

DEAN SAKEL

## Another User of the lost Source of Scutariotes

**Abstract:** The present article sets out the case for identifying the extension to the chronicle of the Logothete in Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 as being derived from the largely lost Byzantine world chronicle traditionally known to have acted as a source for the chronicles of Zonaras and Scutariotes. The identification results in a better appreciation of the lost work but also of Scutariotes himself, who is shown, yet again, not to have used its text as fully as has usually been assumed. It also points to the possibility of largely reconstructing the lost chronicle, especially in the light of the chronicle compilation present in Cod. Atheniensis Benaki 58.

For the section of his work from Creation up to the reign of the Byzantine emperor Alexius I Comnenus (1081–1118), the late thirteenth-century chronicler Scutariotes is known to have reproduced a now mostly lost world chronicle that covered around similar historical margins.<sup>1</sup> The initial sections of this source (up to the beginnings of Rome) have been preserved in the margins (which evidently date from the fourteenth century) of the eleventh-century Cod. Patmiacus *μονὴ Ἰωάννου Θεολόγου* 132, as I suggested elsewhere, and as can now be confirmed given the content of Cod. Atheniensis Benaki 58.<sup>2</sup> This last manuscript, which dates from the early fifteenth century, contains a world chronicle from Creation till the accession of the emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143–1180) that has been drawn from no fewer than four Byzantine chronicles, one of which was the ‘lost source of Scutariotes’.<sup>3</sup> In this compilation, the lost source has largely been used at specific points, selectively yet piece-meal, without intermingling with other works, and this allows for immediate conclusions to be drawn about its precise nature, as well as Scutariotes’ use of it.<sup>4</sup> Other known users of this lost

<sup>1</sup> E. PATZIG, Über einige Quellen des Zonaras. *BZ* 5 (1896) 24–53. Patzig suggested that the relevant portion of Scutariotes is in fact drawn from two lost works rather than one, which is not borne out by the evidence of Cod. Patmiacus *Μονὴ Ἰωάννου Θεολόγου* 132 (on which see following footnote). For Scutariotes’ work: C. N. SATHAS, *Bibliotheca Graeca Medii Aevi*. Venice – Paris 1894 (reprint Athens 1972) VII 3–556 (hereafter Scutariotes). For some recent work on Scutariotes, see most notably: R. TOCCI, Der unsichtbare Kaiser. Zum Bild Iustinianos’ I. bei Theodoros Skutariotes, in: *Realia Byzantina*, ed. S. Kotzabassi – G. Mavromatis (*Byzantinisches Archiv* 22). Berlin – New York 2009, 283–292 (with references to recently published items on the subject). It ought nonetheless be pointed out that things here credited to Scutariotes in fact apply to the lost source. Apart from using it in his standard chronicle, Scutariotes also made an outline of it, evidently as part of his preparations for the world chronicle. This is the so-called *Χρονικὰ Παρεκβάλαια*, present in Cod. Vaticanus graecus 1889, a chronicle from Creation up to Alexius I, anonymous yet in Scutariotes’ very hand, and still to be published. Cod. Vaticanus graecus 1889 dates from around 1270–1280 and therefore not much earlier than Scutariotes’ authorship of his chronicle (after 1283). See R. TOCCI, Zu Genese und Kompositionsvorgang der *Σύνοψις χρονική* des Theodoros Skutariotes. *BZ* 98 (2005) 551–568, at 552, 556. Also IDEM, Bemerkungen zur Hand des Theodoros Skutariotes. *BZ* 99 (2006) 127–144, at 128, 133–135. The *Χρονικὰ Παρεκβάλαια* have long been recognized to contain points of similarity with Scutariotes. See G. MORAVCSIK, *Byzantinoturcica*. Die byzantinischen Quellen der Geschichte der Türkvölker (*BBA* 10). Berlin <sup>2</sup>1958, 234. In spite of its distinct nature, we find it being listed, absurdly, as a manuscript of Scutariotes’ standard chronicle in K. ZAFEIRIS, The Issue of the Authorship of the Synopsis Chronike and Theodore Skoutariotes. *REB* 69 (2010) 253–263, at 255.

