23. The original is as follows. ἐπεὶ δ' οὐκ ἐλάττω παρέχεται τῆς ὄψεως τὴν ἀκρόασιν, ἀναγκαῖον ἔδοξέ μοι συγγράψαι περὶ τούτων, ὡς τοῖς μὲν ἰδοῦσι μηδὲν ἐνδέοι τῆς ὁλοκλήρου καὶτελειοτάτης ἱστορίας, οἱ δὲ μὴ θεασάμενοι τὸ γοῦν ἀκηκοέναι περὶ αὐτῶν ἔχοιεν.

[320] Russell, *Byzantion and the Bosporus*, 4. (Emphasis by me.)

[321] A poignant example is when Russell points out at the introduction of his work "In what follows, I hope to show that the history of Byzantion should not be considered in isolation from the city's geographical context." Russell, *Byzantion and the Bosporus*, 16.

genre, not as a façade but as a narrative strategy, a structure, and a framework that helps the author convey the information in a certain way.

Albrecht Dihle notes that Dionysios uses "this literary form purely as a literary convention, with a view to a readership that wanted to be entertained as well as to enlarge their knowledge."[322] Dihle is quite right. As has been emphasized in this this thesis often, when we analyze the use of genres, we have to keep in mind the autonomy of the writers and expectations of the readers not within an informational vacuum but within the horizons of expectations of a certain era. Thus, when we think about Dionysios's work, we cannot conceive it along the lines of a modern navigation guide whereby geographical information would have precedence over mythological legends. However, there is more to the use of this genre.

In Dionysios's account, the use of the genre of a navigation guide presents Dionysios as a formal structure to narrate and memorialize the collective memory of his city by stopping by the places of memory along the shore. It enables Dionysios to shift from one location to another effortlessly and to step outside the confines of the genre of local historiography. It frees him from expounding intricate cause and effect relationships as well as forming a chronological framework of events. Dionysios simply recalls the events that have shaped the places of memory he visits. Thus, the genre of navigational guide enables Dionysios to take advantage of paratacticality. He places he visits are on "an observable sequence" of navigation, placed on the same narrative level.[323] The work's paratacticality makes it highly compartmentalized, enabling the author to freely switch his focus from one location to another. Furthermore, Dionysios uses the act of sailing as a rudder to his narration, helping him navigate how he reveals information. Hence, the act of navigation

[322] Dihle, *Greek and Latin Literature*, 235.
[323] Agapitos, "Contesting Conceptual," 84.

shapes his strategies of absorptivity and revealment. Through these strategies, Dionysios embeds and presents layers of collective memory at the C^{e} and C^{a1} levels, and at the Ca^{2} level, by going through a skillful process of selection and manipulation of his oral and textual sources in producing the desired memory he wants.

Last but not least, we should take into consideration that through a narrative based on navigation, Dionysios takes advantage of using a mnemonic technique that is commonly known as the *method of loci*. The *method of loci* was and is commonly used to remember things and memorize lists in a sequence by imprinting mental images that represent these things to be remembered on mental images of well-known places, paths, and journeys already stored in the memory.[324]

Cicero brings up the *method of loci* in his *De Oratore* and Quintillian details it in *Institutio Oratoria.* It is also featured in the anonymous *The Rhetorica ad Herennium.* However, despite being quite well-known in the Latin tradition, the *method of loci* is not attested by the Latin tradition only. In the *Oratore*, Cicero mentions the Greek poet Simonides of Ceos's famous story of using it and impressing his audience through his impeccable memory.[325] In *De Memoria*, Aristotle uses an alphabetic mnemonic technique to recover information from his memory storage.[326] In her book, the *Book of Memory*, Mary Carruthers argues that ever since Aristotle's work *De Memoria*, memory was associated with imprinting images in the mind as if writing on wax tablets.[327] Furthermore, she argues that "that recollection from memory was deeply linked with the invention and producing

[324] Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 25-27.
[325] Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 25
[326] Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 129.
[327] Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 25-27.

speeches."[328] We can never know whether Dionysios was familiar with the *method of loci*. Nevertheless, we can argue that it was likely that Dionysios was familiar with the method. The genre of navigation enables Dionysios to use of the *method of loci* not only to recall information about his city but also to make it more memorable to his readers.

4.2.3 The first events that Dionysios reports: the origin of Pontos and the name of Bosporos

Dionysios starts his narration and navigation by saying an account handed down from old memory transmits that Lake Maiotis (Sea of Azov) was the mother or the nurse of Pontos (Black Sea).[329] First, this sentence makes a connection with first textual, and secondly, to an oral source while presenting the origin myth of the Pontos (Black Sea). Therefore, the first event, the C^{e}, that Dionysios relates, at the beginning of his account on the Bosporos, is the origin myth of Pontos. His C^{a1}, the sources, are composed of ancient unidentified sources of oral and textual memory.

Dionysios ends his brief remarks on the origin of Pontos with a couple of geographical remarks but, most importantly, by noting that the shores of Pontos are populated by Greeks who colonized it after the birth of Byzantion.[330] At this instance, we witness Dionysios's use of a literary flash forward and what Barthes calls "a conflict of two time spans."[331] Dionysios interrupts his storyline, the event C^{e}, the origin of the Pontos, to emphasize the importance of an event that happened

[328] Carruthers, Book of Memory, 1-17.
[329] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 2. Ἀρχὴ δὲ—αὐτὴ τοῦ τε λόγου καὶ τῆς τῶν χωρίων φύσεως—πέλαγός ἐστιν ὁ Πόντος ὁ Εὔξεινος, μεγέθει τῶν ἄλλων πλεῖστον, ὅσα μὴ πρὸς τὴν ἔξω θάλασσαν ἰσώσασθαι· μόνη δ' ὑπὲρ αὐτὸν ἀνακέχυται λίμνη Μαιῶτις, ἣν μητέρα καὶ τροφὸν τοῦ Πόντου κατεφήμισε λόγος ἐκ παλαιᾶς μνήμης παραδεδομένος.
[330] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 2. περιοικοῦσι δ' αὐτὸν πρὸς θαλάττῃ μὲν πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες, ἃς μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Βυζαντίου γένεσιν ἔνιοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπῴκισαν, ὑπὲρ δὲ τὴν θάλασσαν ἔθνη βάρβαρα πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα.
[331] Barthes, "The Discourse of History," 128.

much later, the foundation of Byzantion, bears on his own present. The ease of transmission from one time plane to another, from mythological to historical, is granted by the genre of a navigation guide and Dionysios's general style of not using any time indicators and chronology. The choice to start with the origin of the Pontos, which is naturally situated at the far end of the Bosporos from Byzantion, is a deliberate and a strategic one. Dionysios's detailed navigation guide actually does not even start at the Black Sea; instead, it starts at the *akra* the tip of the Bosporos. By strategically choosing to introduce this piece of information with a flashforward about the essential role of the birth of Byzantion in the colonization of the Black Sea, Dionysios gives Byzantion a prime role in the wider Greek world from the very beginning of his account. He absorbs his sources and reveals his information in quite a strategic manner. By doing so, Dionysios inserts a clue regarding his motivations for writing his account.

After his introduction of the Pontos and subsequent mention of the "birth of Byzantion," Dionysios briefly introduces the geographical features of the Bosporus and Golden Horn, such as the currents, the depth, length, and the width. Once again, geographical information has a specific purpose: Dionysios uses it as a way of dragging the reader's attention from where he started at the Black Sea, back down to the akra whence Dionysios starts his detailed narrative. As such, at this instance, Dionysios employs his authorial voice and a testimonial shifter masterfully in his revealment and states that this sort of geographical information was of a general nature for the readers not wishing to get into detail. Then, he proceeds to the details for the readers who want more information.[332]

[332] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 6.

Once again, Dionysios begins by sharing crucial information: how the landscape received its name. The organizational placement of this event at the very beginning of his account, led and structured conveniently by the act of navigation, is also quite telling of Dionysios's motivation to produce his work in the place as Dionysios is chiefly interested in the collective memory of the region. He mentions that there are two different accounts, about the *akra*, the headland, modern Sarayburnu.

The two different accounts of how the landscape received its name form the second C^{e}, after the origin of Pontos. Dionysios introduces them by stating that while some *say*, (C^{a1} for Dionysios,) that a cow caught by a gadfly, crossed the strait here, others *recall* (C^{a1} for Dionysios again) the more legendary myth of Io, the daughter of Inachos, being driven by the jealousy of Hera from here to Asia [333] At this first instance, Dionysios only mentions these stories very briefly as such, without giving detailed narratives of the stories. Furthermore, he wraps them up with a testimonial shifter of persuasion: Dionysios inserts himself, again with an interruption of his storyline, and urges his audience to believe (πεπιστεύσθω) in the more divine version of the two accounts by using the imperative voice.[334] He states that it seems to him that it doesn't seem likely, (two testimonial shifters on Ca^{2} level) that the native incident would prevail, and both the Kimmerian and Thracian straits would be called Bosporos from just that if it was not something greater than local history.[335] He

[333] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 7. The whole passage is as follows. Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἄκρας, ἣν Βοσπόριον καλοῦμεν, διττὸς κατέχει λόγος· οἱ μὲν γάρ φασι βοῦν οἴστρῳ κατ' αὐτὴν ἐνεχθεῖσαν διανήξασθαι τὸν μεταξὺ πόρον, οἱ δέ, μυθωδέστερον ἀπομνημονεύοντες, Ἰὼ τὴν Ἰνάχου κατὰ ζῆλον Ἥρας ἐλαυνομένην ἔνθεν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαπερᾶσαι· πεπιστεύσθω δὲ τῶν λόγων ὁ θειότερος· οὐ γὰρ ἄν μοι δοκεῖ τοσοῦτον ἐπικρατῆσαι τὸ ἐπιχώριον πάθος, ὥστ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸν μὲν Κιμμέριον, τὸν δὲ Θρᾴκιον καλεῖσθαι Βόσπορον, εἰ μή τι μεῖζον ἦν τῆς τοπικῆς ἱστορίας· κληρονομεῖ δ' οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ συμβεβηκότος μνήμης τοὔνομα.

[334] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 7. πεπιστεύσθω δὲ τῶν λόγων ὁ θειότερος·

[335] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 7. Emphasis by me. οὐ γὰρ ἄν μοι δοκεῖ τοσοῦτον ἐπικρατῆσαι τὸ ἐπιχώριον πάθος, ὥστ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦτὸν μὲν Κιμμέριον, τὸν δὲ Θρᾴκιον καλεῖσθαι Βόσπορον, εἰ μή τιμεῖζον ἦν τῆς τοπικῆς ἱστορίας· Emphasis by me.

concludes this brief section by appealing to collective memory and states that the *akra* received its name from the memory of the events that happened.[336] The fact that he abruptly ends these myths with the help of the act of navigation, without providing any further details, solidifies his certainty. In fact, he uses non-closure as a way of instilling further certainty. Whereas the readers expect more information, Dionysios chooses to move forward with his navigation and narration.

4.2.4 Byzantion's first figures of memory

Nevertheless, besides the use of testimonial shifters and the narrative strategy of navigation, Dionysios' certainty is also granted by the fact that the events that he describes have taken place in a distant mythological past. Having been firmly settled in the collective and cultural memory of Byzantion by Dionysios's age as fixed points of reference, the foundation story and its figures have turned into what Assmann refers to as figures of memory.

Assmann describes "cultural memory" as "a collective concept for all knowledge that directs behavior and experience in the interactive framework of a society."[337] Cultural memory does not form immediately: members of a group inherit it through "repeated societal practice and initiation."[338] It is bound by "fixed points of horizon in the past,"[339] called the "figures of memory" which are events and characters whose memories are maintained by "cultural formations," such as monuments (like the temples and landmarks that Dionysios often mentions) and texts

[336] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 7. κληρονομεῖ δ' οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ συμβεβηκότος μνήμης τοὔνομα.
[337] Assmann, "Collective Memory," 126.
[338] Assmann, "Collective Memory," 126.
[339] Assmann, "Collective Memory," 127.

(like Dionysios's text itself) as well as "instructional communications" such as recitations and practices.[340]

Cultural memory and figures of memory serve as resources from which groups develop an awareness of their unique identity.[341] The certitude with which Dionysios refers to Io's legend, which he has not yet explained to his readers, shows us that she was an established figure of memory in Byzantine cultural memory and identity that Dionysios expected his readers to be acquainted with. In addition, the use of this figure of memory by Dionysios and later by Hesychios attests to the "mnemonic energy"[342] and significance this figure of memory was capable of carrying over many generations. Nevertheless, in a similar manner, Dionysios's alternative version of the founding story, the mundane one that he chooses not to endorse, also emits energy that Dionysios cannot resist, as it is also situated deeply in the cultural memory. They both constitute, what Assmann calls "islands of time."[343] Dionysios can leave these islands of time to be elaborated on later in his discourse, aided by the act of navigation, without risking a gap in the cause and effect relationship of his narrative.

Spatio-temporal frameworks are essential markers for the maintenance of collective memory and figures of memory.[344] Through the act of navigation, Dionysios uses plenty of specific spatial markers; however, he avoids using temporal markers. This could be due to two reasons. The first and the most obvious one is that the mythical instances that Dionysios relates are so far removed from his present time that they cannot be accurately dated. In Assmann's terms, the Io myth is from

[340] Assmann, "Collective Memory," 127.
[341] Assmann, "Collective Memory," 130.
[342] Assmann, uses mnemonic energy as a quality that figures of memory have. Assmann, *Collective Memory*, 130.
[343] Assmann, "Collective Memory,"130.
[344] Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*,134–40.; Casey, *Remembering*, 189.

the "the time of the Gods," "the time of the great events," that gave rise to the world as they know it.[345] Hence, the memory of this myth is part of an "internalized past:" [346] it is part of the genesis of the city. This event does not refer to "a historical time."[347] Dionysios's treatment is in no way extraordinary either. Often local Greek historiographers install the early beginnings of their city in a mythological time that features heroes and gods.[348]

Nevertheless, as we shall see, Dionysios does not date any historical events either. It can be argued that these "historical" events that come after the foundation of the city are also quite far from Dionysios's present reality and that they have also become part of the "internalized past," which contains an amalgamation of myth and history without any significant distinction between them.[349] In fact, often, we can observe this phenomenon as Dionysios actually merges historical and mythical stories in his narrative.

As settled as they are, figures of memory and collective memory are continuously shaped by processes of repeated reconstructions, selective remembering, and at times invention (which is even more obvious in Hesychios's narrative). For example, by choosing to endorse one version over another, Dionysios makes a conscious choice about which foundation story should survive in the collective memory of his city. He becomes an "agent of memory" as someone who actively listens, selects, modifies, and rigidifies particular versions of the past.[350] Furthermore, as an agent of memory, Dionysios forms a commemorative narrative.

---

[345] Assmann, *Collective Memory*, 57.
[346] Assmann, *Collective Memory*, 58.
[347] Assmann defines historical time as "nothing but the continuation of what has already become. " Assmann, *Collective Memory*, 58
[348] Clarke, *Making Time*, 198.
[349] Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 59.
[350] Boyer and Wertsch, "How Do We Build,"113.

Yael Zerubavel, in her seminal book *Recovered Roots,* defines a commemorative narrative as follows,

> Each act of commemoration reproduces a commemorative narrative, a story about a particular past that accounts for this ritualized remembrance and provides a moral message for the group members. In creating this narrative, collective memory clearly draws upon historical sources. Yet it does so selectively and creatively.

Furthermore, Zerubavel calls a "master" commemorative narrative "a basic 'storyline' that is culturally constructed and provides the group members *with a general* notion of their shared past."[351] Along similar lines, Dionysios is interested in using fragments of his society's collective memory to create a basic storyline, a master commemorative narrative for his city that provides the moral that Byzantion was an auspicious location.

In conclusion, by utilizing the genre of a navigation guide, which frees him from using chronological narrative, Dionysios introduces the cultural memory and the figures of memory that define the landscape and make up the city's identity. Even though Dionysios's work falls more closely within the realm of remembered history, Dionysios is also an active agent of memory involved with the selection of the contents and hence shaping the construction of his city's written past. Haying clarified the horizons and goals of Dionysios's work and introduced the concept of figures of memory and cultural memory, we can now continue to take a deeper look at the structural workings and content of Dionysios's work.

4.2.5 Places of memory and the colonists

After providing a narrative foreshadowing of the foundation story, Dionysios continues his navigation and narrative by moving along the Bosporos and the Golden

[351] Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots*, 6.

Horn. During the course of these, he introduces various shrines, landmarks, and monuments that have evolved into places of memory as well as real-life and legendary characters that have evolved into figures of memory, all of which contribute to the region's identity. Eventually, Dionysios circles back to the Io story by reaching the main location where the story began. We should keep in mind that he had introduced the Io story earlier, where it geographically ended, which is another example of Dionysios's masterful skills in absorbing information and later revealing in strategic instances.

After endorsing the more legendary foundation story, interestingly enough, Dionysios mentions the alternative foundation stories that humans play a greater role in. This highlights the fact that Dionysios's priority is not forcing a singular and the holiest version of events. He is not interested in producing a historical narrative either: he mentions human actions and human events only with relation to what remains in terms of places of memory, the physical landscape, and the collective memory of the city.[352]

An instance such as this is when Dionysios mentions Athena the Disembarker's altar and notes that this is where after disembarking, "the leaders of the colony" at once fought for the land as if their own.[353] Here, Dionysios does not identify the origin of the leaders of the colony and leaves them anonymous. Likewise, Dionysios mentions the precinct of *Anesidora*, which he points out that he thinks "the ancients" had marked the absolute power of the earth, by enclosing it with an enclosure of polished stone.[354] Even though the use of the term ancients

[352] See chapter two of this thesis for an introduction of "places of memory."
[353] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 8-9. "Μικρὸν δ' ὑπὲρ αὐτὴν Ἐκβασίου βωμὸς Ἀθηνᾶς, ἔνθεν ἐκβάντες οἱ τὴν ἀποικίαν στολαγωγήσαντες εὐθὺς ὡς ὑπὲρ ἰδίας ἠγωνίζοντο τῆς γῆς"
[354] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 12-13. ἔπειτα Γῆς Ἀνησιδώρας τέμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς θαλάσσης, κατὰ κορυφῆς μὲν ἄστεγον, ἐπισημηναμένων, οἶμαι, τῶν ἀρχαίων τῆς Γῆς τὸ αὐτεξούσιον, λίθου δὲ ξεστοῦ περιβόλῳ συγκλειόμενον.

recall a sense of archaic founders, he does not identify who these people are either. In another instant, Dionysios mentions that nothing but the names of the two temples of Hera and Pluton remain. The first one, he notes, was burned down by some of the Persians during the campaign against the Skythians, taking vengeance of the king against those of the city who were blamed.[355] Secondly, he notes that the temple of Pluton was razed to the ground by Philip of Macedon who was in need of material while besieging the city.[356] He poignantly notes that only memory attributes the names to the places. [357] Furthermore, Dionysios mentions that a Megarian custom of sacrifice was held at the same spot.[358] Here and in other instances,[359] we learn that Megarians were active in Byzantion. Likewise, Dionysios mentions Corinthians in the colonization activity as well. For example, he mentions that there were rocks called Skironides, "for they show the likeness of the roughness of Corinthian ones for the Corinthians participated in colonization and marveled at the likeness."[360]

Thus, at times Dionysios mentions the colonists by their mother city, and at times he feels no need to do so as the questions of "whom" and "why" are not necessarily relevant to his goal all the time. However, he often refers to the later natives of Byzantion as Byzantines. Accordingly, from this switch in Dionysios's narrative, we can observe that what matters to Dionysios is strengthening the Byzantine identity at Dionysios's present. This is why Dionysios often refers to

[355] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 14. The whole paragraph is as follows. Κατὰ δ' ἀπόβασιν τῆς θαλάττης δύο νεώ, Ἥρας καὶ Πλούτωνος· λείπεται δ' αὐτῶν οὐδέν, ὅτι μὴ τοὔνομα· τὸν μὲν γὰρ οἱ σὺν Δαρείῳ Περσῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ Σκύθας ἔλασιν ἐνέπρησαν, τῷ βασιλεῖ τιμωροῦντες ἀνθ' ὧν ᾐτιᾶτο τὴν πόλιν, τὸν δὲ τοῦ Πλούτωνος ὁ Μακεδὼν Φίλιππος, ἡνίκα προσεκαθέζετο τῇ πόλει, χρείᾳ τῆς ὕλης καθεῖλε· προστίθησι δ' ἡ μνήμη τοῖς χωρίοις τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Πλούτωνος ἄκρα, τὸ δ' Ἠραία λέγεται· Πολυείδῳ μάντει καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου παισὶν ἐνταῦθα καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἐντέμνεται σφάγια τοῦ μὲν λήγοντος ἔτους, τοῦ δ' ἰσταμένου· τὸ δ' ἔθος Μεγαρικόν.
[356] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 14.
[357] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 14.
[358] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 14.
[359] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 34.
[360] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 15.

