

# The *Suda*'s Flavian Erasure

*Paul T. Keyser*

THE *SUDA* is an important, oft-used, and almost unavoidable source for scholars of the history of Greek literature<sup>1</sup>—yet it is well known to be unreliable. When using unreliable sources, it is helpful to know the nature of their unreliability.<sup>2</sup> The *Suda* displays a pervasive and systematic erasure of the Flavians. It is as if nothing happened, and no one wrote, during the 27 years of Flavian rule—or even that those years did not occur.

The *Suda* treats the Flavian era in three peculiar ways: (1) the Flavians are hardly ever used as epochal markers, in contrast to Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Trajan, Hadrian, and even Nerva; moreover, (2) some entries seem to imagine that very little time intervened between Nero and Nerva; and (3) many entries having to do with authors of the Flavian period are oddly curtailed or absent. Given that the *Suda* includes entries

<sup>1</sup> Within, I use these abbreviations in addition to the usual ones: *BNJ* = *Brill's New Jacoby*, ed. I. Worthington (<http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby>); *BNP* = *Brill's New Pauly*, ed. H. Cancik and H. Schneider (Leiden 2002–2010; <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-pauly>); and *EANS* = *Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists*, ed. P. T. Keyser and G. L. Irby-Massie (New York/London 2008). Very useful for this work has been the *Suda On Line*, <http://www.stoa.org/sol/>.

<sup>2</sup> H. Hunger, “Was nicht in der *Suda* steht oder was konnte sich der gebildete Byzantiner des 10./11. Jahrhunderts von einem ‘Konversation Lexikon’ erwarten?” in W. Hörander and E. Trapp (eds.), *Lexicographica Byzantina* (Vienna 1991) 137–153, notes manifold omissions with no pattern: 145 (“aleatorisches Element,” of entries on homonymous people), 147 (“unwillkürlich verzichtete,” of Byzantine daily life), and 151 (“ohne ersichtliche Planung,” of entries on the Quadrivium).

on all three Flavian emperors, and highly praises both Vespasian (β 246, οὔτος τοῖς ἀρίστοις τῶν πώποτε βασιλέων παραβάλλεσθαι ἄξιός ἦν) and Titus (τ 691, ἀνὴρ πᾶν ἀρετῆς συνειληφῶς γένος),<sup>3</sup> it seems very unlikely that (the compilers of) the *Suda* intended the erasure.

### 1. *Erasing a dynasty*

Let us first examine the use of emperors in the first and second centuries CE as epochal markers. The entries in the *Suda* for the Roman emperors are relatively full. Vespasian is praised (β 246, cross-referenced at ο 833), Titus also (τ 691), and Domitian is expectedly condemned (in the peculiar doublet δ 1351+1352). There are even entries for the ephemeral emperors Otho (ο 92) and Vitellius (β 309), though not for Galba.

Many emperors are used as epochal markers for various writers, expressed as γέγονεν *under so-and-so*.<sup>4</sup> First, Tiberius (for whom there are entries: κ 1198, τ 551, and τ 552), who ruled 23 years, is used as an epochal marker 10 times in the *Suda*.<sup>5</sup> Caligula (κ 216, also known as Gaius γ 11+12), who reigned 4 years, serves as an epochal marker 5 times.<sup>6</sup> Claudius (κ 1708), who ruled 13 years, is used as an epochal marker 11 times.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> From the *Historia Chronike* of John of Antioch, *FHG* IV 578 fr.99, 102.

<sup>4</sup> The verb γέγονεν in the *Suda* almost certainly means “was active,” as shown by E. Rohde, “Γέγονε in den Biographica des Suidas,” *RhM* 33 (1878) 161–220, 368, and 34 (1879) 620–622 (rpt. *Kleine Schriften* I [Tübingen/Leipzig 1901] 114–184): (a) the verb refers to birth only for persons who lived before ca. 300 BCE (p.177/131–132); (b) and over 105 cases of 129 refer to the period of activity (p.219/177).

<sup>5</sup> α 735 (Athenodoros of Tarsos); α 3215 (Apion of Oasis); γ 12 (emperor Gaius); δ 1170 (Dionysios the Areopagite); θ 151 (Theodoros of Gadara); κ 1201 (the city Caesarea in Cappadocia); π 664 (Parthenios of Nicaea); π 2127 (Potamon of Mytilene); σ 61 (Sallustius the doctor); and σ 1155=1187 (Strabo).

<sup>6</sup> α 2634 (Anteros); α 3198 (Appian); α 3420 (Apollonios of Tyana); ι 503 (Josephus), and φ 448 (Philo of Alexandria).

<sup>7</sup> α 2634; α 3215; α 3420; β 246 (Vespasian); δ 1118 (Diktys, cf. δ 1117); η 463 (Herakleides of Pontos, Jr.); ν 10 (the Nazirites) ~ χ 523 (the Christians);

Nero (ν 254), who ruled 14 years, serves as a marker 14 times.<sup>8</sup> Even Galba, despite lacking his proper entry, is used as an epochal marker once, α 943 (the Athenian orator Akusilaos).

In the period immediately following the Flavians, likewise, Nerva (ν 252), who ruled less than 2 years, serves 4 times as an epochal marker.<sup>9</sup> Then Trajan (τ 902), who ruled 19 years, is used 17 times as an epochal marker.<sup>10</sup> Hadrian (α 527, based on Cassius Dio, Book 69), who ruled 21 years, serves about 30 times as an epochal marker.<sup>11</sup>

In contrast, Vespasian (ruled 10 years) and Titus (2 years) are each used only once as an epochal marker, and that together: β

---

σ 388 (the Sicarii); φ 448 (Philo); and φ 798 (the phoenix).

<sup>8</sup> α 3420 (Apollonios), β 309 (Vitellius); δ 875 (Didymos); δ 1173 (Dionysios of Alexandria); ε 2004 (Epaphroditos of Chaeroneia); ε 2424 (Epicтетus); ε 3612 (Euodos of Rhodes); η 463 (Herakleides); κ 2098 (L. Annaeus Cornutus); μ 1305 (Musonius Rufus); ο 82 (Otho); σ 965 (Nero's boyfriend Sporos); φ 422 (Philostratos); and φ 447 (Philo of Byblos).

<sup>9</sup> α 1866 (the city Anazarbos); α 3420 (Apollonios); ε 2004 (Epaphroditos); and σ 655 (Scopelianus of Klazomenai).