<sup>2</sup> D. SAKEL, Cod. Patmiacus graecus 132 and the Chronicle of Scutariotes, in: *Atti del X Simposio di Efeso su San Giovanni Apostolo*, ed. L. Padovese. Rome 2005, 313–326.

<sup>3</sup> D. SAKEL, Further Testimony on the ‘Lost Source of Scutariotes’, in: *International Conference on Classical and Byzantine Literature ‘Literary Crossroads’*. Abstracts. Brno 2010, 55. On the manuscript, see: Eurydike LAPPAS-ZIZIKA and Matoula RIZOU-KOULOPOULOU, *Κατάλογος Ἑλληνικῶν Χειρογράφων τοῦ Μουσείου Μπενάκη (10ος–16ος αἰώνας)*. Athens 1991, 110–112. The manuscript had previously been classed as Cod. Musée Benaki Fonds des Échangeables 131. Prior to that, whilst at the Greek College of Adrianople, it bore the number 100, and according to an even earlier cataloguing, the number 911.

<sup>4</sup> The lost source has been reproduced principally, though by no means exclusively at two separate points along the length of the chronicle. One is for much of Roman history, and culminates with the reign of Constantine I. The other is for later Byzantine history beginning with much of the reign of Theophilus and virtually all of that of Michael III, but especially the period from Romanos I onwards. The dependence will be discussed in detail in a forthcoming study.

work include the twelfth-century Byzantine chroniclers John Zonaras and Michael Glycas, but these writers are known to have made a complicated use of their source material, the lost chronicle being only one of many used, so they are not of immediate value in reconstructing the lost work.<sup>5</sup>

In this paper we shall deal with one further user of Scutariotes' lost source, where this work has been used in uncontaminated form, as occurs in Scutariotes and portions of Cod. Benaki 58.

Cod. Venetus Marcianus graecus 608 dates from around the 1430s, as has been securely established on the basis of watermarks.<sup>6</sup> Its principal content consists of a form of the tenth-century Byzantine world chronicle of Symeon the Logothete. This is a work which in its original form (so-called Redaction A) covers the period from Creation to the death in 948 of the Byzantine emperor Romanus I Lecapenus (which actually took place within the reign of his son-in-law and successor Constantine VII). In Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 however the chronicle begins only with the accession of Julius Caesar, yet it proceeds up to and including the reign of Michael VII Parapinaces (1071–1078). The extension, present on folios 273r–284r, begins however only with the accession of John I Tzimisces, there being a gap for much of the reign of the emperor Constantine VII, as well as all of the subsequent reigns of Romanus II and Nicephorus I Phocas. Before this gap, we encounter the text of the original Logothete, which breaks off in mid-sentence while announcing the death of Romanus I.

The extension was first published by de Muralt in his edition of the ninth-century world chronicle of George the Monk, and this was reprinted some years later in the more accessible *Patrologia Graeca*.<sup>7</sup> Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 was presented here as part of the sub-text to a supplement of George's chronicle that de Muralt had reproduced from an anonymous world chronicle present in Cod. Parisinus Bibliothèque Nationale graecus 1708. Some decades later, Praechter classed both Cod. Parisinus graecus 1708 and Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 as manuscripts of the anonymous late-Byzantine chronicle that was in time to become better known as the *Historia Imperatorum*.<sup>8</sup> It is indeed immediately evident that Cod. Parisinus graecus 1708 contains this anonymous work, to which however Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 bears no relation, though Praechter was inclined to see the latter as another, albeit highly divergent variant of the same text.<sup>9</sup> In this he was influenced both by the content of de Muralt's edition of George the Monk, as well as by a note from his colleague E. Patzig (then actively researching Scutariotes' lost source), about a supposed correspondence between this extension and some other, better representative of the *Historia Imperatorum*.<sup>10</sup> Despite the passage of more than a century since then, Praechter's pioneering study on the