Byzantines as Byzantines at moments of strength and dominance. For example, he mentions the naval power of Philip II of Macedon not being a match for that of the Byzantines.[361] Likewise, he refers to the Byzantines at moments of keeping a holy custom alive or making a sacrifice.[362]

4.2.6 The colonists and Semestre

When Dionysios's navigation and narration reach the tip of the gulf of the Golden Horn called the Σαπρὰ Θάλασσα, Rotten Sea, where the rivers of Kydraros (Tr. Alibeyköy Deresi) and Barbyses (Tr. Kağıthane Deresi) meet, Dionysios mentions that God had given a prophecy to the colonists about this very place by referring to these two rivers as pups.[363] He notes the prophecy as follows,

> where the two cubs take hold of the gray sea,
> where the fish and stag graze the same pasture. [364]

Here, Dionysios uses geographical information to make sense of the prophecy by utilizing the genre of a navigation guide once again. The geographic explanation is as follows: the cattle feed on the alleviated plane of this area, whereas the fish nest in the same swampy waters.[365] Throughout this instance, Dionysios's

---

[361] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 27. ἐν γὰρ δὴ ταῖς ναυσὶν οὐκ ἦν ἀξιόμαχος, περιπολλὰ θαλαττοκρατούντων τῶν Βυζαντίων.

[362] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 36 .Daily activities and making a sacrifice : τὸ δ' ἐφεξῆς Βόλος, εἰς τὴν κατὰ χειμῶνα τῶν ἰχθύων θήραν εὐφυής· ἐφ' ᾧ τέμενος Ἀρτέμιδος Φωσφόρου καὶ Ἀφροδίτης Πραείας, ᾗ κατ' ἔτος θύουσι Βυζάντιοι· δοκεῖ γὰρ δὴ ταμιεύειν τῶν ἀνέμων τὴν εὐκαιρίαν, πραΰνουσα <καὶ> καθισταμένη τὴν ἐπὶ πλέον αὐτῶν ταραχήν. Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 41.Μικρὸν δ' ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ νεὼς Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου· τοῦτον ἐτίμησαν ἴσα θεῷ Βυζάντιοι, μεγαλοφροσύνης τ'αὐτοῦ καὶ τιμῆς τῆς περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀπολαύσαντες· καὶ γὰρ χώραν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας δωρεῖται καὶ σίτου πολλὰς μυριάδας καὶ βέλη καὶ χρήματα.

[363] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 23. τούτους ὁ θεὸς σκύλακας ᾐνίξατο τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀποικίας χρωμένους προτρέπων·

[364] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 23. Also see Kaldellis's translation in chapter four of this thesis. The original Greek is as follows. Ἔνθα δύο σκύλακες πολιὴν μάρπτουσι θάλασσαν, ἔνθ' ἰχθὺς ἔλαφός τε νομὸν βόσκονται ἀν' αὐτόν.

[365] This information is presented in one straightforward sentence in Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 23 as follows: εἴρηται δὲ ταῦτ' ἀπὸ τοῦ συμβεβηκότος· οἵ τε γὰρ ἔλαφοι κατιόντες ἐκ τῆς ὕλης ὥρᾳ χειμερίῳ σιτοῦνται τὸν ἑλείτην κάλαμον, ἰχθύων θ' ὅσον, ἐπίμικτον θαλάσσῃ καὶ ποταμοῖς, ὑποφωλεύει τῇ τοῦ Κέρατος ἡσυχίᾳ, νωθρὸν ἅμα καὶ ἀργὸν ὑπ' εὐτροφίας, λιχνεύει τὴν κατὰ βυθοῦ ῥίζαν,

authorial voice, the C^{a2}, is highly discernible. Dionysios rationalizes this mythological tale from the deep collective memory of his city with geographical information to make the story more believable to his readers. In short, Dionysios absorbs the mythical story in his narrative from the common collective memory, and reveals it in a realistic and logical manner with the use of his authorial voice.

Dionysios also adds that where the two rivers of Kydraros and Barbyses meet was the altar of Semestre.[366] He notes that Semestre was the altar where Io, because of the mechanizations of Zeus and rage of Hera, having been abandoned in the shape of a cow, terrified by a winged gadfly, and driven to many places, had given birth to her daughter, Keroessa, and that Semestre the water nymph had nursed this child there.[367] He adds that marks of thorns projected from each side of her forehead, and for this reason, she was called Keroessa.[368] He adds Keroessa's son by Poseidon was Byzas, "a man honored like a god," from where the name Byzantion comes.[369] Nevertheless, in the same paragraph, Dionysios inserts yet another mythological account right in the middle of his discourse. He makes a crucial digression from the legendary account to a human-led account. He mentions that at the altar of Semestre, "the colonists" made sacrifices to the God, which a raven snatched away to the headland, *akra*: the colonists taking it as a sign from Apollo decided to found their city there instead of Semestre.[370] Dionysios goes as far as saying that Semestre

[366] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 24. καθ' ὃ δὲ συμπεσόντες ἀλλήλοις ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπαντῶσαν παχεῖαν ἄκραν ὑπερενεχθέντες ἐκβαίνουσιν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, Σημύστρας βωμός.
[367] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 24. Σημύστρα δέ, νύμφη ναΐς, Κεροέσσης τροφός· Ἰὼ γάρ, ἐπεὶ μηχαναῖς μὲν Διός, ὀργῇ δ' Ἥρας πτερωτὸν οἶστρον ἄφετος ἐν μορφῇ βοὸς ἐπὶ πολλὴν ἐπτοήθη γῆν, κατὰ τοῦτον μάλιστα τὸν τόπον ἐπειγο- μένη ταῖς ὠδῖσι—θείας γὰρ γονῆς ἔμπλεως ἦν—ἀπερείδεται θῆλυβρέφος.
[368] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 24. τύποι γὰρ κεράτων καθ' ἑκάτερον τοῦ μετώπου μέρος ὑποδύντες ἐξεῖχον · ἔνθεν καλεῖται Κερόεσσα.
[369] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 24. ταύτης καὶ Ποσειδῶνος Βύζας ἀνὴρ ἶσα θεῷ τετιμημένος, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ Βυζάντιον.
[370] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 24. λαμπομένων δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν κόραξ ἁρπάσας ἐκ μέσης τῆς φλογὸς ἕνια τῶν μηρίων καὶ εἰς ὕψος ἀρθεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν Βοσπόριον ἄκραν ἐφέρετο· τοῦτο πρὸςἈπόλλωνος εἴκασαν τὸ τέρας οἱ λόγιοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

almost had the chance to become a city, for "the leaders of the colony" laid down the foundation of the city there before the raven snatched the sacrifice away.[371] This episode is another moment of hearing Dionysios's voice as Dionysios presents the readers with a "what if" scenario.

It is important to note that while throughout his navigation and narration Dionysios mentions various Greek colonists such as the Corinthians, Megarians, and Athenians, he does not identify the certain colonists who receive this holy prophecy and hence have a significant role in the foundation story that he connects with the legend of Io. Offering a clue with regards to their identity, he mentions that "the learned ones of the Greeks (οἱ λόγιοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων) took it as a sign from Apollo that a raven snatched away the sacrifice and carried it to the headland. Thus, the readers only learn that the founders were Greeks and nothing more.

4.3 Chapter summary and conclusions

We have used Agapitos's seven internal organization principles to analyze the structure of Hesychios's historical accounts and as tools to further analyze Dionysios's work. We continue using these very useful principles in the upcoming chapter as well.

In this chapter, we have discussed Dionysios's use of the genre of a navigation guide and how he structures the absorptivity and revealment of his text by making use of Roland Barthes's theories. Dionysios's account is a survey of the places and figures of memory that make up the collective cultural memory of the landscape. The navigation is like a frame story that reveals various mini-episodes

[371] Dionysios, Anaplous, 24. Σημύστρα γε μὴν ἐκινδύνευσε παρ' ὀλίγον πόλις εἶναι· ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ κατέθεντο τῆς πόλεως τὴν κτίσιν οἱ τῆς ἀποικίας ἡγεμόνες.

regarding the city's past. Moreover, the navigation enables the author to use his authorial voice and swiftly move on from one instance to another without developing characters, a linear narrative, and cause and effect relationships. The navigation also makes instances of flashback, flash forwarding, and foreshadowing possible throughout the narrative, helping the author give crucial information in strategic turning points of his account. Thus, Dionysios's selective revealment processes shape the narrative and construct the past of Byzantion in the way that Dionysios presents it. Eventually, Dionysios becomes an agent of memory, responsible for creating a general commemorative master narrative for his city. However, Dionysios is not necessarily concerned with providing a single fixed past and origin to the Byzantines, which we will see Hesychios was concerned with inventing. Instead, the combined effect of Dionysios's narration and navigation is a patchwork of various collective memories sewn together.

As we have noted in chapter two, we can conceive of the late antique *patria* as a hybrid genre composed of history, memory, and imagination. Even though Dionysios's work is not necessarily an example of the genre of *patria,* within the "complex literary tradition"[372] of late antique and Byzantine literature in which we can see narrative "as an ever-present, transcultural form,"[373] it presents itself as the perfect basis and springboard for Hesychios's work. As we will see, Hesychios, by adapting and appropriating figures of memory and places of memory according to his present, forms a whole new account out of Dionysios's work and utilizes it to create a literary performance of his own.

[372] Nilsson, "Desire and God," 236.
[373] Nilsson, "Desire and God," 236.

CHAPTER 5

HESYCHIOS'S WORK AS A LITERARY PERFORMANCE

As discussed in chapter three, Hesychios begins his *Patria* by stating that when the elder Rome reached the end of its lifetime, Constantine the Great established the younger/new Rome as an equal to the old one and the New Rome had attained prescribed greatness after having been ruled by tyranny, monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy.[374] In Hesychios's narrative from early on, there is an undeniable solemn acceptance of the fate of Old Rome, which stands in stark comparison with the "prescribed greatness" of New Rome. To justify the transfer of power and perhaps to make it seem more natural, predestined, and unavoidable, Hesychios tacitly utilizes the classical biological analogy of historical development as detailed in chapter three of this thesis. Rather than a catastrophic event, the decay and fall of Rome become part of its biological lifespan.

If we are to assume that with the regimes Hesychios enumerates he refers to Byzantion the Greek city's past and not Constantinople or Rome's (which he makes clear towards the end of his narrative by repeating this section once more), we can argue that by binding New Rome and the forms of government of Byzantines together, Hesychios aims to impart to his readers the sense that New Rome was organically connected to Byzantion. However, often scholars note that by mentioning these forms of government which Rome as actually governed by,

[374] Hesychios, *Patria*, 1. Throughout the work, I used Preger's edition of Hesychios's work, cited earlier, and consulted Kaldellis's translation in Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," $F_{7.}$ I also used Albrecht Berger's translation of the fragments featured in the tenth-century *Patria*. For the most part, Kaldellis's translation can be used as a point of a reference. Unless otherwise stated, I have used Kaldellis's translation. The paragraph numbers of Preger overlap exactly with Kaldellis's translation (hence I did not repeat them); however, not with Berger's. For citing Berger's translation, I used Berger's paragraph numbers of Book I for ease of reference, and not the page numbers except for the footnotes. I indicate when there is a significant difference in translations.

Hesychios parallels Byzantion's past with that of Rome's. They also argue that the fact that there are seven *strategoi* that come after the rule of Byzas parallels the seven kings of Rome. This is certainly not impossible; regardless, we should keep in mind that Hesychios never mentions the number seven directly and his text was highly abridged and edited by later editors: some *strategoi* might have been edited out of the narrative. Instead, what appears as a more direct connection is the fact that Byzantion was governed by different forms of government and that, as stated in chapter three of this thesis, Hesychios was making it seem that New Rome was the final stage of Byzantion's political life cycle. Furthermore, both the biological and political evolutionary theories introduce a leeway for him to narrate the mythological foundation of Byzantion. "How did it all start?" wonders the reader. The next sentence further strengthens this hypothesis in which Hesychios goes on to state,

> It is necessary for us to tell how it came to be from the beginning and by whom it was settled/colonized, basing it on the ancient poets and historians.[375]

Situated at the beginning of his chapter, with this sentence, Hesychios makes it known that he is first and foremost interested in how and by whom Byzantion was founded in his work by inserting himself, by stating that it was necessary for him to tell the foundation stories. For the foundation stories of Byzantion, it appears that Hesychios mainly uses Dionysios's account or a source that has also used Dionysios's account, or Dionysios's source. As we have discussed earlier, Dionysios is primarily interested in the patchwork of memories that contributed to his city's identity rather than a singular foundation story. Furthermore, as evident from Dionysios's account, and as other material evidence suggests, the city was more

[375] Hesychios, *Patria*, 1.The Greek is as follows, translation is mine. Λεκτέον δὲ ἡμῖν, ὅπως τε ἐξ ἀρχῆς γέγονε καὶ ὑπὸ τίνων ἀπῳκίσθη, ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίωποιητῶν καὶ συγγραφέων τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ποιουμένοις. Kaldellis's translation:. "It is incumbent on us, then, to give an account of how it was originally founded and by whom it was settled, basing our narrative on the poets and authors of old."

likely to have been settled by various colonizers over time.[376] Dionysios reports these alternative human-led actions of colonization without discrediting them. On the other hand, as the next section analyzes in-depth, Hesychios is concerned with inventing a singular and unique yet typical foundation story to Byzantion.[377] Thus, whereas Dionysios still works in the realm of remembered history, Hesychios works in the realm of invented history by manipulating these instances of remembered history and textual memory that he finds in his sources through structural choices and new inventions. For this purpose, Hesychios takes the events present at the C^e level of Dionysios's narrative; however, he significantly alters Dionysios's narrative structure and reformulates a chain of events with testimonial shifters and organizational shifters to suit to his purpose.

5.1 C^e – The foundation of Byzantion: Discredited versions and the more persuasive one

5.1.1 The story of the colonists

First, Hesychios relates the story of the colonists who receive the mysterious prophecy, which is also present in Dionysios's account. Hence, he starts to tell this story using the testimonial shifter, "they say."[378] However, while Dionysios does not identify who these colonists were, Hesychios identifies them specifically as Argives and makes them receive the prophecy from whom he specifically identifies as Pythia. Furthermore, Hesychios adds two lines to the prophecy. The whole prophecy that Hesychios reports is as follows,

> Blessed will be those who settle that holy city

[376] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 236.
[377] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 236.
[378] Hesychios, *Patria*, 3.

the narrow Thrakian coast by the mouth of the Pontos,
where two pups lap the grey sea,
where fish and deer feed in the same pasturage.[379]

It may not necessarily be the case that Hesychios invented this slightly altered version. He might have found this version of the prophecy from the earlier *patria* of the city that have not survived to modern times. This possibility is true for all the other "inventions" that modern scholars often ascribe to Hesychios. However, there are instances where we can discern Hesychios's authorial decisions and choices. For example, what is clear from Hesychios's prophecy narrative is that, if a later editor has not edited or removed this part, Hesychios does not give any geographical information as to why the prophecy referred to this area as a place where the two pups drink of the gray sea and where the fish and stag graze on the same pasture, unlike Dionysios. The omission of this information, which Dionysios provides in detail, appears to be a conscious effort on Hesychios's behalf to bestow further mystery and mythic feeling to the landscape (of what is to become Byzantion and later Constantinople.) Furthermore, Hesychios, as well as using the adjective clause, the holy city, (ἱερὴν πόλιν)[380] at the very first line of his prophecy, uses the clause destined land (τὴν εἱμαρμένην)[381] to refer to the land that the colonists are supposed to reach. These adjectives further emphasize the unique divinity of the city that Hesychios wants to convey to his readers. In his version, Hesychios relates that when the colonists arrived at the prophesized location, they propitiated the local

[379] Hesychios, *Patria*, 3. Above is Kaldellis's translation. Albrecht Berger's is too similar to Kaldellis's to reproduce here. Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, {1}. Earlier, in chapter four, I translated the last two lines in a similar way, except for the word "pups" I used, cubs and for the word "lap" I used take hold of. The original Greek is as follows,
Ὄλβιοι, οἳ κείνην ἱερὴν πόλιν οἰκήσουσιν
ἀκτὴν Θρηικίην στενυγρὸν παρά τε στόμα Πόντου,
ἔνθα δύο σκύλακες διερὴν μάρπτουσι θάλασσαν,
ἔνθ' ἰχθὺς ἔλαφός τε νομὸν βόσκονται ἐς αὐτόν."

[380] Hesychios, *Patria*, 3.

[381] Hesychios, *Patria*, 4. Ἐπεὶ οὖν εἰς τὴν εἱμαρμένην ἀφίκοντο <χώραν>. Kaldellis does not provide the χώραν.

deities with sacrifices, [382] which a raven snatched away and carried it to another place, which has the name Bosporos. A shepherd (*boukolos*) marked out the raven's flight, and hence that spot is called Boukolia.[383] If another later editor has not edited it, Hesychios leaves this story as it is without further detail and explanation, and goes on to relate another competing version.

5.1.2 Alternative stories

Immediately, Hesychios relates a second foundation story by stating that some people recount (ἱστόρησαν) that people from Megara led by Byzas sailed to the city and that they invent the fable that (μυθεύουσι) his name was thus attached to the city.[384]

Since this is not the version Hesychios wants to endorse, once again he quickly leaves it aside and moves on to state that others imagine/make up (ἀναπλάττουσιν) that Byzas was the child of the local nymph Semestre.[385] Even though the verbs "to recount," "to invent the fable," and "imagine/make up" refer to the act of Hesychios's sources, and form the C^{a1} level of the narrative, the fact they are so charged with Hesychios's efforts to disparage the efforts and capabilities of his sources' historians testify to Hesychios's own thoughts, so the C^{a2} level of the narrative. Hesychios is present in the text, even when he seems as a disengaged

[382] Hesychios, *Patria*, 5. Berger translates the section, "τοὺς ἐγχωρίους ἐξιλάσκοντο δαίμονας" as the colonists "propitiated the local demons." Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 2. Kaldellis uses the term "local divinities," instead. I disagree with Berger's translation and agree with Kaldellis's translation; regardless, I think "deity" is the more appropriate word here.
[383] Hesychios, *Patria*, 5.
[384] Kaldellis uses the term "fabulously relate," for μυθεύουσι. I agree with Berger that "invent the fable that' is more appropriate here. Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 3. The whole sentence is as follows. Ἕτεροι δὲ Μεγαρεῖς ἱστόρησαν ἀπὸ Νίσου τὸ γένος κατάγοντας εἴσπλουν ἐν αὐτῷ ποιησαμένους τῷ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡγεμόνι Βύζαντι, οὗπερ τὴν προσηγορίαν μυθεύουσι τῇ πόλει προστεθῆναι. Ἄλλοι δὲ Σεμέστρης τῆς ἐπιχωρίου νύμφης παῖδά τινα γεγονότα τὸν Βύζαντα ἀναπλάττουσιν.
[385] Hesychios, *Patria*, 5.

storyteller, just reporting what he has found. Through these testimonial shifters that actually refer to the C^{a1} level, hence his sources act of telling the story, Hesychios concurrently discredits his sources and elevates the veracity of the version he is about to endorse.