<sup>10</sup> α 3918 (Aristokles of Pergamon); α 4106 (Archibios son of Ptolemaios); α 4107 (Archigenes of Apamea); α 4409 (Abgar of Edessa) ~ ε 207 (Edessa); δ 23 (Dacia); δ 1173 (Dionysios); δ 1240 (Dio of Prusa); δ 1352 (Domitian); η 545 (Herodes Atticus); λ 683 (Lucian); π 1793 (Plutarch); π 1889 (Polemon of Laodicea); π 3037 (Ptolemaios 'Quail'); ρ 241 (Rufus of Ephesos); σ 851 (Soranos of Ephesos); and φ 4 (Favorinus).

<sup>11</sup> α 3918 (Aristokles); α 3421 (a younger homonym of Apollonios of Tyana); α 3868 (Arrian); α 4203 (Aspasios of Byblos); αι 178 (Aelian of Praeneste); δ 1139+1140 (Diogenianus of Herakleia Pontica); δ 1150 (Diodoros son of Polion); δ 1171 (Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Jr.); δ 1174 (Dionysios of Halikarnassos); ε 3045 (Hermippos of Berytos); ζ 73 (Zenobios); η 545 (Herodes); θ 151 (Theodoros); κ 1165 (Caecilius); κ 1449 (Kephalon of Gergis); λ 670 (Lollianus of Ephesos); μ 204 (Marcellus of Pergamon); μ 215 (Marcus Aurelius); μ 668 (Mesomedes of Crete); ν 375 (Nikanor of Alexandria); ν 518 (Noumenios the orator); π 809 (Paulos of Tyre); π 2166 (Polion of Alexandria); π 3037 (Ptolemaios 'Quail'); σ 11 (Sabinus the sophist); σ 851 (Soranos); φ 4 (Favorinus); φ 447 (Philo); φ 527 (Phlegon of Tralleis); and perhaps ω 189 (Orion of Alexandria, if he differs from ω 188, the much later Orion of Thebes).

200 (on the statue of Hadrian in Jerusalem). Likewise Domitian, who ruled 15 years, is used only once: ι 428 (on Juvenal). There is also the doublet paraphrase of Josephus' autobiography (ι 503+504), which mentions the Flavians—simply because it is a paraphrase of Josephus. In sum, for the 27 years of Flavian rule, there are only three or four chronological references, an average of one every ten years.

Thus, for the 55 years prior to the Flavians, i.e. under Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, and the three brief emperors of 69 CE, there are 41 chronological references in the *Suda*, a little less than one per year. Likewise, for the 42 years following the Flavians, under Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian, there are about 50 such references, well more than one per year. Three of these four Julio-Claudians, and both Trajan and Hadrian, are mentioned in quotations,<sup>12</sup> which do not constitute epochal markers—and likewise Vespasian (β 433, ε 1094) and Domitian (η 174, θ 307) are mentioned in quotations.

## 2. *Erasing three decades*

Secondly, there are six entries that assume that very little time passed after Nero and before Nerva, or even that Nerva followed almost immediately after Nero.

First is α 3420, of Apollonios of Tyana, based on Philostratos' *Life of Apollonios* (perhaps mostly from Book 1), saying that he ἤκμαζε μὲν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου καὶ Γαίου καὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα. That disorders the three Julio-Claudians (Gaius should of course precede Claudius), and erases all the Flavians (the mention of the three Julio-Claudians shows that it was not only the termini of the period that were intended as markers, but each emperor of the whole period). That erasure is peculiar, since Philostratos' *VA* itself includes a scene with Nero (4.35–47), but also: (1) a major scene with Vespasian (5.27–41), (2) a scene with Titus (6.29–34), and (3) a massive and climactic scene with Domitian, in Books 7 and 8. Nerva only appears in

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Tiberius in σ 215, Claudius in φ 142, Nero in ε 395, Trajan in β 430, and Hadrian in π 850.

the same two books as Domitian: see 7.8–11, 20, 32–33, 36.3, and 8.7.31–32 (in Apollonios’ long defense speech intended for Domitian), and 8.27. The *Suda* quotes a mention of Domitian from 8.5 (μ 1262, repeated in Domitian’s second entry δ 1352).

Second is the pair ε 2004, of the grammarian Epaphroditos of Chaeroneia, saying that he ἐν Ῥώμῃ διέπρεψεν ἐπὶ Νέρωνος καὶ μέχρι Νέρβα, καθ’ ὃν χρόνον καὶ Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἡφαιστίωνος, together with π 3037, of the same Ptolemaios, saying that he was τοῦ Ἡφαιστίωνος, γεγονώς ἐπὶ τε Τραϊανοῦ καὶ Ἀδριανοῦ τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων, προσαγορευθεὶς δὲ Χέννος. The *Suda* on Epaphroditos erases the Flavians, and assigns Ptolemaios ‘Quail’ (assuming χέννος is the same as χέννιον) to two distinct eras, Nero and Trajan-Hadrian. The Hephaisstion of Alexandria who ca. 140 CE tutored L. Verus, the future emperor (*HA Verus* 2.5), cannot be Ptolemaios’ father Hephaisstion, but could be Ptolemaios’ son;<sup>13</sup> the tutor is typically identified with the writer on metrics, as in *Suda* η 659. Epaphroditos is securely dated to the second half of the first century CE.<sup>14</sup> It seems likely that Ptolemaios ‘Quail’ was active under the Flavians and Trajan: (a) he dedicates his work to a Tertulla, from a family associated with the Flavians (Suet. *Vesp.* 2, *Titus* 4), and (b) refers to a portrait on display ἐπὶ Οὐεσπασιανοῦ (“in the time of Vespasian”) in the temple of Pax in Rome (Photios *Bibl. cod.* 190, 149b29–33).

Third is ε 2424, of the philosopher Epictetus, saying he was Ἱεραπόλεως τῆς Φρυγίας, φιλόσοφος, δούλος Ἐπαφροδίτου,<sup>15</sup> τῶν σωματοφυλάκων τοῦ βασιλέως Νέρωνος ... καὶ διατείνας μέχρι Μάρκου Ἀντωνίνου. The name Marcus Antoninus in the *Suda* refers to the emperor we normally designate Marcus Aurelius (ruled 161–180).<sup>16</sup> Thus, Epictetus is said to have been

<sup>13</sup> O. Hense, “Hephaisstion (7),” *RE* 8 (1912) 296–309.

<sup>14</sup> B. K. Braswell and M. Billerbeck, *The Grammarian Epaphroditus: Testimonia and Fragments* (Bern/New York 2007) 25–27 and T1 (64–72).

<sup>15</sup> This Epaphroditus, distinct from the grammarian above, was the savior of Nero in 65 CE (Tac. *Ann.* 15.55) and died ca. 95 (Suet. *Dom.* 14).