<sup>5</sup> Zonaras' use of the lost source constituted Patzig's basis of comparison with Scutariotes. Glycas' use of the lost work had been suggested by Patzig, albeit only in passing (*op. cit.*, p. 51); it was later confirmed and partly detailed in Soultana MAUROMATI-KATSOUGIANOPOULOU, *Ἡ Χρονογραφία τοῦ Μιχαὴλ Γλυκά καὶ οἱ πηγές της (περίοδος 100 π.Χ.–1118 μ.Χ.)*. Thessalonica 1984, 294–331. Neither work has been studied to an extent that would allow for secure evaluation of their debt the lost source. For the works of Zonaras and Glycas see respectively (though long outdated): *Epitome historiarum*, ed. L. DINDORF, 6 vols. Leipzig 1868–75; *Annales*, ed. I. BEKKER. Bonn 1836.

<sup>6</sup> On the manuscript, see E. MIONI, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum. Codices Graeci Manuscripti 2*. Venice 1986, 534–535. Also, especially in terms of the manuscript's content of the Logothete, see: Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae *Chronicon*, ed. S. WAHLGREN (*CFHB* 44). Berlin – New York 2006, 33\*–34\*.

<sup>7</sup> E. DE MURALT, *Georgii monachi, dicti Hamartoli, Chronicon ab orbe condito ad annum p. Chr. 842 et a diversis scriptoribus usque ad annum 1143 continuatum*. St. Petersburg 1859. *PG* 110, 1211–1248; for the section from the Paris manuscript, with the text of Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 in footnotes (except for a section within the main body of material derived from Cod. Parisinus graecus 1708, namely paragraphs 4 and 5 of the chapter on Constantine X Ducas; at column 1237). We ought note here that the published text is not a faithful representation linguistically of the content of the manuscript.

<sup>8</sup> K. PRAECHTER, *Eine vulgärgriechische Paraphrase der Chronik des Konstantinos Manasses*. *BZ* 4 (1895) 272–313. For something more recent on the *Historia Imperatorum*, see footnote 11.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, in particular 300, 306 and 307.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibidem* 274.

Historia Imperatorum remains basically unsuperceded, leading to an ongoing presumed association of Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 with the Historia Imperatorum.<sup>11</sup>

By sad coincidence, Praechter's study on the Historia Imperatorum dates from just about the same time as the appearance in print of Scutariotes' chronicle (namely 1895 and 1894 respectively). By further misfortune, Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 has remained unexamined in the light of the published Scutariotes ever since. A comparison shows a very close similarity between the two, though the relevant section of Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 contains less extensive coverage of the period it deals with, while it is more wordy than Scutariotes for what it actually contains. Apart from this relationship, the extension only proceeds up to the reign of Michael VII, whereas Scutariotes extends almost two centuries later, up to the year 1261. Given now that Cod. Patmiacus 132 shows Scutariotes to have abbreviated his source, while the lost work stretched to a point closer to the end of Cod. Marcianus graecus 608, one would suspect that this manuscript may in fact represent usage of the later sections of the lost source rather than of Scutariotes himself.

It is at this point that Cod. Benaki 58 turns out to be of real interest, as it chronicles the eleventh century in a way that at times corresponds almost exactly with Cod. Marcianus graecus 608, though less so with Scutariotes. Below I reproduce two cases of text common to all three works that demonstrate this relationship. Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 has been reproduced from the *Patrologia Graeca*, while the text of Cod. Musée Benaki 58 has been edited slightly to meet basic publication standards.

Marc. gr. 608: <i>Patrologia Graeca</i> 110, 1224, n. 34.	Benaki 58 f. 205v	Scutariotes p. 160, 10–13
Συνείχето πάθει τινὶ λαθραίῳ· ὑφ' οὗ πολλάκις ἐνεργουμένος κατὰ γῆς ἄφωνος ἔρριπτο, καὶ νεκρῶ δι' ὅλης μιᾶς ὥρας ἔκειτο ἕως αὐτὸν καταλιπόντος τοῦ συμπνίγοντος δεινοῦ, εἰς τὴν προτέραν ἐπαν- έρχεται αἴσθησιν	συνείχето δὲ πάθει τινὶ χα- λεπῶ ὀλεθρίῳ· ὑφ' οὗ πολλάκις ἐνεργούμενος, ὑπὸ γῆς ἄφωνος ἔρριπτετο. καὶ νεκρῶ ἐώκει δι' ὅλης μιᾶς ὥρας ἔκειτο. ἕως αὐτὸν καταλιπόντος τοῦ συμπνίγοντος δεινοῦ, εἰς τὴν προτέραν ἐπαν- ήρχετο αἴσθησιν.	Συνείχето δὲ πάθει τινὶ λαθραίῳ· ὑφ' οὗ πολλάκις ἐνεργούμενος, κατὰ γῆς ἄφωνος ἔρριπτο. καὶ νεκρῶ ἐώκει ἕως ὥρας μιᾶς ἔκειτο, καὶ πάλιν  εἰς τὴν προτέραν ἐπα- νήρχετο συναίσθησιν