In a conspicuous diversion from what is most likely his source material, Hesychios does not merge the story of the colonists with the story of Io as Dionysios does. Instead, Hesychios states that while some have recounted different stories, he intends to present a plausible inquiry (πιθανὴν τὴν ἱστορίαν) to those wishing to read.[386] He chooses to use the adjective πιθανός plausible/persuasive/credible instead of μυθώδης legendary that Dionysios uses to describe the version he endorses, even though both Dionysios and Hesychios endorse the same version of the foundation of Byzantion. Hesychios declares that he *fittingly* προσφόρως begins the story of Io, the daughter of Inachos.[387] By inserting himself, his techniques and his choices into the narrative openly using C^{a2} testimonial shifters, and making the reader part of this work by referring to those wishing to read his version of the accounts, Hesychios distances himself even further from the earlier sources that he discredits.

5.1.3 The Io story

As soon as Hesychios starts to recount the version of the foundation story that he represents as the more plausible one, he stops using testimonial shifters on both C^{a1} and C^{a2} levels. In this event level, we neither hear what the sources say nor what Hesychios thinks, which bestows further certainty to Hesychios's version of the events.

[386] Hesychios, *Patria*, 6.
[387] Hesychios, *Patria*, 6. Kaldellis chooses to translate this word as "profitably."

First, Hesychios states that Io was the daughter of Inachos, the King of Argives and that Argos watched over her virginity. He recounts that Zeus, having fallen in love with her, persuaded Hermes to kill Argos. With Argos out of the picture, Zeus has sex with Io, after which she gets transformed into a cow. Hesychios continues by stating that Hera, angry at what has happened, sent out a gadfly and drove Io, who has been transformed into a cow, through the land and the sea.[388] It is not clear from both Hesychios's and Dionysios's accounts as to why Io is transformed into a cow. (Was Zeus trying to protect Io from Hera, or was Hera punishing Io, or because of some sort of punishment for losing her virginity?) The fact that this detail is not clear in Dionysios's account demonstrates that we cannot ascribe this lack of clarity to Hesychios or a later editor and that we can hypothesize a general lack of clarity with regards to the myth.

Moving on, Hesychios relates that when Io arrived at the headland, she left behind the name Bosporos[389] and returned to the Golden Horn to give birth to a daughter called Keroessa at the altar of Semestre situated where the rivers Kydaros and Barbyses mix. Hesychios states that after Keroessa, the area was called Keras.[390] (Hesychios notes that Keras was where people were cured of their inflictions as well.) He also states that "others are rather inclined to derive the name from the shape of the place"[391] and adds that "Some indeed appeal to the horn (keras) of the Amaltheian goat on account of the abundant harvest."[392] These are the first instances that Hesychios uses reporting words. More importantly, Hesychios states that

[388] Hesychios, *Patria*, 6-7.
[389] Albrecht Berger states, "Bosporos is actually a Thracian name that predates the Greek settlement, but it was explained by the Greeks, from the words bous and poros, as 'ox-ford'" Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 285, n.8.
[390] All of the information from this paragraph is from Hesychios, *Patria*, 9.
[391] Hesychios, *Patria*, 9. Kaldellis's translation.
[392] Hesychios, *Patria*, 9. Kaldellis's translation.

Kereossa bore a child with Poseidon named Byzas. Hesychios adds that Byzas received his name from the water nymph Bizye, who nourished him in Thrace. Lastly, he states that the citizens of the city still draw their water from that spring. Let us look at the structure of the above passage and its relation with other foundation stories and Dionysios's account.

5.1.4 Foundation stories: Differences and similarities with Dionysios

All of the versions that Hesychios reports are much more detailed than Dionysios's versions, which brings forth the notion that while Hesychios could have indeed invented some of these details, he might have also used fragments from other intermediary sources. However, two crucial differences with Dionysios's work lies in the fact that, as stated earlier, Hesychios does not provide geographical information to make sense of the prophecy and he does not structurally mix the legendary version of the story with human-led ones like Dionysios does, even though Hesychios seems to have access to his work. Dionysios's work's structure, supported by the use of the genre of a navigation guide, is geared towards laying out the landscape and places of memory of the city. On the other, the focus of Hesychios's text as seen from his introduction is not the landscape and the memory attached to it: it is providing an auspicious foundation story for which the landscape and manipulated textual and oral memory serve. This is especially visible in Hesychios's efforts to highlight the holiness of the landscape as we have discussed and as we most recently encountered in the previous paragraph in the case of the Keras's water healing people from their afflictions. However, he only uses these as long as they do not intervene with his foundation story.

Overall, while Dionysios bases his account on oral and textual memory with ample references to memory throughout his navigation, Hesychios is more concerned with discrediting these memories and inventing a singular version of the past with regards to the foundation stories. As we portray in further detail in the next section, when Hesychios refers to places of memory, he uses them specifically to make a connection with the city's present locales, which is another narrative layer that he is also forming. Lastly, due to his choice of genre and the way Dionysios chooses to present the collective memory of the city through navigation, Dionysios does not focus on individuals. In the next section, we analyze that Hesychios, on the other hand, narrativizes the foundation of Byzantion further, presenting it as an epic story with Byzas as the heroic main character.

5.2 The narrative of Byzas: An epic hero

5.2.1 Byzas's call to adventure

After introducing Byzas to the center stage with the more "plausible" version of the foundation story, Hesychios relates the deeds of Byzas and uses his life to form the beginning of a narrative storyline, which continues until the encroachment of Roman rule. Hesychios constructs the second event level of his narrative, the deeds of Byzas, similar to the journey of an epic hero, which helps Hesychios portray Byzas as a worthy founder and not as a mythological character who simply gave the city his name.

At first, Hesychios relates that when Byzas was advancing into prime age and dwelling in Thrace and causing fear amongst men and barbarians, he was

approached by embassies of other rulers who wanted to be his ally.[393] With this very first sentence, Hesychios demonstrates Byzas as an archetypical epic hero, residing in an unknown location, spreading fear amongst living beings. Hence, Hesychios does not limit himself by portraying Byzas to be of holy birth only; he also portrays Byzas as a physically able and formidable character capable of doing great things. Hesychios also signifies Byzas's impressiveness by emphasizing that people wanted to be his ally, signifying the leadership qualities that Byzas has. By highlighting Byzas's potential, this introduction serves as a foreshadowing of what Byzas will accomplish later.

Fittingly, Hesychios relates the story that Melias, the king of Thracians,who sends Byzas to battle a wild bull, which Byzas vanquishes and offers it as a sacrifice to gain the favor of the deities that live at the confluence of the two rivers.[394]The action of Melias is the typical "call of adventure" of an epic hero. It sets off Byzas's journey into the unknown and makes a hero and king out of him. At this point, Hesychios masterfully conjoins the separate foundation myths with the personality of Byzas. The raven that snatches the colonists' sacrifice becomes an eagle that snatches away the sacrifice of the vanquished bull and drops it on the headland across Chrysopolis where Byzas founds Byzantion. We have seen earlier that Dionysios was merging the colonist version of the foundation story with that of Io. However, in Dionysios's narrative structure, the two stories are not connected in an organic and causal mechanism, even though Dionysios interweaves them in their presentation. In Hesychios's version, Byzas has a prime and active role in vanquishing the wild animal, sacrificing it, and deciding to build his city where the

[393] Hesychios, *Patria*, 10.
[394] Hesychios, *Patria*, 11. Kaldellis translates the phrase "τοὺς πατρώιους ἐξιλασκόμενος δαίμονας" as "appeasing the ancestral divinities." Berger translates it as "appeasing the tutelary demons." I agree with Kaldelis's translation. Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 9.

eagle drops the sacrifice. He is not just a mythological character born from gods; he is a hero that actively shapes the narrative. As we analyze in the next section, Hesychios portrays Byzas as an active builder of Byzantion and its ruler during times of war and peace. Dionysios, on the other hand, simply mentions that he was the son of Poseidon and Kereossa, that he was honored like a god, and that the name Byzantion comes from him.[395]

This drastic change in the narrative structure of events, the different mingling of stories, and Byzas's first actions may or may not be Hesychios's invention. In this section, Hesychios does not use any testimonial shifters that would indicate his use of other sources C^{a1}, such as the words "they say," "they imagine," and "they report," as he did earlier. The readers neither hear about the sources of Hesychios nor Hesychios's voice C^{a2} (I think, it is necessary for us to tell, etc.) as was the case with the Io story. Indeed, the first instance of a testimonial shifter comes only after this section when Hesychios starts talking about how Byzas built his city, so at another C^{e} level. However, this is not a definitive conclusion that Hesychios invented this storyline and did not use other sources. Hesychios might have omitted the use of testimonial shifters to improve narrative flow and not because he had invented the story and had not used any sources. Unless we can find sources that portray Byzas similarly or differently, whether this version of the Byzas story was an invention by Hesychios is doomed to remain unknown. Nevertheless, either by invention or by inclusion Hesychios chooses to portray Byzas with a narrative that resembles that of an epic hero even when he had access to a source that does not (Dionysios). Again, via editing or invention Hesychios chooses to mix elements from the Io story and Byzas's first acts in founding the city even when he had access to a source that does

[395] Dionysios, *Anaplous Bosporou*, 24.

not (Dionysios). All of these choices by Hesychios solidify Byzas's status as the sole founder of Byzantion.

5.2.2 Byzas's building activities

5.2.2.1 The city walls and the figures of memory of Apollo and Poseidon

In the next section of Byzas's story, Hesychios narrates that Byzas builds a city with encircling defensive walls and sanctuaries of gods.[396] At the beginning of this section, Hesychios recounts that Apollo and Poseidon help Byzas build the city walls. Hence, within the epic hero narrative structure, Hesychios appears to be presenting their help as "the supernatural aid" that heroes receive from a protective figure after their call to adventure.

Scholars have often noted that Hesychios invents the story that Poseidon and Apollo helped Byzas build Byzantion's walls, replicating the myth that Poseidon and Apollo helped build the walls of Troy.[397] These scholars claim that through this motif, Hesychios was alluding to Troy's walls. [398] Hence, they claim that while connecting Byzantion and Troy on a mythological level, Hesychios was connecting the present Constantinople and Rome, as Troy is the legendary mother city of Rome. Considering the abundance of other motifs that scholars assume are also related to Rome, which we discuss momentarily, Hesychios could have invented these connections with Rome in mind. In fact, if we modify our horizon of expectations to that of Hesychios's readers as per Jauss's theories, we can speculate that Hesychios's sophisticated readers would most likely notice such an intended connection between

[396] Hesychios, *Patria*, 12-15.
[397] Hesychios, *Patria*, 12. Notable examples include but are not limited to: Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 213. Kaldellis, "The Works and Days of Hesychios," 396.
[398] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 213.; Kaldellis, "The Works and Days of Hesychios," 396.

Rome and Byzantion. Therefore, the motif of Poseidon and Apollo working together on the walls of Troy appears as a narrative template in the collective memory of the textual community that has the power of affecting the reconstruction of the past for a particular purpose, in this case forming a connection between Rome and Byzantion. As discussed earlier in chapter two, identity is socially constructed, and foundation stories can render the present more meaningful and divinely inspired. Thus, Hesychios's invention could have served to make the present moment of Constantinople ever more meaningful and connected to Rome.

However, did Hesychios invent the motif of Poseidon and Apollo in the narrative of the story? Actually, when Hesychios mentions Poseidon and Apollo helping Hesychios, he uses the testimonial shifter, "they say."[399] Therefore, Hesychios may not have invented this conspicuous motif at all. He might have found it in one of his sources and reported it. However, this does not reduce the fact that someone, whether it was Hesychios, an oral storyteller, historian, or writer, has invented this connection between Byzas, Poseidon, and Apollo. Hesychios chooses to insert it in his narrative, which is nonetheless a significant authorial decision. Thus, even if he did not invent it and found it in earlier sources, he could have had this connection with Rome and Constantinople in mind. However, can we argue that we can know what the author had intended, and this modern and contemporary reconstruction of Hesychios's text is the only possible reconstruction?

If we take a closer look at the totality of Hesychios's text and his source Dionysios, we can see that Hesychios connects the past of Byzantion to the Greek world of mythology and figures of memory as much as, perhaps even more so, than he does with a Roman past. For example, Poseidon and Apollo are not the only

[399] Hesychios, *Patria*, 12.

paired gods to build a city's walls in Greek mythology. Just like Poseidon and Apollo were instrumental in building Troy's walls, Amphion and Zethus, twin sons of Zeus, built the walls of Thebes, along with "seven" gates.[400] (Hesychios mentions that Byzas build the walls with seven towers[401] and also ascribes a half-brother to Byzas named Strombos, making him part of a pair as well.)

Furthermore, Poseidon and Apollo appear in other instances that specifically relate to Byzantion, the ancient city, and not Rome. As readers should recall, for example, Poseidon is attested to be the father of Byzas by Hesychios and Dionysios both. The fact that this is present in Dionysios's account eliminates the possibility of Hesychios inventing Poseidon as the father of Byzas, which could hypothetically parallel Mars' role in the birth of Remus and Romulus. Likewise, in Dionysios's account of the foundation of Byzantion, the colonists regard the raven bringing the sacrifice to the *akra* "as a sign from Apollo."[402] Similarly, Hesychios notes that the colonists received the prophecy from Pythia, the high priestess of Apollo.[403] Hesychios includes all these moments in his narrative, most likely through retrieval from other sources, before mentioning Apollo and Poseidon helping with the building of city walls. Hence, they appear to be established figures of memory in the foundation of Byzantion prior to this instant in the storyline.

Besides these textual relations, other material evidence shows that the Byzantines conceived their identity with a close connection to Poseidon and Apollo, in instances unrelated to invented connections (either by Hesychios or by us) with Troy and Rome.[404] For example, both Poseidon and Apollo were used in Byzantion's

[400] Nardo, *Greek and Roman Mythology*, 20.
[401] Hesychios, *Patria*, 13.
[402] Dionysios, *Anaplous Bosporu*, 24.
[403] Hesychios, *Patria*, 3.
[404] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 118.

and Chalcedon's coins. Russell demonstrates that while Byzantion had a coin with "a veiled head of Demeter on the obverse, and Poseidon sitting on a rock on the reverse," Chalcedon used the same formula and depicted the Apollo on the reverse with the Demeter on the obverse instead.[405] Poseidon and Apollo were conceived as having prime importance as the identity markers of each city and equal to each other by both cities. Furthermore, Russell also draws attention not only to Poseidon's presence but also to other Apolline motifs on the coinage of Byzas from the late fifth–fourth century.[406] Consequently, it can be argued that Apollo and Poseidon were influential figures of memory already present in Byzantion's cultural memory long before Hesychios. As figures of memory, they were created and bolstered by Byzantines' self-defined identity and image and by local agents of memory, like Dionysios. They were strengthened by Byzantine cultural enforcements, such as legends, stated in Dionysios and Hesychios, and institutional and public reinforcements such as coins. Therefore, while the connection with Rome is most readily available to modern readers because we are more acquainted with Rome's history, Apollo and Poseidon were organic and established figures of memory in Byzantine cultural memory.

However, we cannot overrule that Hesychios did not intend a connection with Rome either. "The term 'premediation' draws attention to the fact that existent media which circulate in a given society provide schemata for future experience and its representation."[407] theorizes Astrid Erll. As emphasized earlier, figures of memory, such as Apollo and Poseidon, are not fixed points in time. As they are transmitted over time, they undergo manipulations and attributions of different meanings by

[405] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 118.
[406] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 50.
[407] Erll, "Literature, Film," 389.

various memory agents. Through processes such as premediation, Hesychios could have taken (either by invention or through his decision to include them in his narrative) what is already present in the cultural memory and textual memory of Byzantion's landscape and have manipulated in a way relevant for the identity of his community. Thus, it is possible that Hesychios was using an existent popularized and mediatized memory in Greek and Roman mythology and creating one anew in his present. Thus, it can be the case that Hesychios was not only using the Greek mythological past of Byzantion, or singularly the legends traditionally ascribed to Rome as it is concluded by modern scholarship. On the contrary, since he was living in a new hybrid identity, one that is politically Roman in a culturally Greek landscape, Hesychios could have inserted Poseidon and Apollo in quite a strategic manner by using both Greek and Roman connotations of the figures of memory. Nevertheless, this is only a hypothesis aimed at enriching our understanding of Hesychios's text by detaching it from the ossified view that Hesychios was constantly trying to form connections with Rome.

After building the city walls with the help of Poseidon and Apollo, Hesychios mentions Byzas linking them with seven towers in such a way that they echoed sound to one another. Cassius Dio also mentions this work of engineering; however, he does not attribute it to Byzas.[408] Hesychios also mentions that Byzas built temples. In fact, neither Dionysios nor Cassius Dio nor any other sources that survived to our times mentions Byzas building any sanctuaries. Hesychios might have ascribed these civilizing acts to Byzas on his own, or found them in earlier sources and included them in his narrative. Either way, it forms part of Hesychios's

[408] Cassius Dio, *Dio's Roman History,* 195.

efforts to fashion Byzas into a proper founding figure. Let us now take a closer look at Hesychios's narrative about Byzas's temples.

5.2.2.2 The temples and the creation of places of memory

While Hesychios describes the building efforts of Byzas, he makes a conscious effort to connect the places of these buildings to his present time. Hesychios first notes that Byzas built (καθιδρύσατο) a temple and a statue of Rhea at the place called (λεγόμενον) Basilike .[409] Here, while Hesychios chooses to use an aorist tense for the act of building, he uses a present participle, which would imply that he is forming a connection with a place called Basilike that was still existing in his own time.[410] Moreover, Hesychios notes that the place has been honored (τετίμηται) as a Tychaion by the citizens."[411] The use of perfect tense for the word honor, instead of the aorist, gives a sense of continuity and connection with Hesychios's present-day and the time of Byzas's building activities.

Next, Hesychios notes that Byzas built a temple of Poseidon by the sea where the house of the martyr Menas has now been built.[412] Here, again, whereas Hesychios uses an aorist tense for Byzas's building activities, he changes to perfect tense for the building of the martyr Menas's house. Since this is the only time that Hesychios openly mentions a Christian building in the city, it has often been considered to be an interpolation.[413] This need not be the case, as it can be seen from

[409] Hesychios, *Patria*, 15. Ῥέας μὲν κατὰ τὸν τῆς Βασιλικῆς λεγόμενον τόπον νεών τε καὶ ἄγαλμα καθιδρύσατο.
[410] Kaldellis notes that "The Basilike was an open court surrounded by porticoes to the northwest of the imperial palace of Constantinople." states that the connection between Rhea, Thyche and Kybele is present in the accounts of Zosimos and Sokrates as well. Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390), F_7, Commentary.
[411] Hesychios, *Patria*, 15. ὅπερ καὶ Τυχαῖον τοῖς πολίταις τετίμηται.
[412] Hesychios, *Patria*, 15. Ποσειδῶνος δὲ τέμενος πρὸς τῇ θαλάττῃ ἀνήγειρεν, ἔνθα νῦν ὁ τοῦ μάρτυρος Μηνᾶ οἶκος διακεκόσμηται
[413] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 286. n.18."This is the only mention of a Christian building in Hesychios's text and therefore possibly a later interpolation."

the range of sentences and tenses about the building activities of Byzas that Hesychios was actively concerned with making connections with the present. For example, along with the example of the temple and statue of Rhea, Hesychios mentions a temple of Hekate, at the present site of the Hippodrome..”[414] Likewise, he mentions that Byzas set up (ἀνεθήκατο) altars of Ajax and Achilles by “the so-called” Strategion[415] in which case, Hesychios uses aorist tense for the building activity and switches to using a present participle to say “so-called.”