<sup>16</sup> See the entry on M. Aurelius μ 216, based on Cassius Dio 71.34.2–

active from ca. 65 CE or earlier to ca. 165 or later. The dates of Epictetus are somewhat uncertain;<sup>17</sup> however, we do know that he was: (1) a student of Musonius Rufus, (2) exiled from Rome by Domitian (according to Gellius 15.11.3–5, cf. Suet. *Dom.* 10.3 and Philostr. *VA* 7.4.2), (3) a teacher of Arrian, and (4) known to Hadrian, according to *HA Hadrian* 16.10. Probably, Epictetus died by ca. 130. That is, the *Suda* entry, in dating the death of Epictetus to ca. 160, appears to erase ca. 30 years of history, in particular, the Flavians.

Fourth is Caecilius, one of the *Suda*'s eleven named sources, whose entry, κ 1165, states ῥήτωρ, σοφιστεύσας ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος καὶ ἕως Ἀδριανοῦ.<sup>18</sup> That would mean that he was active from ca. 10 CE or earlier, to ca. 120 CE or later. The *Suda* τ 588 synchronizes Timagenes with Caecilius in the first century BCE,<sup>19</sup> and Dionysios of Halicarnassos *Pomp.* 3.20 (ca. 30 BCE) mentions Caecilius, so his activity in the Augustan era is secured, and the terminus of ca. 120 CE is rendered even more impossible.<sup>20</sup> Apparently, Caecilius (was attested to have) survived until 'after Tiberius', which had become or was understood as 'Tiberius Nero', i.e. the last of the Julio-Claudians, and then owing to the erasure of the Flavians, the *terminus ante* for Caecilius was extended to

35.2. For the same nomenclature of the emperors 'Antoninus' and 'Marcus' in the *Suda* see esp. α 3868 (Arrian); ι 448 (Justin Martyr); κ 1199 (the name 'Caesar'); and μ 205 (Marcellus of Side). Well before the *Suda*, see e.g. John Malalas 11.28. The confusion over the names in π 1970, on Polycarp, is clearly due to the *Suda* copying from two distinct sources (one unidentified and the other Jerome *De vir. ill.* 17), each using distinct nomenclature.

<sup>17</sup> P. P. Fuentes González, *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques* 3 (2000) 106–151, at 112–117.

<sup>18</sup> F. W. Jenkins, *BNJ* 183 T 1.

<sup>19</sup> Jenkins, *BNJ* 183 T2b = J. McInerney and D. W. Roller, *BNJ* 88 T 1.

<sup>20</sup> The extended career here given to Caecilius seemed acceptable to Adam Daub, *Studien zu den Biographika des Suidas* (Freiburg i. B. 1882) 57–60, but Barry Baldwin, "Aspects of the *Suda*," *Byzantion* 76 (2006) 11–31, remarks "even modern tenure does not permit such longevity" (22).

Hadrian.<sup>21</sup>

Fifth is φ 421+422, of two of the Philostratoi: the father is said to have lived in the time of Nero (φ 422, γεγονώς ἐπὶ Νέρωνος), whereas the son is said to have lived in the mid-third century, in the time of Severus and Philip (φ 421, ἐπὶ Σευήρου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἕως Φιλίππου). The prosopography of this family is tangled, but the ‘son’ here is evidently the grandson, author of the *Life of Apollonios*, ca. 220 CE.<sup>22</sup> The Flavians are erased, and further distortion has been somehow introduced: perhaps the (grand-)father had been placed a century or more before the author of the *Life of Apollonios*, i.e. ‘under Trajan and before’, a ‘before’ that was then projected backward to Nero?

Sixth is φ 447, of Philo of Byblos, saying that he lived in the time of Nero and wrote in the time of Hadrian, γέγονεν ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων τῶν ἐγγύς Νέρωνος καὶ παρέτεινεν εἰς μακρόν ... γέγραπται δὲ αὐτῷ ... Περὶ τῆς βασιλείας Ἀδριανοῦ, ἐφ’ οὗ καὶ ἦν ὁ Φίλων; the entry also records that Philo said he was 78 in the 220<sup>th</sup> Olympiad (101–104 CE) when Herennius Severus was consul, which would mean that he was born 23–26 CE.<sup>23</sup> The *Suda* again erases the Flavians, and accords to Philo an extraordinary life span of over 100 years (or even 115, if his work on Hadrian was written, as seems necessary, after Hadrian’s death).<sup>24</sup> Three other testimonia from the *Suda* seem to confirm

<sup>21</sup> For the same or a similar shift, see on Theodoros, below.

<sup>22</sup> G. Anderson, *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.* (London/Dover 1986); E. L. Bowie, “Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality,” *ANRW* II.16.2 (1987) 1652–1699, and “Philostratos (5–8),” *BNP* 11 (2007) 114–120.

<sup>23</sup> A. Kaldellis and C. López-Ruiz, *BNJ* 790 T 1 (who interpret γέγονεν here as ‘was born’) = J. Radicke, *FGrHist* IV.7 1060 T 1 (who argues that the *Suda* computed Philo’s *floruit* as 38 years before the 220<sup>th</sup> Olympiad, i.e., as 63–66 CE, and attaches the age of 78 years to Herennius Severus when he was consul, and then rejects the *Suda*’s account).

<sup>24</sup> Rohde (n.4: 175–177/130–132) addresses the problem of Philo and points out that the age and Olympiad in the *Suda* entry are expressed in numerals (ὅταν ἦγεν ἡ’ καὶ ο’ ἔτος, ὀλυμπιάδι δὲ κ’ καὶ διακοσιοστῆ) that could easily have become corrupted. A. I. Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History*

that Philo was active under Hadrian: ε 3045, Philo's student Hermippos also active under Hadrian; π 809, Paulus of Tyre, a contemporary of Philo, lived (γεγονώς) at the time of Hadrian; and perhaps η 546, Herodian of Alexandria, who lived (γέγονε) under Marcus Aurelius, was younger than Philo (but evidently somehow comparable).<sup>25</sup> Philo of Byblos was likely active as early as Trajan, and the evidence may have stated 'and before', which was then interpreted, due to the erasure of the Flavians, as 'under Nero'.

### 3. *Erasing authors and works*

Thirdly, there are nine or more entries concerning Greek writers from the Flavian era that are oddly curtailed or missing. The sole Flavian author who is by the *Suda* unambiguously dated to the Flavian period is Juvenal: ι 428, οὗτος ἦν ἐπὶ Δομετιανοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων; the entry also records his exile. Other well-known Latin authors of the Flavian era, such as Martial, Pliny, Quintilian, Silius, Statius, and Valerius Flaccus, are absent. Even the Greek authors of the era are ill-served.

First is δ 1240, on Dio of Prusa, son of Pasikrates, the sophist later called 'Golden-Tongued', whose period of activity is given as διέτριψε τὸ πλεῖστον παρὰ Τραιανῶ τῷ Καίσαρι. We know a good deal about the career of Dio, most of which predates Trajan: he reached Rome when Vespasian was emperor, was among those banished by Domitian, and died late in Trajan's reign.<sup>26</sup> Thus the Flavian majority of Dion's career is erased.