Marc.gr.608: <i>Patrologia Graeca</i> 110, 1225, n. 35.	Benaki 58 f. 206r	Scutariotes p. 161, 11–15
οὗ δὴ γεγονότος, ὁ βασι- λεὺς καὶ τοῦ χαλεποῦ ἐκείνου πάθους ἐπισυχνάζοντος, ἐξατενίσας καὶ πρὸς μετάνοιαν καὶ τὸ μοναχικὸν σχῆμα	οὗ δὴ γεγονότος· ὁ βασι- λεὺς τῷ χαλεπῷ ἐκείνῳ πάθει ἐπισυχναζόμενος, ἐξ- ατονήσας καὶ πρὸς μετάνοιαν· καὶ τὸ μοναχικὸν σχῆμα	Οὗ δὴ γεγονότος, ὁ βασι- λεὺς ἤδη καὶ τῷ χαλεπῷ πάθει ἐπισυχνάζοντι ἐξ- ατονήσας, καὶ πρὸς μετάνοιαν καὶ τὸ μοναχικὸν σχῆμα

<sup>11</sup> For a critical recent statement on the value of the work, its manuscript tradition as well as previous literature, see D. SAKEL, Review of 'Anonymi, Historia Imperatorum, Parte Prima, Introduzione, testo critico, versione italiana, note e indici a cura di Francesca Iadevaia. EDAS, Messina 2000'. *BZ* 102 (2009) 242–245.

<p>ἐρωτικῶς ἔχων ἀεὶ, εἰς τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ κτισθέν μοναστήριον τοῦ Κοσμιδίου κατέρχεται, καὶ αἴφνης ἀποκείρεται, καὶ ὀλίγον ἐπιβιούς, πρὸς ὃν ἠγάπησε Θεὸν ἐξεδήμησεν ὁ ἀοίδιμος, καὶ χοροῖς ἀγγέλων συναριθμεῖται</p>	<p>ἐρωτικῶς ἔχων ἀεὶ· εἰς τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ κτισθέντι μοναστήριον τοῦ κοσμιδίου, κατέρχεται· καὶ αἴφνης ἀποκείρεται· καὶ ὀλίγον ἐπιβιούς πρὸς ὃν ἠγάπα θεὸν, ἐκδημεῖ ὁ ἀοίδιμος· καὶ χοροῖς ἀγγέλων συναριθμεῖται</p>	<p>ἐρωτικῶς ἔχων ἀεὶ, εἰς τὸ παρ' αὐτοῦ κτισθέν τοῦ Κοσμιδίου μοναστήριον ἀπέρχεται· καὶ αἴφνης ἀποκείρεται· καὶ ὀλίγον ἐπιβιώσας πρὸς ὃν ἠγάπησε θεὸν ἐκδημεῖ</p>
---	---	--

The comparison shows that Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 and Cod. Benaki 58 bear the same relationship to Scutariotes that Cod. Patmiacus 132 has elsewhere been shown to have to the lost source, namely a slightly fuller case of the same text. Accordingly the value of Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 is clear. In spite of its limited use of the source text, it represents one more case of testimony for a now largely lost work, one which seems however to have been relatively widespread in times past given its frequent use by chroniclers from the twelfth century onwards.