> The city can grow and transform itself, hide the land where it was born, obscure its past with a new Roman and Christian culture, these inalienable and unconscious links with an origin remain with the inhabitants.[416]

Dagron offers the above statement on the city’s and its inhabitants’ connection with the past. As tempting and poetic Dagron’s words are, and while Hesychios might be utilizing elements that still linger in the collective memory of the city, it would be erroneous to assign the carefully produced literary performance of Hesychios to “unconscious” ties that the inhabitants might have with the city’s past. Most of the connections that Hesychios makes are deliberate and in unison with each other. For example, the inclusion of the temple of Hekate among the city’s temples does not appear to be coincidental either as Hesychios later recounts the legend of Hekate.

As stated earlier, spatio-temporal frameworks are crucial for collective memory.[417] Nevertheless, as we have seen, both Dionysios and Hesychios do not use temporal places and instead give importance to space. Along with the fact that the events that Dionysios recounts are part of the intrinsic and mythological past of the city, we have argued that the genre of Dionysios’s work frees him from a

[414] Hesychios, *Patria*, 16. Ἑκάτης δὲ κατὰ τὸν νῦν τοῦ Ἱπποδρομίου τόπον.
[415] Hesychios, *Patria*, 16. Ἐγγὺς δὲ τοῦ καλουμένου Στρατηγίου.
[416] « La ville peut croître et se modifier, cacher la terre où elle est née, occulter son passé par une nouvelle culture romaine et chrétienne, il reste à ses habitants ces liens inaliénables et inconscients avec une origine. » Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 69.
[417] Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, 134-140.

chronological framework. Both of these statements apply to Hesychios's work as well.

Modern memory theories provide more answers to the absence of chronological frameworks, which can be applied to Hesychios's work. Edward Casey, author of *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study* argues that "distinct places" rather than generic ones, have a fundamental significance: while time can be fleeting and full of other experiences, places have a "stabilizing persistence" that attach to the memory and enhance remembering.[418] He argues that places are "selective for memories;" while they can summon one kind of memory, they can exclude others.[419] Nevertheless, memories are also selective for places: they are better remembered if they happen to occur in a place that enhances its meaning.[420] Furthermore, certain places aid social frameworks that make it possible for the collective memory to endure.[421] Thus, religion, rituals, and ceremonies that need remembering are intimately connected to their respective spaces.

Hesychios, as an agent of memory, takes advantage of locations' corroborating role in collective remembrance in his efforts to connect the past figures of memory with present places of memory. Hesychios connects these supposed temples and builds on the notion of sacredness preserved in their space with concrete

[418] Casey, *Remembering*, 396. Halbwachs explains the importance of space as such: "Now space is a reality that endures: since our impressions rush by, one after another, and leave nothing behind in the mind, we can understand how we recapture the past only by understanding how it is, in effect, preserved by our physical surroundings. It is to space - the space we occupy, traverse, have continual access to, or can at any time reconstruct in thought and imagination - that we must turn our attention. Our thought must focus on it if this or that category of remembrances is to reappear." Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, 139-140.
[419] Casey, *Remembering*, 400. Casey gives the following example: "My memory, say, of seeing Small Change at a particular theater calls for remembering that is limited to certain visual, auditory, and (to a lesser degree) kinesthetic modalities. It would be literally "out of place" to associate systematically with this theater memories of isolated cogitation, of jogging, of painting, etc. A movie theater is a place with local peculiarities that would not welcome such memories as these: if not disallowing them altogether, it is a most unpropitious setting for them" Casey, *Remembering*, 401.
[420] Casey, *Remembering*, 401.
[421] Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 40.

contemporary monumental and sacred spaces. He associates these two seemingly unconnected yet divine and monumental places with each other: for places are selective of memories and memories are selective for places in return. Retroactively, the house of St. Menas becomes the temple of Poseidon. He underlines that the citizens still honor the temple of Rhea as Tyche. Most conspicuously, Hesychios has Byzas built a temple of the twin gods Kastor and Polydeukes, known as the Dioskouroi.[422] Kastor and Polydeukes were highly regarded in Rome, and the victory of the Battle of Lake Regilus was ascribed to their aid. [423] As such, a temple to them was present in the Roman Forum.[424] Hesychios not only ascribes the building of a temple for the Dioskouroi at Byzantion to Byzas but also places this temple at a very crucial spot: at the altar of Semestre at the confluence of two rivers, where Byzas had appeased the river deities earlier by sacrificing the bull he vanquished and where the colonist prophecy marked as the place of the new city.

Through the materiality of these places, Hesychios creates a master commemorative narrative for his city, just like Dionysios. However, this master commemorative narrative is different from Dionysios, as Hesychios's commemoration is guided by his present concerns and needs, which was providing Constantinople with an organic and wholly connected past with its landscape and possibly with a connection to Rome.[425] In this quest, as an agent of memory, Hesychios first attempts to install the present collective memory of the inhabitants of Constantinople with a connection to Byzantion, which he portrays as a land destined for greatness. He attempts to reinforce this connection by portraying Byzas in terms familiar to them as an epic hero and worthy founder of a holy city. Then, he installs

[422] Hesychios, *Patria*, 15.
[423] Roman and Román, *Encyclopedia of Greek*, 140.; Nardo, *Greek and Roman Mythology*, 34.
[424] Roman and Román, *Encyclopedia of Greek*, 140.; Nardo, *Greek and Roman Mythology*, 34.
[425] See the connection between present at commemoration at Kirk, "Social and Cultural Memory," 10.

the current prominent places of Constantinople with a deep connection to Byzantion; he selectively chooses holy temples as places are selective for memory, and memories are selective for places. Ultimately, it is the case that collective memory, first instituted, then ascribed to and stabilized on public places becomes social and cultural memory. Hence, it becomes embedded in social frameworks that define a group's identity.[426] Thus, Hesychios's master commemorative narrative renders the present Constantinople with an equally Roman and Greek past and identity.

5.2.3 Byzas and the barbarians

As we have discussed in the previous section, Hesychios presents Byzas as a mythical hero from a mysterious place in Thrace, that gets a call of adventure. Gradually, with the development of the city walls and sanctuaries through the divine help of Poseidon and Apollo, Hesychios fashions Byzas as a civilized Greek, who is very much part of the perpetual Greek fight against the Barbarians. For example, Russell notes that Polybius "creates the impression of a Greek enclave, surrounded by hostile Thracians."[427] In his narrative, Hesychios indulges in a similar imagination about the Byzantines vs. the outside world during the times of Byzas. After all, Hesychios is part of a textual community founded on the textual memory that texts carry. Throughout his narrative, Hesychios uses archetypical images (the epic hero Byzantine) and narrative representations (barbarians vs. us) inscribed in his textual community, which help him make sense of the past as well as the present. Furthermore, Hesychios's master commemorative narratives reframe the lived past in moral terms and conceives the Byzantines within an entrenched historical

[426] Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 38-43.
[427] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 165.

imagination in the Greco-Roman world: the barbarians vs. us. This Greco-Roman framework enables him to further strengthen an epic founding story for Byzantion and shapes the reigns of the other *strategoi* that come after him too.

Specifically, Hesychios relates that having built the city, it was then necessary to drive off the invading Barbarians as well.[428] He recounts that Byzas personally fought the Thracian barbarian leader Haimos in single combat, and pushed him down the hill, which "still" bears the name Haimos:[429] another apparent effort to fashion a hero's narrative while connecting the present Constantinople with the Ancient Byzantion. After this victory, Hesychios mentions that another barbarian group, the Scythians, attacked the city. At this moment, Hesychios also adds Byzas's wife to his narrative and mentions that Byzas's wife marvelous (θαυμαστή) Phidaleia hurled the snakes that she had collected at the Scythian invaders and saved the city in this way.[430] Furthermore, Hesychios notes an ancient saying that has come down to his generation, stating that the captured snakes of the city should not be killed as they were its benefactors: yet another effort of Hesychios to connect the deep past of the city to his present time.[431] We will discuss Hesychios's introduction of Byzas's wife, Phidaleia, in the upcoming sections. Let us now focus on the role of Byzas's half-brother Strombos in the war against the Barbarians.

---

[428] Hesychios, *Patria*, 17. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ταῦτα εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ διῳκήσατο πόλιν, ἐχρῆν δὲ λοιπὸν τοὺς ἐπιόντας ἀπωθεῖσθαι βαρβάρους… Kaldellis translates this part as "Having provided his city with these things,
it was necessary *for the rest* to repel the invading barbarians, …" while Berger translates this part as "Having equipped his city with these structures, it was also necessary for him to drive off the invading barbarians, …." I think ἐχρῆν should be taken as impersonal and λοιπὸν as adverbial in the sense of "then."

[429] Hesychios, *Patria*, 17. For the origin of the name Haimos see Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)", F_7, Commentary.

[430] Hesychios, *Patria*, 18.

[431] Hesychios, *Patria*, 19.

5.2.4 Byzas's brother: Strombos

Hesychios ascribes a half-brother named Strombos to Byzas, who incites a great war against Byzas, causing the Scythians to attack Byzas's city shortly after Philadelphia had saved it. [432] Many scholars claim that Hesychios's invention of Strombos is aimed to create a parallel with Romulus and Remus; hence, another connection with Rome's foundation story.[433]

While earlier connections with Rome are plausible, even though some scholars assume that Strombos is Hesychios's invention,[434] he hardly appears to be so. For example, Stephanos of Byzantion also mentions a brother of Byzas named "Stroibos" waging war,[435] which would indicate that there could have been a tradition in the patriographic sources of Byzantion and Constantinople that has not survived into our times which assigned a brother to Byzas. These may have been earlier sources, or contemporary sixth-century sources since both Stroibos and Strombos appear in the sixth century.

Secondly, the brief inimical role of Strombos is quite far from the essential role Remus plays in the narrative of Rome's foundation. Strombos's appearance is more akin to a terse statement. It is possible that Hesychios's sources did not mention much about Strombos. It could be the case that Hesychios edited his sources rather too much. It could also be the case that a later editor edited Hesychios's narrative. Nevertheless, the fact that it was edited concisely would indicate that Hesychios or his source did not give much significance to the storyline of Strombos. Either way, if Strombos had a significant meaning, none of the editors would curtail

[432] Hesychios, *Patria*, 20.
[433] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)", F_7, Commentary.
[434] Kruse, *The Politics*, 50.; Kaldellis, "The Works and Days of Hesychios," 396.; Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 26.; Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 213.
[435] Stephanos of Byzantion, *Ethnica*, s.v. "Gynaikospolis."

this role. However, it could also be the case that Strombos had a very negative role in the narrative and was thus cut from it.

Nevertheless, keeping in mind these limitations about how much we can know about our source, we should look at the similarities and differences between Strombos and Remus in detail, as this is one of the key cornerstones of the modern singularly "Roman" reconstructions of Hesychios's text. Whereas Strombos makes a sudden appearance in the narrative of Hesychios, Remus has an essential role in the storyline; he is Romulus's twin and has been with Romulus since birth.[436] While Remus's death is a pivotal moment in Rome's foundation,[437] the readers of Hesychios never find out about Strombos's death. Strombos is simply vanquished. He unceremoniously exits the narrative.

Marion Kruse argues that "Hesychios may have had many reasons for inventing Strombos, but one effect of his presence is to highlight the fact that Byzantion was founded without fratricide and that its founder avoided ever having to confront his brother in combat."[438] Kruse bases his argument on the claim that Hesychios makes Byzantine outcompete Rome in the parallels between Rome and Byzantion that we have been discussing throughout this chapter. For example, Kruse notes that just like Io, Aineas, whose family line eventually founded Rome, was driven from his home by Hera/Juno.[439] Likewise, Kruse claims that Byzas's descendance from first-generation Olympians, Zeus and Poseidon, outcompetes Romulus's descendance from a second-order Olympian, Mars.[440] He also argues that while Byzas sees an eagle, a sign of Zeus, Romulus and Remus see common birds.[441]

[436] Kruse, The Politics, 50.
[437] Kruse, The Politics, 50.
[438] Kruse, *The Politics*, 50.
[439] Kruse, *The Politics*, 49.
[440] Kruse, *The Politics*, 49.
[441] Kruse, *The Politics*, 50.

While these theories sound quite tempting, they are not convincing. First of all, it is not the case that specifically, Hesychios has invented the characters and roles that Io, Poseidon, and Strombos play in the foundation story of Byzantion. The story had already been circulating at the time of Dionysios, except for Strombos, as far as we know, independent of Byzantion's relations with Rome. Hence, these were neither Hesychios's inventions, nor were they invented to outcompete Rome. While Poseidon and Apollo's help can be Hesychios's invention, he uses the word, they say, to mention it, which casts doubt on Hesychios' invention of the motif, along with their widespread presence in Byzantion's Greek mythology and their representations on coins.

Why does Byzas have a brother then? Once again, we can find answers from Greek mythology. Pairings in the forms of brothers and twins were not that uncommon in Greek mythology.[442] Notable pairings visible in Hesychios's narrative are Kastor and Polydeukes,[443] and Ajax and Achilles.[444] Kastor and Polyduekes, whose connection to Rome we noted earlier, were also from the same mother, Leda, and different fathers, just was the case with Byzas and Strombos: while Kastor was the son of a mortal, Polydeukes was the son of Zeus, who had seduced Leda. More importantly, we should remember that Byzas was the son of Poseidon and Kereossa and Kereossa's mother Io was seduced by Zeus. In other accounts, Io also gives birth to another daughter, Epaphus, also from Zeus, who later gives birth Libya who gives birth to Belos from Poseidon.[445] Furthermore, Belos has a twin brother Agenor, just like Byzas. As we have seen, Byzas's family tree is remarkably similar to that of Belos, with whom Hesychios starts his account of history. Overall, these stories offer

[442] Roman and Román, *Encyclopedia of Greek*, 161-164.
[443] Hesychios, *Patria*, 15.
[444] Hesychios, *Patria*, 16.
[445] *Classics Upenn*, s.v. "Io."

convincing parallels from Greek mythology to the pairing of Byzas and Strombos in connecting Byzantion's mythology and past to a larger cycle and network of heroes and gods, without contriving feeble connections to Rome. It is also possible that Strombos was invented later due to the influence of social and political developments. For example, Timothy Wiseman, in his book *Remus: A Roman Myth* argues that far from being a primordial myth, Remus's emergence can be explained by the context of "plebian power sharing in the fourth century BC."[446] Perhaps, the appearance of Strombos in the sixth-century, or earlier, can be explained by other social and historical developments. However, more research is needed in this area.

Regardless of all the other possible theories, we cannot argue that Hesychios did not have Romulus and Remus in his mind either. We cannot know what Hesychios really thought or believed. We do not even know whether this version of the *Patria*, that has reached our times is the original one. Overall, we can conclude that these parallels with Rome appear as commonplace narrative literary figures that have been used in Greek mythology and the founding stories of other cities. The fact that we can form connections with other narratives attests to the robust continuity and the endless possibility of reconstructions of literary motifs and figures and places of memory and not a singular connection with a specific city. Hesychios could have imagined them along similar lines of continuity, drawing simultaneous connections with the city's Greek past and Roman present.

[446] Wiseman, *Remus: A Roman Myth*,117.

5.3 Apollonios of Tyana: What does it (can it) signify?

Hesychios recounts that Dineos, a Megarian colonist from Chalkedon, came to help Byzas in his fight against the barbarians who were incited to war by Strombos. However, Hesychios also states that Dineos was unable to anchor at the city since the citizens were mourning the death of Byzas.[447] In such an abrupt manner, Hesychios kills Byzas in his narrative. This abrupt ending can be due to Hesychios's sources' nature, can be an authorial decision by Hesychios or be the result of the editing of a later source. However, it is impossible to reach a definitive conclusion.

Hesychios states that after a little time passed, Dineos became the *strategos* of the city. With the death of Byzas and the insertion of Dineos, Hesychios starts to pursue a narrative structure based on recounting significant events that happened during the reigns of *strategoi* that ruled Byzantion after Byzas until the time of Roman ascendance. In this narrative section, Hesychios does not use any specific dates either. Just as Dionysios moves from one place of memory to another, Hesychios seamlessly moves from one place and figure of memory to another significant event. Hesychios's mentioning of the reigns of different *strategoi* works as a vague temporal marker, imparting the reader that time passes and moves forward towards the arrival of Romans without using any specific dates.

Right before reporting Philip of Macedon's attack on the city during the reign of the *strategos* Leo, Hesychios inserts a legend related to snakes once again. Hesychios states that during the rule of the *strategos* Dineos, many snakes came to dwell in the city. Hesychios states that "as they say" (ὥς φασι), the inhabitants with the help of Poseidon took advantage of storks, a specifies of birds that tend to attack snakes.[448] However, Hesychios states that these storks eventually turned in on the

[447] Hesychios, *Patria*, 22-23.
[448] Hesychios, *Patria*, 23.

inhabitants, and the storks started to throw the snakes they have captured on the inhabitants.[449] Then, with a gross anachronism, Hesychios reports that Apollonios of Tyana built stone storks facing each other, which prevented the evil storks from haunting the city.[450] As Kaldellis notes, there is a circular narrative here: snakes save the city from the barbarians, storks save the city from snakes, and Apollonios saves the city from storks.[451]

Apollonios of Tyana, as it is well-known, actually lived in around the first or the second century AD, whereas Hesychios places this short legend before the Philip II of Macedon's attack against Byzantion in 340 BC. Even though magic was associated with Apollonios of Tyana from an early age, associating Apollonios with talismans appears as a Late Antique phenomenon.[452] Thus, it appears that associating Apollonios of Tyana with protecting Byzantion by a magical intervention, whether by Hesychios himself or by other authors that Hesychios used as a source or oral collective memory, was part of this trend, and not an original myth of the city. This trend can be observed in Hesychios's contemporary Malalas's universal history as well.[453] The fact that Malalas also uses Apollonios of Tyanna renders the likelihood of a later editor inserting this figure weak. Furthermore, Perhaps this is one of the few instances where we can eliminate the influence of a later editor as well as an earlier source.

Right after mentioning Apollonios of Tyana's act, Hesychios states that these statues remain in his times and do not allow the storks to come to the city in a typical effort to establish continuity. It is probably the case that these stone statues

[449] Hesychios, *Patria*, 24.
[450] Hesychios, *Patria*, 25.
[451] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," $F_{7,}$ Commentary.
[452] Dzielska, *Apollonius of Tyana*, 85-128.
[453] Dzielska, *Apollonius of Tyana*, 108.

were present in the city's urban landscape, and that quite likely some mythological legend was associated with them, which Hesychios chose to embellish further with the Apollonios of Tyana legend. It is also possible that Hesychios did not invent this story but found in one of the circulating *patria* of the city. It is also likely that the story was circulating orally. Thus, Hesychios might have ignored the conventions of historical accuracy to embellishing his literary performance. It is possible that as was the case with the foundation of Byzantion, there were similar legends about one memorable single event, i.e., snake infestation, which Hesychios inserted in his narrative by embellishing it with the figure of Apollonios of Tyana.