Second is Irenaios of Alexandria, one of the *Suda*'s eleven named sources, εἰ 190, with no date. He was a pupil of Heliodoros and is quoted by Erotianus fr.60 (p.116.8 Nachmanson),

*of Philo of Byblos* (Leiden 1981) 32–35, accepts the long life. V. Palmieri, *Herennius Philo: De Diversis Verborum Significationibus* (Naples 1988) 17–22, points out that the date of the suffect consulship of Herennius Severus is known to have been 128, which does not correspond to any of the data in the *Suda*; he concludes that Philo was born ca. 54 (and precisely in 50), and lived into the reign of Hadrian.

<sup>25</sup> Kaldellis and López-Ruiz, *B&M* 790 TT 2a, 2b, 3.

<sup>26</sup> M. Weißenberger, "Dion I.3," *B&M* 4 (2004) 466–468.

so that his period of activity was ca. 55–75 CE.<sup>27</sup> Apparently, the only record of his activity pointed to the era under erasure.

Third is θ 151, Theodoros of Gadara, who διδάσκαλος γεγωνῶς Τιβερίου Καίσαρος (was a teacher of Tiberius), yet whose son Antonius was a senator in the time of Hadrian, ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἀντώνιος συγκλητικὸς ἐγένετο. The *Suda* also records that Theodoros συνεκρίθη περὶ σοφιστικῆς ἀγωνισάμενος Ποτάμωνι καὶ Ἀντιπάτρῳ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ῥώμῃ; in Rome he debated two men, Potamon of Mytilene, also an Augustan orator (π 2127),<sup>28</sup> and Antipater of Damaskos (α 2705).<sup>29</sup> Theodoros was indeed an Augustan figure (Strab. 16.2.29), and taught Tiberius (Suet. *Tib.* 57).<sup>30</sup> Suetonius records that Theodoros said that Tiberius was πηλὸν αἵματι πεφυραμένον, which the *Suda* has transferred to Alexander of Aigai speaking of Nero, α 1128 (and ν 254). Perhaps the displacement of the son of Theodoros by a century occurred because ‘Tiberius’ had become or was understood as ‘Tiberius Nero’, i.e. Nero; then the son of the ‘tutor of Nero’ was placed ‘after Nero’, and with the Flavians erased, that meant Trajan or Hadrian.<sup>31</sup>

Fourth is the doublet on Josephus, ι 503+504: in the first entry (which clearly was included because of *AJ* 18.63–64), the mentions of Vespasian and Titus derive from the second entry, whereas the mention of Domitian is the terminus for the *Jewish Antiquities*. The second entry is a close paraphrase of *BJ* 3.398–408 (where the mentions of Vespasian and Titus are not epochal markers, but simply the names present in the text), on

<sup>27</sup> S. Fornaro, “Eirenaios (1),” *BNP* 4 (2004) 860–861; L. Cohn, “Eirenaios (7),” *RE* 5 (1905) 2120–2124.

<sup>28</sup> *FGrHist* 147; M. Weibenberger, “Potamon,” *BNP* 11 (2007) 701.

<sup>29</sup> M. Weibenberger, “Antipater (11),” *BNP* 1 (2002) 775.

<sup>30</sup> R. Granatelli, *Apollodori Pergameni ac Theodori Gadarei testimonia et fragmenta* (Rome 1991) VI–VII.

<sup>31</sup> For a similar displacement compare Caecilius, above. Cf. also Marwan Rashed, “‘Boue pétrie de sang’,” *Philosophie antique* 3 (2003) 165–172, arguing that the phrase better suits Theodoros’ milieu than Alexander’s.

the capture of Josephus. The *Suda* quotes Josephus well over 200 times.<sup>32</sup> That is, the *Suda* provides a longish pair of entries on an author regarded as important, but gives his period of activity only implicitly through the quotations in the entries, and makes no explicit statement about when 'he lived'. Evidently the compiler(s) of the *Suda* did not know.

Fifth is a pair of obscure Kritons, and an erasure: κ 2453+2454, on the historian Kriton of Pieria, known only from this testimonium,<sup>33</sup> plus Kriton of Naxos, who wrote an *Octaeteris* (an astronomical work on the calendar), apparently cited only by Pliny (*HN* 18.312). In contrast, the *Suda* quotes the historian-and-pharmacist Kriton 5 or 6 times;<sup>34</sup> and 11 further passages cited anonymously are reliably assigned to him.<sup>35</sup> The *Suda* provides no proper entry for this Kriton, offering only an apparently marginal annotation treated as an entry, κ 2452, which says merely: Κρίτων ἔγραψε ἐν τοῖς Γετικοῖς ("Kriton wrote in his *Getika*"), and the entry ρ 241, on Rufus of Ephesos, which synchronizes Kriton with Rufus and Trajan.<sup>36</sup> The reference to him by Martial (11.60.6) shows that Kriton was active in Rome under Domitian.<sup>37</sup> This Kriton was from

<sup>32</sup> Add to the almost 200 citations listed in A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon* V (Leipzig 1938) 89–90, the 35 listed in C. Theodoridis, *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon* II (Berlin/New York 1998) LXXXIII–LXXXVIII.

<sup>33</sup> V. Costa, *BNJ* 277, and contrast T. M. Banchich, *BNJ* 200 (for the inscriptions see *BNJ* 200 F 19).

<sup>34</sup> α 4035, β 388 = ε 1235, γ 208, δ 368, and κ 114 are Banchich, *BNJ* 200 FF 4–8.

<sup>35</sup> I. Russu, "Getica lui Statilius Crito," *StClas* 14 (1972) 111–128, followed by Banchich, *BNJ* 200: see α 2923 (F 9), α 3115 (F 17), ε 426 (F 14), ε 1864 (F 11), ε 1961 (F 12), ε 2038 (F 10), θ 413 (F 15), οι 53 (F 18), υ 181 (F 19), υ 483 (F 13), and υ 503 (F 16).

<sup>36</sup> Banchich, *BNJ* 200 T 4; see below for Rufus, who is likewise displaced.

<sup>37</sup> On the pharmaceutical work of Kriton see C. Fabricius, *Galens Exzerpte aus älteren Pharmakologen* (Berlin/New York 1972) 190–198; J. Scarborough, "Criton, Physician of Trajan: Historian and Pharmacist," in J. W. Eadie and J. Ober (eds.), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian* (Lanham 1985) 387–405.

Herakleia Salbake in Caria,<sup>38</sup> and a doctor from Herakleia ‘Albake’ is mentioned in δ 1140 (the second of a doublet about the grammarian Diogenianus).