Further comparisons lead to other important conclusions. Specifically in the light of Cod. Benaki 58, Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 demonstrates that material present in Scutariotes yet absent from this manuscript was indeed present in the lost source, and was not added by Scutariotes from elsewhere. There are two cases in point here, both accounts on patriarchal history, both for the fourth year of the reigns of the emperors Constantine X and Michael VII respectively.<sup>12</sup> Here, as in the comparison above, the extension of Cod. Marcianus graecus 608, being slightly different, contains the more original form of the text than what is preserved in Scutariotes.<sup>13</sup> The two cases moreover constitute ready proof that the lost source itself and not the Benaki chronicle was the source of the extension in Cod. Marcianus graecus 608.

We have noted a gap in coverage in Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 between the text of the Logothete and the reign of John I. This is on account of the absence of four folios from this manuscript; their presence in Cod. Parisinus Bibliothèque Nationale graecus supplementum 1092 (folios 23–26) has only recently been identified and they remain unpublished.<sup>14</sup> The text here begins with the final clause of the original Logothete that announces the death of Romanus, and continues with a standard extension of the same chronicle (so-called Redaction B) further into the reign of Constantine VII. When the text of the Logothete concludes by the second of these four folios, there follows use of the lost source for the reigns of Romanus II and Nicephorus II Phocas. As with the sections published by de Muralt, this portion is of real value in helping us to reconstruct the largely lost source.

<sup>12</sup> Cod. Marcianus graecus 608: *PG* 110, 1237, 1248, n. 17. Scutariotes 165, 168.

<sup>13</sup> *PG* 110, 1237: Τούτῳ τῷ δ' ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας θνήσκει ὁ πατριάρχης Κωνσταντίνος, καὶ ἐχίρευσεν ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ἄνευ ποιμένος μῆνας ε'. Scutariotes 165: Τούτου τῷ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας θνήσκει ὁ πατριάρχης Κωνσταντίνος, καὶ ἐχίρευσεν ὁ θρόνος ποιμένος μῆνας πέντε. *PG* 110, 1248, n. 17: Τῷ δὲ δ' ἔτει τῆς τοῦ Μιχαὴλ βασιλείας θνήσκει ὁ ὀσιώτατος πατριάρχης Ἰωάννης, καὶ θάπτεται ἐν περατικῇ μονῇ τῇ καλουμένῃ Ἀγγοῦρίᾳ, καὶ χειροτονεῖται πατριάρχης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Κοσμάς, ἀνὴρ γηραιὸς καὶ τίμιος καὶ ἐπισκόπευσεν ἔτη ε' καὶ μῆνας θ'. Scutariotes 168: Τῷ δὲ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας Μιχαὴλ θνήσκει ὁ ὀσιώτατος πατριάρχης Ἰωάννης καὶ θάπτεται ἐν τῇ Περαιτικῇ μονῇ τοῦ Ἀγγοῦρίου κατὰ τὸ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς μέρος τῷ ἀναπλέοντι τὸν καλούμενον Στενὸν πορθμὸν, καὶ χειροτονεῖται Κοσμάς, ἀνὴρ γηραιὸς καὶ τίμιος, καὶ ἐπεσκόπησεν ἔτη πέντε καὶ μῆνας θ'. In the latter case one notices Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 abbreviating its source.

<sup>14</sup> Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon 39\*. On the manuscript, see: Ch. ASTRUC and M.-L. CONCASTY, Bibliothèque Nationale. Département des Manuscrits. Catalogue des Manuscrits Grecs. Troisième Partie. Le Supplément Grec. 3. Paris 1960, 218–221.

One can speculate here on the possible date of supplement of the Logothete chronicle with material from the lost chronicle. Indeed, it has been established that Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 contains a form of the Logothete drawn either directly, or through some now lost intermediary, from the early fourteenth-century Cod. Vindobonensis Historicus graecus 37.<sup>15</sup> Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 of course dates from the 1430s, so its additions from the lost source date from no earlier than the intervening century. Whether these portions were added on the occasion of writing Cod. Marcianus graecus 608, or whether a parent manuscript of the latter also existed, remains an open question, though one may point to the lack of corrections in Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 suggesting the latter.