Can the insertion of Apollonios of Tyana be more than a literary invention and Hesychios's tacit way to advertise his pagan belief and worldview? After all, Apollonios of Tyana was a "pagan philosopher," as Albrecht Berger conspicuously notes in his footnotes.[454] Kaldellis also considers it part of Hesychios's "pervasive paganism."[455] His life, written by Philalethes, had managed to attract the attention of Eusebius, who had felt the need to refute Philalethes's work, as it had drawn many parallels between Jesus and Apollonios.[456] Nevertheless, if we consider that Apollonis's motif as a talisman maker also makes an appearance in Malalas's account, Hesychios's use of the same motif seems part of a broader literary trend. Examining the reception of Apollonios of Tyana in Late Antiquity is a task beyond the confines of this thesis; however, it is worth taking a look at Christopher P. Jones summary of Apollonios's image in Late Antiquity to understand better whether Hesychios could be making a statement with the motif of Apollonios. Jones states,

[454] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople,* 287, n.32.
[455] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 397.
[456] Jones, "Apollonius of Tyana in Late Antiquity", 61-62.

> So various are the reactions to Apollonius in late antiquity that a summary is not easy to achieve. There is a tendency in modern scholarship to be over-influenced by Eusebius' Reply to Hierocles, and to suppose that Apollonius was always and everywhere the hero of a 'pagan reaction', and by the same token an object of fear or detestation on the part of Christians. The truth is rather that for non-Christian Greeks, and especially philosophers, he was in the first place an embodiment of their ancestral culture. Even educated Christians in both East and West recognized aspects of him that recalled the Christian 'philosophy', but in other ways their views diverged. In the East, belief in his talismans, shared by many of the laity, disturbed clergymen such as Isidore of Pelusium; on the other hand, the use of his memory by anti-Christians such as Hierocles had little effect, and Eusebius' Reply is never mentioned, for example in Jerome's *De viris illustribus*. It is not therefore so paradoxical as might appear that in the Byzantine realm Apollonius ends by being integrated into Christian art and thought, or that Philostratus' Life should come down in so many copies.[457]

5.4 The siege of Philip II of Macedon: The role of Hekate

With the siege of Philip II of Macedon, Hesychios takes a step out of the mythological past of the city into the historical one. Nevertheless, the historical world that Hesychios creates is also fused with magical and mythological elements.

Hesychios states that Philip II of Macedon would have easily taken the city, if the Byzantines had not received divine help, which roused the dogs in the city to bark, calling people to arms and brought clouds of fire into the northern regions. Hesychios continues the recount the incident by stating that the citizens rebuilt the damaged towers and battlements by using stones from nearby graves and called the wall Tymbosyne for this reason. Lastly, Hesychios adds that the citizens set up a torch-bearing statue of Hekate.[458] Hesychios finishes his narrative that Byzantines defeated the Macedonians with naval warfare.[459]However, Hesychios's narrative of the events is a little unclear. Therefore it is necessary to look at how modern scholars approached and reconstructed it.

[457] Jones, "Apollonius of Tyana in Late Antiquity", 61-62.
[458] Hesychios, *Patria*, 27.
[459] Hesychios, *Patria*, 27.

Kaldellis translates the section of Byzantines receiving divine help in the wake of the siege as "had *the* god not come to their aid."[460] Berger translates this part as "if they had not received *some* divine assistance."[461] Kaldellis's statement puts more stress on the word god. However, the original statement puts more emphasis on the role of the assistance (συμμαχία) of a god, than the god as Berger translates it since Hesychios uses an indefinite pronoun τις to refer to this help. More accurately, the exact translation would be more similar to "if some alliance of a god had not materialized to them." The god's identity; however, is not clear. Hesychios's mentioning of Hekate at the end of the narrative could be due to the fact that Hekate was considered to be an intermediary between humans and gods. This would indicate that Hekate had made possible what the humans needed from an anonymous god.[462]

Lorenzo Focanti notes that Stephanos of Byzantion, a likely contemporary of Hesychios, attributes this supernatural intervention more directly to Hekate. For example, Stephanos states that while sieging the city, "Philip of Macedonia had a secret passage dug. Those who excavated it seeked to emerge from there without being seen, but the enlightening Hecate made torches appear to the citizens in the night."[463] Focanti argues that compared to Stephanos, Hesychios merely mentions an anonymous and generic divine assistance and only mentions that the citizens built a torch-bearing statue of Hecate later. Subsequently, Focanti points out that either

[460] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," $F_{7,}$ 27. (Emphasis by me.) The original Greek of the part is as follows "…εἰ μή τις αὐτοῖς τοῦ θείου γέγονε συμμαχία…" Hesychios, *Patria*, 27.
[461] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 25. (Emphasis by me.)
[462] See Glenn W. Mosts's comments about Hekate's role in Hesiod's cosmology. "Hesiod's unparalleled attribution of universal scope to Hecate (Th 412-17) derives probably not from an established cult or personal experience but from consideration of her name, which could be (mis-)understood as etymologically related to heketi, "by the will of' (scil. a divinity, as with Zeus at WD 4), so that Hecate could seem by her very name to function as an intermediary between men and any god at all from whom they sought favor." Most, "Introduction," *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia.* xxx.
[463] Focanti, "The Fragments,"19-20.

Hesychios or his sources curtailed the role of Hecate.[464] Therefore, Focanti claims that "The strong reduction of Hecate's importance can be explained through a Christian re–interpretation of the story, which gave a "rational" representation of the miracle, and substituted for the goddess a less traumatic (and more generic) deity."[465] It is not clear whether Focanti implies the "Christian re-interpretation" was due to Hesychios's Christian editing of his earlier sources or a Christian re-interpretation of Hesychios's text.

There are two questions against Focanti's arguments: if Focanti's claims were true, then why would Hesychios or the later editor mention Hekate at all? Along the same lines, why would Hesychios or the later editor mention other pagan gods, such as Apollo and Poseidon helping Byzas if they were keen on reducing Hekate's role? Is there a line between elements that can be edited (i.e., Hekate's help) and others that cannot be edited (i.e., Poseidon and Apollo's help)? Can we argue that Hekate's role was curtailed because she is a female god with connections to the underworld, and Poseidon and Apollo's role was not curtailed because they formed a connection with Rome? The possibilities are, once again, endless only to be limited by our subjective perspective. All in all, considering that actions of other gods were retained in the text, Hesychios inserting Hekate at the end of the narrative is most likely a matter of artistic style, perhaps a matter of careless editing by Hesychios or later sources and not an effort to hide the miracle of a pagan god.

Another matter of interest regarding the siege of Philip II of Macedon is Hecate's role in making the city's dogs bark. Some scholars note that this instant mirrors how Rome was saved from the Gauls by the honking of the sacred flock of

[464] Focanti, "The Fragments," 26.
[465] Focanti, "The Fragments," 26.

geese that lived in the temple of Juno.[466] The resemblance is quite convincing, and indeed just as the instant of Poseidon and Apollo helping the walls of Byzantion could be, Hekate and the barking dogs motif may be an effort of reinscribing the history of Elder Rome upon the history of Ancient Byzantion, as Kaldellis puts it.[467] Nevertheless, just as we noted the Poseidon and Apollo's significance in Greek mythology and Byzantine local identity, we should note that Hecate was a prominent figure in Greek mythology. Hekate was often depicted as guarding entrances and crossroads and can be seen holding torches.[468] Hesiod writes that Hecate helps the group she prefers in wars.[469] Most importantly, Hekate has associations specifically with barking dogs outside of Hesychios's text.[470] Thus, the connection of the barking dogs and torch-bearing Hekate and a survival story based on these two may not be far removed from the organic legends of the city. Let us take a couple of examples of material evidence that supports this argument.

Thomas Russell notes that there are Byzantine coins with a depiction of a goddess holding two torches, who is often usually assumed to be Artemis, [471] who shared a close connection with Hekate, a motif which is present in Dionysios text as well.[472] Moreover, Russell points out the existence of coins minted during the reign of Septimius Severus depicting Severus while offering a sacrifice before a torch. [473] Therefore, Hekate's position as the protector of the city goes well beyond Hesychios and Stephanos of Byzantion.

---

[466] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 396.; Dagron Constantinople *imaginaire*, 73.; Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 213.
[467] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 396.
[468] Edwards, "The Running Maiden," 307-318.
[469] Hesiod, *Theogony*, 411-450.
[470] Roman and Román, *Encyclopedia of Greek*, 187. "She is most consistently associated with witchcraft, crossroads, the underworld, graves, the night, and barking dogs."
[471] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 183.
[472] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 184-185.
[473] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 185.

With a limited amount of evidence, whether Hesychios's narrative is his own invention with or without a purpose to form connections with Rome or a reformulation of his sources as he did with the information present in Dionysios's text with or without a purpose to form connections with Rome, cannot be determined. Either way, we should keep in mind that any perceived connection to Rome in Hesychios's narrative is just as connected to the world of Ancient Greek mythology.

5.5 The Athenian general Chares: His role in the narrative

Hesychios finishes the story of Philip II of Macedon's siege by stating that Byzantines defeated Philip decisively in a naval war.[474] Thus, Hesychios ostensibly chooses to ignore their contributions and attributes the victory solely to the Byzantines, even though, Byzantines, in reality, had received a considerable amount of help from other Greek powers.[475] So much so that when Hesychios mentions Byzantines receiving help against Philip, he only mentions the arrival of Chares, an Athenian general present at the Bosporos even before Philip's declaration of war as he was escorting a grain fleet through the strait.[476] Regardless, Hesychios inserts that Chares came to help the Byzantines, and that "he tried his hand at war."[477] However, the wording is quite unclear. The reader does not find out whether this trial was successful and the sense of trying imparts a sense of defeat.

[474] Hesychios, *Patria*, 27.
[475] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 91.
[476] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 67.
[477] Hesychios, *Patria*, 28. The Greek is as follows, καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ προσορμήσας τῷ τόπῳ ἀπόπειραν ἐλάμβανε τοῦ πολέμου. Kaldellis translates this part as "he made a trial of the war." Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F7, 28. Berger provides a neat English idiomatic translation: "he tried his hand at war." Berger, Accounts of Medieval Constantinople, 26.

Why does Hesychios mention a defeat, especially right after mentioning that the Byzantines secured a decisive victory? It might be that since Hesychios has been following a narrative structure more or less based on the significant events that happened during the reign of each *strategos* of the city, mentioning Chares, whom Hesychios lists as one of the *strategoi* indirectly, was inevitable.[478] Nevertheless, there is a literary strategy present in mentioning Chares's defeat. Chares's defeat prepares the reader for information about a melancholic statue and inscription that Hesychios claims Chares set up for his female companion.

Both Dionysios and Hesychios mention that Chares set up a statue of a cow on top of a column in memory of his female companion who died while they were at the Bosporos against Philip. Dionysios notes that the monument included an inscription which "shows the truth of this account" that Chares set up the statue for his female companion.[479] However, Dionysios does not state what the inscription is. Nevertheless, he adds that those who make hasty and effortless historical inquiries, suppose the image to be from of ancient times.[480] The fact that Dionysios needs to discredit other accounts indicates a multiplicity of versions regarding the statue's origin despite an apparent inscription (which he does not state what it is) being present as early as Dionysios's time. This fact also attests to dialectic between "mémoire concrète," and the "mémoire imaginative."[481] It underlines that what remains in collective memory about a certain monument and a certain event that the monument was meant to memorialize are vulnerable to changes in collective

[478] Hesychios mentions that when Chares departed Byzantion for Athens, Protomachos became the new *strategoi*. Hence, we are to understand that Chares was briefly the *strategos* of the city. Hesychios, *Patria*, 31.
[479] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 110. Translation by me. σημαίνει δ' ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τοῦ λόγου τἀληθές.
[480] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 110. Translation by me. οἱ μὲν γὰρ εἰκαίαν καὶ ἀταλαίπωρον ποιούμενοι τὴν ἱστορίαν οἴονται τῆς ἀρχαίας λήξεως εἶναι τὴν εἰκόνα.
[481] Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 10.

remembrances, as emphasized in chapter two. This example also demonstrates how patriographic literature can shape how places of memory evolves in collective memory, after "a rift has occurred in memory."[482] Let us go back to the inscription which Hesychios states as below,

> I am not the image of the cow, the daughter of Inachos, nor after me,
> is the facing Bosporian sea named.
> Her in times of old the grievous wrath of Hera drove
> to Pharos[483], but I here am a dead Athenian.
> I was the mistress of Chares and sailed when he sailed
> here, against Philipos' ships.
> Little-cow my name was then, now Chares'
> Mistress I am gladdened by both continents.[484]

If the inscription has initially been what Hesychios claims it was, as seen above, then, it is clear that the other accounts Dionysios refers did not know who Chares was at all. Then, if the inscription was what Hesychios says it was and if the other accounts did not know who Chares was, it appears that Chares was not an important character in the collective memory of Byzantion from early on. If the identity of Chares was indeed forgotten, since the legend that the inscription contains was quite pertinent to the collective memory of Byzantion, the monument could be taken to be more ancient, i.e., referring to the story of Io. Dagron makes an insightful comment about the "realness" of the inscription. He states that just like Malalas and Agathas, Hesychios could not conceive the writing of the history of a city without using commemorative inscriptions and that we can only wonder if he was using the inscriptions directly as he sees them or was using earlier and invented *Patria* to account for them.[485]

---

[482] Nora and Kritzman, *Realms of Memory*, 1.
[483] Pharos could refer to the lighthouse of Alexandria. Readers should remember that Io also gives birth to Belos from Zeus as well. Belos becomes the King of Egypt. Nardo, *Greek and Roman Mythology*, 20.
[484] Hesychios, *Patria*, 30. Translation by Kaldellis. Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," $F_{7,}$ 30.
[485] Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 151.

Thus, the below questions remain: Was this epigram passed on to Hesychios only in the form of literature? Did Hesychios invent it for literature? Or, contrary to both, was Hesychios an eye witness to this inscription? If Hesychios used the anecdote from an earlier source without ever seeing the statue, Hesychios would be abiding by the established norms of the genre of patriographic literature, such as including anecdotes about statues and epigrams of the city. This epigram would be a particularly rich one, as it contained two legends in one. If Hesychios were inventing this epigram, we could argue for the importance of genre of patriographic literature bore on the work once again. If he were an eye witness to the inscription, the monument than would be serving as a place of memory, where the memories of both Chares, his female companion, and Io were crystallized in the wider landscape of Byzantion. Either way, as Dagron states, Hesychios could not conceive the history of the city without the testimony of commemorative monuments, and Hesychios's inclusion is a testimony to the conventions of the genre. Once more, the nature of evidence hinders us from making a solid judgment; regardless, the endless number of reconstructions enables us to conceive Hesychios's work as a literary performance.

4.4.5 Protomachos, Timesios, Kalliades

Before the momentous ascendance of Rome over Byzantion and the arrival of the Roman Emperor Septimius Severus, Hesychios goes over the acts of three otherwise unknown *strategoi* of Byzantion. Hesychios's account in this event level is rather concise. Once again there is a possibility that either Hesychios abridged his sources or that later editors abridged Hesychios.

The text brushes up the reign of next strategos, Protomachos, very briefly and only comments that after defeating the Thracians, he erected bronze trophies at the

now so-called Million of the city.[486] This presents itself as yet another effort of Hesychios to connect the city's past with his present locales. It also attests to the monuments' powerful capacity to retrieve instances of the past and stand as a reference to the events.

Next, Hesychios mentions Timesios, who Hesychios claims was an Argive man that strived to build another city on the strait at a location close to the Black Sea. Hesychios notes that the place where Timesios wanted to build his city was Ephesiates as Ephesians had once attempted to build a city there. However, Hesychios relates that Ephesians had a change of mind when they heard the original prophecy about the place where the fish and stag graze on the same pasture.[487] In his account, Dionysios also mentions the same place and the Ephesian colonization attempt; nevertheless, he does not mention them being heedful of the prophecy. [488] Thus, this piece of information about Ephesians heeding the prophecy, while it might also be present in other sources, can be yet another invention by Hesychios to embellish his narrative in his efforts to highlight the significance and uniqueness of the location Byzantion.

Hesychios states that after attempting to colonize the city and failing in his hopes, Timesios joined the Byzantines and was appointed the *strategos* over the entire people.[489] Furthermore, Hesychios credits Timesios with embellishing the city and establishing laws.[490] He mentions Timesios renovated the temple where Jason had once made sacrifices to twelve gods and the temple of Artemis. Kaldellis deems that Timesios's role of joining his people and the Byzantines is an effort of

[486] Hesychios, *Patria*, 32.
[487] Hesychios *Patria*, 32.
[488] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 79.
[489] Hesychios, *Patria*, 32.
[490] Hesychios, *Patria*, 32.

Hesychios to draw a parallel with Roman history, specifically with the character of Numa.[491] Kaldellis's argument might have merit; nevertheless, it is just a hypothesis. Russell points out that connections to Argonauts in Dionysios's narrative were a way of putting on emphasis on Byzantine's role of the opening the Black sea to traders and colonists.[492] Hence, Hesychios could be borrowing from such a tradition as well.

Hesychios concludes his narrative of the *strategoi* of the city with Kalliades. He mentions that Kalliades, after fighting with his internal and external enemies, set up the famous statue of Byzas at the (now) so-called Basilike with the below inscription.

> Strong Byzas and lovely Phidaleia,
> Kalliades, who dedicated this, honored simultaneously.[493]

Again, whether Hesychios invented the existence of the statue and the epigram, whether he found this information in the textual memory of earlier sources, or whether he saw the statue remains a mystery. Nevertheless, there are authorial decisions that are clear regarding Hesychios's choice of inscription and his placement. First, even though Dionysios depicts Phidaleia as ashamed of her sexual relations with Byzas and committing suicide by throwing herself in the sea because of it, Hesychios mentions no such information about Phidaleia. In Kalliades statue, Byzas and Phidaleia are "fashioned in a single group," which would symbolize a harmonious union.[494] Thus, along with her role in saving the city from snakes, Hesychios represents Phidaleia as an integral part of the city and the legend of Byzas. Dionysios, on the other hand, does not mention this statue at all. Instead,

[491] Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," $F_{7,}$ Commentary.
[492] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 41-42.
[493] Hesychios, *Patria*, 34. Τὸν κρατερὸν Βύζαντα καὶ ἱμερτὴν Φιδάλειαν / εἰν ἑνὶ κοσμήσας ἄνθετο Καλλιάδης Berger translates this part as follows. "Strong Byzas and lovely Phidaleia Kalliades dedicated here, fashioning them in a single group." Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 32.
[494] See footnote above.

Dionysios mentions a tomb of Phidaleia made by Poseidon as he pitied her suffering.[495] Though we do not know whether Hesychios found this story in an earlier source that came later than Dionysios, or invented it, we can argue that being acquainted with Dionysios's account, he had chosen to omit the negative information. Not only does Hesychios chose a more positive version of the account, but he also situates it strategically at the end of the line of seven *strategoi*, which marks the end of Byzantion's independence from Rome. Thus, Byzantion's independent lifetime starts and ends with Byzas: a perfect founding figure that established and built Byzantion, who was loved by his wife and respected by later generations.

5.6 The Roman rule

5.6.1 Septimius Severus: Just another ruler or a second founder?

After enumerating the regimes that Byzantines went through that we have discussed earlier in this chapter, Hesychios resumes his narrative to recount the Byzantines' fate under Roman Rule.