Sixth is Musonius Rufus, μ 1305, dated to the time of Nero (γεγονώς ἐπὶ Νέρωνος), and said to be acquainted (γνώριμος) with Apollonios of Tyana.<sup>39</sup> The *Suda* adds a claim that Nero executed Musonius, although in fact he was exiled by Nero (Tac. *Ann.* 15.71, Philostr. *VA* 7.16), and survived well into the Flavian era, meeting Vespasian (Tac. *Hist.* 3.81; Cassius Dio 65.13), and teaching Epictetus.<sup>40</sup>

Seventh is Niketes the sophist, ν 387 (undated), and his student Scopelianus, σ 655, two significant sophists and orators of the Flavian era. Pliny Junior heard Niketes in Rome ca. 79 CE (*Ep.* 6.6.3), and Tacitus (*Dial.* 15.3) says he was the reviver of oratory around that time.<sup>41</sup> Scopelianus was the student of Niketes, active in the time of Nerva (γεγονώς ἐπὶ Νέρβα), a correspondent of Apollonios of Tyana—and sent as an envoy to Domitian.<sup>42</sup> Thus, Niketes preceded Scopelianus, but (like Irenaios, above) has no date—since the Flavian emperors are erased. Moreover, the *Suda* entry for Niketes is something of an after-thought, simply copied from entry α 1002, a lexicographical entry on the word ἀκροθίνια. The *Suda* is in general very interested in men of the ‘second sophistic’ (δεύτερος σοφιστής)<sup>43</sup>—and mentions over a dozen of them.<sup>44</sup> So it is

<sup>38</sup> Scarborough, in *The Craft* 389.

<sup>39</sup> Based apparently on Philostr. *VA* 4.46.

<sup>40</sup> R. Laurenti, “Musonio, maestro di Epitteto,” *ANRW* II.36.3 (1989) 2105–2146.

<sup>41</sup> See also Philostr. *VS* 1.19 (511–512); E. Bowie, “Nicetes (2),” *BNP* 9 (2006) 717: possibly already active under Nero.

<sup>42</sup> Philostr. *VS* 1.21 (514–521), *VA* 6.42; E. Bowie, “Scopelianus,” *BNP* 13 (2008) 101.

<sup>43</sup> A label it uses, φ 421 (on Philostratos), and indeed derived from Philostratos, *VS* 1.19.

<sup>44</sup> For example, Adrianos α 528; Aristeides α 3902; Aristokles α 3918; Aspasios α 4203+4204+4205; Dio δ 1240; Dionysios of Halikarnassos, Jr. δ

most peculiar that the man known for starting the movement, and praised by Greeks and Latins alike, is (nearly) erased.

Eighth is Plutarch, π 1793, γεγονὼς ἐπὶ τῶν Τραιανοῦ τοῦ Καίσαρος χρόνων καὶ ἐπίπροσθεν (“lived in the times of Trajan and before”). None of Plutarch’s activity was as early as the reign of Nero, and he mentions as contemporaries all three Flavians, Vespasian,<sup>45</sup> Titus,<sup>46</sup> and Domitian.<sup>47</sup> Again the Flavians are erased, and thus the Flavian portion of Plutarch’s career is erased.<sup>48</sup>

Ninth is Rufus of Ephesos, ρ 241, who is said to γεγονὼς ἐπὶ Τραιανοῦ σὺν Κρίτωνι (“lived in the time of Trajan, at the same time as Kriton”);<sup>49</sup> on Kriton, see above. Damokrates’ verses on the Egyptian compound *kuphi* (preserved in Galen *Antid.* 2.2 [XIV 117–119 K.]) cite Rufus’ recipe (119, Ῥοῦφος μὲν οὕτω δεῖν ἔφασκε σκευάσαι). Damokrates worked under Vespasian,<sup>50</sup> and so Rufus must have been active already under Vespasian, i.e. by ca. 70 CE.

Three other biographical puzzles provide confirming evidence. There is ι 450, on Justus of Tiberias,<sup>51</sup> the opponent of Josephus, whose date is synchronized only with Josephus, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ συνέγραψεν ὅτε καὶ Ἰώσηπος. That is, the (compilers of the) *Suda* had no emperors whose reigns could be

1171; Herodes η 545; Nikostratos ν 404; Pausanias π 819; Polemon π 1889; Sergius σ 246; Favorinus φ 4.

<sup>45</sup> *Amat.* 24 (770C11), *De soll. An.* 19 (973E–974A), *Publicola* 15.2.

<sup>46</sup> *De tuenda sanit. praec.* 5 (124CD).

<sup>47</sup> *Aetia Rom. Graec.* 50 (276E), *De curios.* 15 (522DE), *Aem.* 25.5–6, *Publicola* 15.3, 5.

<sup>48</sup> C. P. Jones, “Towards a Chronology of Plutarch’s Works,” *JRS* 56 (1966) 61–74, places four works in the Flavian period, from ca. 80 (*Galb.*, *Otho*, *Consol uxor.*, and *Praec. coniug.*), and possibly as many more.

<sup>49</sup> J. Scarborough, *EANS* 720–721.

<sup>50</sup> Plin. *HN* 24.43 (cured the daughter of ‘M. Servilius’, probably Nonianus, *cos.* 35 CE) and 25.87; Damokrates quoting Andromachos in Galen *Compos. Medic. sec. Gen.* 6.12 (XIII 920 K.); S. Vogt, *EANS* 226.

<sup>51</sup> R. Bloch, *BNJ* 734.

used to describe the date of Justus. Then, there is the medical family of Philippos and his son Archigenes, active in the late first century and early second century CE, with the Flavian portions of their careers erased. Archigenes reached the age of 63 and was active in Rome under Trajan: α 4107. The simplest interpretation is that he was not active (i.e., no longer alive) after Trajan, and so must have been born ca. 45 CE—which would very likely mean that he was active under Domitian (or even Vespasian). That seems to be confirmed by references in Juvenal to Archigenes as an exemplary physician.<sup>52</sup> His father Philippos is quoted by Asklepiades the pharmacist (in Galen), and thus must have been active in the Flavian period,<sup>53</sup> and yet receives no entry in the *Suda*. Third, there is the sophist Nikostratos,<sup>54</sup> said at v 404 to be a contemporary of: (a) Aristeides (who was active ca. 145–180), (b) Dio the orator, primarily Flavian (as above), and (c) the emperor “Marcus Antoninus” (as above: M. Aurelius). The inclusion of Dio seems to refer to his dating under Hadrian, displaced from his proper Flavian position.