We have noted that the chronicle in Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 concludes with the reign of Michael VII. However, it is clear that the lost source concluded *with* the reign of Alexius I. This is evident from a combined reading of Scutariotes and Cod. Benaki 58 at this specific point (as I shall specify elsewhere), as well as the evidence of Cod. Patmiacus 132, the title of whose chronicle shows that it was meant to proceed up to the reign of Alexius I.<sup>16</sup> Why the borrowings in Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 cease before this point is suggested by the concluding sentence of the extension, which reads:

Ἐπὶ τούτου ὁ σύμπας κόσμος σχεδὸν κατασχεθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν  
ἀθέων τούρκων ἠφάνισται, καὶ ἔρημος οἰκητόρων ἀπεκατέστη<sup>17</sup>

In Scutariotes and Cod. Benaki 58, this sentence introduces the Byzantine collapse in Asia Minor in the late eleventh century and leads, especially in Scutariotes (as the Benaki manuscript concludes with the accession of Manuel I), to fuller coverage of history from the reign of Nicephorus III onwards.<sup>18</sup> In comparison to the middle Byzantine period when the lost source was written, this phrase must have seemed much more pertinent to describe later Byzantine times given the Turkish successes that had since intervened. It seems possible that the writer of the extension, writing no earlier than the fourteenth century, saw no sense in proceeding any further, and having to concern himself with later history, which he may have been either unable (in terms of sources or abilities) or unwilling to do. Therefore he may have considered this phrase to describe later times sufficiently and left matters at that.

<sup>15</sup> Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon 40\*–41\*. On the manuscript, see: H. HUNGER, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek I. Codices philosophici et philologici (Museion IV 1, Teil 1)*. Vienna 1961, 40.

<sup>16</sup> And there is of course the more immediate evidence from Scutariotes himself in Cod. Vaticanus graecus 1889, which concludes *with* Alexius I. Patzig had stated that the lost source had been authored ‘in the first third of the twelfth century’, but he believed it to come to an end with the reign of Nicephorus III. This was on the basis of its use by Zonaras, who proceeds to cover the reign of Alexius I in a way markedly different from Scutariotes. Tocci gravitates towards accepting the presence of Alexius I’s reign in the source, evidently on account of the identification of Scutariotes’ hand in Cod. Vaticanus graecus 1889, as well as the lack of any known source for the material in Scutariotes on Alexius. See R. TOCCI, *Zu Genese und Kompositionsvorgang der Σύνοψις χρονική des Theodoros Skutariotes*. This observation notwithstanding, appreciation of Scutariotes’ debt to his source is absent. Note especially page 562, where Scutariotes (who is writing in the late thirteenth century) is credited with having personally inspired views of Alexius I (reigned till 1118), which cannot reasonably be those of anyone other than the author of the lost source.

<sup>17</sup> *PG* 110, 1248, n. 17.

<sup>18</sup> Scutariotes. 169: Ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ βασιλέως ὁ σύμπας σχεδὸν κόσμος κατὰ γε γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀθέων βαρβάρων κατασχεθεὶς ἅπας ἠφάνισθη καὶ ἔρημος οἰκητόρων κατέστη. Cod. Musée Benaki 58, f. 209v: ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ βασιλέως, ὁ σύμπας σχεδὸν κόσμος, κατὰ τε γῆν καὶ θάλασσαν, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀθέων τούρκων κατασχεθεὶς, ἅπας ἠφάνισθη καὶ ἔρημος οἰκητόρων ἀπεκατέστη. Again one notices Cod. Marcianus graecus 608 abbreviating its source, the passage following on immediately from the second case in footnote 13. Scutariotes gives the full text, though he writes τούρκων instead of βαρβάρων and ἀπεκατέστη for κατέστη.

This paper has identified a hitherto unknown user of the 'lost source of Scutariotes', as a result of which its special nature has been further appreciated and its importance in terms of the Byzantine chronicle tradition becomes clearer. Further work remains to be done on its traditionally known users, namely Zonaras, Glycas and Scutariotes, none of whom has as yet been appropriately studied. As this article has shown, even more urgent is a study on the useful Cod. Benaki 58 we are working on at present.