> When Roman rule by the authority of the councils overthrew every power and also enslaved the peoples of Greeks, likewise, the Byzantines continued/lived by obeying it. [496]

[495] Dionysios, *Anaplous*, 59.

[496] Hesychios, *Patria*, 35. My translation. I found Kaldellis's translation rather reconstructive at this key passage. It is as follows: "As Roman rule superseded all local forms of power through the authority of the consuls, and enslaved even the nations of the Greeks, it was only to be expected that the Byzantines too would eventually submit to it." Kaldellis, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)," F_7, 35. Berger's translation is closer to the original text, When Roman rule superseded ail local powers by consular authority; it also subdued the Greek tribes, and the Byzantines also fittingly submitted to it. Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 33. I agree the most with Kruse who translates this part as follows "But when the empire of the Romans, by means of the authority of the consuls, overthrew every power and enslaved the tribes of the Greeks, the Byzantines likewise came to obey it." Kruse, *The Politics*, 52.

Marion Kruse highlights that while Hesychios states that other Greeks peoples were enslaved. He adds,

> Hesychios uses the verb peithō to describe the submission of the Byzantines and thereby frames the act in the traditional Greek distinction between persuasion and violent force (bia). Because the Byzantines were persuaded, rather than overthrown and enslaved, the reader is meant to understand that their submission was voluntary, or at least not the result of the same violent compulsion that affected the rest of the Greek world. This small detail creates a unique status for Byzantion inside the Greek context Hesychios has constructed for it in the *Patria*. Byzantion, alone among Greek cities, is not a slave to Rome, but some species of partner.

Thus, Kruse draws attention to a subtle yet to the apparent difference between the treatment of the other Greek powers vs. Byzantion in Hesychios's text. While Byzantion survives by obeying the Roman power, the Greek tribes, who presumably did not obey it, are overthrown and enslaved. Likewise, in the next section, when the Byzantines do not support the "right" emperor, Septimius Severus, over Niger, they are similarly brutally destroyed and denigrated to be the subject of Perinthians.[497] However, once pacified, Septimius Severus is credited to rebuild the city in Hesychios's narrative. Hesychios resumes, "When Severus's anger was pacified, they [the Byzantines] returned to good order once again."[498] With this short and brief description, Hesychios broadcasts the fate of those obeying the Roman power and those who refuse it. Furthermore, Kruse claims that, in this paragraph, Hesychios "presents the consulship as the engine of Roman imperial expansion" like "Zosimos, Jordanes, Lydos, and Prokopios."[499] Unfortunately, with only fragmentary evidence of Hesychios's writing, it is quite hard to pinpoint his political leanings, as

---

The original is as follows, Ὡς δὲ τῇ τῶν ὑπάτων ἐπικρατείᾳ ἡ Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴ πάσας ὑπερεβάλετο τὰς δυναστείας, κατεδούλωσε δὲ καὶ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔθνη, εἰκότως αὐτῇ καὶ Βυζάντιοι πειθόμενοι διετέλουν. Hesychios, *Patria*, 35.

[497] Hesychios, *Patria*, 36.

[498] Hesychios, *Patria*, 37. My translation. Kaldellis translates this part as "But when Severus' anger had cooled, they were restored to an even greater glory." The Greek original is as follows. παυσαμένου δὲ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ Σεβήρου, αὖθιςεὶς μείζονα κόσμον ἐπανῆλθον.

[499] Kruse, *The Politics*, 52.

Kruse also underlines.[500] Thus, let us go back to how Hesychios portrays Septimius Severus.

Even though scholars do not dwell on this, it should be acknowledged Severus does not receive any special laudation. As a matter of fact, Hesychios describes Severus's building activities in his typical fashion. The emperor is credited with building the likes of the usual monumental public structures, such as the baths of Zeuxippos and adorning the racecourse dedicated to the Dioskouroi. Hesychios forms by now commonplace connections with Greek mythology by connecting the baths of Zeuxippos to Herakles's twelve labors and once more recalling the temples of twin gods, Dioskuroi. Hesychios mentions that as long as Severus lived, , the city was called Antoninus. Nevertheless, when Severus died, it was once again called Byzantion.[501] Therefore, Severus's supposed building activity was not enough to leave a lasting impact on Byzantion's identity.

The readers should notice that Hesychios even praises the otherwise unknown Timesios more extensively with regards to his building and civilizing activities than Severus. Dagron considers Severus as the second grand personality situated right in the middle between the legend and history of Constantinople in the triad of Byzantion's "founders": Byzas, Severus, and Constantine. [502] For Dagron, Severus prefigures Constantine and serves as a foil to him. [503]Likewise, Kaldellis agrees with Dagron that Severus foreshadows Constantine's foundation.[504] Echoing

[500] Kruse, *The Politics*, 52.
[501] Hesychios, *Patria*, 38.
[502] « Sévère est le deuxième gros plan de ce rattrapage de la légende à l'histoire, à mi-chemin entre l'une et l'autre. » Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 69.
[503] « Sévère ne préfigure pas seulement Constantin, il lui sert de repoussoir, et les raisons de son échec soulignent terme à terme les raisons de la réussite de 330 » Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 70.
[504] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 397. "The second, pagan aspect of the *Patria* has not received attention. But it is likewise clear that the pervasive paganism of the text, manifested in the actions of gods (presented mostly as fact, not legend), oracles, sacrifices, omens, miracles, and magic (even Apollonios of Tyana makes a guest-appearance), attempts to reinscribe not merely the history of New Rome but its very topography upon a matrix of pagan symbolism. This is especially evident in the

Dagron, Russell asserts that Severus's coins that make a connection with Hekate "were meant to associate the city's new founder and protector (its erstwhile destroyer) with the city's divine protectress. They evoke, once again, the relationship between the 'protectress' and torches."[505]

However, due to the narrative structure we cannot argue that Hesychios portrays Severus as a second founder. In fact, Hesychios treats the reign of Severus rather tersely. Thus, if we are to claim that Severus is the second founder of the city, then we should wonder what was so special about Timesios who undertook very similar civilizing acts? Since nothing was special about Timesios, we can argue that nothing is special about Severus either. Conceiving Severus as a second founder of the city is trying to fit him into a narrative that he does not belong to. Nevertheless, Dagron is right that Severus serves as a foil to Constantine. He destroys the city, and he fails to give it his name,[506] while Hesychios ostensibly notes that Constantine gave the city his name.

Paul Stephenson, in his work, *Constantine: Roman Emperor, Christian Victor* (2009) claims that after fortifying the city against Maximinus, Licinius had made Byzantion his primary residence.[507] Stephenson argues for Constantine's desire to build "a victory city" over his rival Licinius's city and states that Constantine was driven by a "by a determination to obliterate the memory and legacy of Licinius."[508] Timothy D. Barnes in his work *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power in the Later Roman Empire* (2011) draw attention to the fact that no other earlier source

chapters on Byzas' religious foundations (15–16), which are mapped out on the sixth-century topography of the city, while that on Severus' foundations (37) points toward the Constantinian foundation."

[505] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 185.
[506] Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire*, 71.
[507] Stephenson, *Constantine: Roman Emperor, Christian Victor*, 345-346.
[508] Stephenson, *Constantine: Roman Emperor, Christian Victor*, 346.

mentions Septimius Severus's building activities in Byzantion and argues that Septimius Severus was not responsible for the rebuilding of the city.[509] Hence, building on Stephenson's work, Barnes claims that the only likely candidate to have built the city's infrastructure was, in fact, Licinius.[510] Raymond Van Dam, in a 2014 article, draws attention to Constantine's effort to erase the memory of both Maxentius and Licinius. Van Dam states, "By appropriating Byzantion, Constantine consigned any memories of Licinius to oblivion. His conversion of Byzantion as Constantinople was as much a technique for disgracing Licinius as a means of glorifying himself."[511]

Did Hesychios know about Licinius at all? Was he continuing the obliteration of Licinius's memory willingly or unwillingly? We can never know; however, since Malalas's work of history also has an account of Severus rebuilding the city, it is possible that there existed earlier works such as other *patria* whereby the tradition of reducing the role of Licinius's role in Byzantion and ascribing it to an earlier emperor who had dealings with Constantinople existed. Nevertheless, Hesychios's brief treatment of Severus's reign also attests to the fact that Hesychios did not have much to stay about Severus either. Nevertheless, the obliteration of Licinius's memory and the invention of Severus's role in Byzantine historiography demonstrate the power of late antique *patria* and historiography, in shaping a city's and a nation's collective memory by destabilizing the undesired figures of memory and replacing them with new ones according to present needs. This example manifests how *patria* could be used as figures of memory to shape the present as well as the future as discussed in chapter one.

[509] Barnes, *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power*, 111-113.
[510] Barnes, *Constantine: Dynasty, Religion and Power*, 111-113.
[511] Van Dam, "Constantine's Beautiful City," 86.

5.6.2 The reign of Constantine the Great: Change within continuity

Right after Hesychios mentions that after Severus's death and that the city was once again called Byzantion, Hesychios inserts that Constantine after transferring the power to the city, called it Constantinople, and the city gladly accepted it.[512] Hesychios relates that Constantine made the city's beauty more wondrous by extending the city walls, building baths, and "holy houses."[513] He adds that he gave Constantinople equal rights with elder Rome.[514] Hesychios states that Constantine erected a statue for his mother Helena on a column and built houses for the senators who followed him from Rome.[515] In additions, he mentions the building of a water supply and that Constantine set up a statue of himself shining like the sun to his citizens on a porphyry column.[516] Furthermore, Hesychios mentions that Constantine erected statues of Dodonian Zeus and two shrines of Pallas and built a palace for himself.[517] Altogether, Constantine's activities are pretty similar to those *strategoi* that came before him yet a little bit more detailed.

The controversial part apart this section is when Hesychios states that Constantine built holy houses (ἱερός οἶκος.). Berger urges the readers to note the deliberately vague expression which may refer to either pagan or Christian holy sanctuaries.[518] Secondly, Berger contents that Hesychios's narrative ends when the tenth-century *Patria* mentions that Constantine built two other holy houses, one for Saint Eirene and another for Holy Apostles. However, he notes that this part "may

---

[512] Hesychios, *Patria*, 39.
[513] Hesychios, *Patria*, 39. Kaldellis translates the phrase" λουτροῖς τε καὶ **ἱεροῖς οἴκοις** ἐπιδείξαντος φαιδροτέραν" "as he brightened it with baths and *sacred temples*." (Emphasis by me.) While Berger chooses to translate the same phrase as "holy houses." Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 43. Either one of translations does not reduce the ambiguity of the phrase. However, Berger's translation is more fitting.
[514] Hesychios, *Patria*, 39.
[515] Hesychios, *Patria*, 40.
[516] Hesychios, *Patria*, 41.
[517] Hesychios, *Patria*, 41.
[518] Berger, *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, 290, n.66.

also belong to an earlier Christianized version of Hesychios's text."[519] However, Kaldellis, as we have seen, deems Hesychios to be pagan ends the text earlier.

It is indeed conspicuous that Hesychios does not mention Christianity at all. In a genre so devoted to the monuments, inscriptions, and statues of the city, Hesychios's does not even mention the details of the statue of Constantine's mother, Helena, to which later sources attributed Christian elements.[520] On the other hand, he does mention that Constantine ornated the senate with the statues of Zeus. This unequal treatment could support the view that the Christian elements such as the house of St. Menas mentioned earlier and the mention of "holy houses" of Saint Eirene and Holy Apostles can be later interpolations. Then the question of whether Hesychios was pagan or Christian presents itself. We have discussed the treatment of Kaldellis and Treadgold in detail. Let us take a look at if we, after having analyzed the text thoroughly, can come to conclusions.

5.7 Hesychios: Christian or pagan?

Now that we have analyzed the text thoroughly and discussed what the use of figures of memory, places of memory, Hesychios's language and the narrative could signify, a couple of points should be clear to the readers. First of all, as Hesychios states at the beginning of his account, he was working from both oral and textual sources; hence, he was working within the realm of remembered history and textual memory. He was not reporting the events that he has directly witnessed. He was reporting the events he has gathered and weighed. Modern scholars assume that he was including

[519] Berger, *Patria*, 291, n.76.
[520] "On the arch of the vault of the Forum there stand two statues of Constantine and Helena, and a cross between them on which is written: "One holy lord Jesus Christ to the glory of God the Father, Amen."" *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, Book 2: paragraph 16. "On the Milion. - Statues of Constantine and Helena are 29 on the arch of the Milion. They hold a cross that can also be seen there to the east.." *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople*, Book 2: paragraph 29.

his own inventions within the stories that he has encountered. However, can we know that it was Hesychios who was the inventor and not another storyteller that Hesychios reported? There are some instances in the text when Hesychios's authorial decisions are clear. Regardless, any Christian or pagan elements that might be present in the text can be attributed to his sources as much as Hesychios's authorial decisions. Did Hesychios's source reduce the role of Hekate, or did Hesychios himself? Unfortunately, we cannot come to a clear cut decision.

Moreover, the nature of our text is quite fragmentary and corrupted. Scholars often presume the text to have gone through later editing starting as early as the sixth century until the tenth century. If we consider the Hekate example once again, we might as well ask the question of whether a later edition curtailed the role of Hekate, rather than Hesychios's source or Hesychios himself. Thus, the multiple degrees of transmission takes the contemporary readers far from the genesis and the meaning that might have been intended by its original author, Hesychios. The operative word is "might" here; because, even though Hesychios might have intended a specifically pagan or Christian reading of his text and used literary motifs, figures of memory, the narrative and specific word choices to achieve this purpose, once created and released to a group of readers, texts assume a life of their own and myriad of meanings are created. For example, while Poseidon and Apollo might have just been Greek gods in earlier sources, they can a impose a more "Roman" reading on the text to later audiences. Thus, the meaning present in texts is always unstable. Different readers from different time periods can reconstruct the meaning quite differently. However, we have observed that readers from the same time period, modern scholars, can come to opposing conclusions about Hesychios's religious identity by using "evidence" in chapter three. Even though, this thesis deems reaching clear cut

conclusions as Treadgold and Kaldellis's as demonstrated in chapter three impossible, we can still reach educated inferences keeping in mind the instability of texts, their openness to different interpretations, as well as the specific hardships that Hesychios's text present to scholars.

Let us go back to the beginning. While the text itself attests to the fact that Hesychios was writing within the genre of *patria*, we can infer that the original corpus of the work was based on classical history writing, based on Photios's summary of the work. While classical history writing imitates earlier classical works, patriographic literature uses myths and legends in relating city's foundation stories. As we have discussed this subject in length earlier, it is sufficient to say that genres have conventions and rules that the authors use and they do not determine what the author's "really" believe in. Thus, Hesychios's use of these two genres cannot signify that Hesychios necessarily believed these stories as his religion However, Kaldellis disagrees. He notes,

> But it is likewise clear that the pervasive paganism of the text, manifested in the actions of gods (presented mostly as fact, not legend), oracles, sacrifices, omens, miracles, and magic (even Apollonios of Tyana makes a guest-appearance), attempts to reinscribe not merely the history of New Rome but its very topography upon a matrix of pagan symbolism.[521]

Kaldellis has a valid point in arguing that Hesychios presents the legendary events in his story "as fact, not legend." In fact, Hesychios does present the legends as facts, as what has really happened. Often, he does not even use testimonial shifters, such as they say, about legends. As we have examined earlier, he even mentions that he is willing to tell a more persuasive account than his sources, which is the legend itself. Nevertheless, there are two counter-arguments on what Hesychios presents as a fact does not entail that he necessarily believed in them.

[521] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days," 397.

The first argument is quite straightforward: we can never really know what the authors believe in. We can make inferences yet they are our subjective reconstructions. . Secondly, it is of use to remember Assmann and Cameron's comments about what the use of myths entailed in these kind of works. We have noted that Assmann argues that "the forms of the remembered past entail myth and history without any distinction between them," [522] Likewise, we have mentioned Cameron's observation that mythological stories were treated as ancient history and that it was impossible to know whether storytellers believed in these mythological stories. [523]For example, just because Hesychios relates the story of Hekate, we cannot assume that Hesychios prays to Hekate at night. In short, Hesychios was creating a literary work, based on the ancient history of his city: not a text or polemic based on religious dogma. In a literary work, the author creates a literary world.

Regardless, it is undeniably conspicuous that Hesychios does not mention the much propagandized significance of Christianity in the foundation of Constantinople.

However, this omissions tells us less about his religious beliefs and more about the literary world he creates. Rather than questioning whether Hesychios was pagan or Christian we should instead ask the question of how Hesychios portrays Constantine the Great's reign in the city in the general structure of his narrative, which is a more answerable question than what Hesychios really believed in.

In Hesychios's narrative, Constantine's activities are not so different than the acts of the other earlier *strategoi*. He builds monumental public buildings, walls and statues. The only difference is that builds "holy houses," "ἱερός οἶκος," which as we noted Berger thinks is "an ambiguous term." However, Hesychios does not use the

[522] Assmann, *Cultural Memory*, 59.
[523] Cameron, "Poetry and Literary Culture in Late Antiquity," 166.

term “holy house” earlier in his text: when he refers to Pagan temples he uses “νεώς,” Therefore, Hesychios does not actually ignore the Christian edifices. Regardless, he does not mention words that would denote a specifically Christian meaning such as church ἐκκλησίᾳ either.

Often scholars argue that that such word choices signify a superficial mimesis of classical works. However, in his work, “The Wor(l)ds of Procopius,” Peter Van Nuffelen, focuses on Prokopios’s vocabulary and Prokopios’s challenge in turning “Justinian's world into words, or, in more general terms, how to represent reality in a historiographical narrative.”[524] Hesychios’s challenge is similar yet different: he does not want to present the reality, instead he is interested in creating a “possible world” yet not real world for his readers that seamlessly connects Byzantion and Constantinople. The focus of the text is making Byzantion’s legendary history real, the transition between the legendary and reality smooth and Byzantion’s history wholly connected with Constantinople’s. In this case, Hesychios acknowledges Christianity, but he makes the name of the edifices fitting to the timeless world he is creating, where the present and past exist side by side without clashing. Altogether, Hesychios’s work is a literary performance, engulfed in creating a possible yet nor real world in a realistic manner, in which Byzas is an epic hero and founding figure, Byzantines defeat Philip II of Macedon valiantly all by their selves, where Apollonios of Tyana makes a sudden anachronic appearance. To search for Hesychios’s religion in this sort of literary performance is similar to wondering whether a director/script writer of a historical movie really believes in the history he creates, or believes in the religion that he portrays.

[524] Van Nuffelen, “The wor(l)ds,” 40.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Where do we draw the line between what can be classified as a historical narrative, a historical fiction, and fiction, a purely literary production?[525] Hesychios conspicuously places his *Patria* in the middle of his account of world history (we do not know the nature of the text for sure; however, since Photios, a genre-aware, sophisticated reader of his time, is not hesitant to call the work a historical text, we can presume that the rest of the work fell under the confines of historiography). The fragment ostensibly presents itself as an account of the history of the landscape of what was once Byzantion and what was then Constantinople. While we do not have Hesychios's whole history, we do know that it contained other mythological events that were established as ancient history, such as the reign of Belos or the Trojan War. Nevertheless, even if historical accounts could contain mythological events as ancient history, since the Byzantines had a high formal consciousness and were capable of understanding genre convolutions, we can argue that the switch to the genre of *patria* in the middle of a historical account must have presented an intentional and not so subtle break from the conventions of the genre of history writing. It must have also interrupted the chronological storyline of the work that we learn from Photios. As we have discussed in chapter one, genres are not only normative formulations but also communicative signifiers. In their decision to use a specific genre, the authors intend to generate a particular response from their readers. If we adjust our horizon of expectations, we can argue that Hesychios was probably able to signify to his sophisticated readers that he was going to stop his historical

narrative and gather, at times, even invent, a deserving history for Constantinople through the use of the genre of *patria*. This section might have served to entertain his audience, as texts were performed in front of an audience in Late Antiquity. Hesychios's audience could have perceived it as fanciful digression. Regardless, first and foremost, the use of the genre of *patria* communicated to Hesychios's readers that he was going to present to them a mythical origin story and that what he presented was a particular form of remembered past, a mixture of myth and facts, fashioned as foundational history, whereby the reality expands to include myths. Not necessarily realistic or fictional, but real enough for Hesychios's audience, a possible world. Arguably, then, not only do the content and narrative strategies present in the text but also the choice of genre revealed Hesychios's goal of endowing Constantinople with an organic connection with the mythical landscape on which it resided, that of Byzantion.