Note that the chronological displacements in §2 above, and those here in §3, can all be understood as due to the erasure of the Flavians from the record. Six of the seven persons in §2 have either a clear *terminus post* before the Flavians (Apollonios of Tyana; Epaphroditos of Chaeroneia; Epictetus, whose *terminus ante* was evidently not well known; and perhaps Caecilius) or else a clear *terminus ante* after the Flavians (Ptolemaios ‘Quail’ and Philo of Byblos), and their other less-clear terminus is then displaced forward (Apollonios, Epaphroditos, Epictetus, and Caecilius) or else backward (Ptolemaios and Philo). Similarly, the persons in §3 were mostly active during the Flavian period,

<sup>52</sup> Juv. 6.235–236, 13.96–98, 14.252–255; A. Touwaide, *EANS* 160–161.

<sup>53</sup> Galen *Compos.Medic.sec.Loc.* 4 (XIII 88 K.); A. Touwaide, *EANS* 648–649. The reference in Juv. 13.124–125 is likely to this Philip, but the name Philip is far more common than Archigenes.

<sup>54</sup> J. Radicke, *FGrHist* IV.7 1089 T 1; E. Bowie, “Nicostratos (10),” *BNP* 9 (2006) 747–748.

and hence can find no place, or only a partial place, in a chronology that erases the Flavians.

#### 4. *An epitomator of Hesychios wielding an eraser*

There appears to be a distortion, and that can be confirmed by examining briefly the use of the emperors as chronological markers in other Greek texts.<sup>55</sup> If there were no systematic distortion, we would expect the number of times a given emperor's name was used in a chronological marker to be proportional to the length of his rule. The source of a distortion about the Flavians could be a work as early as the second century CE, and might be attested as late as the fifteenth century. A search was made through the TLG over all authors within those centuries,<sup>56</sup> for the following chronological markers, and involving all the emperors from Tiberius through Hadrian:<sup>57</sup> (1) ἐπὶ + NAME;<sup>58</sup> (2) ὑπὸ + NAME; (3) μετὰ + NAME;<sup>59</sup> and (4) μέχρι/ἕως + NAME.<sup>60</sup> Precision in these counts is not possible, given that some passages are repeated verbatim in two or more authors, and that any one of numerous particles might interrupt a phrase, not to mention the difficulty of perfectly eliminating imperial homonyms in the cases of Claudius, Gaius,<sup>61</sup> Tiberius, and Titus. Nevertheless, the proportions will likely be similar even under those variations.

<sup>55</sup> I am indebted to an anonymous referee for suggesting this test.

<sup>56</sup> When the search was made there were 1061 such authors; including the *Suda* itself, which has been eliminated from the counts.

<sup>57</sup> Note: (1) Otho does not appear in any of the phrases searched for; (2) Vitellius appears only once, as Βιτέλλιος; (3) Vespasian appears both as Βεσπασσιανός and as Οὔεσπασσιανός; and (4) Nerva appears both as Νέρβα and as Νέρουας.

<sup>58</sup> Including once ἐπὶ τῶν Οὔεσπασσιανοῦ χρόνων, to which compare the ἐπὶ τῶν Τραιανοῦ χρόνων of π 1793 and ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀδριανοῦ χρόνων of μ 668.

<sup>59</sup> Including twice, in Galen, μετὰ τὸν Ἀδριανόν.

<sup>60</sup> Including μέχρι τῶν NAME χρόνων in eight cases with Trajan and in two with Hadrian.

<sup>61</sup> Gaius is called Καλλιγόλας in ι 503, κ 216, and φ 448, but that name did not appear in the phrases searched.

Table 1: Emperors as Chronological Markers, 2<sup>nd</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> c.

<i>Emperor</i>	<i>Years Reigned</i>	<i>Total (Ratio)</i>	<i>(1) ἐπὶ +</i>	<i>(2) ὑπὸ +</i>	<i>(3) μετὰ +</i>	<i>(4) μέχρι/ ἕως +</i>
Tiberius	23	59 (2.6)	35	18	6	0
Gaius	4	33 (8.2)	12	8	8	5
Claudius	13	37 (2.8)	31	3	3	0
Nero	14	96 (6.9)	39	39	17	1
Galba	(1)	9 (9)	5	1	3	0
Vitellius	(1)	1 (1)	0	1	0	0
Vespasian	10	46 (4.6)	38	7	1	0
Titus	2	20 (10)	9	6	5	0
Vespasian + Titus	12	66 (5.6)	47	13	6	0
Domitian	15	31 (2.1)	11	12	7	1
Nerva	2	10 (5.0)	1	7	2	0
Trajan	19	51 (2.7)	30	11	3	7
Hadrian	21	15 (0.7)	2	1	6	6

The ratio of the number of times a given emperor's name was used in a chronological marker to the length of his rule varies roughly from 2 to 10, with the shorter reigns (Gaius 4 years, Titus 2, and Nerva 2) having the higher ratios. About one-third of the citations of Titus (for ἐπὶ + NAME and for ὑπὸ + NAME) append Vespasian ("... Titus and Vespasian," 4 of

15), and likewise about one-third of the citations of Vespasian (for ἐπὶ + NAME and for ὑπὸ + NAME) append Titus (“... Vespasian and Titus,” 22 of 60). That suggests that they may have been considered together as a single epoch, and as the row ‘Vespasian + Titus’ in Table 1 shows, the combined reign receives mention as a chronological marker in a proportion consistent with a reign of their combined 12 years. Domitian (at a ratio of 2.1) does not greatly differ from Tiberius (at 2.6) or Trajan (at 2.7). The sole outlier appears to be Hadrian, mentioned less often than might be expected.

The Flavian distortion is real—what was its origin? Given the *Suda*'s evident interest in the Flavians (and even appreciation for Vespasian and Titus), as noted above, the *Suda* itself is not likely the source.<sup>62</sup> We expect rather a common source for all of the literary biographies. Scholars have identified that common source as the *Onomatologos* of Hesychios of Miletos (ca. 510–530 CE), in epitome.<sup>63</sup> The *Suda* itself records this source, η 611, Ἡσύχιος Μιλήσιος, υἱὸς Ἡσυχίου δικηγόρου καὶ Φιλοσοφίας, γεγονῶς ἐπὶ Ἀναστασίου βασιλέως. ἔγραψεν Ὀνοματολόγον ἢ Πίνακα τῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ ὀνομαστῶν, οὗ ἐπιτομή ἐστὶ τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον (where the final clause was copied by the *Suda* from the superscription of the work used, evidently an epitome of Hesychios' book).<sup>64</sup> The epitome was composed

<sup>62</sup> No account here is taken of the mid-sixteenth-century forgery (by Konstantinos Palaiokappa) of ‘Eudokia, *Ionia*’, on which see P. Pulch, “Zu Eudocia: Constantinus Palaeocappa, der Verfasser des *Violariums*,” *Hermes* 17 (1882) 177–192; L. Cohn, “Konstantin Palaeokappa und Jakob Diassorinos,” in T. Vogel et al. (eds.), *Philologische Abhandlungen Martin Hertz* (Berlin 1888) 123–143; and Fr.-J. Leroy, “Les énigmes Palaeocappa,” in W. Bal et al. (eds.), *Recueil commémoratif du X<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres* (Louvain/Paris 1968) 191–204.

<sup>63</sup> Franz Tinnefeld, “Hesychius (4),” *BNP* 6 (2005) 288–289; B. Baldwin, “Hesychios,” *ODB* 2 (1991) 924; “Hesychius Illustrius (14),” *PLRE* II (1980) 555. Cf. Photios *Bibl. cod.* 69 (34ab), about Hesychios' *Histories*, in which Book 5 covered Julius Caesar to Constantine: see A. Kaldellis, “The Works and Days of Hesychios the Illustrius of Miletos,” *GRBS* 45 (2005) 381–403.

<sup>64</sup> G. Wentzel, *Die griechische Übersetzung der Viri Illustres des Hieronymus*

in the ninth century,<sup>65</sup> but there may have been multiple revisions and editions, all—like the American *Webster's Dictionary* or the British *Burke's Peerage*—named for the original editor. The *Suda's* use of this work seems to be confirmed by the phrase *συχνοὶ τῶν ὀνομαστῶν ἐν παιδείᾳ* in ε 2004 (synchronizing Epaphoditos of Chaeroneia and Ptolemaios 'Quail'): the collocation of *ἐν παιδείᾳ* with *ὀνομαστ-* is not found elsewhere. The arrangement of Hesychios' *Onomatologos* appears to have been entries ordered by literary category within each letter, as seen wherever the *Suda* provides biographies of several homonyms: the poet, if there is one, always comes first; then the philosopher, if there is one; then the historian; then the sophist; then the grammarian; etc.<sup>66</sup>

Over a century earlier,<sup>67</sup> in his *Bibliotheca*, Photios also used this source tradition, more sparingly.<sup>68</sup> He sometimes errs in his literary biographies, but there is no discernible tendency,<sup>69</sup> so

---

(Leipzig 1895) 2–4; W. T. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (Washington 1980) 53. J. Schamp, *Photios, historien des lettres: la Bibliothèque et ses notices biographiques* (Paris 1987) 53–68, doubts its reality.

<sup>65</sup> Wentzel, *Die griechische Übersetzung* 57 (829–857 CE); A. Adler, *RE* 4A (1932) 675–717, at 706–708; Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca* 31–32, 36 (843–845 CE); and W. Hörandner, "Suda," *Lexikon des Mittelalters* VIII (1997) 281. Wentzel shows that the epitomator added Christian names to what was otherwise apparently a work of purely pagan content, per the *Suda*, which states that there were no entries on Christians; cf. Kaldellis, *GRBS* 45 (2005) 381–403.

<sup>66</sup> Wentzel, *Die griechische Übersetzung* 57–63.

<sup>67</sup> The *Suda* seems to have been completed ca. 1000 CE: Adler, *RE* 4A 679; Hörandner, *Lexikon des Mittelalters* VIII 281, "gegen Ende des 10. Jh."; A. Kazhdan, "Souda," *ODB* III (1991) 1930–1931, "certainly later than mid-10th C., probably ca. 1000"; E. Dickie, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007) 90–91, "late tenth century"; R. Tosi, "Suda," *BNP* 13 (2008) 912–914, perhaps ca. 970; and D. L. Kellogg, "Suda," in *Encyclopedia of Ancient History* (Hoboken/Chichester 2013) 6434–6435, "possibly 969–976 CE." Note that the *Suda* quotes Photios twice, ο 541 and λ 256, cf. Theodoridis, *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon* II XXVIII–XL.

<sup>68</sup> Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca* 31–32, 36, 52–59.

<sup>69</sup> Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca* 67–80.

any distortion visible in Photios is likely to be due to this source. However, Photios reports on relatively few authors of the first century CE, and almost none of those from the Hesychios-epitome.<sup>70</sup> For example, cod. 76 on Josephus, and 33 on Justus of Tiberias (which mentions Vespasian), derive primarily or entirely from Josephus himself.<sup>71</sup> The very full codex on Ptolemaios 'Quail' (190) gives no biography or date at all. Also independent of the Hesychios-epitome are the codices on bishop Clement of Rome (112–113), which appear to be derived from (the Greek translation of) Jerome, *On Famous Men*.<sup>72</sup> Nevertheless, there is one codex on a Flavian-era author that appears to be derived from the Hesychios-epitome, cod. 209 on Dio of Prusa—and it indeed erases the Flavians, assigning Dio solely to the reign of Trajan.<sup>73</sup>

Other biographical sources are mere shadows to us. One such is Helikonios (ca. 395 CE; ε 851),<sup>74</sup> cited twice for biography, on Apion of Oasis (α 3215) and on Arrian (α 3868). In both cases, the author is dated to the reigns of two emperors, with an omitted intermediate emperor ("Tiberius and Claudius," omitting Caligula; "Hadrian and M. Aurelius," omitting Antoninus Pius)—but a full explanation eludes us.<sup>75</sup> In any case, omitting single intermediate emperors could not erase three sequential emperors. The entry on Apion is replete with puzzles, and if Helikonios was a major source for that entry, his

<sup>70</sup> Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca* 177–180, lists by century the authors treated in each codex of the *Bibliotheca*; and 188–189 lists codices derived from the Hesychios-epitome.

<sup>71</sup> Schamp, *Photios* 242–258.

<sup>72</sup> Schamp, *Photios* 281–284.

<sup>73</sup> Schamp, *Photios* 263–270, arguing that the literary judgments are by Photios himself.

<sup>74</sup> Fr. Tinnefeld, "Heliconius," in *BNP* 6 (2005) 70.

<sup>75</sup> G. Wirth, "Helikonios der Sophist," *Historia* 13 (1964) 506–509; in the entry on Arrian, the text is interpolated, reading "Marcus [and] Antoninus."

remark that Apion was a “Cretan,” sc. liar,<sup>76</sup> might suggest caution about Helikonios himself. On the other hand, “Agreophon” is cited (α 3421) for an alleged Hadrianic homonym of the Flavian Apollonios of Tyana.<sup>77</sup> Several other peculiar doublets might be due to Agreophon, such as that on the Trajanic doctor Soranos of Ephesos (σ 851+852), or that on the Hadrianic grammarian Diogenianus of Herakleia (δ 1139+1140), but the creation of doublets does not constitute the erasure of a dynasty. A third possibility is likely a mere ghost, but is hinted at by the extensive and long-lasting commemoration of the sack of Jerusalem in the propaganda of the Flavian dynasty:<sup>78</sup> would a Jewish or Judaizing source have wished to damn the memory of the emperors who destroyed the temple? But there is no other evidence of such a source, unless the Domninus cited by Malalas actually existed and was Jewish (as was perhaps his homonym Domninus of Larissa),<sup>79</sup> and it all seems *a priori* somewhat unlikely.