In his account, Hesychios makes his readers step through a looking glass. At the first event level of his narrative, that of the foundation stories, he presents to his readers a world of mythological happenings and inventions produced out of accounts that had already rendered the information fragmentary and preselected. Overall, the real historical happenings lose their importance as the information gets filtered by Hesychios, a man with a penchant for weaving a tale filled with the extraordinary and the divine. Hesychios continuously downplays the importance of significant human actions, their causes, and effects in favor of the magical and mythical explanations and legends. By using testimonial and organizational shifters, Hesychios debunks alternative human-led foundation stories. Through these shifters, Hesychios implicitly invites the readers to compare the competing human-led and mythological versions of events. However, he ultimately provides the conclusive

version of the events, which he deems to be more plausible. In reality, it is the most mythical version. However, this was already signified to his readers by Hesychios's choice of genre.

At the second event level of his narrative, Hesychios invents a hero's journey and an accompanying narrative for Byzas, which would make him worthy of being the founder of a great city, not only in name and pedigree but also in terms of his deeds. Whereas earlier sources that have reached our times do not explore the possibility of Byzas taking further actions to found a city with infrastructure, Hesychios seems to create an entire lifespan with invented milestone events for Byzas. Ironically, the plausibility and verisimilitude of this invented narrative stem from its reliance on stock elements of mythological narratives and epics within the horizon of expectations of Hesychios's readers. While the highlights of Byzas's life are only loosely connected in a structure of causal relationship, they are bound by the development arch of an epic hero. Byzas is born to mythological parents, he gets called into the unknown where he vanquishes a beast, makes sacrifices to gods, founds a city, gets supernatural help, fights the barbarians, and has a strong wife who also rescues the city from the barbarians. Ultimately, Hesychios utilizes what Keith Jenkins calls the capacity of the narrative "to give shape to time and place" to historical events, which would otherwise be the enumeration of one event after another.[526] We can argue that the fact that the event itself is legendary forces Hesychios to utilize a higher degree of creativity to form a meaningful narrative. Furthermore, Hesychios's mythological emplotment binds his work to a certain "ideology"[527] that Constantinople was built on a landscape that was deeply

[526] Jenkins, *Re-thinking History*, 16.
[527] Ideology of a work can be defined as "a set of prescriptions for taking a position in the present world of social praxis and acting upon it (either to change the world or to maintain it in its current state." White, *Metahistory*, 22.

connected to a respectable past. Even if Hesychios has not invented Byzas's narrative, he has chosen to include it in his work and made use of the narrative in the aforementioned manner, which nevertheless perpetuates the same ideology.

In addition, Hesychios embellishes the narrative of Byzas not only through the epic hero story arch but also with conventional paradigms (such as the barbarian vs. the Greek), figures of memory (e.g. Poseidon and Apollo) and motifs (e.g., twins) of Byzantine, Greek, and Roman cultural memory. Regardless, we still cannot conclude which specific past Hesychios would have wanted his readers to espouse. Research has tended to focus on parallels with Roman history rather than connections to Greek mythology. However, as we have seen, we can form strong arguments that rather than forming parallels with Rome, Hesychios had intended to form connections with Greek mythology, especially in the cases of Hekate, Apollo and Poseidon, and Strombos. Hesychios's use of the genre of universal history writing, his use of the genre of *patria* and his use of various classical Greek historiographical schemes point us towards this direction too. However, it could have been the case that he intended his works to have both Roman and Greek connotations, fitting for the hybrid society he was living in. Furthermore, we should keep in mind the horizon of expectation of Hesychios's readers: figures of memory are vulnerable to change with time. They can signify different things to different readers from different times. We should keep in mind that even if Hesychios did not invent motifs, figures of memory, and common themes by himself, he nevertheless chose to include them in his narrative. Regardless, the use of such common themes, figures of memory, and motifs, whether they are invented or found, whether they relate to the Greek or Roman cultural memory, render the past of Byzantion more

pertinent to Hesychios's present which had evolved into an amalgamation of both. It opens up a possibility that Hesychios's city was connected to a Greek past.

In Byzas's epic journey event level, Hesychios continuously attempts to associate the locales and monuments that he ascribes to Byzas in Byzantion with contemporary places in Constantinople. He actively re-inscribes a layer of deep memory to the existing locales and attempts to install a more profound sense of past in the current collective memory. This attempt works in several ways: while installing the present with a more profound sense of meaning and belonging, Hesychios renders the city's past, which he was eagerly creating, more relevant to the present. In short, with the invention of Byzas's narrative, full of common stock figures that makes him relevant to his present readers, and by inserting old non-existent monuments into current locales, Hesychios subtly invades the realm of the present in collective memory and infuses it with micro-doses of his intended version. These are such inventions that do not shock the audience, they are reasonable, believable and possible.

About the monuments and locales of the city, complex questions remain: did Hesychios see them in situ? Did he find the information in his sources, did he encounter them in the contemporary oral memory, or did he invent them? Eventually, whether the presence of these monuments and locales was of a physical nature (that they survived in the time of Hesychios), whether they were only of textual survival (they did not survive, but texts perpetuated their memory) whether they were imaginary impositions on the collective memory by Hesychios himself or other authors become irrelevant in the afterlife of Hesychios's text. His discourse manages to give the reader an illusion of a lingering memory of the mythological Byzantion over the contemporary cultural and physical world of Constantinople. His

aim is to make what is immaterial, i.e., the legends, material, and incorporate them into his environment and into his society's collective memory.

Hesychios's recounting of the acts/monuments/notable events that happened during the reign of various strategoi moves Hesychios's account forward in time from deep mythology to a historical period in a linear fashion. However, this section lacks a clear plot with "dynamic, sequential elements,"[528] as the *strategoi* have stories, with a few characters and actions, yet no causal framework of events. During the reign of the *strategoi*, Hesychios presents his readers with information that has little historical importance. For example, even though Hesychios describes the different regimes that ruled, the readers are never presented with their details. One wonders if Hesychios is not going to elaborate on these regimes, why does he mention them at all? Kaldellis argues that this one yet another attempt to draw parallels between Rome and Byzantion.[529] However, the question of why Hesychios does not narrativize this section as he does Byzas's event level remains. Was this section severely abridged by later redactors? From what survived to our times, it seems that Hesychios did not connect the rules of the *strategoi* in a meaningful way: there are no logical gaps; they were formed as watertight compartments and the brevity appears to be his narrative style. Hesychios seems simply not interested in giving further information.

We can safely speculate that Hesychios must have encountered other information about these supposed regimes he enumerates Byzantion to have gone through. For example, Histiaeus of Miletos, Pausanias the Spartan, and Clearchus the Spartan, who had the chance to control the Bosporus at one time or another, were

[528] Rigney, "Narrativity and Historical," 592.
[529] Kaldellis, "The Works and Days of Hesychios," 396.

commonly blamed by contemporary sources to be "tyrants:"[530]. In fact, sources refer to almost every powerful individual who controlled the Bosporos during the fourth and fifth centuries as a "tyrant."[531] Even though Hesychios mentions tyranny as one of the regimes that Byzantion went through : he never mentions these individuals or any other significant regional powers such as Sparta, Persians, or Athens. Likewise, Hesychios does not mention Byzantion enjoying territorial expansion and dominance in the Hellenistic era and reaching the height of its power in the third century BC.[532] Furthermore, some of the *strategoi* that Hesychios mentions are only ever mentioned in his account, which is quite suspicious. The only noteworthy historical element that Hesychios briefly mentions is the siege of Philip II. Notwithstanding, it is also connected to a legend about the city. The question remains: why doesn't Hesychios mention noteworthy historical characters and events if we can safely presume that he was acquainted with them? Why does he invent (most likely) some of the *strategoi*, but does not narrativize their roles, especially when he had already invented a narrative for the founding figure, Byzas, about whom scarcely anything is known?

The answers lie in the role narrative has in the production of meaning in historical discourses. Roland Barthes asserts that narrative "ceaselessly substitutes meaning for the straightforward copy of events recounted"[533] Following this, White concludes that the absence or refusal of narrative would signify an absence or refusal of meaning itself.[534] This could imply that Hesychios was deliberately refraining from forming a meaningful narrative for the reigns of the *strategoi*. Hesychios quite ostensibly from the very beginning was interested in revealing by whom Byzantion

[530] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 56-65.
[531] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 65.
[532] Russell, *Byzantium and the Bosporus*, 65.
[533] Quoted in, White, *The Content of the Form*, 2
[534] White, *The Content of the Form*, 2.

was first settled and how it came to be from the beginning: thus, he was only interested in creating a *patria* for Constantinople that fit the conventions of the genre. A narrative structure that would give a sense of purpose for the history and the reality of Byzantion after its foundation was not needed for Constantinople. Only the foundation of Byzantion and stories of a couple of artifacts and legends were enough for Hesychios.

Likewise, the depiction of Septimius Severus and Constantine the Great does not signify phenomenal eras in Hesychios's narrative. We have argued that indeed, these eras resemble the reigns of the other *strategoi* that came before them. This observation draws attention to the fact that Hesychios was not interested in the present/prescribed greatness of Constantinople, which he presented as a fact. Instead, he was interested in presenting a story of uniform a past with connections to the present. Furthermore, we have argued that he does not use specific Christian elements in order to not diverge from the possible world and *patria* that Hesychios created.

Let us go back to the beginning of this chapter. Why was Hesychios interested in composing a *patria* in the midst of a historical account? We implied that the switch to the genre of *patria* would indicate to his readers that he would present them a different sort of information full of inventions and legends. We have argued in chapter two that the emergence of late antique *patria*, could be explained by the way they serve the needs of their contemporary present. By authorial decisions to include a certain type of information in his text (e.g. about Phidaleia) and his supposed inventions, Hesychios appears to be interested in creating a "present

past,"[535] meaning that he was filtering his sources selectively through the lens of his present interest: connecting Byzantion to Constantinople.[536] In this quest, Hesychios creates "a possible world"[537] that was more closely related to historical fiction than a historical narrative in which Byzantion's Greek past is intertwined with Constantinople.

What sets historical fiction apart from a historical narrative and pure fiction? Why do we call Hesychios's literary creation a possible world, why is it more fitting to a late antique literary production, than to other genres? While historical narratives are also constructs of authors, they intend to represent what the authors believe "really happened" in the actual world.[538] On the other hand, historical fiction has more freedom: while abiding by the limits of known historical facts and outcomes, it commingles these with authors' inventions.[539] Literary works that indeed deviate from reality, i.e., a version in which Rome gets conquered by Aliens rather than Gauls, can be called historical fantasy. Hesychios does not indulge in creating a fantasy world, as Byzantium's fantastical elements were considered as ancient history by his textual community. Blurring fiction, history, and collective memory

[535] Robinson defines "present past" as "an anachronistic narrative world, whose model of reality depends on the 'cognitive asymmetry' between present inquiry and past experience." Robinson, *Narrating the Past*, x.
[536] Robinson, *Narrating the Past*, 5.
[537] The concept of "possible worlds" was developed by early twentieth century philosophers inspired by Leibniz's philosophy to solve problems in formal semantics and modal logic. It gained considerable attention around the sixties with the seminal article of Saul Kripke, entitled, "Semantical Considerations on Modal Logic," published in 1963. In this article, Kripke formulates that there is a "K" set of elements made out of possible worlds. G is the actual world, a privileged member of the set with the relationship R to other possible worlds within K, which are not actualized. See, Ryan, "Possible Worlds," 528. Starting in the seventies, literary theorists such as Eco, Pavel, Doležel, and Ryan adapted this concept to literary theory to explain various issues regarding fictionality, such as the truth-value in fiction and horizon of possibilities in a fictional world. See, Ryan, "Possible Worlds," 528. Doležel in his seminal article "Possible Worlds of Fiction and History" defines possible worlds in fiction as follows, "Fictional worlds are possible worlds in that they are ensembles of nonactualized possible particulars persons, states, events, and so on. Hamlet is not a man to be found in the actual world; he is a possible person inhabiting an alternative world, the fictional world of Shakespeare's play." Doležel, "Possible Worlds," 787-788.
[538] Robinson, *Narrating the Past*, 29.
[539] Robinson, *Narrating the Past*, 29.

together, Hesychios creates what can be called "a possible world" [540] that is not entirely historical, fantastic, alternative, or completely fictional. We can conclude that the narrative is not entirely historical as Hesychios, whether he believes in the myths of ancient history or not, was likely aware of when Apollonios of Tyana lived, and regardless inserts him in his narrative. In the same vein, his possible world resembles historical fiction but is not fiction in its entirety, for surely its main characters and events (although they may only exist in legends) exist in the actual world for Hesychios and his readers. Furthermore, his account is not entirely fictional, as producing a fictional account was not Hesychios's aim: Hesychios, for the most part, stays in the boundaries of historical data as it was available to him while he was set on inventing a mythological *patria* for a political entity (Constantinople) that did not have an organic cultural memory connected to its landscape (Byzantion.) As stated in chapter one, history or *patria* authors are creative agents. Even though the flexible nature of Byzantine historiography was more open to mixing fact and fiction than our modern understanding of history writing, *patria* was a more suitable and malleable genre for Hesychios's purposes.

Are Hesychios's texts comprised of truth or his inventions? Doležel states that fictional texts are outside truth-valuations. [541] He gives the following example "It makes no sense to ask whether Gustav Flaubert was telling the truth or lied when he made his Emma Bovary die by poisoning herself. There was no world, no life, no death of Emma Bovary prior to Flaubert's authenticating act."[542] On the contrary, it makes a difference if Hesychios lies about, for example, the death of Byzas. Therefore, his text is not outside of truth-valuations and not entirely fictional.

[540] Doležel, "Possible Worlds," 790.
[541] Doležel, "Possible Worlds," 790.
[542] Doležel, "Possible Worlds," 790.

Nevertheless, because what Hesychios creates is a possible world with fictional elements, there are some aspects of the narrative, such as the life of Byzas, that are probably not true. However, these elements, such as supplying Byzas with a narrative, do not pose problems to the truth-valuation of the text as long as the text stays in the parameters of facts and outcomes. After all, historical narrative as exemplified by Hayden White's numerous works, also supplies historical events with a narrative. Nevertheless, Hesychios bends the truth. At times, he might even be guilty of creating alternative facts in his possible world. (Such as the appearance of Apollonios of Tyana.) Nevertheless, his aim is not to create a fictional world: his aim is to create a possible one that could be taken as the past of the actual world. To make this aim an actuality, he uses elements that install his text with verisimilitude such as established figures of memory, common themes, and motifs and narrative arts.

In chapter one, we have discussed that the mythological content of the late antique *patria* in an increasingly Christian environment can be seen as a way of negotiating with the past and aligning it with the current present. However, we have also discussed that the use of the mythological past can be seen as a way of resisting change in a subversive literary fashion in Assmann's terms, by promoting contrapresent memories. As we have demonstrated, we cannot argue for the religion of Hesychios. Nevertheless, from the structure of Hesychios's account, Hesychios's use of the past appears more of as a form of negotiation. His aim is to connect the present landscape of Constantinople with a deeper sense of history, be that real or mythological and to give the illusion that it was real. Hesychios works like a lego master, striving to find the best place for various snippets of information, in the possible world that he strives to create.

However, could Hesychios's possible world be part of an attempt to preserve the contrapresent memories of the past at a point of cultural rupture? For example, Kaldellis argues for the existence of a "dissident circle" amongst possible intellectual contemporaries of Hesychios.[543] We know that a myriad of *patria* were produced in Late Antiquity that have not reached our times. (On Constantinople we can note the *Patria* of Christodoros and Stephanos of Byzantion, both mentioned earlier.) All these other works could have been attempts to preserve contrapresent memories at a time of immense change. They could have had different agendas than Hesychios's work. However, the small fragment of Hesychios's work that we have analyzed does not seem to have a subversive or nostalgic tone that could make us argue for such intellectually dissident actions. Marion Kruse's point about the importance given to councils is worth exploring;[544] however, we do not have Hesychios's texts to explore it further. In this sense, Hesychios's goals do not appear to be ideological, as the text has survived to us. Fitting to the *Patria*'s genre, his goals appear to be intimately connected establishing a sense of continuity with the landscape. Earlier in chapter one, we have argued that it is possible to conceive of *patria* as a method of codifying memory by absorbing the oral cultural memory of myths into texts; Hesychios's narrative appears to be along these lines.

All of the above are the conclusions this thesis draws from Hesychios's text. It is certainly not all that Hesychios's text is about, neither is it the absolute truth regarding the text. In summary, the second chapter of this thesis offered alternative ways to reconceptualize the concept of genre and the genre of *patria* in modern scholarship based on memory studies. The third chapter analyzed both Byzantine (Photios and the *Souda*) and modern reconstructions (Treadgold and Kaldellis) of

[543] Kaldellis, "Dissident Circles," 1-17.
[544] Kruse, *The Politics*, 52.

Hesychios's *Patria*, their methodology, and the veracity of their conclusions. Throughout this thesis, but especially in chapter three, we have argued that while it is possible to make educated inferences through the use of textual and material evidence, singular conclusions are untenable. The fourth chapter has taken a look into the source of Hesychios's text, *Anaplous Bosporou* to understand how Hesychios reformatted one of his source materials. The fifth chapter analyzed the narrative structure of Hesychios's *Patria,* his use of emplotment, figures of memory and places of memory. The final chapter has concluded that irrespective of his religion, which we cannot know, Hesychios was concerned with creating a literary possible world that ensured a continuum with Byzantion and Constantinople.

The reasons as to why Hesychios was concerned with creating a literary possible world that connected Byzantion and Constantinople were not investigated in this thesis. In chapter one, we discussed that myths could provide authors with cognitive narrative templates to recount past events.[545] This certainly seems to be the case for Hesychios as he uses an epic hero narrative to narrativize the acts of Byzas. We have argued that *patria* could serve as mythomotors for a society and constructors of collective identity, which seems to apply for Hesychios as he tries to fashion a past for Constantinople.[546] We have observed that Hesychios makes use of places of memory to form this connection, as we have discussed, we could conceive *patria* as collection of places of memory.[547] Altogether we have argued that Hesychios was infiltrating the collective of memory of his present and instilling it with a possible world of his past. Since Hesychios's *Patria* is quite fragmentary and his account of history has not survived in its entirety, such an inquiry would require

[545] See section 2.4.1 of this thesis.
[546] See sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of this thesis.
[547] See section 2.4.5 of this thesis.

us to look into the greater social and political developments of the era, as well as the other literary worlds from the textual products of his textual community. There is a single lived past, one actual world (as far as we know), yet many experiences of it and many works born out of these individual experiences. Even when authors are aspiring to be truthful, they all use common themes, literary motifs, figures of memory, and recognizable narrative structures to create narratives that are appealing to their readers. Thus, a study of the possible worlds of Hesychios's textual community would entail finding endless historical narratives, historical fictions, and finally possible worlds (including the ones that we create as readers) and can only give us a vague idea about the shared experiences of their textual community and our textual community. However, such an endeavor would not be futile. We should not be hindered by what Keith Jenkins calls "hapless relativism."[548] Rethinking the existing schemes of thought is freeing and deconstructing the ossified views is fruitful in creating more sophisticated ways to approach texts. This thesis has tried to produce these alternatives without falling into the convenient pitfall of staying within the established norms.