We might consider the effects of careless epitomizing, but that would not generate a systematic erasure, only random omissions and gaps. Two instructive examples provide such garbles. First is Zosimus, the programmatically pagan historian (ca. 510),<sup>80</sup> whose *New History* is oddly oblivious to contra-

<sup>76</sup> Compare Cynthia Damon, “‘The Mind of an Ass and the Impudence of a Dog’: A Scholar Gone Bad,” in I. Sluiter and R. M. Rosen (eds.), *Kakos: Badness and Anti-Value in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden 2008) 335–364, at 336–340, 355.

<sup>77</sup> The MSS. have the otherwise unattested *Agresphon*, emended to *Agreophon*, a name attested from the 3rd c. BCE: H. Hauben, “Les vacances d’Agréophon (253 av. J.C.),” *ChrEg* 60 (1985) 102–108; J. Radicke, *FGrHist* IV.7 1081 T 1.

<sup>78</sup> Fergus Millar, “Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome,” in J. Edmondson et al. (eds.), *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (Oxford 2005) 101–128.

<sup>79</sup> Active ca. 430–475 CE; compare Bernard, *EANS* 275.

<sup>80</sup> M. Meier, “Zosimus (5),” in *BNP* 15 (2010) 971–973.

dictions in its sources, and introduces doublets.<sup>81</sup> Another is the historian John Malalas (writing ca. 570), whose Books 10 and 11 are chronological by emperor (Augustus to Nerva and then Trajan to M. Aurelius).<sup>82</sup> Augustus is given 56 years of rule, i.e. dating from the death of Julius Caesar; and the ephemeral Vitellius is unaccountably given nine years of rule. Moreover, episodes and persons are doubled, evidently when Malalas mechanically merged his sources.<sup>83</sup> His most important sources are otherwise unknown, and fiction may be suspected in the cases of 'Bottios', 'Brynichios', 'Domninus', 'Nestorianus', and 'Timothy'.<sup>84</sup> However, Malalas does not display any systematic erasure—he mentions only a few, mostly religious, authors. In

<sup>81</sup> L. Mendelssohn, *Zosimi comitis et exadvocati fisci Historia nova* (Leipzig 1887) XLVIII, "Tempora miscet, loca ignorant, res non conexas nectit nexasque diuellit, fabulas miraculaque persequitur ... eandem narrationem paulo aliter conformatam bis proponit"; F. Paschoud, "Zosime et la fin de l'ouvrage historique d'Eunape," *Orpheus* N.S. 6 (1985) 44–61, esp. 58 n.38 (on 3.35.1, muddle about two Prokopii) and 61 "nombre extraordinairement élevé de bourdes grandes et petites [qu'il] contient"; Paschoud, *Zosime: Histoire nouvelle* I (Paris 1971) 236. P. Speck, "Wie dumm darf Zosimos sein? Vorschläge zu seiner Neubewertung," *Byzantinoslavica* 52 (1991) 1–14, esp. 12, defends Zosimos' reliability by hypothesizing that the extant text is a second edition, like that read by Photios (cod. 98 [84b], δοκεῖν δέ μοι καὶ οὗτος δύο ἐκδόσεις, ὡς περ κάκεῖνος πεποιηκέναι· ἀλλὰ τούτου μὲν τὴν προτέραν οὐκ εἶδον· ἐξ ᾧν δὲ ἦν ἀνέγνωμεν ἐπέγραψε νέας ἐκδόσεως συμβαλεῖν ἦν καὶ ἐτέραν αὐτῷ ὡς περ καὶ τῷ Εὐναπίῳ, ἐκδεδόσθαι)—but an unfinished edition, incorporating marginal notes, which somehow eclipsed the published first edition.

<sup>82</sup> E. Jeffreys, "Chronological Structures in the Chronicle," in E. Jeffreys et al. (eds.), *Studies in John Malalas* (Sydney 1990) 111–166, at 139–143.

<sup>83</sup> E. Jeffreys, "Malalas' Sources," in *Studies* 167–216, at 199.

<sup>84</sup> For these sources see Jeffreys, in *Studies* at respectively 174, 175, 178–179, 187, and 195–196; Jeffreys defends their reality. The names Bottios and Brynichios are otherwise unattested. W. T. Treadgold, "The Byzantine World Histories of John Malalas and Eustathius of Epiphania," *International History Review* 29 (2007) 709–745, esp. 722–725 and 728–729, argues that Malalas invented at least nine of his otherwise unattested sources, namely: Bottios, Clement, Domninus, Eutychianus, Membronius, Nestorianus, Philostratos, Theophilus, and Timothy.

Books 10–11, see only: 10.28, Diktys of Crete (under Claudius); 10.32, Simon Magus (under Nero); 10.51, Apollonios of Tyana (under Domitian); 11.19, bishop Markion of Sinope (under Hadrian); and 11.30, Julian the Chaldaean (under M. Aurelius).

The erasure of the Flavians is pervasive and systematic, and thus must be due to a single cause. The simplest hypothesis is that the cause was a single source that erased the Flavians, namely some (lost) epitome of the *Onomatologos* of Hesychios of Miletos, used by the *Suda* (and Photios). Probably Hesychios did not erase the Flavians, and we have no MS. of the epitome-tradition, so we are left to wonder why (or how) some epitomator did so. Whatever was the cause or reason, scholars exploiting the *Suda* should be aware of this systematic erasure of the Flavians. Those sixteen authors discussed here, whose dates actually overlapped the Flavian era,<sup>85</sup> should not be misdated on the basis of the erasure of (the source of) the *Suda*.<sup>86</sup>

August, 2013

Chicago  
rolarenfan@gmail.com

<sup>85</sup> Namely, in alphabetical order: Apollonios of Tyana, the doctor Archigenes, Dio of Prusa, Epaphroditos of Chaeroneia, Epictetus, Irenaios of Alexandria, Kriton of Herakleia, Musonius Rufus, Niketes the Sophist, Philo of Byblos, the elder Philostratos, Plutarch, Ptolemaios ‘Quail’, Rufus of Ephesos, Scopelianus the Sophist, and Theodoros of Gadara.

<sup>86</sup> John Scarborough's remark to me about the *Suda*'s date for Rufus of Ephesos prompted my investigation, and he commented on an earlier draft. Anthony Kaldellis generously provided very useful advice on many aspects of the paper, saving me from a number of errors. To both I am very grateful.