[548] Jenkins, *Re-thinking History*, 30

REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

Patriographic literature

The *Patria* of Constantinople according to Hesychios Illoustrios. (2013). In A. Berger (Trans.), *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: The Patria* (pp. 3-45). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hesychios of Miletos. (1901). The *Patria* of Constantinople. In T. Preger (Ed.), *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum* (pp. 1-18). Leipzig: Teubner.

Hesychios of Miletos. (2007). The *Patria* of Constantinople. In "Hesychios of Miletos (390)" (A. Kaldellis, Trans.). In I. Worthington (Ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby*, published online at doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a390. :Brill.

Anaplous Bosporou

Dionysios of Byzantion. (1958). *Anaplous Bosporou*. In R. Güngerich (Ed.), *Dionysii Byzantii Anaplus Bospori una cum scholiis x saeculi*, Berlin: Weidmann.

The *Souda*

*Suidae Lexicon (*A. Adler, Ed.; 5 vols) (1928-1938). Stuttgart: Teubner.

The *Bibliotheca*

Photios. (1959-1991). *Bibliotheque* (R. Henry, Ed.; 9 vols). Paris: Les Belle lettres.

Photios. (1977). (W. Treadgold Trans.) The preface of the "Bibliotheca" of Photios: Text, translation, and commentary. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, *31*, 343-349.

Other Primary Sources

Aristotle. (2007). *Aristotle on memory and recollection: Text, translation, interpretation, and reception in western scholasticism* (D. Bloch, Trans.; Electronic ed.). Leiden: Brill.

Cassius Dio. (1955). *Dio's Roman History* (E. Cary & H. B. Foster, Trans.; Vols. IX Books 71-80.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Diodorus Siculus. (1933). *Library of History* (C. H. Oldfather, Trans.; Vols. I: Books 1-2.34.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hermógenes. (1999). *On types of style* (C. W. Wooten, Trans.; Electronic ed.). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Hesiod. (2006). *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia* (G. W. Most, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Malalas, J. (1986). *The chronicle of John Malalas* (E. Jeffreys, M. Jeffreys, & R. Scott, Trans.). Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Photios. (1958). *The homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople: English translation, introduction and commentary* (C. A. Mango, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Prokopios. (1914). *History of the wars* (H.B. Dewing, Trans.; Vols. I: Books 1-2. (Persian War)). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stephanos of Byzantion. (2006). *Stephani Byzantii ethnica* (M. Billerbeck, J. F. Gaertner, B. Wyss, & C. Zubler, Eds.; Vol. 1). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Zosimos. (1982). *New history* (R. T. Ridley, Trans.). Canberra: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Zosimos. (1971-1989). *Histoire nouvelle*. (F. Paschoud, Ed.; 3 vols). Paris: Belles Lettres.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Afinogenov, D. Y. (1998). Comments. *Symbolae Osloenses*, *73*(1), 22-60.

Anca, D. (2008, May 13). Dionysius of Byzantium. In *Encyclopaedia of the Hellenic world, Constantinople*. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from <http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=10954>

Agapitos, P. (2012). Late antique or early Byzantine? The shifting beginnings of Byzantine literature. *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere, 146*, 1-36.

Agapitos, P. (2015). Contesting conceptual boundaries: Byzantine literature and its history. *Interfaces: A Journal of Medieval European Literatures, 1*, 62-91.

Armstrong, J. A. (1982). *Nations before nationalism*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Assmann, J. (1995). Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique*, (*65)*, 125-133.

Assmann, J. (2012). *Cultural memory and early civilization: Writing, remembrance, and political imagination*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Baldwin, B. (1991). Hesychios. In A. Kazhdan (Ed.), *The Oxford dictionary of Byzantium* (Vol. 2, p. 924). New York: Oxford University Press.

Barnes, T. D. (2014). *Constantine: Dynasty, religion and power in the later Roman Empire*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Barthes, R. (1986). The discourse of history. In *The rustle of language* (pp. 127-140). New York, NY: Hill and Wang.

Bassett, S. (2006). *The urban image of late antique Constantinople.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bawarshi, A. S., & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy* (Electronic ed.). West Lafayette: IN: Parlor Press and The WAC Clearinghouse.

Berger, A. (1987*). Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos* [Doctoral dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin]. Heidelberg historic literature – digitized. https://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/berger1988

Berger, A. (Ed.). (2013). *Accounts of medieval Constantinople: The Patria*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boyer, P., & Wertsch, J. (2009). How do we build shared collective memories?. In P. Boyer & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), *Memory in mind and culture* (pp. 113-115). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bourbouhakis, M. (2017). Byzantine literary criticism and the classical heritage. In A. Kaldellis & N. Siniossoglou (Eds.), *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium* (pp. 113-128). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, A. (2005). *Procopius and the sixth century*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cameron, A. (2016). Paganism in sixth-century Byzantium. In A. Cameron (Author), *Wandering poets and other essays on late Greek literature and philosophy* (pp. 255-286). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cameron, A. (2016). Poetry and literary culture in Late Antiquity. In A. Cameron (Author), *Wandering poets and other essays on late Greek literature and philosophy* (pp. 163-184). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cameron, A., & Herrin, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Constantinople in the early eight century: The Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai. Introduction, translation and commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

Carruthers, M. J. (2008). *The book of memory: A study of memory in medieval culture* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Casey, E. S. (2000). *Remembering: A phenomenological study* (2nd ed.). Bloomington,IN: Indiana University Press.

Clarke, K. (2008). *Making time for the past: Local history and the polis*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Croke, B. (2006). Tradition and originality in Photius' historical reading. In J. Burke, U. Betka, & R. Scott (Eds.), *Byzantine narrative: Papers in honour of Roger Scott* (pp. 59-70). Leiden: Brill.

Croke, B. (2017). The early development of Byzantine chronicles. In E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, & R. Scott (Eds.), *Studies in John Malalas* (pp. 27-38). Leiden: Brill.

Croke, B. (2018). Hesychius Illustris. In O. Nicholson (Ed.), *The Oxford dictionary of Late Antiquity* (p. 716). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cuddon, J. A. (1999). *The Penguin dictionary of literary terms and literary theory* (4th ed.). London, UK : Penguin Books.

Dagron, G. (1984). *Constantinople imaginaire : études sur le recueil des 'Patria'*. Paris : Presses universitaires de France.

Dzielska, M. (1986). *Apollonius of Tyana in legend and history* (P. Pieńkowski, Trans. ; Vol. 10). Roma : L'Erma di Bretschneider.

De Bruyn, F. (1993). Genre criticism. In I. R. Makaryk (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of contemporary literary theory: Approaches, scholars, terms* (Reprint ed., pp. 79-84). University of Toronto Press.

Derrida, J. (1980). The law of genre. *Critical Inquiry, 7*(1), 55-81.

Dihle, A. (1994). *Greek and Latin literature of the Roman Empire: From Augustus to Justinian*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Doležel, L. (1998). Possible worlds of fiction and history. *New Literary History, 29(4)*, 785-809.

Drews, R. (1965). Assyria in classical universal histories. *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte*, *14*(2), 129-142.

Duff, D. (2010). *Modern genre theory* (Electronic Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Edwards, C. M. (1986). The running maiden from Eleusis and the early classical image of Hekate. *American Journal of Archaeology*, *90*(3), 307-318.

Efthymiadis, S. (2017). Questions and answers. In A. Kaldellis & N. Siniossoglou (Eds.), *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium* (pp. 47-62). Cambridge,UK: Cambridge University Press.

Eisenstadt, S. N., Giesen, B. (1995). The construction of collective identity. *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes De Sociologie / Europäisches Archiv Für Soziologie*, *36*(1), 72-102.

Erll, A. (2008). Literature, film, and the mediality of cultural memory. In A. Erll, A. Nünning, & S. B. Young (Eds.), *Cultural memory studies: An international and interdisciplinary handbook* (pp. 389-398). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Focanti, L. (2018). *The fragments of late antique patria* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Ghent]. https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/8563612

Foucault, M. (2002). *Archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. S. Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fowler, A. (1982). *Kinds of literature: An introduction to the theory of genres and modes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gwynn, D. M. (2018). The religious world of John Malalas. In T. Shawcross & I. Toth (Eds.), *Reading in the Byzantine Empire and beyond* (pp. 237-254). Cambridge.UK: Cambridge University Press.

Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory* (L. A. Coser, Trans.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Halbwachs, M. (1980). *The collective memory* (F. J. Ditter, Jr & V. Y. Ditter Trans.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Hoffmann, L. M. (2016). Patria Constantinoupoleos. In G. Dunphy & C. Bratu (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of the medieval chronicle*. Brill. Retrieved July 5, 2020, from http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2213-2139_emc_SIM_001225

Holmes, C. (2010). Byzantine political culture and compilation literature in the tenth and eleventh centuries: Some preliminary inquiries. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, *64*, 55-80.

Huyssen, A. (2003). *Present pasts: Urban palimpsests and the politics of memory*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

James, L. (1996). "Pray not to fall into temptation and be on your guard": Pagan statues in Christian Constantinople. *Gesta*, *35*(1), 12-20. https://doi.org/10.2307/767223

Jauss, H. R. (1970). Literary history as a challenge to literary theory. *New Literary History*, *2*(1), 7-37.

Jauss, H. R. (1982). Theory of genres and medieval literature. In T. Bahti (Trans.), *Toward an aesthetic of reception* (pp. 76-109). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Jeffreys, E. (2017). Chronological structures in the chronicle. In E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, & R. Scott (Eds.), *Studies in John Malalas* (pp. 111-166). Leiden: Brill.

Jenkins, K. (2004). *Re-thinking history* (Electronic ed.). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Jones, C. P. (2006). Apollonius of Tyana in Late Antiquity. In S. F. Johnson (Ed.), *Greek literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, didacticism, classicism* (pp. 49-66). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Kaldellis, A. (2004). Identifying dissident circles in sixth-century Byzantium: The friendship of Prokopios and Ioannes Lydos. *Florilegium*, *17*, 1-17.

Kaldellis, A. (2004). *Procopius of Caesarea: Tyranny, history, and philosophy at the end of Antiquity*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kaldellis, A. (2005). The works and days of Hesychios the Illoustrios of Miletos. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, *45*, 381-403.

Kaldellis, Anthony, "Hesychios of Miletos (390)", In I. Worthington (Ed.), *Brill's New Jacoby*. BRILL. Retrieved July 4, 2020, from http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a390.

Kaldellis, A. (2015). *Byzantine readings of ancient historians: Texts in translation, with introductions and notes*. London; New York, NY: Routledge.

Kaldellis, A. (2015). *The Byzantine Republic: People and power in New Rome*. Cambridge: MA. Harvard University Pres.

Kaldellis, A. (2019). Constantinople's belated hegemony. In P. Van Nuffelen (Ed.), *Historiography and space in Late Antiquity* (Kindle Edition ed.). Cambridge,UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kazhdan, A. (1991a). Encyclopedism. In A. Kazhdan (Ed.), *The Oxford dictionary of Byzantium* (Vol. 1, pp. 696-697). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kazhdan, A. (1991b). Patria. In A. Kazhdan (Ed.), *The Oxford dictionary of Byzantium* (Vol. 3, p. 1598). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Kazhdan, A. P. (1999). *A history of Byzantine literature: (850-1000)* (C. Angelidi, Ed.). Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Byzantine Research.

Kent, T. (1986). *Interpretation and genre: The role of generic perception in the study of narrative texts*. London, UK: Bucknell University Press.

Kirk, A. (2005). Social and cultural memory. In A. Kirk (Ed.), *Memory, tradition, and text: Uses of the past in early Christianity* (pp. 1-24). Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Kruse, M. (2019). *The politics of Roman memory: From the fall of the Western Empire to the age of Justinian*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kustas, G. L. (1962). The literary criticism of Photius. *Hellenika*, *17*, 132-169.

Larsen, S. F. (1988). Remembering without experiencing: Memory for reported events. In U. Neisser & E. Winograd (Eds.), *Remembering reconsidered: Ecological and traditional approaches to the study of memory* (pp. 326-355). New York, NY : Cambridge University Press.

Lemerle, P. (1971). *Le premier humanisme byzantin ; Notes et remarques sur enseignement et culture à Byzance des origines au 10e siècle*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Lemerle, P. (1986). *Byzantine humanism: The first phase notes and remarks on education and culture in Byzantium from its origins to the 10th century* (H. Lindsay & A. Moffatt, Trans.). Canberra : Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Lemon, M. C. (2003). *Philosophy of history* (Electronic ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lewis, B. (1975). *History: Remembered, recovered, invented*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mango, C. (1963). Antique statuary and the Byzantine beholder. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, *17*, 53-75.

Mango, C. (1972). The construction of St. Sophia: A semi legendary account. In *The art of the Byzantine Empire, 312-1453: Sources and documents* (pp. 6-102). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Magdalino, P. (2007). *Studies on the history and topography of Byzantine Constantinople*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Magdalino, P. (2013). Byzantine encyclopaedism of the ninth and tenth centuries. In J. Konig & G. Wolf (Eds.), *Encyclopaedism from antiquity to the renaissance* (pp. 219-231). Cambridge University Press. Doi:10.1017/CBO9781139814683

Markopoulos, A. (2006). Roman antiquarianism: Aspects of the Roman past in the middle Byzantine period (9th-11th centuries). In E. Jeffreys (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 21st international congress of Byzantine studies* (pp. 277-297). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Mendels, D. (1981). The five empires: A note on a propagandistic topos. *The American Journal of Philology*, *102*(3), 330-337.

Mendels, D. (1986). Greek and Roman history in the *Bibliotheca* of Photius – A note. *Byzantion*, *56*, 196-206.

Moffatt, A. (2017). A record of public buildings and monuments. In E. Jeffreys, B. Croke, & R. Scott (Eds.), *Studies in John Malalas* (pp. 87-110). Leiden: Brill.

Momigliano, A. (1994). Daniel and the Greek theory of imperial succession. In A. Momigliano (Author), S. Berti (Ed.), & M. Masella-Gayley (Trans.), *Essays on ancient and modern Judaism* (pp. 29-35). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Mullett, M. (1992). The madness of genre. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, *46*, 233-243.

Munslow, A. (2000). *The Routledge companion to historical studies* (Electronic ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Nardo, D. (2002). *The Greenhaven encyclopedia of Greek and Roman mythology* (B. S. Spaeth, Ed.). Detroit, MI: Greenhaven Press.

Németh, A. (2018). *The Excerpta Constantiniana and the Byzantine appropriation of the past*. Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Nilsson, I. (2009). Desire and god have always been around, in life and romance alike. In I. Nilsson (Ed.), *Plotting with Eros: Essays on the poetics of love and the erotics of reading* (pp. 235-260). Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen.

Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, *26*, 7-24.

Nora, P., & Kritzman, L. D. (Eds.). (1996). *Realms of memory* (A. Goldhammer, Trans.). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Odorico, P. (1990). La cultura della ΣΥΛΛΟΓΗ. 1) il cosiddetto enciclopedismo bizantino. 2)Le tavole de sapere di giovanni damascene. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, *83*(1), 1-21.

Papaioannou, S. (2010). The aesthetics of history: From Theophanes to Eustathios. In R. Macrides (Ed.), *History as literature in Byzantium: Papers from the fortieth spring symposium of Byzantine studies, University of Birmingham, April 2007* (pp. 3-21). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Purcell, N. (2015, December 22). periploi, 'voyages around'. In *Oxford classical dictionary*. Retrieved July 20, 2020, from https://oxfordre.com/classics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.001.0001/acrefore-9780199381135-e-487

Ryan, M. (1992). Possible worlds in recent literary theory. *Style*, *26*(4), 528-553.

Rigney, A. (1991). Narrativity and historical representation. *Poetics Today*, *12*(3), 591-605.

Robinson, A. (2011). *Narrating the past: Historiography, memory and the contemporary novel*. (Electronic ed.) Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rollinger, R. (2017). Assyria in classical sources. In E. Frahm (Ed.), *A companion to Assyria.* (Electronic ed., pp. 570-582) Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Roman, L., & Román, M. (2010). *Encyclopedia of Greek and Roman mythology.* (Electronic ed.) New York, NY: Facts On File.

Ronconni, F. (2013). The patriarch and the Assyrians: New evidence for the date of Photios' library. *Segno e Testo*, *11*, 387-397.

Russell, T. (2016). *Byzantium and the Bosporus: A historical study, from the seventh century BC until the foundation of Constantinople*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Stephenson, P. (2010). *Constantine: Roman emperor, Christian victor*. New York, NY: The Overlook Press.

Stock, B. (1983). *The implications of literacy written language and models of interpretation in eleventh and twelfth centuries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Stock, B. (1990). Textual communities: Judaism, Christianity, and the definitional problem. In B. Stock (Author), *Listening for the text: On the uses of the past* (pp. 140-158). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Struck, P. (n.d.). Io. In P. Struck (Author), Classics UPenn. Retrieved July 22, 2020, from http://www.classics.upenn.edu/myth/php/tools/dictionary.php

Treadgold, W. T. (1977). The preface of the "Bibliotheca" of Photius: Text, translation, and commentary. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 31, 343-349.

Treadgold, W. (1980). *The nature of the Bibliotheca of Photios*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies.

Treadgold, W. (2007). The Byzantine world histories of John Malalas and Eustathius of Epiphania. *The International History Review*, *29*(4), 709-745.

Treadgold, W. (2007). *The early Byzantine historians*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Treadgold, W. (2013). *The middle Byzantine historians* (Electronic ed.). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Trizio, M. (2017). Reading and commenting on Aristotle. In A. Kaldellis & N. Siniossoglou (Eds.), *The Cambridge intellectual history of Byzantium* (pp. 397-413). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Dam, R. (2004). 'Constantine's beautiful city': The symbolic value of Constantinople. *Antiquité tardive*, *22*, 83-94.

Van Nuffelen, P. (2017). The wor(l)ds of Procopius. In C. Lillington-Martin & E. Turquois (Eds.), *Procopius of Caesarea. Literary and historical interpretations* (pp. 40-54). New York, NY: Routledge.

Van Nuffelen, P. (Ed.). (2019). *Historiography and space in late antiquity* (Kindle Edition ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. (2008). A clash of deep memories. *Profession*, 46-53.

Wertsch, J. (2008). Collective memory and narrative templates. *Social Research, 75*(1), 133-156.

Wertsch, J. (2008). The narrative organization of collective memory. *Ethos, 36*, 120-135.

Wertsch, J. (2009). Collective memory. In P. Boyer & J. Wertsch (Eds.), *Memory in mind and culture* (Electronic ed., pp. 117-137). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Whitby, M., & Roberts, M. (2018). Epic poetry. In S. McGill & E. J. Watts (Eds.), *A companion to late antique literature* (Electronic ed., pp. 221-240). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley- Blackwell.

White, H. (1975). *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

White, H. (1990). *The content of the form: Narrative discourse and historical representation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wilson, N. (1968). The composition of Photius' *Bibliotheca*. *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies, 9*, 451-455.

Wiseman, T. P. (1995). *Remus: A Roman myth*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wooten, C. W. (Ed.). (1999). *On types of style* (Electronic ed.). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Zerubavel, Y. (2007). *Recovered roots: Collective memory and the making of Israeli national tradition*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.